6.2.'04.

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by President Patton.

BX 9941 .H3 1841
Hatfield, Edwin F. 1807-1883.
Universalism as it is

Library of
JOSIAH HATT.
No.

78

UNIVERSALISM AS IT IS;

OR,

TEXT BOOK

OF

MODERN UNIVERSALISM

IN

AMERICA:

BY REV. EDWIN F. HATFIELD.

NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED BY J. A. HOISINGTON,
THEOLOGICAL BOOKSELLER, 156 FULTON STREET,
THIRD DOOR EAST OF BROADWAY.
1841.

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1841, by
EDWIN F. HATFIELD,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, for
the Southern District of New York.

S. W. BENEDICT, PRINTER, 128 FULTON-ST.

PREFACE.

ERROR, to be successfully combated, must be known. A minute acquaintance with the resources of an enemy is indispensable to a prosperous campaign. A mode of attack suited to one position would be utterly unsuitable to one of a different character. Ignorance, in such a case, is defeat.

These remarks apply with peculiar force to the controversy with UNIVERSALISM. A sect has grown up in this land within the memory of those now living, which, with loud professions of charity and universal benevolence, under the above name, arrogates to itself the peculiar distinction of being *the only depositary of religious truth.* Insignificant at first by reason of their entire want of a profound acquaintance with the Scriptures, and the disreputable character of those who became the first converts to the creed, it has now acquired importance by the extent of its prevalence. With a diligence and industry worthy of a better cause, they have insinuated themselves into the confidence of the community in various sections of the country, until they now claim to be regarded as one of the most numerous religious sects in the land. They are, in their own estimation, ('Life of Murray,' p. 272,) "the *fifth*, (if not the *fourth*,) in order, in point of *numbers, respectabiltiy and talent*, among the denominations of the land;—among the greatest reading people in the Union; having no less than nineteen or twenty periodicals, issuing every month at least 100,000 sheets to 25, or 30,000 subscribers, among at least thrice that number of regular readers." "In the southern and western States," they say, "the doctrine is extending its progress faster than preachers can follow to proclaim and defend it; while in the eastern and middle States, ministers, laymen, and even whole societies are embracing this calumniated doctrine, and coming over to its avowal and support."

Such were the pretensions of the sect eight years since. Their statistics for the present year show that they have lost none of "this same confident boasting." They maintain

(' Universalist Companion,' p. 70,) that "during the past year —no less than fifty-nine new laborers have entered into" their "field of labor, of whom nine are converts from the Partialist ministry;—while hundreds, yea, thousands, if not tens of thousands, of the Partialist laity have embraced and avowed the faith of Universalism during the past year." "There are," they say, (p. 71,) "in the United States alone, 1 General Convention, 12 State Conventions, 56 Associations, about 853 Societies, 512 Preachers, and 513 Meeting-houses owned wholly or in part by Universalists. In addition to those in the United States, there are about 15 Societies, 7 Preachers, and 3 or 4 Meeting-houses in the British Provinces."

It is, doubtless, the case that this estimate makes but little allowance for societies that have ceased to be, and are among the things that were. Yet with every deduction that can be made, and that truth demands, it is still quite apparent, that hundreds of enterprising preachers, and a score of editors are constantly engaged in disseminating from the pulpit, through the press, and by every means in their power, their peculiar tenets throughout these United States. Every opportunity is watched and carefully improved to bring themselves into notice. If a paragraph appears in any periodical reflecting, in the least degree, on them or their doctrines, it is made the basis of a labored and spirited defence. If a sermon is preached in defence of the strict eternity of future punishment, it is made the occasion of a course of Essays, or Sermons, in reply. In every possible way discussion is provoked, and the people called out to hear their claims.

To this course they are encouraged to adhere, because in part they are aware that their doctrines are but little understood by their opponents. "There is one advantage," says one of their preachers, (' Magazine and Advocate,' III. 134,) "which Universalists ever have had over their opponents, thought it may not appear so to the multitude. Very few Partialists are there, who are acquainted with what we believe, and *as* we believe it, with the arguments by which we defend, and the proofs we adduce to support our positions. But where will you find a Universalist, who thoroughly understands his own system, and does not, at the same time, understand every nook and corner in the crazy old edifice of Limitarian theology?—Set a Partialist to disproving Universalism, and what murderous work must he make of logic, what perversion of truth, what contradiction of facts! He brings forward passages his own teachers have rejected, lays down positions

which have nought to do with the subject, assumes premises denied by his opponent, and destitute of all proof," and "argues, in his ignorance, the truth of the very position contended for by the Universalist."

It is by no means uncommon for a Universalist preacher to accuse and convict one, whom he regards and treats as an opponent, of being but little acquainted with the peculiarities of the doctrine against which his labors have been directed. The author has seldom heard a sermon against Universalism, that was not based on assumptions, or directed against principles, which no well-informed Universalist at the present day admits. Such discourses, therefore, must not only be powerless, but give an opponent a great advantage in reply.

Orthodox preachers, in order to acquaint themselves with the peculiarities of the sect, have, in too many cases, contented themselves with an examination of the masterly argument of the younger Edwards against Chauncy; or the 'Calvinism Improved' of Dr. Huntington; or the writings of Winchester and Mitchell. Thus informed, they have constructed a most powerful argument, and completely overthrown the strong holds of the early advocates of this peculiar creed; and they wonder that any can hold on to a doctrine so untenable, and be Universalists still. The truth is, that not a Universalist preacher in the land, so far as the author has been able to learn, does hold on to the system thus attacked. These are not their text-books. They that would know what they believe must consult more modern writers, and gather their creed from their most recent publications, and inform themselves thoroughly in regard to the latest discoveries and intrenchments of the sect, or they will labor in vain.

To aid such in this investigation the following work was undertaken. The results of his inquiries were first given to the public by the author, in a series of seventeen Essays, over the signature of "Enoch," through the columns of the New York Evangelist. The volume now presented is a republication of those Essays only in part. The work has subsequently been re-cast, the greater part entirely re-written, and large additions made to the whole. A list of the authorities from which information has been drawn is appended, and great care has been taken to obtain the utmost accuracy in citing their testimony. The books themselves are such as may be found in almost every Universalist library, and are constantly advertised, with three or four exceptions, for sale in their bookstores, as 'Universalist Works.'

It is worthy of remark, that, though the substance of this Treatise has been before the public several months, no reply has been attempted, and all allusion to the series itself, by any of their periodicals, has been most carefully avoided, as far as possible. Ordinarily, as has been remarked, every allusion to the sect is replied to at once, and every such reply copied again and again by their periodicals. In the present case a most ominous silence has pervaded their whole ranks. They have not ventured to deny the truth of the allegations here made, nor can they. On the other hand, when, about a year since, the author presented, from his own pulpit, in the presence of two at least of their ministers, and a large number of the members of one of their societies, the leading features of the system, as they are detailed in this volume, they took occasion to congratulate themselves, and the Universalist public, that for once an orthodox preacher had told the truth. "A zealous sister in the faith who was present" ('Universalist Union,' V. No. 15,) thought him "deserving of *a vote of thanks* for introducing so much Universalism into his desk. We think so too," said the editor of the 'Union,' "and hope he will not be weary in well doing. Let him buckle on his whole armor."

Should a reply be attempted, it will be of no use to say that the statements of the author are not worthy of credit, or that he has not given the sense of the writers to whose language he has referred. Errors of the press may have been overlooked in the revision of so many quotations, but these can hardly affect the general result. These quotations are too numerous, and too evidently speak the same language, to be misunderstood. If any doubt be cherished as to the honesty of the author, the reader is respectfully referred to the books themselves, where he will find vastly more of the same purport, of which what is here given is but a small specimen.

It is hoped that the work will be of service not only to the community at large, but to theological students, and brethren in the ministry, who have but little time or opportunity to accomplish a task, that has proved so unpleasant and often heart-sickening to

THE AUTHOR.

March 4, 1841.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PRIMITIVE UNIVERSALISM.

Rise of the Sect in America—Doctrine of their first Preachers—The original system abandoned—The new scheme and its founder—Transition-state. 13

CHAPTER II.

PREVAILING CREED OF UNIVERSALISM.

Progress in error—Essentially different from all other schemes—Arrogance of wisdom—Not a Christian denomination—Real and nominal Universalists—Formed into a system—Embraced by Universalist preachers generally—The Creed—Peculiar to this age and country. 21

CHAPTER III.

FINAL HAPPINESS OF ALL MANKIND.

Summary of the creed—Denial of every thing heretofore thought sacred—Pretence of being the plain doctrine of the Bible—Final holiness and happiness universal—Does not teach that men will be happy at death—Novel mode of interpretation—Bible a Jewish affair—Credulity. 33

CHAPTER IV.

PENALTY OF SIN.

Penalty of Sin—Once universally supposed to be endless death—This position denied—Final happiness never forfeited by Sin—How regarded by Murray, Chauncy, and Huntington—Views of this penalty expressed by Modern Universalists—Strauge interpretation of 'eternal life'—'Eternal death' not mentioned in the Bible. 46

CHAPTER V.

DENIAL OF NATIVE DEPRAVITY.

Sin not an Infinite evil—Native Depravity denied—The account of the Fall fabulous—Man is by nature as good now as Adam ever was—Origin of Sin—God not the lawgiver, but the mind itself—Sin fulfills the will of God—The mind is not the sinner, but the flesh—God the author of sin—Men not totally depraved. . 61

CHAPTER VI.

NO PUNISHMENT AFTER DEATH.

Is sin punished after death?—Views of Relly, Murray, and Chauncy—Sin punished only in this life—No punishment after death, a novel sentiment, not twenty-five years old—Secession of the Restorationists—Evasion of the question of no punishment after death—Culpable indifference to the question of a future punishment—Appeal to their preachers, and to the people themselves. 76

CHAPTER VII.

SIN CEASES AT DEATH.—DEATH NOT THE FRUIT OF SIN.

New Rule of Faith—No common ground in controversy—Sin ceases at death—Mankind naturally mortal—Yet they interpret most of the threatenings of the Bible, of natural death—Inconsistency—Scripture-account of the matter. . . . 89

CHAPTER VIII.

MAN HAS NO IMMORTAL SOUL.

What becomes of man at death?—Poetic effusions—Mind not immortal—Man has but one nature, and that material and mortal—Mr. Ballou's ignorance—Sketch of Mr. Balfour—His exegetical labors—Man has no immortal soul, exegetically considered—These views generally received—Source of the doctrine—Materialism—Death the great Savior. 101

CHAPTER IX.

NO ESCAPE FROM PUNISHMENT.

Nature of suffering for sin—God all just and inexorable—Sin invariably punished in full—Zeal for God's justice—No remission of punishment by forgiveness—Views of Zophar, David, Ezra, and the pious in our day—Question of Suicide—Denial of its criminality—The mercy of God excluded. . . . 117

CHAPTER X.

SIN ITS OWN PUNISHMENT.

Nature of Punishment—Sin fully punishes itself—Human penalties should be abolished—The Mosaic Law unjust—The more sin, the less punishment—The doctrine a mere hypothesis—Its truth cannot be known. 130

CHAPTER XI.

NO SUCH THING AS PUNISHMENT.

Design of punishment—A carnal scheme—Danger of misapprehending their admissions—What does sin deserve—Denial of all punishment—All suffering for sin is the fruit of God's love, and designed only for the sinner's highest good—Its removal, and not its infliction, a curse—All men the children of God—Mankind not divided into two distinct classes—Fearful language of Scripture. 140

CHAPTER XII.

DENIAL OF THE ATONEMENT.

No salvation from punishment, or deserved sufferings—Christ is not a Savior in this sense—Views of Murray, Winchester, Chauncy, and Huntington, on the Atonement—Christ saves no one from endless misery, or from deserved punishment—Nature of salvation by Christ—The sufferings of Christ have only a moral effect—No vicarious Atonement—No accounting for the Mosaic sacrifices. 154

CHAPTER XIII.

THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST NOT PECULIAR.

No peculiarity in the sufferings of Christ—Atonement the work not of Christ, but of the sinner—Christ suffered not as much as many others; and in the same sense as his apostles did—The nature of his sufferings the same with theirs—He saved the world, just as the American revolutionary fathers saved their country—Agreement with Thomas Paine—Christ only saves men from deserving punishment—He is not therefore the Savior of the whole world—Specimens of false reasoning from the fact that Christ died for all. 171

CHAPTER XIV.

DENIAL OF THE TRINITY.

No need of an Incarnate God—Christ only a man—No truth in the doctrine of the Trinity—Views of Murray—The Trinity exploded by Hosea Ballou—Christ superior to other men only by office—Christ not possessed of two natures, human and superhuman—Socinianism favorable to devotion—They profess to honor Christ more than others. 186

CHAPTER XV.

GOD'S FAVOR NEVER LOST.

Recapitulation—God's favor can neither be gained nor lost—God never displeased with sinners—Not at all affected by our sins—Never our enemy—All love—Prayer has no effect upon God—These views popular with the vilest of men. . 199

CHAPTER XVI.

THIS LIFE NOT PROBATIONARY TO ANOTHER.

Sense of accountability in a future state nearly universal—Effort to get rid of this responsibility—Mortal life not probationary to another—Conduct here nothing to do with condition hereafter—Boston Discussion—No punishment after death essential to the system—Folly to talk of securing an interest in Christ—Paul and Nero fare alike hereafter. 208

CHAPTER XVII.

FAITH NOT NECESSARY TO FUTURE HAPPINESS.

Future happiness not dependent on faith—Faith is simply belief in evidence—Faith not distinguished into various kinds—Religion here not necessary to happiness hereafter—Faith not necessary to justification—Universalism aims only to do men good here—Their indifference to the woes of the heathen—Have much the same anxiety as the apostles had—But never show it. . 223

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE NEW BIRTH.

The New Birth—Not necessary to future happiness—Regeneration not a change of nature—Not a superhuman work—No change but that of the Resurrection needful for entrance to Heaven—The New Birth really denied—Common doctrine ridiculed—Mysteriousness of Regeneration denied—The fact of Regeneration easily known—To be hereafter experienced by all—Regeneration nothing more than Reformation, or a change of party—Experience of all the saints contradicted. 236

CHAPTER XIX.

THE RESURRECTION-STATE.

Resurrection—Time of it indefinite—Its nature—Resurrection of the whole man—At death man annihilated—Man and beast perish alike—Resurrection is a new creation—Resurrection denied—The same body not raised again—All equal in the Resurrection. 250

CHAPTER XX.

THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

Accountability confessed, but not as to a future state—Views of the Pharisees in the Savior's day—Scripture language about the Judgment—How understood at the time—The day of Judgment not in a future state—Mr. Balfour's labors—Heb. ix. 27—The common doctrine discarded by them all. 261

CHAPTER XXI.

DEVIL AND HIS ANGELS.

English Translation of the Bible—Mr. Kneeland's version—Neither angels nor devils—Satan a symbolical being only—Angels only our fellow-men—Devil is the carnal mind—No agreement as to the identity of the devil—Variety of definitions—Sadducceans. 273

CHAPTER XXII.

CHRISTIANS HAVE NO ORDINANCES.

RESULTS—Christian Institutions—The Sabbath a human device—Our Sunday not the Sabbath—The Sabbath ceased with the Mosaic dispensation—Our Sunday a weekly festival, but not holy—Sabbath-journeying—Baptism—Not indispensable to Church-membership—A rite of initiation only—Never intended for our observance—Lord's Supper—Various opinions—Not binding on the conscience—Most of them repudiate it—Those who do believe in it do not make it a test of fellowship—Churches rare—A matter of expediency—More than two-thirds of the Societies have none—They are never large. 284

CHAPTER XXIII.

FRUITS OF UNIVERSALISM.

Moral efficacy—Fruits of Orthodoxy—Ministry of Christ and Paul—Such should be its fruits if true—Their own concessions—Want of piety—No public measures of usefulness—Dark prospects—Relish for piety not common—Disguised Infidels—Character of leaders—Ropes of sand—A lifeless theory—Sleepy congregations—Hirelings poorly paid—Prayer-meetings rare—Disastrous tendencies—Hypocrites—A good description—Mr. Balfour's forebodings and experience—Philadelphia—New York—No memorials of good done—Affinity with infidelity—No secret, nor family-prayer—Too great a risk. 302

CHAPTER XXIV.

LEARNING OF UNIVERSALIST PREACHERS.

The work done—The charge conceded—Utterly unlike every other scheme—A mass of heresies—A man's creed of no consequence—Latitudinarians—A modern Pantheon—Is this the Bride?—Their peculiar claims on our confidence—Literary character of James Relly—of John Murray—Of Hosea Ballou—Of Abner Kneeland—Of Walter Balfour—Of the junior preachers—Qualifications necessary to their preachers—Of A. B. Grosh—Of I. D. Williamson—Of their whole ministry—Final appeal to the reader. 323

UNIVERSALISM AS IT IS.

CHAPTER I.

PRIMITIVE UNIVERSALISM.

Rise of the Sect in America—Doctrine of their first Preachers—The original system abandoned—The new scheme and its founder—Transition-state.

"Sing, muse! (if such a theme so dark, so long,
May find a muse to grace it with a song,)
By what unseen and unsuspected arts,
The serpent, Error, twines round human hearts;
Tell where she lurks, beneath what flow'ry shades,
That not a glimpse of genuine light pervades,
The pois'nous, black, insinuating worm
Successfully conceals her loathsome form."—COWPER.

"THE Father of Universalism in America" was JOHN MURRAY. Born of pious parents in Alton, Hampshire, England, at an early age he became a follower of Wesley and a preacher of his views. Afterwards brought, by a constant round of folly and dissipation during a short residence in London, to the borders of starvation, he was again awakened by the preaching of Whitefield, and soon became distinguished for his fluency in prayer and exhortation. Shortly after, he became a follower of *James Relly*, who was then

preaching Universalism in London, and who appears to have been the originator of the *sect* in England. In 1770, Mr. Murray came over to America, and preached his new faith first at Cranbery in New Jersey, then in New York and Philadelphia, and afterwards in New England. At Gloucester, Massachusetts, he became pastor of a Universalist Society, where he continued, until, in 1793, he removed to Boston, and was installed over the First Universalist Society in that town, where he died in 1815, in the 75th year of his age.

Early in 1781, *Elhanan Winchester*, a popular preacher connected with the Baptists, and settled over the First Baptist Church in that city, adopted and began to preach Universal Salvation. In 1784, appeared a work in favor of this doctrine, attributed by common consent to the Rev. *Dr. Charles Chauncy*, pastor of the First Congregational Church in Boston, then in his 80th year. Forty years before he had distinguished himself as a writer against vital religion, by the publication of his "Seasonable Thoughts," in which he endeavored to destroy the influence of Mr. Whitefield, and boldly maintained that "the great revival of 1740" was a wretched excitement, fraught only with evil to the churches, and as such ought to be put down by all well-wishers to society.

Another work in favor of this doctrine appeared in 1795, called "Calvinism improved," by the Rev. *Joseph Huntington, D. D.*, pastor of a church in Coventry, Connecticut. Though written many years previously, it was not published until the author's death.

These, and especially the two former, became the principal pillars of Universalism in this country, until the commencement of the 19th century. The views which they embraced differed chiefly from those of the Christian church generally, in the article of future endless punishment. They believed, for the most part, in the distinguishing doctrines of Christianity, with this one exception. Their hopes of universal salvation were based on the atonement of Christ, whom they regarded as constituting, in his superior nature, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, the one only God, or as God himself. They expected to obtain eternal life, only on the ground that Christ had died for all men, and so had delivered them and the whole human family from the condemnation of the law. They believed most firmly in *future punishment*, and taught that the misery of unbelievers in a future state would be, not only unspeakably dreadful, but of very long continuance.

Dr. Huntington was originally a Calvinist, and attempted to deduce from those views the doctrine of Universal Salvation. "It was not by giving up the peculiarities of his former views ('Mod. Hist. of Universalism,' p. 384,) that he became a Universalist, but by grafting upon them the hypothesis of universal salvation, and by carrying through the system of Calvin in regard to all mankind, as it had been generally done in reference to the elect alone. He held to the sinner's absolute depravity by nature; the justice of the sentence of endless misery, which he saw plainly threat-

Creed of Murray, and of Winchester.

ened in Scripture; the doctrine of the Atonement, whereby Christ suffered for us the penalty of the divine law, our guilt having been set to his account, as our federal head and sponsor, and his obedience in like manner transferred to us, and thus proclaimed a salvation for man solely on the ground of free grace and mercy." These, for substance, werealso the views of Chauncy and Winchester.

Similar were the sentiments of a large proportion of the early disciples of Murray. Their notions of religion were derived, for the most part, from Calvinistic preachers, and the Westminster Catechism; and their conversion to Universalism was, in most cases, a carrying out of those ideas of the atonement, so as to include the whole human family.

Mr. Murray believed that

"In Adam's fall
We sinned all,"

and so were brought under condemnation; that in like manner, all mankind were from eternity identified with the *second Adam*, who, by his death, made an expiation for the sins of every human being, and bore the penalty of the law for all, and not the elect alone, so that all are thereby exempted from condemnation, and made, through him, partakers of endless life; that those who die in unbelief will lie down in sorrow and dwell in darkness, until the judgment to come. "Mr. Murray, ('Mod. His.' pp. 431–2,) was not a Unitarian. Mr. Winchester maintained the doctrine of the trinity, perhaps in not a very dissimilar manner. They both held to the existence of misery in a future state."

Dr. Chauncy, after making numerous "extracts from the writings of ancient authors on his side of the question," makes this observation:—"It is fully and freely acknowledged, by all the above writers, that *many* among the sons and daughters of Adam will pass through a state of *unutterable misery*, before they will be prepared for, and admitted to the joys of God's presence in the heavenly world. Would to God it might be realized as an *undoubted truth*, that there is the same reason, from Scripture, to believe there is a HELL as a HEAVEN. And those who are infidels as to the former, would do well to take care lest they should know from their *own experience*, the horrors of that *dreadful place*." And, on another page, he distinctly states that some of the wicked "will be tormented for ages of ages." All that he contends for, in regard to the duration of future punishment, is, that it will not be strictly endless.

But *Universalism is not what it was.* They who judge of it by the writings of either Chauncy, Huntington, Murray, or Winchester, form a very erroneous idea of the system. Since that period, it has undergone an almost constant process of *transition.* This we learn from the confession of its warmest friends. Mr. Whittemore in his "Modern History of Universalism," says, (p. 431,) "The *radical* changes, which have taken place in the opinions of American Universalists, constitute one of the most interesting traits in their history." Of course, therefore, the present system is not merely a modification of the old, but radically different. It is

based on other principles, and differs more from its original self, than at first it differed from the prevailing belief of the Christian world.

These changes have been rapid. One by one, almost every doctrine, heretofore regarded as essential to Christianity, has, within a period of forty years, been at first undermined, and then thrown away and treated with contempt. The author of the "Modern History," says, (p. 432,) "We apprehend that as early as 1800, very essential departures had been made; and finally, the doctrines of the Trinity and atonement, with *all kindred notions*, were discarded by the whole denomination, with a very few exceptions." The utmost latitude of opinion appears to have been allowed among both ministers and members of the sect, so long as they agreed in rejecting the doctrine of endless misery.

The Biographer of Murray says, (pp. 279, 280,) "his views of the nature of salvation differ essentially from those now entertained by Universalists. Indeed, it is now well known, that the method by which he proved the final salvation of all men, and his interpretations of Scripture, differed essentially from those of the denomination generally." They, who now bear the name, appear to have agreed with him in scarcely more than the *results* to which he came. They have since discovered that he was all his life in the most essential error, —that his views were unscriptural and unreasonable, and are to be discarded.

These changes are to be attributed, in the main, to

the influence of Hosea Ballou, Sen., who more than any other man deserves the appellation of *the father of Universalism as it now is:* (see 'Mod. Hist.' p. 432.) Mr. Ballou began to preach about the year 1791, before he had completed his twenty-first year. At this early period, with but very limited opportunities and attainments, he began his great work of reform. In a letter, bearing date, Nov. 25th, 1829, to the author of the "Modern History," he gives the following account of the dispatch with which he exploded one *notion* after another;—"I had preached but a *short* time before my mind was *entirely* freed from the perplexities of the doctrine of the *Trinity*, and the common notion of *atonement.* But in making these *advances*, I had the assistance of no author or writer. As fast as those old doctrines were, by any means, rendered the subjects of inquiry, in my mind, they became *exploded!*" Like one of old he could, therefore, say with great propriety, "*veni, vidi, vici:*" *I came, I saw, I conquered.* Wonderful man! and so very young! who would have thought it?

Whether other changes as radical will yet be made, or not, none can tell. That the system is now complete, none can pretend. There are questions of great moment, to which no definite answer has thus far been given. The utmost diversity of opinion prevails in respect to some important matters. Hosea Ballou is still alive, and may yet make further discoveries. At his death some Elisha may receive his mantle, and with far bolder strides lead the way into some hitherto un-

trodden field. Other striplings may explode many antiquated notions that still find a place in the belief of these liberal Christians. Soon the very name of Christianity may be discarded because of its *opprobrious* origin. ("The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch:" most probably by the heathen, in reproach.) Already some have been bold enough to outstrip their leader in this matter, and with Abner Kneeland, who for more than twenty years was in high repute among them, to cast away the Bible itself. Deists and Atheists, also, have, of late, so extensively made common cause with them—many such holding offices of trust in the societies—that they may yet become the majority.

I presume not to say what these *transitionists* will yet become. It is proposed merely to make the inquiry—*What is the present prevailing creed of Universalism?* and to show that, in its present form, it bears but little resemblance to what the wisdom and piety of the Christian world, for nearly a score of centuries, have united in exhibiting as the faith taught by Christ and his disciples. In this exposition the appeal will, in every instance, be made to their own writings, particularly those that are received with the greatest favor among themselves. It will thus be shown that Universalism has but little more of Christianity than the name, is a crafty system of *covert infidelity*, and does not deserve to be ranked as a Christian denomination.

CHAPTER II.

PREVAILING CREED OF UNIVERSALISM.

Progress in error—Essentially different from all other schemes—Arrogance of wisdom—Not a Christian denomination—Real and nominal Universalists—Formed into a system—Embraced by Universalist preachers generally—The Creed—Peculiar to this age and country.

> "The breach, though small at first, soon opening wide,
> In rushes folly with a full-moon tide;
> Then welcome errors of whatever size,
> To justify it by a thousand lies."—COWPER.

UNIVERSALISM began its career with a denial of the doctrine of endless punishment. It was enough, at first, to promise heaven at last to all mankind without distinction. It troubled itself but little about other doctrines so long as this was conceded.

But error is never stationary. The mind that embraces it finds no rest. Dissatisfied with the ground on which its hopes are based, it is constantly shifting its position, or forming new entrenchments. One error has a strong affinity for every other. They can nestle together in the same bosom. Easy is the downward path. They who enter it "wax worse and worse, decieving and being deceived."

Falsehood never can harmonize with truth. If grafted thereon it is only an unsightly excrescence. The whole scheme of religious truth must be remodeled be-

fore it can even seem to harmonize with a single error. To make the Bible teach the final happiness of all the human race, its threatenings must be silenced, or limited in their application. Every opposing doctrine must be made to bend, or be cast away. Philosophy and criticism must be called in to make the Scriptures speak, in all their parts, but one voice. *A theological system, almost entirely new*, is the product.

This *system* of belief, now openly avowed and published to the world, bears but little resemblance to any other. It is neither Calvinism, Antinomianism, Arminianism, nor yet Pelagianism. With Socinianism it sympathizes to some extent, but never identifies itself. It proclaims all other creeds to be the offspring of Ignorance, Superstition, and Bigotry; utterly unworthy to be received by immortal beings. It speaks of Calvinism with unmeasured severity. The editor of the life of Murray says, (pp. 275, 6,) that, when Murray began to preach, "Calvinism, *rank and impure* as it came from the hands of its author, was the prevailing doctrine of this country. It was adapted to the stern and *unenlightened* natures of our Puritan forefathers. Few are sensible of its *grossness and absurdity.*"

Thus even "*the Pilgrim Fathers*" were ignorant, superstitious, and bigoted in the estimation of this new sect. Calvin was "rank and impure," Wesley a babe, and all the Christian world beside, both learned and unlearned, the victims of priestcraft or prejudice. The progress of Universalism is called the triumph of reason over bigotry and falsehood. "The strong energies of

reason, ('Gospel Anchor,' II. 5,) gathering fresh impulse from revelation, have made sad havoc with the *forgeries* of antiquity. Men have dared *to think for themselves*, and some begin to claim the right of judging for themselves. In proportion as man throws off the manacles of bigotry, the faith of the impartial goodness of their Creator will prevail." *They* are the only Freethinkers in the world—none else dare to think or judge, but as they are bidden!

In thus arraying themselves against all other creeds, Universalists confess that they have no sympathy with other religious systems. They stand alone in the religious world. If any other creed is true, theirs is wretchedly false. This they openly avow. In an "Exposition and Defence of Universalism," by I. D. Williamson, of New York, the writer states, (p. 215,) "I have no disposition to conceal the fact, that *there is a wide and irreconcilable difference between us and our opposers;* nor can it be denied that if we are right, they are wrong, not merely in some small points, but *radically, and, I had almost said, totally wrong*. This is a truth with which we are well acquainted: and that man pursues a mistaken policy, nay, even a wicked course of hypocrisy, who attempts to conceal this fact. There is no manner of use in endeavoring to make it appear, that there is but a shade of difference between us and other denominations, for *there is a difference, high as heaven, wide as the earth;* a difference *as hopelessly and utterly irreconcilable as light and darkness;* and there is no disguising the *obvious* truth, that, *if one system is true the*

other is false, desperately and hopelessly false, I had almost said, in its whole length and breadth." Either, then, they, or we, are utterly unworthy of the Christian name. Theirs, or ours, must be a most unblushing system of unbelief and falsehood.

In asserting that Universalism is an Anti-Christian system, let me not, therefore, be charged with uncharitableness or bigotry. Its advocates themselves allow, as appears from the above extract, that such is its character, if our scheme, and the scheme of the Christian world be true. The alternative is unavoidable.

Nor let the kind-hearted Christian be any longer imposed upon with the idea, that the Universalist is as much a Christian as any one, only that he does not believe in endless punishment; and that, therefore, it is not worth while to enter into any dispute with him. It is often said,—" there are good people in all denominations," and among these are reckoned Universalists. But, by their own showing, they and we cannot be members of the same household. Either *they are the church, wholly and entirely*, or they have *no part nor lot in it.* So entirely do they differ from all Christian denominations, that it is no breach of Christian charity, if our views are in the main correct, to expose and oppose theirs with all our might.

I say not, that all who bear the name of Universalists have thus forsaken the ancient landmarks. This name, it is claimed, belong to all who agree in the belief of the final happiness of all mankind. In " the Plain Guide" (p. 15,) it is said, " The sentiments by which

Universalists are distinguished, is this: *that at last every individual of the human race shall become holy and happy.*" Again, (pp. 16, 17,) "all persons who truly believe in the eventual salvation of all mankind by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, are Universalists." "It makes no difference what are the individual's views concerning punishment, if he holds the doctrine above described." "We wish it distinctly understood, that Universalists admit of no distinction in the denomination, on account of difference of opinion on the subject of punishment. They are all *one*—they all go for *one* thing."

Thus every variety of doctrine may find a home in this motley sect, if it be linked to the belief of Universal Salvation. To swell their number they welcome them all. They search the records of the church from the age of the apostles, and whenever they find one expressing his doubts as to the endless duration of the punishment of the wicked, they forthwith proclaim him one of them. In this manner they endeavor to show that their sect is ancient and honorable.

But if one of these motley religionists renounces Universalism, he and the world are at once told, that he never was a Universalist, except in name. He never received the *system*, and embraced it with all his heart. In the 'Plain Guide' the writer says, (pp. 278, 9,) "There are two kinds of Universalists—*positive* and *negative* Universalists." "Negative Universalists are those who merely assent to the doctrine. They believe, they say, that all men will at last be saved. They think the

doctrine of endless misery a very bad doctrine, and entertain no doubts of the final happiness of the whole world. This is the amount of their religion. Now there is a wide difference between these, and those we are pleased to call *positive* Universalists."

None but those who receive the *system*, as now professed and taught by the leaders of the sect, are regarded as *real* Universalists. Let this distinction be carefully marked. After many and violent changes these doctrines have been reduced to a system, distinct and independent, taught from the preacher's desk, and in numerous publications, occasional and periodical. The attempt has been undertaken to lead, not only nominal Universalists, but the world, into the belief of a theological system, which strikes a death-blow at all those doctrines which are dear to the hearts of Christians. They call upon us to receive a system, as the substance of what the Bible teaches, that is as unlike what we and our fathers have believed, as day and night. This they themselves confess. In the 'Expositor and Universalist Review,' for September, 1839, appears an article written by Mr. Sawyer, of New York, designed to show that Professor Tholuck, of Germany, either is, or was, a Universalist. "Of what avail is it, for instance," he says, (p. 341,) "to assert, 'that the whole spirit of Tholuck's theology is as dissonant from that of American Universalists, as music from discord?' No one ever pretended that Tholuck's theological *system* was consonant with that of American Universalists. It was asserted—'that his belief *was* nothing less than that all

men will actually be saved.' *His agreement with us was limited to this single point.*"

Now, before we embrace the doctrine of Universal Salvation, it becomes us to look well to the end of the way; to ask, "where does this path lead?"—"what is the next step?" Let us know *the whole of the creed;* let us view it in all its nakedness, stripped of its ornaments and borrowed garments, and ask,—"Is this the daughter of Zion?"

To a faithful exposition of this novel and strange creed, I shall now direct the reader's attention. Though but little understood, and less cared-for by the great body of Universalists, it is received and advocated by nearly every preacher in the denomination. A. C. Thomas, in his 'Theological Discussion' with the Rev. Dr. Ely, states, (p. 25,) that his "own views" "are the views of a large majority of American Universalists." And of another system of Universalism, which he calls "Calvinism Improved," he says that "Edward Mitchell, of New York, is, I believe, (1834,) the *only public advocate* of this form of Universalism in the United States."

The reader may, therefore, rest assured, that the system now to be exhibited is, with a few exceptions that will hereafter be stated, the creed of Universalists in this country, as taught by their standard authors, and preached from their pulpits. In the form in which it is now to be presented it is found in none of their publications. And yet every article as here exhibited is gathered from their writings, where it is plainly stated and boldly defended.

The following *Synopsis* may properly be called

THE CREED OF AMERICAN UNIVERSALISM.

1. All mankind will eventually become holy and happy.

2. Final happiness never has been, and never can be, forfeited by sin.

3. Mankind are born as pure as Adam was when he was created.

4. Sin has its origin, not in the mind, but in the animal nature.

5. Man never becomes totally depraved.

6. Sin is punished only in this life.

7. Sin ceases with the death of the body.

8. Mankind are naturally and originally mortal.

9. Man has no immortal soul.

10. Every man will inevitably suffer to the full extent of his deserts.

11. Sin fully punishes itself.

12. There is properly no such thing as punishment.

13. Christ saves no one from any deserved suffering.

14. There was nothing peculiar in Christ's death.

15. Jesus Christ was only a man of superior gifts.

16. There is no distinction of persons in the Deity.

17. The favor of God can neither be gained nor lost.

18. Mortal life is not, in any sense, a state of probation for another state of being.

19. Faith has no connection with happiness in a future state.

20. Regeneration is merely a change of party.

21. All mankind will be equal in the Resurrection.

Peculiar to this age, and Country.

22. There will not be a day of general judgment in the resurrection-state.

23. There are no merely spiritual beings, called angels, either holy or unholy.

24. The Christian Sabbath is a mere human device.

25. Church ordinances are of doubtful utility.

Such are some of the peculiarities of this novel system. The most of them appear in nearly all their systematic exhibitions of their own faith, and are regarded as essential to their scheme. One after another these tenets have been put forth as circumstances required. As they now appear they form a complete chain, the links of which are mutually dependent;—a chain most difficult to break when once it has been thrown around the heart. To most it proves to be an everlasting chain of darkness.

This creed is peculiar to this age and country. It is the production of men who are yet on the stage of action. It had no being fifty years since. There have been those in former ages who denied that the misery of the wicked in a future state would be strictly endless. And so others of these articles have been maintained singly in, perhaps, every age of the world. But we search in vain for any evidence, that the system of modern Universalism, here exhibited, had any existence before it was devised, as occasion required, by Hosea Ballou, Sen., of the city of Boston.

Nor is this creed now received by any religious society out of this country. The nearest approach to it is found in that product of scepticism and "philosophy,

falsely so called," which prevails in Germany, and has received the names of Rationalism, Naturalism, and Neology. But yet no one maintains that the two systems are identical, or that there are not important distinctions between them.

In Great Britain and Ireland there is neither a society, nor preacher, that holds these views. *The system of American Universalism has not a single defender in the British Isles*, so far as is known in this country. There are those who believe in the final happiness of all mankind, but on far different grounds from what have been presented above. In London there is not a society that even bears the name. When Mr. Le Fevre, recently of New York, visited England, he had *but one* opportunity of preaching during his abode in London, and that was to a Unitarian congregation in Newington, near London, which at the time "did not exceed thirty people."

In an article on "Universalism in Great Britain and Ireland," by Mr. Sawyer, in 'the Expositor and Universalist Review,' for May, 1840, the writer says, (p. 190,) "We know of but one flourishing society in England at the present time, that of Liverpool, under the charge of the Rev. David Thom." After reviewing the Theological System of Mr. Thom, Mr. Sawyer says, (p. 210,) that Mr. Thom "declares our views of the nature of Jesus Christ and of the atonement to be *awfully erroneous*, and what is more, *excessively superficial*." And then he adds, of Mr. T.'s system, "it seems to us, in many of its prominent features, *essentially erroneous*."

Yet, though so essentially different from Universalists in this country, their number is very small. Mr. Thom, in a letter to Mr. Sawyer, bearing date March 30, 1836, writes, "You cannot conceive the need which we (Universalists) have on this side of the Atlantic of being cheered on. *A few stragglers, amounting in all to some hundreds, is the sum of our numbers.*"

I have been credibly informed, that, when it was announced in this country, not long since, that Mrs. Sherwood, of England, had become a Universalist, a box, containing a copy of each of their principal publications, was sent to this lady by some American Universalists; which, however, much to their mortification, was returned unopened.

"In Scotland," we are told, ('Exp. May, 1840,' p. 190,) "Universalists, considered as a distinct sect, are scarcely more prosperous than in England." "They (p. 211,) have generally adhered to that form of Universalism, which, with some more or less important modifications, prevailed in England and America forty or fifty years ago. It embraces the doctrine of the supreme divinity of Jesus Christ, the popular doctrine of the atonement, and others of a kindred nature." "In Ireland, (p. 190,) Mr. Whittemore mentions a society of Universalists at Colerain. Of its present state we are not informed; nor, indeed, could we affirm its existence."

Such is the state of Universalism in the British Isles. We look in vain among them all for the creed that is so popular among the sect in this country. It has no

existence there. Hence the writer just quoted, remarks, (p. 211,) "As Universalists now exist and believe in Great Britain, we do not flatter ourselves with the expectation of much *progress*. If we turn to the Unitarians, we shall find little more reason to be encouraged."

The reader will now perceive the propriety of the phrase "*American* Universalism." The *im*propriety of calling it Christianity, will, if not already seen, be made apparent as we proceed.

CHAPTER III.

FINAL HAPPINESS OF ALL MANKIND.

Summary of the creed—Denial of every thing heretofore thought sacred—Pretence of being the plain doctrine of the Bible—Final holiness and happiness universal—Does not teach that men will be happy at death—Novel mode of interpretation—Bible a Jewish affair—Credulity.

> They "the truth of God
> Turn'd to a lie, deceiving and deceiv'd;
> Each, with th' accursed sorcery of sin,
> To his own wish and vile propensity
> Transforming still the meaning of the text."—POLLOK.

IT needs but a very moderate share of discernment, in order to discover the almost total dissimilarity between this novel system and those which have preceded it. Well may its advocates affirm, that between them and other denominations, "there is a difference high as heaven, wide as the earth." This strange creed maintains, that neither temporal nor eternal death are consequences of sin; that mankind are strangers alike to native and total depravity; that the mind is not the source of sin, and that all sin will cease with the destruction of the flesh. It denies, that the death of Christ was properly an atonement or satisfaction for the sins, past and to come, of the children of men, or that there was any peculiarity in the nature of his sufferings. It denies the supreme divinity of our Lord, the distinct

personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit, and the doctrine of the Trinity. It teaches that the salvation of the gospel, in no case, delivers men from deserved punishment, that God regards both saints and sinners with the same feelings, that his favor can never be lost, that the actions of this life do not affect in the least degree our eternal welfare, and that man needs no radical change of nature. It denies that, at the resurrection, any will be raised to 'shame and everlasting contempt,' or that there will be a general judgment immediately following that event.

Thus every doctrine, heretofore regarded as sacred, and undoubtedly revealed in the Scriptures, with the single exception of the Unity of God, (a doctrine not peculiar to Christianity,) is unblushingly denied and ridiculed by these New Lights of the world. They are the favored of heaven! Hitherto darkness has covered the earth, and gross darkness the people! But the Lord has arisen upon them, and his glory has been seen upon them! A most palpable blindness has afflicted alike the learned and unlearned, the wise and the ignorant! The Bible, that book given of God to be the light of the world, has, till now, been shrouded in darkness! The book of revelation has proved to all the world beside, and to every preceding generation, a sealed book!

But, what is most of all strange, Universalists maintain, that this system, which they pretend to have gathered from the Bible, lies on the very *surface;* is the most obvious, most directly taught; and that it argues wilful blindness, and fear of the truth, if any expounder

Said to be clearly revealed. Contempt of Orthodoxy.

of Scripture does not perceive it. Mr. Grosh, of Utica, in the "Universalist Companion for 1841," says, "We believe that in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments the foregoing sentiments are clearly revealed." Speaking of "our common English version of the Bible," the younger Ballou says, ('Exp.' I. 273,) "We hazard nothing in repeating a statement in which all good judges appear agreed, that on the whole it exhibits *intelligibly*, at least, if not with perfect clearness, the *general* tenor and doctrines of the original text. So far as it respects the means of understanding these, the English reader need not *much* regret his ignorance of the dead languages."

They can scarcely have any patience with those, who teach the old-fashioned doctrines of the Trinity, atonement, and endless punishment. In speaking of the latter particularly, they can scarcely find words strong enough to express their contempt and abhorrence. It is a "wretched hypothesis;" "a doctrine, which, if true, would disgrace the benevolent author of our being," "ascribes a character to God which no language can express—which, indeed, for innate and unprovoked cruelty, infinitely surpasses the loftiest powers of imagination," and "represents God as sustaining a character compared with which, that of Nero is excellence;" "it is an insult alike to reason, and every sentiment of purity and reverence; it is contempt thrown upon the word of God and the character of its author." It is therefore a "horrible dogma," "absurd and blasphemous," "bolstered up by horrid assumptions." (See

'Letters to Brownlee,' and 'Letters to Remington,' by T. J. Sawyer.) "When," says this *mild* writer, "will the *Christian world* have ceased to indulge in these *wretched* peurilities, and be willing to interpret the word of divine truth in a manner worthy of itself?"

Thus these very modest and unassuming reformers maintain that the Christian *world* have heretofore indulged themselves in *wretched puerilities*, and that all their show of learning has amounted to nothing more than mere *boys' play*. Nay, it is gravely asserted that they (i. e. all who have not adopted this new creed,) have not been "*willing* to interpret the word of divine truth in a manner worthy of itself." Having eyes they would not see! What a sweeping charge! And this is attributable to their depravity: "Among the most astonishing facts of the moral world, stands this *general credulity* in all that is dishonorable and blasphemous relative to the universal Creator. It furnishes one of the strongest evidences of man's awful depravity!" ('Sawyer to Remington,' p. 115.)

What awfully-depraved men, according to Mr. Sawyer, were Luther, Calvin, Baxter, Hammond, Patrick, Lowth, Whitby, Henry, Gill, Doddridge, Wesley, Scott, Bloomfield, and Clarke! How strange that such wicked men should have been selected to give tone to nearly all the piety in the world by their "wretched puerilities!" Stranger still that men of such profound and extensive learning, such matured wisdom, and such penetrating intellects, should not, with all their intimate acquaintance with the original language of Scripture, have dis-

covered what the merest tyro in the Universalist ministry can now see, without Greek or Hebrew optics, *as plain as day!* And stranger still, that the Savior, the prophets, and the apostles should have chosen to express themselves in such phraseology, that, whether read in the original, or in the numerous versions into which the Scriptures have been rendered, it has never been known until recently what was their true meaning! What a pity that Ballou, Balfour, and Kneeland had not written the epistles of Paul, Peter, and John! Then we could never have doubted whether there were future and endless punishment, or not.

But, lest the reader should imagine that I have charged these modern interpreters of Scripture falsely, I proceed, without further preface, to introduce the requisite testimony. My object is not to enlighten the informed Universalist, in regard to the items of his creed, for none such will deny the charge. But I design to show the unthinking many, who compose the mass of the half-million claimed to belong to the denomination, what they must believe, if they become "positive Universalists;" and to undeceive others in regard to the assumption of the Christian name, by those who "deny the Lord that bought them."

The great and leading doctrine of Universalism, and that for which all its other doctrines were made, is that

I. ALL MANKIND WILL EVENTUALLY BECOME HOLY AND HAPPY.

In this they are all agreed. "The sentiment," says the author of the 'Plain Guide,' (p. 15,) "by which Universalists are distinguished is this: that at last every individual of the human race shall become holy and happy. This does not comprise the whole of their faith, but merely that feature of it, which is peculiar to them, and by which they are distinguished from the rest of the world." And such is the beginning and end of all their writings.

The text book of Modern Universalism is 'a Treatise on Atonement' by Hosea Ballou, in the preface to which he remarks, (p. 6,) "Perhaps the reader will say, he has read a number of authors on the doctrine of Universalism, and finds considerable difference in their systems. That I acknowledge is true; but all agree in the main point, viz. that *universal holiness* and *happiness* is the *great object* of the *gospel plan*."

At what time this anticipated result will take place does not fully appear. All, however, agree in the belief that it will not be delayed beyond the resurrection. I say, all; for I cannot learn that any of them believe that the misery of the wicked will continue beyond the resurrection of the dead.

"In the resurrection," says A. C. Thomas, ('Theo. Discus.' p. 281,) "*universal* humanity shall walk forth in the beauty of holiness, redeemed and regenerated by the quickening Spirit of the living God." Mr. Ballou says, ('Expositor' I. 78,) "that the resurrec-

None happy at death. Resurrection indeterminate.

tion-power, which brought again from the dead the Lord Jesus Christ, will finally, in him, make the whole human family gloriously immortal and incorruptible." But, how long a time will elapse before the resurrection, they pretend not to say. "Whether the resurrection instantly succeeds the death of the body, or whether it is a progressive work in the hands of God, performed upon different individuals at different times, as he shall please to raise them, or whether it is to take place with all simultaneously at some future time, Universalism, as such, does not decide." ('Expositor,' III. 31.)

That all, or any of mankind will be *happy at death*, will then enter into bliss, forms no part of this creed. "*We* do not presume," they say, "to know that men by shortening their days upon the earth, will hasten their entrance into heaven. . . . . As it respects the hastening of an introduction into another life by the shortening of the present, (i. e. suicide,) we would state distinctly, that no particular speculation upon this point is any essential part of the Universalist system." ('Exp.' III. 22, 31.)

It is true, that we often see, in their ephemeral publications, much that would imply, that the departed had gone to glory. But the Universalist preacher can hold out no such hope to his dying disciple, and be honest. He cannot assure the trembling sinner that he will enter into the joy of his Lord, until, it may be, thousands of years have rolled around, and ushered in the resurrection-morn. No wonder that, with such instructions,

Old Testament. Silent as to a future state.

the wretched man clings to life, and shrinks back from the dreary prospect of long-continued darkness and death.

Their views on this point will be given in another place. But let me add a word of caution to those who have blindly adopted this creed, that they no longer flatter themselves that they will be happy at death. I know of no Universalist writer, or preacher, that maintains such a doctrine. Look before you take the final leap.

The reader, however, who has not made himself familiar with this crafty system, will, doubtless, be ready to ask, how do these preachers dispose of those numerous passages of Scripture which affirm the everlasting punishment of those who die in their sins?' In the first place, then, they maintain, that *the Old Testament says but little, perhaps nothing, of the future immortal state.* The younger Ballou says, ('Exp.' I. 182,) "The future state of existence was not clearly revealed till the time of our Savior." "The views which the Old Testament had afforded of this most interesting subject were faint and indistinct, like a prospect amid the obscurity of night." Mr. Sawyer, in his sermon on the 'Penalty of Sin,' (p. 15,) quotes with implied approbation this remark of Dr. Jahn; "We have not authority decidedly to say that any other motives were held out to the ancient Hebrews to pursue the good, and to avoid the evil, than those which were derived from the rewards and punishments of this life." And again, (p. 22,) "Indeed, as I have before suggested, the Old

Testament is confessed by many eminent divines, to contain no hint of future rewards and punishments."

"Where in the Old Testament," asks the same writer, ('Universalist Union,' IV. 213,) "are to be found any thing but mere *temporal* sanctions." And after quoting several very learned and orthodox divines to the same effect, he adds,—"Now if these several writers are correct" (and of course he thinks them so,) "mere *temporal* sanctions were the *only* sanctions of the Old Testament known to God's favored people, the Jews." But why not quote Heb. xi. as in point?

Such is the opinion of their leader also. "It is worthy of special regard," says the elder Ballou, ('Lecture-Sermons,' p. 274,) "that the divine promises and threatenings recorded by Moses and the prophets, with which God was pleased to signify his approbation of righteousness, and his disapprobation of sin, relate to *blessings and punishments which have been enjoyed and suffered by the house of Israel in the earth.*" Again, he remarks, (p. 275,)—"We have no more authority for applying either the promises for obedience, or the threatenings for disobedience, to a future state, than we have for believing that the Jews, for their obedience in this world, will be blessed in the future state in the quiet possession of the land of Canaan; and for their disobedience will be visited with sickness, and be carried away into captivity by their enemies."

Now it happens, very unfortunately for these innovators, that some of their most important proof-texts are derived from the Old Testament; e. g. Gen. xxii.

18. " In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." To be consistent, they must admit, that here is no hint of future rewards except in this world. The same must be admitted of Psalm xxii. 27, and Isa. xxv. 8. Before appealing to these again, I would advise them, first to settle the question, whether or not the Old Testament sheds any light on the immortal state ; and if so, how much ?

But the New Testament is not liable to this objection. There, confessedly, " life and immortality" are brought to light. Yet who does not know " that most of it was written under the very shadow of an impending judgment which was about to sweep the holy city, the Mosaic system of worship, and a large part of the Jewish nation from the face of the earth, and to scatter the broken remnant in everlasting dispersion ?" " A recollection of these facts will prepare the reader to trace the reference of many passages in the gospels and epistles, which would otherwise be dark and perplexing." So says the younger Ballou, ('Exp.' I. 280,) and who cannot see, in the light of this new luminary, that every threatening of the New Testament, that seems to look to a future world, must have had its fulfilment, in the destruction of Jerusalem ? These new interpreters affirm it, and it would be very impolite to call in question their infallibility.

As to the Apocalypse, or Revelation of John, of which orthodox writers make such frequent mention, and which most of them say was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, inasmuch as there are a *few* ex-

positors who give it a date prior to that event; therefore, they say, we do not know certainly that it refers to any other destruction, than what takes place in this world. Thus Mr. Sawyer remarks, ('Penalty of Sin,' p. 16,) "It has been, and may well be, doubted, whether any part of the Apocalypse relates to the future and eternal world." Besides, it is a very obscure book, at least in some respects. The same writer says, ('Letters to Remington,' p. 131,) "I do not profess to understand that book." Mr. Balfour, in his 'Reply to Professor Stuart,' remarks, (p. 205,) "If you can say in truth, that you understand the book of Revelation, and can explain it, you are the first man whom the world has furnished since it was written, of whom this could be said." And, because Dr. Lardner included the Apocalypse among the books which cannot "afford alone sufficient proof of any doctrine," Mr. Balfour casts it aside as irrelevant to the controversy. Therefore, though some of its language is very fearful, "I can see no propriety," says Mr. Thomas, ('Theo. Discus.' pp. 37, 38,) "in referring such language to a future state. Nor do I see the propriety of urging so confessedly *hyperbolical* a book as the Apocalypse, in proof of any important doctrine." And Mr. Le Fevre says, ('Gospel Anchor,' II. 62,) "The book of Revelation is manifestly obscure, and its authenticity and genuineness having been disputed from the earliest ages of the church, we agree with the sentiments expressed by Dr. Lardner, 'that it may be well to read it in churches for edification, but it ought not to be brought forward as sufficient

authority to *establish any doctrine.*' " The easiest way to dispose of some of its fearful language is undoubtedly to deny its authority. It may be read for amusement, or entertainment, but not for doctrinal instruction!

If now a man can be so credulous as to believe that the Jews were more ignorant than the Heathen, and that their Bible contained not even a " hint of future rewards and punishments," though coming from God himself; that neither Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Samuel, David, nor any of the prophets expected to live again after death; if he can also believe that " most" of the New Testament relates simply to the destruction of Jerusalem, and that the Apocalypse is no authority at all, he is in a fair way to become a Universalist. But, in the language of another I would add, if he succeeds " in digesting the monstrous absurdity, let him be honest enough to call things by right names, and label the New Testament " JERUSALEM'S DESTRUCTION FORETOLD;" and then lay it aside as a book which interests him no more than any other treatise upon times and events so remote,—as fit only for antiquarian purposes;—lay it aside on the ground that what was written mainly, and so exclusively, for the men that lived 2000 years ago, claims little authority and influence over him."

The reader surely must admire the wonderful and labor-saving simplicity of this course. All that is needful is, in the first place to throw away the Old Testament and the Apocalypse, and then, in the second place, to refer every fearful threatening in the remain-

der of the New Testament to the destruction of Jerusalem, and not a passage remains that even hints at a retribution in the future immortal state.

> " What doth the man deserve of human kind,
> Whose happy skill and industry combin'd "

have thus proved the Bible to be, at the best, a mere Jewish affair, of but little use to the world, since the end of the Hebrew commonwealth, save as a history of interesting events? What, but

> " The praises of the libertine confess'd,
> The worst of men, and curses of the best!"

CHAPTER IV.

PENALTY OF SIN.

Penalty of Sin—Once universally supposed to be endless death —This position denied—Final happiness never forfeited by Sin—How regarded by Murray, Chauncy, and Huntington —Views of this penalty expressed by Modern Universalists —Strange interpretation of 'eternal life'—'Eternal death' not mentioned in the Bible.

> "The heart surrender'd to the ruling pow'r
> Of some ungovern'd passion ev'ry hour,
> Finds by degrees the truths, that once bore sway,
> And all their deep impressions, wear away;
> As coin grows smooth, in traffic current pass'd,
> Till Cæsar's image is effac'd at last!"—COWPER.

IT would be impossible to persuade all men, at once, to adopt the novel mode of interpretation, by which the Bible is made to keep a profound silence respecting punishment after death. "After all that has been said ('Exp.' I. 283,) it will require probably about *a quarter of a century* to induce people generally" to believe that the passage in Mat. xxv. 31—46, and kindred declarations, refer only to the destruction of Jerusalem; that it was mainly to save the Jews, tens of thousands of whom would then be *in their graves*, from premature and violent death, that the Savior and his apostles "ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears." If this proceeding had been confined to Jerusalem and Jews, these views would be more readily credited. But, when in the cities of Syria, Asia Minor,

and Greece, the Apostles are seen pursuing the same course "both to the Jews and also to the *Greeks*," or Gentiles, the mind needs a long schooling before it can give credence to such strange assumptions.

In order to meet this emergency, it was discovered, not long since, that the world had made a gross mistake about the *penalty of sin!* Mankind, it is true, have transgressed the law of God, and incurred the penalty of the law, but the law never meant to inflict endless punishment on the transgressor! Sin is not so great an evil as men thought that it was! It is not possible for men to sin so greatly as to deserve endless death! Therefore it cannot be taught in the Bible, and the doctrine is only the product of a horrid fancy! If so, the question is settled at once. "What need we any farther witness?" The building must now rise, for a *limited penalty* has "become the head-stone of the corner."

Here is the starting point. The attempt is made unblushingly to unsettle the foundations of ages. Every scheme of doctrine, heretofore received as taught in the Bible, both conceded, and was based, on the supposition or belief, that endless punishment was the proper penalty of transgression. And, however the patrons of these schemes may have differed in the extent of the application of the atonement, in this they were all agreed. They, who first embraced the doctrine of Universal Salvation, based their hope of escaping endless death, on the ground that Christ had redeemed all men from the curse of the law. But it was replied to such, that if Christ had redeemed them from unending pun-

ishment, then they would have suffered such a punishment, had he not have redeemed them; and that such suffering would consequently have been just. Thus the justice of endless punishment would be, at once, conceded. This ground, therefore, proving untenable, it was abandoned, and a bolder position taken.

Modern Universalism teaches that

II. FINAL HAPPINESS NEVER HAS BEEN, AND NEVER CAN BE, FORFEITED BY SIN.

Mr. Murray held that our loss in the first Adam, and gain in the second were the same; that what we have procured through the atonement of Christ, and union with Him, we forfeited by the sin of our first parents; that, therefore, final happiness was forfeited by sin.

Dr. Chauncy, too, though his scheme differed much from Murray's, agreed with him in this particular. He seems to have wavered much in regard to the true nature of the penalty threatened by the divine law. He labors hard, indeed, in his book on 'the Salvation of all men,' to establish the point that the law did not threaten eternal death, or "everlasting destruction." But that he did not feel secure on this ground appears from what he says, (p. 282,) of *annihilation*:—"If the foregoing scheme should be found to have no truth in it, and the wicked are sent to hell, as so many incurables, the second death ought to be considered, as that which will put an end to their existence, both in soul and body, so as that they shall be no more in the creation of God." By falling back on this scheme, after

admitting, as he does, that the reward of obedience was to be endless happiness, he admits that such happiness was forfeited by sin.

Dr. Huntington seems not to have questioned the point at all. He "maintained that endless punishment was a doctrine of the Scriptures," "and in reference to the question, 'does the Bible plainly say that sinners of mankind shall be damned to interminable punishment?' he answered, 'it certainly does, as plainly as language can express, or any man, or even God himself can speak.' Nor did he deny that endless misery was consistent with divine justice. On this subject he was perfectly plain. 'The endless duration of punishment,' said he, 'appears obviously just, no more than we deserve, and not in the least cruel for God to inflict. To argue, as some do, that it is not *just* for God to punish eternally, for transient sins in this world, is the perfection of absurdity, and arises from a total ignorance of God, and ourselves, in the true character and relation of each." ('Mod. His.' pp. 385, 6.) He doubted not that, by sin, future endless happiness had been justly forfeited.

Not so, however, with the degenerate, or, as they would call themselves, perhaps,—the *re*generate, disciples of Murray and Chauncy. They are "wiser than their fathers were." Mr. Ballou had the goodness, nearly forty years since, to inform the Christian world, that what they called *law*, was "only a creature of false education." In his 'Treatise on Atonement,' (pp. 127,8,) he says, "Before you found peace, you thought you could see the justice of God in your eternal exclusion

from heaven and happiness. Now we ask, can you find, that God ever gave a law to man, which required endless misery, in case of disobedience? *Sure we are*, the Scriptures speak of none, neither do the dictates of *good reason* admit of its existence." "A false education has riveted the error in the minds of thousands, that God's law required endless misery to be inflicted on the sinner. How often do professed Christians address the Almighty, and say—'Hadst thou been *just* to have marked iniquity, we should long since have been in the grave with the dead, and in hell with the damned.' This address amounts to nothing more nor less, than a complimental accusation against God of injustice! It surprises us to think how professed Christians will contend for the honor and glory of God, in a way that renders his character infinitely inglorious and dishonorable."

That Mr. Ballou, without the aid of a liberal education, should understand, at the age of somewhat more than thirty years, so surely both what "the Scriptures speak," and "the dictates of good reason admit," as to call in question the wisdom and discrimination of nearly all the wise, and good, and great, who preceded him, may appear very plausible to himself, if not to others. It seems not have occurred to him, that, in charging the people of God, with bringing, in their prayers, "a complimental accusation against God, infinitely inglorious and dishonorable," he might be only exposing his own ignorance of the *true nature of sin;* or, that their feelings might be owing to their superior

light, and greater love of a holy God. It is well known, that as Christians increase in holiness, they acquire a vastly greater abhorrence of the evil of sin, leading them often to express themselves in the language, at which Mr. B. so contemptuously sneers. The more that one sees of the holiness of God, the more he will be induced, with Job, to abhor himself, and repent in dust and ashes.

Since the publication of the 'Treatise on Atonement,' every Universalist preacher, with here and there an exception, can see with perfect clearness, that "there is not the *slightest intimation* given in the Scriptures, that this death was endless death." So says Mr. Whittemore in his 'Plain Guide,' p. 56. But has he attained to a perfect acquaintance with every text of Scripture, not forgetting what Mr. Thomas calls that "*hyperbolical*" book, the Apocalypse? If not, how can he know that there is no such intimation? Has it never entered into his mind, that possibly his sight may be imperfect, so that what he beholds on the page of inspiration, is sometimes warped by reason of a very common disease, called *prejudice?*

It is worthy of remark, that these men manifest, not only the most intimate acquaintance with every part of the Bible, but also with the *psychology*, or spiritual properties of the Most High God, so as to be able to determine infallibly what God can, and cannot do, what course it would be proper, or improper, for him to pursue in the treatment of offenders. Thus Mr. Williamson, in his 'Exposition and Defence of Universalism,'

(pp. 15, 16,) puts the matter to rest: "The dogma of endless wo we reject, as unmerciful, unjust, and cruel; a penalty which a just God never did, and *never can*, annex to his law." "I am not speaking at random, but *I know whereof I affirm*, (how modest!) when I say that no living man can take up the Bible, and find a place where God gave man a law, and annexed to it the penalty of endless misery. Hence, I say, that man needed not to be saved from such an evil, for the best of all possible reasons, that in the *economy of God*, he never was exposed to any such calamity." The reader cannot fail to perceive how minutely Mr. W. has acquainted himself with "the economy of God," or the principles of the divine government: and with what entire confidence in his own judgment he avers both what God can, and cannot, do. Wiser men are more humble. They go to the Bible, and ask—'What has God declared, in this sacred Book, to be his purpose concerning the wicked who continue in unbelief?' and thus they learn what God "can" do.

In like manner, Mr. Sawyer, of New-York, says, ('Letters to Brownlee,' X. 13,) "here I meet the popular but *monstrous* idea, that the penalty of the divine law is endless misery. Beware, sir! how you trifle with the *divine attributes.*" A little more humility, in addressing one so much his senior and superior, would have been more becoming in "one of so humble attainments as himself." To hear a stripling, just out of college, calling thus on a learned divine, who began to study divinity before he was born, to beware how he

"trifles with the divine attributes," is truly pitiful. And yet it is of a piece with the whole course of his compeers, in their assaults on those of another creed.

So, too, in his sermon on the 'Penalty of Sin,' he tells us, (p. 21,) that "if God may be allowed to be his own interpreter, Adam was not threatened with endless misery as the consequence of sin; at least *no intimation of such a penalty is ever given.*" In the 'Universalist Union,' (VI. No. 4,) he uses similar language:—"I hazard nothing in saying that there is not in all the books of Moses—bringing down the history of our race and of God's revelation to, and dealings with it, for more than twenty-five hundred years after the creation —*there is not in all the books of Moses one single passage*, upon which the doctrine in question can be maintained, with even a tolerable show of fairness and truth." "But I need not confine these observations to the books of Moses. They apply with equal force, if I mistake not, to the *whole Old Testament.* Where is the evidence they furnish that endless punishment is the proper penalty of the divine law? I believe it is not to be found." "What has God revealed on this subject in the *New* Testament? There are a few passages, and but a few, where the word *everlasting* or *eternal* is applied to punishment; and on this circumstance must the advocates of endless misery chiefly rely. Yet this word is confessedly ambiguous, and its corresponding word in the Old Testament is known to be repeatedly used in relation to punishment which is clearly national and

temporal. Why shall not the word be understood in the same manner in the New Testament?"

Other examples of the kind, touching the matter in hand, might be given, showing the entire unanimity of the sect in occupying this ground. Its influence, in modifying their views of the whole system of divine truth, will very readily be perceived. It makes sin a very trifling evil, easily recompensed, and requiring no vicarious atonement, or satisfaction to justice by a divine person. It simplifies vastly the great plan of redemption, so that we can scarcely suppress our wonder, that it should have been said of it, by so judicious a writer as Simon Peter, "which things the *angels* desire to look into."

It follows, as a matter of course, from this view of the penalty of sin, or the curse of the law, that eternal life, or endless happiness, never has been forfeited by sin. No amount of guilt can deprive a human being of this inheritance. "I maintain," says Mr. Balfour, ('Letters to Hudson,' p. 36,) "that *no man by his unbelief and disobedience can forfeit a future immortal life*, and subject himself either to a limited or endless punishment in a future state."

But it will doubtless occur to the reader, that the Savior addressed his hearers in a manner that seemed to imply that they were destitute of any good hope of eternal life. Nothing was more frequently on his lips than the *offer of everlasting life* to those who would become his followers. Nicodemus was told, "that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have

everlasting life;" i. e. should have this everlasting life as a reward of his faith. The Jews were exhorted to "labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto *everlasting life*, which the Son of Man shall give unto" them. In other words, the Savior promised to bestow on them the *gift* of everlasting life, if they would strive for it. In like manner the Savior says of his sheep, "I give unto them *eternal life*, and they shall never perish." Eternal life is here equivalent to never *perishing*; and it is implied, that without this gift from the hands of Christ, they would inevitably perish.

In these and similar passages, it is in the clearest manner taught, that final happiness, here spoken of under the figure of 'everlasting,' or, 'eternal life,' is the peculiar privilege of those who believe in Christ, and that it was to bestow this happiness on all who should believe in him, that he came into the world. For how could the Savior make such an offer, and propose it as a reward of his service, if those to whom he spake were already possessed of endless happiness, or if they had never forfeited it by sin? That this eternal life had been forfeited, appears to have been the understanding of those who heard him. The young ruler asks, "Good Master! what shall I do that I may inherit (procure) *eternal life?*" "To whom shall we go?" says Peter, "thou hast the words of eternal life."

If, now, those who obtain eternal life through Christ, would, but for him, have been destitute of it—and nothing is more clearly taught in the Bible—it follows

inevitably that their portion would have been *eternal death;* and that this is the portion of all by nature. Eternal life is equivalent to endless bliss, and consequently eternal death can mean nothing more nor less than endless misery. But if man "never was exposed to any such calamity," how could the Redeemer promise to save men from it by the gift of endless bliss?

It is manifest, that it must be admitted that the penalty of sin, from which Christ came to save men, was endless misery, unless it can be shown that 'everlasting life' is not endless life. But what is too hard for a Universalist? All that he has to do is to deny, and require others to prove. You would not require him, surely, to prove a negative. Accordingly, it is most boldly denied by these new expositors of Scripture, that the phrase 'everlasting,' or 'eternal life,' relates to another world. It simply means, *happiness in this world!* "It is believed by Universalists," says Mr. Lewis, ('Mag. and Adv.' VIII. 26,) "that there is a *present* salvation, (also denominated 'everlasting,' or 'eternal life,') which it is our duty to seek and cherish." But Mr. Sawyer is "much more bold." In his 'Letters to Remington,' (p. 93,) he says—"The *fallacy* in which you indulge yourself, begins by *assuming* that eternal life means endless felicity in heaven, and of course concludes that eternal torment means nothing less than endless misery in hell. I deny your premise, ... and call upon you for proof. You cannot be ignorant that these words are often employed in the New Testament to express the life and peace which the Christian

Eternal life has nothing to do with heaven.

enjoys in the Gospel, *here in this world.*" Is there, then, no *assumption* and *pre*sumption in calling that a "fallacy," which has obtained the almost unanimous assent of the wisest of men—men, who surely have had as good opportunities to know the truth as Mr. S. himself? But the conclusion is irresistible, unless the premises are disproved. Therefore 'eternal life' cannot refer to another world!

In like manner Mr. Skinner, of Boston, tells us, in his 'Universalism Illustrated and Defended,' (p. 241,) "that the phrase, 'eternal life,' is a common expression, to denote the enjoyment experienced *in this world*, through the influence of the Gospel on the heart." In other words, 'eternal' is the same as 'temporal!' How then, are we to understand that declaration of Paul—"For the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal?" What an outrage on common sense do these writers commit!

But the learned Mr. Balfour, of Charlestown, Mass., does not hesitate to limit every passage, in which the phrase, 'eternal life,' occurs, to this world. In his 'Reply to Professor Stuart,' (p. 60,) he says—"I should think the texts need only be read, to see that they do not say anything about their *endless* happiness in *heaven*. On the contrary, the texts speak for themselves, that 'eternal life' is enjoyed on earth, and is enjoyed by every believer." Again, (p. 74,)—"You assume, that 'eternal life' refers to the future endless happiness of the righteous." "This I deny." "'Eternal

life' designates indeed the happiness of the righteous, but it is their happiness *in this world.*"

Let us now try the experiment of 'only reading' some of the texts which speak of 'eternal,' or 'everlasting life.' Mr. B. refers us to Luke xviii. 30: "Who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting," or "*happiness in this world!*" The passage in John xii. 25, is also referred to. Let us read it according to Mr. B.'s definition: "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal," or, unto "*happiness in this world!*" But, perhaps, we shall be more fortunate with John vi. 27; "Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto everlasting life," or, unto "*happiness in this world!*" And does not the happiness enjoyed in this world perish?

What complete nonsense should we make of the Scriptures, if we should consent to be led by such interpreters! Who cannot see, at once, that they are determined that the Bible shall not be so read or understood, as to speak of future punishment in the immortal state? At one time we are told, that the word 'hell' does *not* refer to another world, because '*everlasting*' is not connected with it; and at another, because it is. Mr. Balfour, in his 'First Inquiry,' in order to prove that the word 'hell' does not signify a place of endless misery for the wicked, says, (p. 222,)—"that none of the original words translated in the common version, 'eternal,' 'everlasting,' and 'forever,' are

once connected with Gehenna, or hell." But on p. 153, he remarks, "If it should be said, that 'it is the word '*everlasting*,' applied to the punishment of hell, that proves that hell is a place of future misery,' to this I answer, that it is this very word '*everlasting*,' being applied to Gehenna or hell-fire, that convinces me that hell has no reference to a place of eternal misery for the wicked!!"

What cannot such men prove, or rather, *disprove?* "It is the very word 'everlasting,' applied" by the Savior to the word life, that convinces them that it has no reference to another world! This life is nothing more than a *temporal* life! Why? Because the Savior calls it 'eternal'"!!! Admirable! Who can now question the doctrine thus established?

There are forty passages in the New Testament, where this phrase is used. And these have usually been regarded as proof-texts for the hope of heaven after death. In no other passages is the doctrine of endless blessedness more clearly taught. Take these away and what remains? What else can endure the torture of this unsparing criticism? And yet, rather than admit, that 'eternal' or 'everlasting destruction' means endless misery they are willing to give up every passage in which the word translated 'eternal,' or 'everlasting' occurs, though thereby they tear away the most solid foundations of a happy immortality beyond the grave. What reliance can be placed on such interpreters? Is it not a venture, too fearful, to trust the soul in such hands,—to rest our hopes of heaven on such evident wresting of Scripture?

Some of them appear to be sensible themselves of this difficulty. And so Mr. Whittemore, in his 'Notes on the Parables,' is constrained to assure his readers, that he is not wholly an infidel. "Notwithstanding," he says, (p. 262,) "the everlasting life spoken of in the New Testament is applied in these pages to that state of rest, purity and joy into which believers of the Gospel entered, whenever they embraced the Gospel, the author takes this opportunity to say that he *undoubtingly believes* that a future state of immortality *is* revealed in the New Testament!" But where, if not there, where, he says, it is not found?

If, however, our Universalists are so confident that the word in question does not properly mean "endless," why are they so often heard exclaiming with exultation, and quoting Macknight for the purpose (Sawyer on the 'Penalty of Sin,' p. 18,) "that although in Scripture the expression 'eternal life' is often met with, we no where find 'eternal' joined with 'death.'" Do not such remarks betray an apprehension that 'eternal' may mean 'endless'? And of what avail would it be, if such a passage were found? They would tell us, just as they now do in regard to the phrases, 'everlasting punishment,' and 'everlasting destruction,' that they refer only to suffering before death. So that such an omission on the part of the sacred writers, according to their own showing, does not prove that endless punishment is not the proper penalty of the divine law.

CHAPTER V.

NATIVE DEPRAVITY.—ORIGIN OF SIN.

Sin not an infinite evil—Native Depravity denied—The account of the Fall fabulous—Man by nature as good now as Adam ever was—Origin of Sin—God not the lawgiver, but the mind itself—Sin fulfills the will of God—The mind not the sinner, but the flesh— God the author of sin—Men not totally depraved.

"But what is man in his own proud esteem?
Hear him—himself the poet and the theme:
A monarch cloth'd with majesty and awe,
His mind his kingdom, and his will his law,
Grace in his mien, and glory in his eyes,
Supreme on earth, and worthy of the skies,
Strength in his heart, dominion in his nod,
And, thunderbolts excepted, *quite a God!*"—COWPER.

THE penalty of a law should manifestly bear some proportion to the evil of transgression. If sin be an evil of infinite magnitude, it cannot be unjust for God to attach to his law the penalty of endless misery.—But the Universalist denies that the penalty of the divine law is misery without end. He must, therefore, show, that sin is not as great an evil, as has commonly been supposed, and that mankind deserve not an unlimited punishment.

In this manner Mr. Ballou begins his 'Treatise on Atonement.' He first inquires into the nature of sin,

and attempts to show, (p. 15,) "that sin, in its nature, ought to be considered finite and limited, rather than infinite and unlimited, as has by many been supposed." This common supposition he proceeds in a very summary manner "to explode," and then remarks, (p. 19,) "enough, undoubtedly, is said to show the egregious mistake of supposing sin to be infinite." And as to what the Temanite said to Job, (xxii. 5,) "Is not thy wickedness great? and thine *iniquities infinite?*"—he thinks them not worthy of attention because they "are neither the words of God, nor of one whom he approved."

The nature of sin being thus disposed of, and shown, as he thinks, to be limited and finite, the way is prepared for his views of the penalty of the law, and of the atonement. Sin being a trifling evil, it can be easily removed. And, hence, he conceives an exalted opinion of man's moral worth. The sin of Adam being limited, he cannot conceive of it as affecting his posterity. Therefore it becomes an established doctrine with him and his disciples, that

III. Mankind are born as pure as Adam was when he was created.

Mr. Ballou cannot admit the common doctrine of *man's fall*, and the consequent corruption of his nature. He treats the account in the third chapter of Genesis as fabulous, or, at least, figurative. "Should it be said," he remarks, (p. 35,) "that this garden was a *literal* garden, that the tree of life was a literal tree, and that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was also literal;

All men born as pure as Adam ever was.

I should be glad to be informed, what evidence can be adduced in support of such an idea." In this manner he gets rid of "the old serpent," and all tempters, save fleshly appetite. And what was effectual then in leading man to sin, he maintains, is the same that "now worketh in the children of disobedience." We come into the world with animal natures, such as Adam had, and these are sufficient in his opinion to account for all sin. "These conflicting laws of flesh and spirit," he remarks, (p. 34,) "have always existed in man from his first formation, and so long as they both continue to exert their powers in opposition to each other, so long will sin remain, and continue to produce condemnation."

The way being thus prepared for exploding the ancient dogma of original sin, or native depravity, it is now boldly asserted that we are as good by nature as Adam ever was. "In our opinion," says 'the Universalist Expositor,' (I. 248,) "every man, from the first to the last, comes into the world under moral circumstances precisely the same. We are ushered into being in the state of perfect innocency, with no guilt or vice whatsoever; and from all that we can learn, this was the condition of the parents of our race, when they came from the forming hands of their Creator."

In former days, there was no better authority among Universalists than *Abner Kneeland*, now, and for some time past, an avowed Atheist of the worst stamp. I can remember well to have heard a friend, who attended his ministry in this city, and greatly admired him, remark to myself, "Don't you think that Mr. Kneeland

knows what the Scriptures mean better than you do—a man that can read fourteen languages?" He was an oracle indeed, and wielded a power so great that when he fell off to infidelity he drew scores, not a few, with him into that vortex.

> "His tongue
> Dropp'd manna, and could make the worse appear
> The better reason, to perplex and dash
> Maturest counsels."

When his star was in the zenith, he published a volume of 'Lectures' which were then regarded as unanswerable, as well as accurately expressive of the tenets held by the sect. In the second edition of those 'Lectures' he informs us, (p. 62,) "that man is born into the world totally destitute of a moral or religious character, as *pure*, in every moral or religious sense, *as a clean piece of white paper;* without a single impression, but capable of receiving many; and also susceptible of blots and stains." Again, (p. 78,) he adds—"he comes into the world perfectly innocent, in which state he is a fit subject for the kingdom of heaven; he is morally inclined to good, but, nevertheless, prone to evil."

The same is taught by O. A. Skinner, of Boston. He maintains, ('Universalism Illustrated,' pp. 80, 81, 78,) that "every child is born into the world with *as much of the image of God* as Adam had when he was created." "We have the same natural and moral constitution which he had; and consequently, *the common opinion about the fall is altogether imaginary.*" "Such

a fall could not affect his posterity, in any different way from what the sin of a parent will now affect his children." "Adam had the same appetites and passions, the same *propensities to sin*, that his posterity have." Here it is unblushingly maintained, that mankind now have no more "propensities to sin," than Adam had before his fall! The same writer informs us, (p. 91,) what "views of the natural state of man" are held by the denomination:—"We believe—That man is by nature, i. e. as he is born into the world, equally free from sin and destitute of holiness, no more inclined to vice than to virtue, and *equally capable*, in the ordinary use of his faculties, and the common assistance afforded him, *of either*."

Mr. Le Fevre says of man, ('Gospel Anchor,' II. 289,) that his "moral character is the result of education and is not an innate principle. When he comes into the world, his mind is *unsullied as a sheet of white paper*, without a single impression as to what is good or what is evil, and consequently capable of receiving good impressions or of being stained with blots."

And so say they all. With no claim to originality, they scarcely ever pretend to strike out a new path for themselves. While they pretend to be the only ones who dare to think for themselves, they allow Messrs. Ballou, Balfour, and Co., to do all their thinking for them. As these, their captains, lead, they follow, though often much beyond their depth.

If these men are parents, they must have been blessed with remarkable children, or they would have found

their own offspring giving the lie to their doctrines. And not only they, but their hearers, must in this respect have been privileged beyond all the world, if they can discover in their children no more "propensities to sin," than Adam had before his fall. I have hitherto believed it to be invariably true, as taught in Scripture, that "a child *left to himself* bringeth his mother to shame," and that every child "goes astray as soon" as it is capable of doing it. But, if the Universalist doctrine is true, how happens it, that every individual, of every generation, race, clime, and condition, is just as sure to sin, when he comes to the knowledge of good and evil, as he is to breathe? Why is it, that no possible change in the circumstances of men in the least degree vary this result? Such a uniform result argues a uniform cause—a cause commensurate with the effects. The Bible says, "by *one man* sin entered into the world;" "by the offence of *one* judgment came upon all men to condemnation;" and that "by *one man's* disobedience many were made sinners." Which now shall we believe? Judge ye.

Closely allied to this doctrine of native purity is their account of *the origin of sin*. They profess to believe that

IV. SIN HAS ITS ORIGIN, NOT IN THE MIND, BUT, IN THE ANIMAL NATURE.

Let us see how they define sin. "Sin," says Mr. Ballou, ('Atonement,' p. 15,) "is the violation of a law which exists in the mind, which law is"—not the

ten commandments, nor any other express statutes, but —"the imperfect knowledge men have of moral good. This law is transgressed, whenever, by the influence of temptation, *a good understanding yields to a contrary choice.*" Who now, is it, that gives or makes this law? Who is the *legislator?* Common sense would say, that the law, the transgression of which is called 'sin' in Scripture, proceeds from, and is enacted by, God. But this they deny. The legislator in this case "is a capacity to understand, connected with the causes and means of knowledge;" i. e., in plain words, it is the *mind* itself, in which this capacity resides. It cannot be, they say, that God is the lawgiver, for (pp. 16, 17,) "the intention of a legislature, in legislation, must be *thwarted*, in order for the law to take cognizance of sin. Now if God, in a direct sense of speaking, be the legislator of the law which is thwarted by transgression, in the same direct sense of speaking, *his intentions in legislation are thwarted*;" then "the design of the Deity must be abortive;" but, "if God possesses infinite wisdom, he could never intend any thing to take place, or be, that will not," else "we admit of a disappointment to the Supreme Being," and "it follows that we have no satisfactory evidence whereby to prove that any thing, at present, in the whole universe, is as he intended." "The admission of this error would sink the mind to the nether parts of moral depravity, where darkness reigns with all its horrors."

Such is the reasoning, by which God is deposed from his law-giving throne, and man is made his own

law-giver; sin, too, is deprived of its malignity, and made to coincide perfectly with the will of God. It follows, most surely, from such premises, that every sinner, in every act of sin, does exactly what "the *All-wise* desires him to do; as perfectly fulfills the will of his Maker, as if in all things he conformed precisely to the dictates of law. Hence the Universalist's self-complacency. It is impossible for him to feel a sense of guilt, if such sentiments take possession of his mind; for how much soever he may violate the law of his mind, he cannot by such transgressions violate or "thwart" the will of God. How can he be brought under conviction of his guilt? By no possible means, as long as he holds to such infidel absurdities.

But the error stops not here. Sin is not the act of an independent mind, free to choose or refuse! It is, as they say, merely a want of conformity between the choice of a man and his judgment; which choice results inevitably from, or is determined by, the propensities or passions of his amiable nature. The mind has no sympathy with sin,—never consents to it,—is a poor helpless creature, under the yoke of a hard taskmaster, from which it would gladly be delivered, and so at once be pure again. I ask not—'does this representation accord with Scripture?'—for I would not insult the reader so much as to suppose that he could have such a thought, unless he be a perfect stranger to the Bible. But the reader may be allowed to ask for the evidence of such charges. Let him then read the following:—

Moral evil caused by natural evil.

Mr. Ballou, in the treatise already referred to, (pp. 24, 31, 32,) thus plainly speaks:—"The origin of sin has, among Christians in general, been very easily accounted for; but in a way, I must confess, that never gave me any satisfaction, since I came to think for myself on subjects of this nature." "It may assist us in arriving at a satisfactory solution of our subject, to consider, in the first place, the origin of natural evil. This is unquestionably the *necessary result of the physical organization and constitution of animal nature.*" "It has long been the opinion of Christian divines, that natural evil owes its origin to what is denominated moral evil or sin." "We feel fully convinced that the very reverse of the opinion is true." "The ground we shall take is, that natural evil owes its origin to the original constitution of our animal nature, *and* that *moral evil or sin owes its origin to natural evil.*" "From our natural constitution, composed of our bodily elements, we are led to act in obedience to carnal appetites, which justifies the conclusion that *sin is the work of the flesh.*"

That these views are not confined to the breast of a single individual, but are popular in the denomination, appears from the fact that the 'Treatise on Atonement' has "probably been circulated more than any other Universalist work in America." If it be said, that its popularity is owing to his views of the Atonement, it may be replied, that this account of the origin of sin is essential to those views.

But this is not the only work, in which this doctrine of the nature of sin is defended. Abner Kneeland, as

will be seen in his 'Lectures,' embraced these views most cordially, and acknowledged himself indebted for them to "that excellent and unanswerable work—Ballou on Atonement." He declares, (p. 81,) "that *God cannot be considered*, in any direct sense, *the legislator of that law which is transgressed by sin*." In answer to the objection, that in this case "there is not, neither can there be, any such thing as *sin* in the universe," he asks,—"Would it not be more rational to say that sin is something very different from what has been generally supposed?" He then proceeds to remark, (p. 82,) that "the law of a man's own understanding is the law which is transgressed by sin;" and that "man is not amenable" to "any other law." To the question, "who is the law-giver?" in this case, he replies (p. 83,) that "*a man's own conscience*, which is the result of all the knowledge he possesses, from whatever source obtained, *is the legislator of that law which is violated* whenever he commits sin." "This law may be, and often is transgressed by the very acts *through which the perfect law of God is fulfilled*." So that *sin* is often *obedience* to "the perfect law of God!" On such an absurdity I need not remark. The advocate of such sentiments has found his proper place. Such views accord well with the teachings of the Wright and Owen-school.

The following extracts, on the same subject, are from the pen of Mr. Austin of Danvers, Mass., and are taken from the 'Universalist Expositor,' a theological review, recently suspended for want of support, but re-

garded in the order as of the highest authority for exposition of doctrine. He remarks, (II. pp. 295, 6,) that "sin does not, and *cannot* originate in, or proceed from, the mind, spirit, or soul—that portion of our nature which is from above, and which constitutes the image of God." "What faculty or power does the mind possess, by which it can be the source of sin?" "We may enumerate all the capabilities that properly constitute the mind, and I greatly err, or we search in vain for one that is the source of sin." "The inquiry is, '*Do the powers of the human mind sin?* do they prompt to known and wilful wrong-doing?' How can they do so?" "This would seem to be as *impossible*, as for the sun to send down floods of darkness intermingled with its light. Does the reader inquire—'If the mind, or soul, forms no portion of the source of wickedness, whence does it proceed?' I answer, it is very evident to me, that sin proceeds—not necessarily, but incidentally—from the passions, propensities, appetites, and impulses, of the lower, the animal or bodily portion of our nature, as existing in this life."

Having laid down this startling proposition, and, as he thought, established it, the writer waxes bold, and takes still higher ground. Read the following paragraph, (pp. 297, 8,) and learn how completely the human "mind, spirit, or soul," is freed from the imputation of sin:—

"May I not with propriety proceed another step, and assert, not only that sin does not proceed from the mind, but that *the mind or soul*, so far as it is enlight-

ened, *never consents to wickedness?* When uninstructed in regard to the nature and influences of a certain action, the mind, of course, is not competent to decide upon its character, or determine whether it is right or wrong. Its assent to sin, under such circumstances, is unintentional and *guiltless.* But when the mind is clearly instructed in the principles of morality,—when it is fully prepared to decide whether a deed is proper or sinful, does it then ever give consent to the sinful ?" . . "NEVER!" . . "Although, in these circumstances, the mind is in bondage to the propensities, and its higher promptings are lost sight of, in the whirl of unbridled appetites, still *it participates not in their wickedness, but retains the integrity of its purer nature.*"

And was it thus, that Hosea, and Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Joel, Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Malachi preached? Does this style of address bear any resemblance to the Savior's in his discourse to the Pharisees, Peter's on the day of Pentecost, Stephen's on the eve of martyrdom, or Paul's at Antioch in Pisidia and in his epistle to the Romans? And yet they call this—Christianity!

As already intimated, these men do not hesitate, not only to make all sin to be agreeable to the will of God, but, to make him the *author* of sin. "Perhaps," says Mr. Ballou, (p. 23,) "the reader, by this time, is ready to say, according to this reasoning, 'there can be no such thing as *real evil* in the universe.' If by 'real evil,' be meant something that ought not to be, in respect to all the consequences which attend it, *I cannot*

God himself, the source of all moral evil.

admit of its existence." Then, having shown what he thinks to be the "cause, or origin" of sin, he adds, (p. 36,)—"But, perhaps the objector will say, 'this denies the liberty of the will, and makes God the author of Sin.' To which I reply,—that God may be the innocent and holy cause of that, which, in a limited sense, is sin." "If it should be granted, that sin will finally terminate for good, in the moral system, it will then be necessary to admit that *God is its first cause.*" "If God, (p. 37,) produced an agency, and that agency produced sin, it argues that God is the first cause.—If this mode of reasoning be faulted, I ask, 'Is not God the origin and cause of all moral righteousness?' None can be perverse enough to say—'No.' Then I ask again, 'If moral agency, created by God, be not the *original* cause of *moral righteousness*, by what rule of reasoning can it be made the *original* cause of *transgression?*' "

Thus in the same sense in which God is the source of all moral righteousness, is he the source of all moral evil! Thus sin is the work, not of the human mind or spirit, but, primarily, of God; and secondarily, of the animal nature! The reader cannot fail to perceive how completely this view of the origin of sin, puts to flight the orthodox notion of its being so great an evil; and how cruel and unjust it would be, if God should punish with endless misery, a poor unfortunate, whose faults were entirely attributable to that animal nature, which was God's own workmanship!

I need not spend time, after such an exhibition of the integrity and purity of the human mind, or soul, to

show, that they all sneer at the idea of the entire depravity of man, and maintain that

V. MAN NEVER BECOMES TOTALLY DEPRAVED.

"The opinion of our doctors," says Mr. Ballou in his 'Notes on the Parables,' (p. 89,) "that the very nature of man is so depraved that there is nothing morally good in it, and that it is totally averse to the nature of God, is *doubtless erroneous*." A writer in the 'Magazine and Advocate,' maintains, (VII. 11,) that "of all the absurd notions which characterize the creeds of Partialists, the doctrine of total depravity is among the *most inconsistent with reason and revelation*." Another, who has since given unequivocal evidence in his own conduct of possessing a heart inclined to evil lusts, declares, (p. 75,) that the doctrine "is in violation of the whole tenor of the Scriptures,—a reproach upon the Creator,—and opposed to all known facts." Mr. Skinner, of Utica, declares, (p. 303) "that the doctrine, being *opposed to reason and common observation*, is false and untenable." And we are assured by Mr. S. R. Smith of Albany, (VIII. 197,) "that the doctrine of the total moral depravity of mankind is neither agreeable with reason and experience, nor taught in the Bible."

With such views of the nature and origin of sin, as have obtained currency among Universalists, it would indeed be impossible to convince them, that "there is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that seeketh after God; they have all gone out of the way, they

Bible-doctrine unintelligible to them. A matter of wonder.

are together become unprofitable, there is none that doeth good, no, not one. The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil; is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Surely, all this, and much more to the same purpose, must be unintelligible to men, who maintain that the human mind or soul has no affinity for sin, and that sin itself is nothing more than the workings of the animal nature!

It will cease to be a matter of surprise to the reader, that such teachers should not be able to see the justice of God in punishing sin for ever, nor that the Bible teaches that there will be such punishment in a future state. It is of no use to argue with them, about the meaning of the words translated, 'everlasting,' 'eternal,' 'forever and ever.' They are determined to make them suit their theory of sin, and when you have exhausted your proof, they are more confirmed than before.

But it must be a growing matter of wonder, that men, who thus unsettle the very foundations of human accountability, subvert the plainest doctrines of Scripture, and maintain, in opposition to universal experience, the integrity and purity of the human mind, should not blush to call themselves Christians. That they are utterly unworthy of such an honorable name, will most fully appear, as we dive deeper into their corruptions of sacred truth.

CHAPTER VI.

NO PUNISHMENT AFTER DEATH.

Is sin punished after death?—Views of Relly, Murray, and Chauncy—Sin punished only in this life—No punishment after death, a novel sentiment, not 25 years old—Secession of the Restorationists—Evasion of the question of no punishment after death—Culpable indifference to the question of a future punishment—Appeal to their preachers, and to the people themselves.

> "Go, riot, drink, and ev'ry ill pursue,
> For joys eternal are reserv'd for you:
> Fear not to sin till death shall close your eyes,
> Live as you please, yours is th' immortal prize:
> Old Serpent! hail!—thou mad'st a just reply
> To mother Eve,—'*Ye shall not surely die!*'"

Man is too good a being to be lost forever. So says Universalism. He comes into the world as pure as a piece of white paper, and if he becomes defiled, it is more owing to his circumstances than his own exalted nature. Consequently, it would be wrong in God to afflict him forever, for the misfortune of being made a creature of flesh and blood. It cannot be. God is too good. 'Ye shall not surely die!'

But that man suffers for sin, no one doubts. That he suffers until the close of his earthly life is equally

obvious. Will he continue to suffer after death?—And if so, how long?

To the first of these questions an affirmative answer has ever been given by all believers in the Bible, until these last days of the world. Even Universalism did not venture to deny it, until it had gained a standing among Christian denominations. Mr. Relly, the founder of the sect, "admitted the doctrine of partial suffering in the future state—on the principle, that, while in unbelief, men know not, nor believe, that Jesus hath put away their sins by the sacrifice of himself; and, therefore, they are oppressed with guilt and fear; and these are in proportion to their use or abuse of knowledge; to their receiving or obstinately rejecting the divine evidences and demonstrations of grace and salvation. But he looked beyond all evil and misery, whether in this or the future state, to a time of universal restitution." ('Mod. Hist.' p. 279.)

Similar were the views entertained by his disciple Murray, through whom Universalism was imported to these shores. "He did not believe, ('Life' pp. 281, 3,) that the wicked would be immediately, at death, introduced into the enjoyments of the heavenly kingdom. His belief, in relation to this subject, is thus expressed in his own language: 'He who dies in unbelief, lies down in sorrow, and will rise to the resurrection of damnation.'" "If, in the article of death, every one for whom Christ died were made acquainted with him, and consequently, with the things that made for their peace, why trouble mankind in life, about these mat-

ters ?" "If death destroys all distinctions, would it not be well to say—'Let us eat, drink, and be merry; for to-morrow we die ?'" "If every one of the ransomed race are to be equally happy in death, then, although they did not live by faith, they nevertheless finish their course with joy, nor shall any individual arise to the resurrection of condemnation. This may be consolatory, but it is not *scriptural*." "Not having put on the Lord Jesus, the unbeliever dies in his sins; and where Christ is, where is fulness of joy, he cannot come; when he dies, he lies down in sorrow; he leaves all his happiness behind him. *Death and the grave, darkness and hell, receive him;* and when the trumpet, destined to raise the dead, shall be sounded, he will rise to the resurrection of damnation or condemnation."

The views of Chauncy, as we have seen in part, were still more decided. "Many men will be miserable in the next state of existence," he remarks in his book on 'Universal Salvation,' (p. 9,) "in proportion to the moral depravity they have contracted in this." "In the collective sense, (p. 307,) they will be tormented for ages of ages; though some of them only should be tormented through the whole of that period; the rest variously as to time, in proportion to their deserts."

Even the great exploder, Hosea Ballou, had preached more than twenty-five years, before he "was fully satisfied that the Bible taught no punishment in the future world." In a letter to the author of the 'Modern

History,' he says, (p. 437,) "Respecting the doctrine of a future state of retribution, there was, in my youth, but little said. Universalists having obtained satisfaction that none of the human race would suffer *endless punishment*, though they had sufficient reason to rejoice with exceeding joy, and to glory in the mercy of God. *I never made the question a subject of close investigation until lately.*" In the preface to his work on 'Future Retribution,' first published in 1834, he tells us, (p. 8,) that he renounced "nearly eighteen years ago, the doctrine of punishment in the future state."

Since that eventful period, both he and his disciples teach, that

VI. SIN IS PUNISHED ONLY IN THIS LIFE.

Modern Universalists have thus made rapid strides in regard to the doctrine of future punishment. Their predecessors had no idea, that the Bible would warrant them in rejecting the doctrine of punishment in another state; or if they had any such idea, they seem not to have thought that they could make the world believe, that all suffering would end with death. Nay, at the commencement of this century, and for 15 years afterwards, it is not known that any man professing to be, and received by the people as a Christian minister, had the boldness to avow, that man had nothing to fear beyond the grave—that all suffering would end with this mortal life.

Let it, then, be remembered, that THE DOCTRINE OF NO PUNISHMENT AFTER DEATH IS NOT YET TWENTY-FIVE YEARS

Not 25 years old. Generally received.

OLD. An old book may perhaps be found, in which this doctrine is expressed. And Mr. Whittemore of Boston professes, after, I suppose, a very close scrutiny, to have found one in the library of Harvard University, among the scores of thousands there, that taught this doctrine more than 180 years ago. If Mr. Richardson, to whom he refers as the author of that book, did mean to teach such a doctrine, (and this has been denied,) it argues but little for its reasonableness, that it should have slept more than a century and a half from its first avowal, until Mr. Ballou brought the dead to life again. But, whether it is contained in Mr. Richardson's book or not, there is no proof that the doctrine was incorporated into any creed called Christian, until its adoption by Mr. Ballou and his disciples in 1816-18.

Previous to that period, American Universalists were all *Restorationists*. But so fully were they prepared for these new views, and so eager were they to embrace them, that in a few years the new doctrine was almost universally received into the order. And now almost every Universalist preacher can sneer at the idea of " Hell and Damnation."

In 1829, the results of an extended correspondence, by the author of the ' Modern History,' showed, that a majority of the denomination openly avowed their belief in no punishment after death, while a large part of the remainder " would *not* affirm positively, as their settled belief, that there will or will not be punishment hereafter." In 1834, Mr. Ballou maintained, " that the doctrine of a future state of punishment is generally

disbelieved by *Universalists of our connection.*" (' Fut. Retrib.' p. 10.)

To understand this last remark, it is proper to state that so generally was the idea of retribution in a future state discarded by the whole sect, that Restorationists began to be a very small minority. And those who were left, alarmed at these inroads, determined in 1832 to withdraw from the connection, and form one of their own.

This last step, or some other demonstration of public feeling, seems rather to have alarmed the great remainder. It arrayed against them a band of men, fully acquainted with their views, and prepared to combat successfully their darling dogma. And some of the most powerful attacks, that have been made upon their most glaring errors, have come from this quarter. Latterly, therefore, they have very wisely avoided controversy on the subject of a *limited* future punishment. Those of them, who are ever ready to debate the doctrine of endless misery, are utterly averse to enter on a discussion of the simple question of punishment after death. They insist upon it, that this is a question to be settled among themselves. *We* have nothing to do with it! All that we have to do is to take care of the "horrid dogma" of endless torments. "Let them," says the 'Trumpet,' (XIII. 102,) "settle the question of endless misery; and Universalists will settle the matter of future limited punishment among themselves without any foreign help." It is surely very kind of them to take this labor off from our hands!

The people's favorite. Adroit management.

But how do they "settle this matter among themselves?" Verily by suffering it to sleep almost undisturbed. Those who profess to believe in no future punishment are often bold to preach it. This is the favorite doctrine of their *people.* Very few of their societies will endure any other. Again and again they have said, '*if our minister should preach any other we would leave him at once.*' Hence many of their preachers, who cannot deny that the Bible teaches that there will be punishment after death, and secretly, or, in private circles, admit it, dare not openly avow it, lest they should be abandoned by their disciples. They speak, therefore, very cautiously, whenever they approach this debateable topic.

In his 'Discussion' with Dr. Ely, Mr. Thomas, though he admitted his belief in the doctrine, that "the Bible furnishes no evidence of a punishment beyond the present life," (p. 18,) when he found it necessary in one instance to consider a passage having a bearing on this point, evidently manifested his unwillingness to enter upon a full discussion of this question, and says, (p. 69,) "Allow me to observe that the question is, simply, 'Is the doctrine of *endless* punishment taught in the Bible?'" Mr. Sawyer devotes four of his 'Letters to Remington,' to an examination of the nine arguments advanced by the latter in favor of future punishment, and yet manages so adroitly as to keep the reader perfectly in the dark as to his own views on the subject. "*Future punishment,*" he says, (p. 53,) *may be true,* but I do not believe you have proved it." And at the

close of this examination, he says, (p. 80,) "I did not commence this review of your arguments in favor of the doctrine of future punishment because I wished to deny that doctrine; nor because it was necessary to deny it, in order to sustain Universalism."

Mr. Sawyer is evidently unwilling to have it understood that the doctrine of no future punishment is common among Universalists. Speaking of an opponent, he says, ('Union,' Vol. VI. No. 2,)—"The writer assumes that the doctrine of no future punishment has been the "*common doctrine*" of Universalists. This is not true. It was never our common doctrine. The denomination has always been made up of believers in future and no future punishment; and it is so still." Again, he says, (No. 3.) "the only question to be discussed between Mr. J. and myself, is that of the *strict eternity* of punishment. If he can prove this at all, he can prove it directly, and without going through the beaten path of seeking it in future punishment." This path he evidently intends not to pursue himself.

In the year 1833, Mr. Braman, of Danvers, Mass., proposed to Mr. Whittemore, of Boston, at the instigation of the latter, to enter into a pulpit-discussion of Universalism; and, that the subject of discussion should "be divided into two propositions; viz.; first, *Will any of the human race be punished after death?*—and second, Is this punishment eternal?" Mr. W. could not by any means be brought to discuss the former of these questions, and replied, "The question for discussion must be the one I proposed—Is the doctrine of *endless*

misery revealed in the Holy Scriptures?" "Nothing else can be intruded into this discussion by my consent." "If you will accede to these conditions, well.—If not, nothing further need be said about the discussion."—('Danvers' Discussion,' pp. 8, 10, 17.)

It appears, thus, to be a settled point among them, that the only controversy between them and us, and the only one into which they will enter, is, *whether future punishment be strictly endless or not.* To such a statement of our differences we can never assent. By the showing of their own writers, (see page 23,) the difference between us is "heaven-wide," and we cannot consent, that they should any longer blind the eyes of the people, as some of them have done, with such gross assumptions.

The indifference, which they affect to feel in regard to a future limited punishment, is worthy of distinct mention; and the coolness with which they regard the settlement of the question, of the utmost reprobation. Many of them believe that their readers will endure *indescribable wretchedness for*, perhaps, *thousands of years;* and yet never warn them to escape, do not even announce to them the fact, and affect to treat it as a matter of little consequence. Mr. Thomas, after stating in his 'Discussion' that the question of "our final destiny is unquestionably the most important," advances the idea (p. 26,) that his readers "feel comparatively little interest in *minor* points of theology;" and one of these points to which he refers is the condition of man in "the intermediate state." Mr. Whittemore

Mere trash. Criminal ignorance.

assures us, ('Mod. His.' p. 434,) that "the doctrine of a *limited future punishment*, as a distinct question, has never excited a very general interest." Mr. Skinner, of Utica, having occupied about three-eighths of the 36th No. of the 7th Vol. of the 'Mag. and Adv.' with a discussion on this subject, says, (p. 287,) that these articles "occupy more room than *we ever have* at one time [allowed,] *or probably ever shall*, at any one future time, *allow to this subject.* We have generally, for reasons that must appear obvious to our readers, avoided the direct discussion of this subject to any considerable extent." And to show how much better he felt by unburdening his mind, he refers to the anecdote of a servant of a New-England divine, who, to the remark of his master who had been quite ill on the Sabbath morning, that he felt much better for preaching, replied—'Yes, Massa! me tink you feel great deal better after gittin *so much trash* off your 'tomach." In other words, the question of future punishment is MERE TRASH!

Much in the same way Mr. Williamson disposes of the matter in his 'Exposition,' (pp. 97, 8.)" In favor of future punishment there are some plausible arguments, which may be drawn from reason and analogy; and as a *philosophical speculation*, I would not strongly object to that doctrine." "But on this point, I will not dwell, for it is one of *minor* importance."

Now how can Universalist societies allow themselves to remain ignorant of the views of their pastors respecting a future state? If there be punishment after death,

and until the resurection, ought not the people to know it? to demand of their teachers either a confirmation or denial of it? "Even allowing this little eternity of punishment is at last to end, the thought is enough to take sleep from our eyes, lead us to weeping and wailing; and to warn each other, lest we come to this place of torment." So says Mr. Balfour, on supposition of a limited future punishment, and declares that then, "a new era ought to commence among Universalists, in their *zeal* and *exertions* for the salvation of immortal souls. No sect in the community acts so inconsistently as they do, if this opinion is true. What domestic or, foreign missions are they engaged in for the salvation of men's immortal souls? But why not engage in them with great zeal, *unless some thousand years punishment in hell is all a farce?* Religion out of the question, common *humanity* says—save them from so many years mental misery, if money, zeal, and exertion can affect it?" ('Letters,' p. 11.)

If my voice could reach such *preachers*, I would ask them,—On what principle of "common humanity" do you justify your silence on this subject, before your congregations? Do you certainly know that their sufferings for sin are to continue after death? And why, in the name of God, I ask, do you not tell them so? Why will you suffer them to leave the world blinded and deluded? If, on the other hand, you cannot come to a conclusion about it for yourselves, why not inform them that the probabilities, that they will suffer for their sins after death, are so great, that, with all your

prepossessions against such a doctrine, you cannot certainly say that there will be no such punishment? Mr. Thomas asks, ('Discussion,' p. 286,) "Is it strange that the inspired servants of the Most High God should devote their lives and all their energies to the promotion of human happiness in the earth?" But, I ask, 'Is it not both strange and cruel for you to see your fellow-men *exposed* to sufferings in another state that may last for thousands of years, and yet not even warn them?' They appeal to your silence as proof that there is no such punishment. They and we have a right to demand of *you*, who presume to be so much wiser than all others on the subject of a future state, to be no longer *non-committal* in relation to a matter that so deeply affects our future well-being. Settle this question speedily. No longer exclude it from the columns of your reviews and weekly prints. Give your views of it from the pulpit. Let the people know your sentiments without the least concealment. "If thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at thine hand."

To the *people* I would say, Do not be sure that you will not suffer for your sins after death. The doctrine, which you have embraced so eagerly, is not yet twenty-five years old. It has not even the recommendation of antiquity. It is too slender a reed to lean upon. It may pierce you through with many sorrows. At all events, it will be time enough for you to receive the doctrine, when your ministers have embraced it with

all their hearts. In the meantime a dreadful uncertainty must afflict you. If you have any confidence in your own clergy, you can never be at peace, while so many of them are either in doubt of, or opposed to, the doctrine of no punishment after death. It is a hazardous venture to stake your eternity on a doctrine denied by all the Christian world, and even by many of your own authorized expounders of scripture. Wait at least before you believe it, until I shall exhibit to you some of the consequences, into which those of your teachers are led who embrace this doctrine, and into which you must follow them, if you would be consistent. "*I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say.*"

CHAPTER VII.

SIN CEASES AT DEATH.—DEATH NOT THE FRUIT OF SIN.

New Rule of Faith—No common ground in controversy—Sin ceases at death—Mankind naturally mortal—Yet they interpret most of the threatenings of the Bible, of natural death—Inconsistency—Scripture-account of the matter.

"Aut beatus, aut nullus."—SENECA.

Take which you please, 'tis all the same to us—
BLISS, or EXTINCTION: for our creed runs thus:—
All are receiv'd to endless bliss at death,
Or lose their being with their mortal breath.

THE Bible must, at all events, be so interpreted as to exclude the doctrine of endless misery, or it will not please a Universalist. He has determined that so it *must* be; and who can say him—'Nay?' I do but advance the openly-avowed purpose of their great Rabbi. Hosea Ballou, in his 'Lecture-Sermons,' says, (p. 193,) "The fact is, there is no such testimony in the Scriptures, which can, with the least degree of fairness, be applied to a state of never-ending misery.' "Moreover, we feel it to be a duty to state, that, in room of straining particular passages, which speak of the punishment of the wicked, so as to favor the idea of unlimited punishment, *we should feel justified in re-straining any passage*, could such be found, *that should*

seem to favor an opinion, so dishonorable to God, and so revolting to our best feelings."

Let it never be said, after this, that the *Bible* is the Universalist's Rule of Faith. Every thing in and out of the Bible must be made to bend to his own 'FEELINGS.' He has already decided the question, before he opens that blessed book. And, if he finds there any thing that does not accord with that decision, it must be warped, and twisted, and wrested, and compressed, or spirited away, so as to suit the 'feelings' of not the learner, but, the judge. I need not say, that all the writings of these *learned* divines are a perfect illustration of this process. If any one wishes to amuse himself with some rare specimens of this art, (if amusement can be found in such woful exhibitions,) let him read Ballou's 'Notes on the Parables,' or Whittemore's 'Notes and Illustrations of the Parables,' or 'The Plain Guide to Universalism.'

Thus are they armed at all points. They will hold no argument respecting a finite punishment, with those who believe that punishment is to be infinite. And when we attempt to prove it infinite, and make our appeal to the Bible, they are determined to *restrain* any and every passage that seems to favor such an opinion. Of what use then is it to enter into controversy with them on such terms? It is a complete waste of words. Let the world know the length and breadth of their departures from the faith, and let them judge whether such men are to be entrusted as expounders and defenders of "the faith once delivered to the saints."

An argument sought. Sin limited to this life.

Those of them, who believe that punishment ceases at death, are determined that the Bible shall sustain their views in the manner already stated. They must have it all their own way in the other world, as well as in this. Having found that they could dispense with endless punishment, they learned, a few years since, that they could do without any punishment at all beyond the grave; that it was by far the most pleasant and comfortable doctrine, to believe that all their sorrows would cease at death. They therefore set themselves to work to prove it, or, as their manner is, to deny that the contrary can be proved.

Some show of argument was necessary in order to establish the wavering. This, however, was not so easily found. Some novel principles must, in such an emergency, be devised, that would serve the purpose. Reasoning from the premises laid down by Mr. Ballou, and adopted so generally, that sin is the work of the flesh, or man's animal nature as it exists in this life, it was easy to see that

VII. SIN CEASES WITH THE DEATH OF THE BODY.

If man ceases to sin, then, say they, he ceases to suffer; therefore, there is no punishment in a future state. The very thing that was to be proved! It will not answer, to allow that men have any thing to do with sin after the destruction of the body. This, therefore, is a cardinal point, and much they labor to establish it. The doctrine is thus stated by Mr. Le Fevre, in the 'Gospel Anchor,' (II. 289;) "Man's

sins, like himself, are of a mundane or earthly character. *Man dies, and with him die all those temptations which have led him astray* from the path of duty, and constituted him while here a wicked man. When he is raised from the state of death, he will be raised immortal and incorruptible." Thus he attempts to show that a man's wickedness—all that 'constituted him a wicked man'—ceases at death. After that, he is just as righteous as the holiest saint that ever walked the earth. His wickedness being limited to this world, how, then, can it be punished in another?

These views are, doubtless, derived from Mr. Ballou's on the 'Atonement.' In that work, he says, (p. 7,) that "in order to prove that a man will be miserable, after this mortal life is ended, it must first be proved that he will sin in the next state of existence." This he argues from the supposition, (p. 6,) "that a perpetuity of punishment must be connected with an equal continuance of sin," and (p. 7,) "that as long as men sin, they will be miserable, be that time longer or shorter: and that as soon as they cease from sin, they begin to experience divine enjoyment." Just as if it was necessary for a murderer to continue to commit murder daily and hourly in order to be wretched; and as if the remembrance of one murderous act was not enough to embitter the whole future life! In the preface to the fifth edition of the same work, he informs us, that, when he published the first edition, he was not "so fully satisfied, that all which the Scriptures say about sin, and the punishment of it, relates

solely to this mortal state, *as he now is.*" This, of course, was after he had made the wonderful discovery of no future punishment.

In a sermon on the second death, from Rev. xxi. 8, he says, ('Lect. Sermons,' p. 217,) "Another very great inconsistency in the common use of our text is, that it supposes that after people shall have ceased from all the sins which are enumerated in the text, and are in *a constitution of existence in which no such crimes can ever be committed,* they are then and there to be tormented for what they did in this world." "What reason, then, is there in supposing that, *in a world where no crime can ever* be committed, crimes will be eternally punished?" "What is this punishment for in the eternal world, *in which no one (?) pretends that any crime can ever be committed?*" Again, "The hearer is cautioned (p. 370,) against supposing that we allow that the next state will be subject to sickness, *or to sin;* we distinctly say that *the evidence of this is wanting both in scripture and reason.*"

A writer in the 'Universalist Expositor,' for Sept. 1838, is still more explicit. "We have seen, (p. 303,) that all the sin that mankind commit, proceeds from the unnatural activity, the unrestrained indulgence, of the propensities and appetites pertaining to the flesh and blood of which our bodies are composed; and that the soul or mind properly speaking, never is the source of iniquity, and, so far as it is enlightened, never consents to it. Now, if the body, with all its appetites and propensities, perishes in its mother-earth, as the

Scriptures emphatically declare, is it not very evident, that *sin cannot exist beyond the death of this body* and the extinction of its lusts?" "Can sin continue in being after the annihilation of those passions which are *its sole and only source?*" "Sole and only!" One *sole* is not strong enough: so he must have two, lest, after all, his reader should suspect, that as a man "THINKETH *in his heart, so is he.*" Does the *flesh* think? Who is it that tells us, that "unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure, but even their *mind* and *conscience* is defiled?"—and of some, "that were alienated and *enemies in their mind* by wicked works?" Is *flesh* identical with mind and *conscience?* Or are the latter destroyed with the former? But I must not press this question yet.

One more extract will suffice on this point. Mr. Williamson says, ('Exposition,' p. 18,) "We believe," (and here he speaks for the denomination) "that the lusts of the flesh, and all the evil passions that distract and torment man on earth," (poor innocent sufferer!) "will be left *in the earth where they originated*, that God will not transplant them to another world to nourish them there."

It is thus more than intimated, that a mere spiritual being cannot sin. So they would have us believe, whether they teach it in so many words or not. But, "*hic labor, hoc opus est;*" this is a work of painful toil. They can scarcely convince themselves of its truth. How then can they hope to succeed with others? The world has too long been taught in the school of expe-

rience, not to know that *sin is the product of mind*, and *only of mind*—that flesh and blood, or mere animal functions, however much they may serve as occasions for sin, never can themselves sin;—sin cannot be predicated of a finger, tooth, or toe; never of the animal juices, or secretions; never of the bile or gall; but only of "the mind, spirit, or soul."

What, then, is to be done? It will not answer to let man sin after death, for then he must suffer, and the "darling doctrine" of no punishment after death comes to nought. But when, and where, was a Universalist ever at a loss for a subterfuge? Imperturbable to the last, he hits at once on some expedient, and then sets his wits to work, to make the Bible foster his own bantling. The whole difficulty is removed by the discovery, that the pretensions of mankind to an inherent immortality are all wrong,—based on mistaken notions of human nature, and unwarranted by Scripture.

VIII.—MANKIND ARE NATURALLY AND ORIGINALLY MORTAL.

It is maintained very strenuously by this sect, that physical death is not the fruit, in any sense, of sin;—that man would have died, had he never sinned at all, and that, when he dies he ceases to be, as far as all consciousness is concerned; so that the idea of his sinning after death, and previous to the resurrection, they regard as in the highest degree absurd. This theory, moreover, answers an admirable purpose, in the argument against the common notion of "the fall of man," native and total depravity, and some other similar ideas

of the ancients. It must not, therefore, be passed over lightly.

In this instance, as in others, Mr. Ballou is entitled to the distinguished honor of being the first of the order to discover a doctrine, which they have since turned to so good account. "God saw fit," he informs us, ('Atonement,' p. 35,) "in his plan of divine wisdom, to make the creature subject to vanity; to give him *a mortal constitution*." Again, (p. 59,) "Men die natural deaths because they are *naturally mortal;* but they are not mortal because of sin, for *man was mortal before he sinned*, if he were not, he never could have sinned." "*Sin cannot be said to be the cause of natural death*, any more than of natural life." In the 'Lecture-Sermons,' we are told, (p. 62,) "that the opinion that man was constituted in flesh and blood, first a perfectly holy being, but was made subject to vanity *by sin*, is as contrary to the plain declaration of our text, as it is repugnant to the dictates of reason." A pretty compliment, truly, he pays to the reason of all the Christian world who have differed from him, from days with which the memory of man runs not parallel! Hence, he says, (p. 64,) "that the fact is, we have no authority for this doctrine which is called —'*the fall*.'" How can we express our obligations for this wonderful discovery? especially since he tells us, (p. 65,) that "it seems *impossible to avoid this conclusion* concerning the *imperfect* state of man in the beginning."

If now we turn to other authors of this name, we

find them making a plentiful use of Mr. Ballou's "old notes that he delivered almost" forty years ago. Mr. Balfour, in his 'Three Essays,' (p. 96,) maintains that "to say an immortal being became mortal by sin, is a contradiction in terms; nor is it intimated that the entrance of sin produced such a change among mankind." Mr. Skinner of Boston remarks, ('Univ. Ill. and Def.' p. 77,) that "it is contrary to the account of Moses, to say, that a change was produced in the *constitution of Adam*, by the first sin." "The very nature of the human constitution shows, that it was not designed for an endless existence on earth." "Sin does not make us mortal; *we were originally constituted mortal.*" Mr. Sawyer finds fault with Mr. Remington, for attributing to him ('Letters,' p. 42,) the assertion "that temporal or natural death constituted a part of the penalty" of sin; and adds, (p. 44,) "that my 'brethren generally,' do not adopt such an opinion, your friend Mr. Lee would have informed you, had you read him with due care. He says—'It is probably generally known that modern Universalists deny that the death of the body is an effect of sin, and maintain that Adam was created mortal, and that he and all our race would have died, if sin had never entered the world.'"

Similar language is used by B. Whittemore, of Boston.—"*Reason* will not admit ('Gospel Anchor,' II. p. 385,) that all mankind were rendered liable to death by the fall. Had the All-wise God, in the creation of man, designed him to live forever, *neither the fall nor any thing else, would have occasioned his death*—no

power in the universe would be able to take his life. If we view the organic powers of man, we shall discover that they were composed of such materials, that in the very nature of things, they must wax old and decay—of course could not have been intended as the home of endless life."

Now it seems very strange, that while these writers so positively deny that natural death is a consequence of sin, they so frequently maintain that the threatenings of the Bible refer only to the cessation of natural life, thus making natural death the greatest punishment to which mankind are liable. Mr. Sawyer admits ('Penalty of Sin,' p. 14,) that "a premature, violent, and ignominious death inflicted for crime, has always been regarded both by God and man, as the *greatest punishment* that mortals can suffer;" and asks—"Who can be so ignorant as not to know, that under perhaps every government on the globe, temporal death is regarded as the *severest punishment* which can be inflicted?" And yet, in the face of these well-established facts, he has the boldness to deny, that natural death is properly a consequence of, or punishment for, sin! Instances of the same inconsistency abound in the writings of these renowned reformers!

It will be said, perhaps, that these admissions relate to '*premature*' death—to the shortening of a man's life, as in the case of the Antediluvians, the Sodomites, and the Jews of Jerusalem. But if the shortening of a man's life but a few years is spoken of as a testimony of the divine displeasure for sin, how much more must we

regard that as a consequence of, or punishment for, sin, which consists in cutting down human life from a duration of nearly a thousand years to an average of only about thirty!—and especially in making man mortal at first, debarring him from immortality on earth, and making him inevitably subject to that death from which his whole nature instinctively recoils! If it is spoken of as a mark of God's anger, that he should consume a few hundreds, or thousands at most, on the plains of Sodom, how much more does he display his anger in sweeping away, in about thirty years, nine hundred millions "as with a flood!" In Job, (xxiv. 19,) we are told "drought and heat consume the snow-waters; so doth the grave those who have *sinned*." And after the same manner, "Moses, the man of God," whom these writers claim as with them, accounts (Ps. xc. 3, 7, 8, 9,) for the prevalence of natural death: "Thou turnest man to destruction: for we are consumed by thine *anger*, and by thy *wrath* are we troubled; thou hast set our *iniquities* before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance: for all our days are passed away in thy *wrath*, we spend our years as a tale that is told." Man's mortality is thus attributed to the anger of God, consequent upon the iniquities of the sinner.

But Paul is much more explicit, and seems to put the matter beyond controversy. To the Romans he says, (v. 12,) "as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and *so death passed upon all men*." That death in this last clause refers to the body is made plain by what he says, v. 14: "Nevertheless

death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's trangression." Still more apparent is his meaning in 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22; "For since by man came *death*, by man came also the *resurrection* of the dead; for *as in Adam all die*, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The sense of the word, 'death,' in this passage, no Universalist will pretend to dispute. They all mainiain that this passage speaks of a physical resurrection. The Bible, therefore, teaches that, had not man have sinned, he would not have been mortal; natural death is the fruit of sin. Far distant be the day, when men shall forsake the authority of Moses and Paul, speaking "as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," for such self-constituted standards, as Ballou, Balfour, & Co.

CHAPTER VIII.

MAN HAS NO IMMORTAL SOUL.

What becomes of man at death?—Poetic effusions—Mind not immortal—Man has but one nature, and that material and mortal—Mr. Ballou's ignorance—Sketch of Mr. Balfour—His exegetical labors—Man has no immortal soul, exegetically considered—These views generally received—Source of the doctrine—Materialism—Death the great Savior.

> "One doubt
> Pursues me still, lest all I cannot die;
> Lest that pure breath of life, the spir't of man
> Which God inspir'd, cannot together perish
> With this corporeal clod: then, in the grave,
> Or in some other dismal place, who knows
> But I shall die a living death? O thought
> Horrid if true! Yet why? It was but breath
> Of life that sinn'd; what dies but what had life
> And sin? The body properly hath neither,
> ALL OF ME THEN SHALL DIE! let this appease
> The doubt, since human reach no further knows."
>
> MILTON.

How shall we dispose of man after death and until the resurrection? Where is his resting-place? Does he go immediately to heaven when he ceases from earth, or what is done with him? That he goes into a place of punishment, or of suffering, is either positively denied, or greatly questioned, by the expounders

of Universalism. They seem determined that their sufferings shall end with mortal life. But, after all, is it not possible that, if man continues to *exist*, he may continue to sin? And if to sin, then must he continue to suffer. Now, as it cannot be proved that it is impossible to sin in another state of existence, it becomes necessary to deprive man of all conscious existence at the moment of death, and until the resurrection.

A silence, like that of the grave, is observed by the greater part of Universalist writers respecting the state of the dead. Now and then a sentiment appears in the dying sayings of some of their number, and in their fugitive poetry, which would seem to imply that the departed are happy in heaven. A correspondent of the 'Gospel Anchor,' for example asks, (II. 166,)

> "How is the *spirit* prone to break its chains,
> And struggle out beyond its narrow bounds!
> Why is it thus? If wedded to the dust,
> And of the dust a part, and doom'd to die
> And with the body filter through the earth,—
> Why, where, or whence derives its other thoughts?
> Say, does the *body* ask for wings? . . . .
> No! 'tis the *soul*—th' immortal part—the mind,
> Which, not of earth, delights not in it."

The following from a contributor to the 'Universalist Union' is of the same import. (IV. 308:)

> "O grave! terrific thou to human pride;
> Yet o'er the spirit 's light, thou'st no control;
> However near is flesh to earth allied,
> Thy bars, O death! cannot confine the soul!"

Again (p. 124,) another says,

"When the dust sinks to dust,
Then shall we come,
Where we free shall ever be,
In Heaven our home."

Such poetic effusions are not uncommon. Now and then, too, the experience of some dying Universalist is given, in which he is represented as longing for death, that he may fly away to Heaven, and be happy there, while his body is mouldering to dust.

But the creed of the Universalist recognizes no such hope. And, sometimes, the editor, who admits such articles into his columns is honest enough to avow it. In the case of the article, quoted above from the 'Gospel Anchor,' Mr. Le Fevre, one of the editors, first remarks, (p. 244,) "We do not hold ourselves responsible for the sentiments of our correspondents, or for extracts which we may select, especially in poetical productions!"—But we may ask, "if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" He then proceeds to say—"We have *no reason to believe in the immortality of the mind.* As far as *facts* weigh any thing in the argument, they all stand opposed to such an hypothesis." "We are irresistibly led to believe that mind depends on organization, and where that is impaired, the mental capacity is destroyed. Consequently in the article of death, we should say, that *the mind perishes with the body.* Whether the *scriptures* teach the immortality of the soul is a question perhaps

not so easily decided." "We have given considerable attention to this subject, and we do not hesitate to say, that in our humble opinion *the testimony against the doctrine of the soul's immortality appears to preponderate.*"

This is the opinion not of one individual alone. "The junior editor, (Mr. Williamson, now of New York,) concurs with us in these sentiments." And these stand not alone. There are others, "who have boldly acknowledged their disbelief of the soul's immortality." But "there has been exhibited by many editors an unwillingness to approach this subject;" because those, who have denied the immortality of the soul, "have been subject to much reproach, and been stigmatised as deists, materialists, &c."

I am prepared to show, that though, "on this question Universalists are divided in opinion," according to Mr. Le Fevre, it is yet their prevailing belief, that

IX. Man has no immortal soul.

On this subject Hosea Ballou is very equivocal. After so much dogmatism as he has exhibited in relation to the doctrines of future and endless punishment, the reader will hardly be prepared to hear him confess TOTAL IGNORANCE OF A FUTURE STATE. Let his deluded followers know that even *their great Rabbi can give them no assurance respecting the state beyond the grave.* His language is this: "As amazed as any one may be at *my ignorance of a future state*, I have no pride in pretending to know *that of which I*

am totally ignorant. After all that has been said by our doctors of divinity on the subject of a future state, reason will acknowledge that they have no more knowledge concerning its particulars than an infant child. No, they do not know for certainty that man will exist in another state. I am happy to *believe* in the doctrine of the scriptures, and to *hope* for immortality beyond the grave; but as to any *knowledge* concerning that state *I have none.*" ('Future Retribution,' p. 127.) Speaking in another place, (p. 172,) "of everlasting condemnation in the future," he says, "*we must wait until we are introduced into the other world, before we can certainly know.*" What a sandy foundation! Is this all?

In the same volume he tells us, (pp. 182, 183,) that "this subject, (the intermediate state,) has never been much agitated among brethren of our order, until quite lately. Dr. Priestly's views of an unconscious state after death were not known to me when I wrote my treatise on atonement, *nor had this subject then ever been considered by me.* This accounts for my silence on it." (Admirably qualified he must have been for a reformer!) "Of late I have endeavored to know what divine revelation has communicated on this subject; but, *owing to my want of discernment,*" (an honest confession, truly,) "I have not been able to reconcile all the passages, which seem to relate to the case, to a fair support of either side of the question. My efforts, I acknowledge, have not been made with that intenseness of application, respecting this matter, as they would

have been, *had I been persuaded that the question was of any great consequence.*" Of no great consequence what becomes of man for thousands of years! Does he,—can he believe it? Is not this a mere evasion of the whole question? Nay, is it not a confession of the feebleness of his own system? But let us hear him further. "Being fully satisfied that the scriptures teach us *to believe no moral* state, between the death of the body, and the resurrection-state,—it seemed to me *immaterial* whether we enter, immediately, after the dissolution of the body, on the resurrection-state, or sleep in unconscious quietude any given time before that glorious event shall take place." The sum, then, of what Mr. Ballou has said, is that all mankind are immediately at death received to bliss, or are extinguished in the grave, no more to exist until the resurrection. The former he dare not assert. The latter he does not deny.

Let us now turn away from the darkness of the master to the blazing light of the disciple. In 1819, a few straggling doubts, concerning the truth of the doctrine of endless misery, found their way into the mind of Walter Balfour, of Charlestown, Mass. This gentleman "was brought up in the doctrine of the church of Scotland." "When I came to judge for myself," he says, "I became an Independent or *Congregationalist;* I then became a *Baptist;* and am now a *Universalist*, and one of those who have no faith in future punishment." ('Letters to Hudson,' p. 22.) In 1820, he proposed his difficulties to a distinguished Professor,

as an "Inquirer after Truth." It appears that he still remained unsettled in his views as late as 1821, (see 'Reply to Stuart,' p. 5.) Either in that or the following year he became a true disciple of Ballou.

Full of his new views, Mr. Balfour set himself to work with all the zeal of a new convert; and, early in 1824, produced a work of 448 pages octavo, devoted to a determination of the meaning of four words, "all translated *Hell*, in the common English version." To the inexpressible joy of the whole body of Universalists in this country, he claimed for himself the distinguished credit of having "shown by irrefragable proof, that, by *Hell*, the sacred writers meant either the state of the dead in general, without reference to either the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery; or else a state of unhappiness in the present life." In other words, he ascertained that there is in existence no "place called hell, in a future state, prepared for the punishment of the wicked," and that, therefore, all fear of hell torments is wholly imaginary.

In his second edition of the same "Inquiry," published in 1825, he goes farther, and maintains that the doctrine of a future retribution must be given up. A 'Second Inquiry' followed soon after, in which he showed conclusively to his own mind, and his brethren-believers, that no word or phrase, expressive of endless duration, is applied to the punishment of the wicked, and "in which the common doctrine of a super-human devil is exploded." The way being thus cleared, by exploding the devil, and abolishing hell, the same in-

defatigable writer proceeded to show in "Three Essays" published early in 1828, that, there being *no place* for the keeping of the spirits of the departed, the grave is man's only resting-place until the resurrection.

It is "generally believed by Christians of all sects," he remarks, that the spirits, or souls of men "survive death and enjoy happiness, or suffer misery, in a *disembodied* state between death and the resurrection." In this respect, however, he differs from them all; for he declares (p. 12,) "that the common opinions on this subject are *unscriptvral;* have their origin in heathenism; and have proved a fertile source of superstition and imposition in the Christian church." In the course of his 'Inquiry' he remarks, (p. 97,) that "man comes into the world, and *dies similar to the brute creation;*" and he asks, (p. 111,) "of what real benefit can it be to man, to cheer him with the prospect of *immediate happiness* after death, if it is not taught in Scripture? After examining this subject with all the care and attention I am able to give it, I must say it is only *ideal cheer.*" Again, (p. 117,) "*I send no man,* either good or bad, *to heaven at death,* nor at any period after it, until the resurrection of all the dead." How, after this, can any Universalist indulge the delusive hope of being happy when he dies? Mr. Balfour, the scholar and the divine, erudite and profound, has pronounced it a hopeless, "ideal cheer."

In his 'Letters to Hudson,' he denies (p. 32,) "that the intermediate state has any existence, except in the imaginations of men." He assures us (p. 243,) "that

man at death just returns to his original condition;" he returns to dust. That all life, according to Mr. Balfour, becomes extinct at death, appears further from his assertion (p. 261,) "that the only hope revealed to man of future life is in being raised from the dead in the resurrection at the last day." In this he is followed by Mr. Sawyer, who, speaking in his 'Letters to Remington,' (p. 104,) of all men being made alive in Christ at the resurrection of the dead says, "for myself, I am frank to confess that *I know of no life beyond the present*, save as conferred by Jesus Christ."

Mr. Balfour, in his 'Reply to Professor Stuart,' asks, (p. 11,) "Does the gospel, sir, bring to light any other life and immortality, but by a resurrection from the dead? If it does, I will thank you to show this, for here I confess ignorance." "I know, (p. 87,) of no other future life the Bible reveals." Speaking of "a world of souls, naked, helpless, disembodied spirits," he says, (p. 115,) "I honestly believe it has *no existence except in men's imaginations*."

The natural inference from all this is, that man is not immortal—that he has not a nature distinct from, and independent of, the body. The doctrine of two co-existent natures in man—body and soul—maintained by all the Christian world, with rare exceptions, must be given up, if Universalism prevails. Mr. Balfour both denies and ridicules such a doctrine. In his 'Letters to Hudson,' he says, (p. 33,) "If any believe in the doctrine of immortal souls, and take them all to heaven at death, it is no concern of mine." From

the frequent use of the qualifying word *immortal*, it might be thought, that the *existence* of the soul was admitted but not its *immortality*, We are not, however, left to such a conclusion. "The thing God breathed into Adam was (p. 239,) 'the breath of life;' which was *no more a thinking, conscious being than the body* into which it was breathed. It was this breath of life, breathed into the body and in union with it, both were constituted a living soul, or person." With his grammar here I have no concern, but with the sentiment; and that plainly is, that man has no thinking soul distinct from the body and animal life—that these two constitute what is called the soul, the person, the man. That this is his meaning appears from his calling on Mr. H. (p. 240,) to "show how the mere union of life with the bodily frame transforms life into an immortal soul, a thinking conscious being, which is to suffer or enjoy in a disembodied state." Again he asks, "When does your immortal soul first become a thinking, conscious being?"

As usual, he is exceedingly positive and certain that all the world are wrong, except himself and his followers. Hear how he speaks; "I travel," he says, (p. 243,) "through both Old and New Testament in search of evidence for your immortal soul; but *I can find none*, that either such a soul was breathed into man, or is breathed out of any one at death." "Your doctrine of an immortal soul, (p. 339,) and its punishment after death, is of heathen origin;" "is but *heathen chaff*, (p. 342,) which the wind of free inquiry and investigation into

the scriptures must ere long blow away.—Go it must, unless free inquiry is retarded, or some very new discovery is made from the Bible. The very rage for immortal soul-saving, in the present day, is calculated to hasten this desirable event." "It is a doctrine," (p. 353,) "not only at war with the princicles of the Bible, but with that of *reason*, *justice*, and *common sense*." That the Christian world have been until the days of these very *sensible* men, lamentably deficient in "common sense," we have already learned from from others of Mr. Balfour's coadjutors in the work of demolition. Of course, we must, hereafter, give up all claims to its possession.

The amount of these declarations is, that the common notion that man has an immortal soul is all a heathen delusion, that there is no soul to survive the destruction or cessation of animal life, that at death the whole man dies, and that there never would be a conscious existence again, but for the resurrection. If it be said that these are the views of Mr. Balfour alone, I ask for the proof. They have never been disowned by the order, and his works are every where for sale in their book-stores as "*Universalist* publications." That the *common people* maintain them, I do not believe. They hope to go to heaven as soon as they die. And their dishonest teachers have not benevolence enough to undeceive them, and to introduce them to a full acquaintance with their more refined and *atheistical* speculations.

But we learn, not from this inference alone, but from

their own avowals, that these are the views of the sect generally. That "Mr. Le Fevre does not believe in the common doctrine of the immortality of the soul," has already been shown. "He says, (p. 289,) there is no evidence of man possessing any thing about him *immortal*. He does not consider the mind to possess the attribute of immortality; because, like the body, it may be destroyed by accident." "The future state of man, he considers, based on the resurrection, and that state will, according to the Apostle, be glorious for all."

Another writer in the 'Gospel Anchor,' (II. 305,) avows the same sentiments. He says that "it is impossible to deny that all" our "intellectual phenomena, are properties of the *body*. When the body dies, and the nervous system with it, all these phenomena cease and are irrecoverably gone. We never possess after death, so far as our senses can inform us, the slightest evidence of *the existence of any remaining being*, which, connected with the body during life, is separated from it at death." "If the intellectual phenomena is the soul, and dependent upon corporeal organization, *when the body dies, it will, of course, cease to exist*."

The editor of the 'Life of Murray,' in commenting on the differences between the faith of the father of Universalism, and that of his children, fully admits that these views are general among them. "Nor is it now admitted," he remarks, (p. 279,) "by Universalists *generally*, that man possesses *two natures;* and their

views necessarily conflict with many of Mr. Murray's interpretations of Scripture, in which he fully expressed and maintained, that human beings were thus constituted."

Though we find Mr. Ballou asking, ('Lecture-Sermons," p. 328,) "What can give more rational consolation to those who mourn, than to realize that the spirits of their departed connections *are* with God? or what thought can possibly contribute more to tranquilize our minds, and to prepare us to meet our own dissolution, than a confident belief that we shall be with God?—and of this we may be safely persuaded;"—in another place we find him declaring that he is "fully satisfied that the scriptures teach us to believe no moral state between the death of the body and the resurrection-state." ('Fut. Retrib.' p. 183.)

That Mr. Kneeland, and the large portion of the sect, who regarded him then as an oracle, had no faith in the immortality of the soul, is made clear by his own confession. "It will be perceived here," he says, ('Lectures,' p. 48,) that the author does not believe in an intermediate state of conscious existence between death and the resurrection; and of course *death*, to him, *is an extinction of being;* and all his ideas of a future state of existence are predicated on the glorious doctrine of the resurrection."

These sentiments they have been driven to adopt, in order to save the labor of proving that man will not sin, and so suffer after death, and until the resurrection. The course, it must be confessed, is very simple. It is

only to deny that the soul survives the body, and then, that man has an immortal soul that can think, or feel, or exist, except as it is connected with the animal frame. All this they have done. They have degraded themselves nearly to a level with the brutes, and denied that in which the glory of man has been heretofore thought to consist. All this they have been compelled, they have been willing, to do, and much more they would do, if necessary, to maintain their favorite and much-loved doctrine—no punishment after death. The Lord deliver his people and the world from such unprincipled teachers!

It may yet be asked, 'How do these men account for the exercise of *thought*, if man has no distinct spiritual nature?' Mr. Ballou shall give the reply, in his own words. "A careful examination ('Atonement,' p. 31,) of our *natural senses*, as mediums of pleasure and pain, and health and sickness, will very naturally lead to a consideration of *these same senses as being the origin*, as far as we can see, *of our thoughts and volitions.* With these senses are necessarily connected all the various *passions* which we possess, and which are ever in accordance with the ideas or thoughts by them created. From the ever-changing combinations, and various evolutions of these our senses, thoughts, ideas, appetites and passions, are found to originate all that variety of moral character which is found in man." Here is *Materialism* with a witness! Here, after all, I am inclined to think, Mr. Balfour took his text, when he proved, as he

thought, that man had no immortal soul. Mr. Ballou is a Materialist, and of the worst kind, notwithstanding that he has elsewhere told us, that he could not satisfy himself about the intermediate state.

It is not wonderful, that, as says Mr. Le Fevre, some of Mr. Ballou's disciples are afraid to avow their sentiments, and keep silence lest they should be called Deists, &c. They may well be ashamed of a doctrine that makes Death, and not Jesus, the great Savior from sin. Where Christ saves one from sin in this life, Death saves its thousands, if this doctrine be true. Where can we find a perfect man—one entirely free from sin? But death puts an end to sin and sinners too. This is Mr. Ballou's language. "It (the punishment) evidently accomplishes this design—putting a stop to the practice of vice—by the *death* of the subject." ('Fut. Retrib.' p. 126.) In the 'Magazine and Advocate,' (VII. 284,) it is maintained that death is the grand instrument by which Christ frees men from sin. "How then is it impossible," asks the writer, "that men should be saved from their sins by Christ, if death is the grand instrument by which he saves them, or frees them from their sins? I can conceive of *nothing* that will subdue, even annihilate every fleshly passion and appetite that leads to sin, *like the all-conquering power of death.*" All that a man has to do, then, according to this, in order to put an end to his sins, is to put an end to his life—or to commit the awful sin of *suicide.* Thus he becomes his own savior,

through the grand instrument—*death.* Sin saves him from sin!

Of what use was it, then, for Christ to come into the world and endure such sorrows and pains to save men from sin, when death could do it effectually without him? And yet the authors and abettors of this heaven-daring and insulting scheme call themselves CHRISTIANS!!

CHAPTER IX.

NO ESCAPE FROM PUNISHMENT.

Nature of suffering for sin—God all just and inexorable—Sin invariably punished in full—Zeal for God's justice—No remission of punishment by forgiveness—Views of Zophar, David, Ezra, and the pious in our day—Question of Suicide—Denial of its criminality—The mercy of God excluded.

"My firm persuasion is, at least sometimes,
That heav'n will weigh man's virtues and his crimes
With nice attention in a righteous scale,
And save or damn as these or those prevail.
I plant my foot upon this ground of trust,
And silence ev'ry fear with—GOD IS JUST.
But if, perchance, on some dull drizzling day
A thought intrude, that says, or seems to say,
'If thus th' important cause is to be tried,
Suppose the beam should dip on the wrong side;'
I soon recover from these needful frights,
And—GOD IS MERCIFUL—sets all to rights."—COWPER.

THE views thus far presented relate chiefly to the question of the continuance of punishment or suffering for sin. Let us now inquire into their notions respecting the *nature* of this suffering.

When this sect first became known they were accused of setting aside the justice of God, while they magnified his mercy out of all proportion. Said Dr. Young,

> "They set at odds heav'n's jarring attributes,
> And with one excellence another wound,
> Till mercy triumphs over—God himself."

Nor could they, according to the scheme then in vogue among them, and still supposed, by the larger part of the Christian church, to be still their current doctrine, escape the imputation. They felt it, and set themselves to work, in order to rid themselves of the difficulty. Their whole scheme was professedly remodelled; and at length came forth with an entire new dress. From having pushed the doctrine of the divine mercy to an extreme, at the expense of justice, they now cast mercy aside, and maintain that justice will be exacted, even to the uttermost farthing, of every transgressor.

The God, whom our modern Universalists profess to worship, is a God *inexorable*, as determined to exact and obtain, to the very letter of the law, all that justice demands of the sinner personally, as the veriest Shylock. Let the world fully understand that this scheme of "*Universal charity*," as it has been called, shuts up the bowels of divine compassion, and proclaims that,

X. EVERY MAN WILL INEVITABLY SUFFER TO THE FULL EXTENT OF HIS DESERTS.

Whatever a man deserves for his transgressions he will invariably receive, and, as most of them think, in this world. They are determined that justice shall have no claim upon them in another world, or state of being.

Sin punished to the full. No escape from deserved suffering.

Thus they hold out to the world the idea that they pay the highest regard to the justice of God: while, after all their pains to deceive themselves and the people, it turns out, as I shall presently show, that this very suffering required by justice they represent as only the highest exercise of *mercy*.

Since they have adopted this modification of their creed, they appear to be wonderfully pleased with their own ingenuity in devising it. They can scarcely believe or admit that any one, who is not a Universalist of the latest type, believes at all in the justice of God. It is claimed by Mr. Williamson, in his 'Exposition of Universalism,' (p. 15,) "as one of the *peculiar* doctrines of Universalism, that *no man can, by any possibility, escape a just punishment for his sins.*" "Neither forgiveness, nor atonement, nor repentance, nor any thing else, can step in between the sinner and the penalty of the violated law." "It is a remarkable fact," he says, "that we—are the *only* denomination who believe that *all sin* will be punished."

In the 'Universalist Companion' for 1841, we are told, (p. 6,) in a statement, by Mr. Grosh of Utica, of their creed, that "Universalists believe that *there are no means whereby the guilty can be cleared from proper and necessary punishment;*" and that they "hold to the *absolutely certain* and *positively adequate* punishment of sin." As on this point their sentiments are extensively misunderstood, it is proper to go somewhat into detail, and by abundant reference show what they do believe.

They start with this proposition—"There is no one truth more fully and unequivocally taught in God's word, than that he will 'render to every man according to his deeds.'" ('Exp.' III. 66.) Therefore, they maintain, that no man can possibly escape deserved punishment. A writer in the 'Magazine and Advocate,' (VII. 10,) declares, "that *punishment is absolute and unavoidable*—that it cannot be escaped by repentance or any other means." Mr. Sawyer is of the same opinion. He says to Mr. Remington, (p. 29,) "It is supposed to be the chief glory of the Christian religion,—that it reveals the grand panacea by which the sinner can easily escape the punishment of his sin. Notwithstanding the popular nature of this doctrine,—I cannot shake off the conviction which the united testimony of experience and revelation have impressed upon my mind, that a just God will reward every man according to his works, and that he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done without respect of persons." Mr. Sawyer's scheme, as appears from this extract, admits of no escape from punishment.

In the endeavor to show that Universalism is not of corrupt tendency, Mr. Whittemore says, ('Plain Guide,' p. 263,) "So far from destroying the fear of retribution, Universalism quickens it, by showing that *the punishment of sin cannot be avoided.*" He avers, (p. 262,) that Universalists teach that "all men shall be rewarded according to their works, that the punishment of sin is—swift, sure, and *inevitable.*"

Justice inexorable. Forgiveness defined.

Says Mr. Skinner, in his 'Univ. Illustrated',—"*Justice will have* (p. 249,) *all its demands:* every man shall suffer to the full extent of his deserts. There is no remission of punishment, either on account of the Savior's death, or the sinner's penitence."

"I have shown," says Mr. Williamson, ('Exposition,' p. 65,) "that it was no part of the object, either of the labors, sufferings, or death of Christ, to open a way by which the guilty could evade the rod of his Father's justice." "I have more than once said, that *no man can escape the just punishment of his sins.*" From such a punishment, as they think, there can be no deliverance, even by *forgiveness.* Though the Bible every where speaks of forgiveness, they will have it, that pardon never frees the transgressor from the suffering deserved by his sins. These were the views of Abner Kneeland, as early as 1818. "Forgiveness," he says, ('Lectures,' p. 40,) "in imperfect and changeable creatures, i. e., in man, may be a real relinquishment of a punishment which was absolutely intended to have been inflicted; but not so with the Deity. He changeth not. Therefore, forgiveness in him can be *nothing more than a manifestation of his unchangeable nature to the sinner!*" "Forgiveness (p. 41,) does not militate against the idea of the sinner's being punished according to strict justice." Who wonders that such a man should become an Atheist?

"We learn" from the 'Univ. Expositor,' (I. 153,) "that the gospel is not a scheme which God has contrived for clearing sinners from suffering what his own

word solemnly pronounced upon them." "Accordingly, (p. 155,) *the person who has been forgiven has suffered the proper punishment of his sins;* even as the man who has been healed of a bodily disease, has suffered the natural evils of that disease." No forgiveness until the full punishment has been inflicted! Is this the kind of forgiveness that is enjoined on man in relation to his fellow-man? "The lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt." (Matth. xviii. 27.) What? Did he exact the whole debt first, and then forgive it? Absurd.

"The common opinion, that forgiveness is a remission of punishment, is altogether incorrect," says O. A. Skinner, ('Univ. Ill. and Def.' p. 250.) "How," he asks, (p. 251, "can the common doctrine of forgiveness be correct? There is not a syllable concerning it in the Bible." "Accordingly," he adds, p. 252, "*the person who has been forgiven, has suffered the proper punishment of his sins.*" He suffers none the less in consequence of being pardoned.

Mr. Fernald, of Newburyport, in his 'Universalism against Partialism,' (p. 259,) has this language;—"The forgiveness which our Christian clergy preach is generally represented, and generally understood, to be the forgiveness or remission of hell-torments. But the Bible knows nothing about such a doctrine. It never teaches the forgiveness or remission of *punishment* for sins committed. It is the forgiveness of *sins;* by

which is understood, the blotting out, or cleansing from, *after due justice is administered.*"

'Is this the meaning of *forgiveness?*' a stranger to these views at once will ask;—'Who ever attached such a meaning to the word in common life? Surely I must go to school again to learn what the most common-place words mean, and have a dictionary too, compiled by one of these knowing ones.' They who teach these things, know and admit that their sense of the word is peculiar, and so they call the other sense the common one, and strive hard to subvert it, and substitute their own. According to their views of the matter, God never abundantly pardons until he has exacted the utmost farthing from the poor debtor—never says to the prisoner 'Go free!' until the whole debt has been discharged! '*Amazing grace!*' If this be forgiveness or pardon, then Rathbun and every other criminal in Auburn will yet receive a full pardon! And that without asking for it. Let them serve their time out, and they will be pardoned! It is time that our governors were better instructed in the true import of the word 'forgiveness.'

Universalism, then, maintains that every sin of every sinner will be followed by its appropriate and full punishment. That we receive our punishment 'as we go along,' is a very common and favorite doctrine with them all. Those who deny future punishment profess, of course, to believe, that every sin is punished *in this life* in exact ratio to its criminality; and that it is

utterly impossible for the sinner to escape in a single instance.

True, Job's friend, the Naamathite, could say to him, (Job xi. 6,) "Know, therefore, that God *exacteth of thee less than thine iniquity deserveth;*" but Zophar lived too soon to understand much about theology, and was entirely ignorant of neology. David too could say, (Psalm ciii. 10,) "He *hath not dealt with us after our sins*, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities." But David was a little 'hyperbolical' in his language on that occasion, and "we are not to take an expression of *self-reproach*, which one utters under a deep sense of ingratitude and shame, and employ it as if it disproved the well-supported and abstract doctrine of the Bible concerning the retributive government of God!" So says the 'Univ. Expositor,' (I. 159.) The same remark is applied to what Ezra, (ix. 13,) upon his knees before God, poured forth from his burdened heart:—"After all that is come upon us for our evil deeds, and for our great trespass, seeing that thou, our God, *hast punished us less than our iniquities deserve.*"

There are, at this day, some very good people that are just as weak as Zophar, David, and Ezra were; and simple enough most honestly to believe, that the Lord has actually punished them far less than their sins deserve; who are accustomed to say in the language of the good old Psalm, (cxxx. 3, 4, "If thou, Lord! shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord! who shall stand?—But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared." Thus they set punishment and forgiveness

A stubborn fact. The suicide.

over against each other. And what is somewhat remarkable, the more they seem to have of the Spirit of Christ the more are they possessed with this notion; particularly as they survey their life from the brink of the grave. But we must conclude that they are all wrong, David, Daniel, Ezra, and all of them, for "*Gashmu saith it.*"

The principal difficulty, however, lies not in the counter declaration of Scripture, (for he is a poor Universalist preacher that will stumble at a text, however hard,—that cannot

" darken and put out
Eternal truth by everlasting doubt,")—

not in proving that 'everlasting,' or 'eternal,' means *temporal*, but in the stubborn fact that some men die in the very act of crime. It has always been a difficult matter for men of this sort to dispose of the *suicide*. In this case the crime is not consummated until life is extinct. The individual is then, if in conscious existence, in the future state. It is evident that he cannot be punished in this life, and if punished at all, must be in the life to come.

But the doctrine under consideration allows no sinner to escape, and not a single sin to be passed by. He must receive in the body according to the deeds done. How then can the suicide, or the high-way robber, who is killed in the very act of robbery or murder, be a subject of punishment in this sense? It is impossible. It cannot be that *death* itself is the punishment, for many a righteous man is killed as suddenly

and as violently. Moreover, the crime, in the case of the suicide, consists in putting an end to his life—that which, in most cases, is sought as the least of two evils. How can it be the punishment then? Or, how, after the crime is committed, can there be any sense of suffering, if, as they maintain, there is no conscious existence after death until the resurrection?

Various devices have been sought out and adopted to meet this exigency. They think on the whole, that it is not best 'to *dogmatize* upon it.' Each is left to manage it as well as he can. I will give the reader a sample of the manner in which they meet it. Aaron B. Grosh, editor of the 'Magazine and Advocate,' published in Utica, meets the whole difficulty by attempting to show, that

SUICIDE IS NO CRIME.

As this individual exerts a commanding influence over the denomination, particularly in Central and Western New York, his opinions carry weight with them, and, doubtless, pass current among the uneducated. To the question,—"How do you reconcile cases of suicide with your doctrine of all-sufficient punishment in this life!" he replies, (VIII. 358,) thus:—

"I suppose that the Scriptures regard it under one of the following heads:—

"1. Either, they class it under the head of *murder*, —'thou shalt not kill,'—in which case, the penalty, the *whole* penalty, the *only* penalty, *after* the act, I

can there find on record against murder, is inflicted on the criminal *in the very act of transgression ;* viz. by man his blood is shed. I am not very sanguine in this opinion," (i. e. that it is murder,) " inasmuch as there is no appearance of malice in the offender against himself; for the apostle Paul says, ' no man ever yet hated his own flesh ;' consequently, the act is scarcely murder.

" 2. Or, the Scriptures consider it as the act of none who are of *sound mind*, and therefore, accountable beings. In the cases where suicides are recorded, the act itself is never condemned, nor even named as a *criminal* one.—It seems *entirely omitted* in the various and frequent lists of actions forbidden to be practised."

" 3. In conclusion, believing the object of punishment to be salvation from sin, I can conceive of *no use for it for this act* more than for any other. There is no danger that suicide will ever be committed in the immortal state. As to the mental guilt, let it be shown that the suicide had an evil *intention*, and that he was of perfectly sane mind in forming it, and that it is necessary for his salvation to be punished after death,—and there is no one that will object to his receiving all that is necessary. *As this cannot be done*, no more than I can prove the negative of the proposition, and above all as the Bible is silent on the subject, I think it best becomes us not to *dogmatize* upon it."

To such results are they unavoidably driven in the support of a doctrine, contradicted on almost every page of Scripture, and directly subversive of the whole

gospel-plan of salvation. And yet a fearful doubt hangs over the whole subject. Mr. Grosh admits that he cannot prove that the suicide is not punished in a future state, and, therefore, knows not that he will escape. Still he is willing to risk it, and thinks his disciples may.

Who could believe that men, with the Bible in their hands, would teach that *suicide is either no crime, or so slight a one as to demand but a momentary punishment?* If so, men may commit it, whenever they are tired of life, without dread. What, then, is to hinder the frequent commission of the act in that happy day, predicted by these prophets as soon at hand, when all sects shall be merged in theirs? It is not because the doctrine does not lead to it, that such acts are now rare among them, but for want of faith in their own dogmas.

Let the Christian community look at this one result of the system, and say, can that be from Christ which thus encourages men to rush out of life, whenever they care to live no longer?—to run away from all the duties required of them by God, whenever those duties become too burdensome? Surely Universalism hinders no one from death, if he wishes it.

And let them also determine, whether or not there is any room for the exercise of *mercy*, where "every transgression and disobedience receives a just recompense of reward"—where not the slightest punishment is ever remitted,—where the sinner cries in vain even for a drop of water to alleviate the torments endured

Mercy defined. A test.

in consequence of his sin. Does not *mercy*, when predicated of the Divine Being, always imply such a treatment of an offender, as is better than his sins deserve? or, in other words, the exacting less in the way of punishment than justice demands? If so, let the whole scheme be judged by a rule laid down by Hosea Ballou himself. It may be found in the 'Trumpet' of October 3d, 1840:—"There is no better rule to try a doctrine by, than the question '*Is it merciful, or is it unmerciful?*' If its character is that of mercy, it has the image of Jesus, who is the way, the truth, and the life." But this doctrine has nothing to do with mercy. Therefore it is false, or Anti-Christian.

CHAPTER X.

SIN ITS OWN PUNISHMENT.

Nature of Punishment—Sin fully punishes itself—Human penalties should be abolished—The Mosaic Law unjust—The more sin, the less punishment—The doctrine a mere hypothesis—Its truth cannot be known.

> "A dark confed'racy against the laws
> Of virtue, and religion's glorious cause;
> They build each other up with dreadful skill,
> As bastions set point-blank against God's will,
> Enlarge and fortify the dread redoubt,
> *Deeply resolved to shut a Savior out.*"—COWPER.

IF man receives all his punishment in this world, sin must be very easily recompensed. Punishment cannot be the dreadful thing which some have deemed it. Some men, at least, have a very easy time of it, or seem to have. In pursuing our inquiries, therefore, it becomes important, that we should know what Universalists understand by *punishment.* If they differ essentially from the Christian world in their views of the nature and the design of punishment, it is not strange that this difference should also extend to its duration.

What, then, is the punishment of which the Scriptures speak as due to sin? To this question no uniform answer is given. When pressed by the arguments of

their opponents, they seem to admit that it refers to an actual infliction of pain, independent of the crime itself, as a testimony of the divine displeasure against sin But the favorite doctrine of the sect is, that

XI.—SIN FULLY PUNISHES ITSELF.

By this they mean, that there is such a *necessary* connection between sin and misery, that every sin brings with it enough of misery to serve as an adequate punishment. It is asserted by Mr. Ballou, ('Treatise on Atonement,' p. 6,) that "the punishment, or sufferings, which we endure in consequence of sin, is not a dispensation of any *penal law*, but of the *law of necessity*, in which law, as long as a cause continues, it produces its effects." It is here declared, that punishment is not a penal infliction of suffering, but a natural and necessary consequence of sin. So also we hear him saying, ('Lect. Sermons,' p. 157,) "Sin and misery are *inseparably* united in the nature of cause and effect. When and where we are sinful, then and there *we are our own tormentors.*" In other words the sinner punishes himself.

We learn from Mr. Williamson, ('Gospel Anchor,' II. 70,) that "there are those who contend that sin and misery are inseparably connected, and that *the act of transgression induces its own punishment, as a necessary and unavoidable consequence.* These," he adds, "are our views of the subject. We believe that punishment and sin are related as cause and effect, and that they are, as closely and intimately as cause and effect

can be, under any possible circumstances." Referring to the sin of our first parents, he says, "There was no need, if we may so speak, that God should take a rod and smite the sinner in order to punish him; for *the act of transgression would necessarily involve the very penalty annexed.* The punishment for sin is death—*spiritual* death. And this punishment flows as the legitimate effect of the act of transgression." Mr. W. adopts the opinion of Seneca, "There is no greater punishment for sin than sin itself."

In a discussion held at Boston, in 1834, between Mr. Adin Ballou, a Restorationist, and Mr. Daniel D. Smith, a modern Universalist, the latter remarked, (p. 46,) "Punishment is a *natural*, *inevitable* consequence of sin, which cannot be avoided by any means. And so the Scriptures speak. They do not threaten conditionally. They speak of the punishment of sin as something which *naturally grows out of sin*, and which cannot by any means be avoided. There is no clause put in about repentance, and an escape by this means from the consequences of transgression."

The inseparable connection between sin and its punishment they are accustomed to illustrate in the following manner:—"We know ('Exp. of Univ.,' pp. 68, 69,) that there are physical laws which must be obeyed, if we would preserve the health of the body. If we put our hand in the fire, it will be burned. If we expose our bodies to the cold they will freeze." "So it is with the mind: it has its laws written upon it by the finger of the Creator, and these laws must be

Punishment is to sin, as pain to disease.

obeyed or we must suffer." "I say then, (p. 70,) that the very *constitution* of man is proof that there is no escape from the punishment of our sins." Punishment is just as sure to follow sin, as physical suffering a burn. This is the same as to say that sin invariably punishes itself.

Such is the language of Mr. Ballou. In relation to the prodigal son he states ('Expos.,' I. 167,) that "the father did not punish his son after he had done committing sin: but that *the sinner punished himself*, by walking in that way in which there is no peace."

A writer in the same volume, (p. 151,) informs us that "the *just* punishment of sin is *the tribulation and anguish* which the disobedient suffer in their sins.—Consequently men must be punished with misery just as long as they walk the sinner's way." Of course, any thing else than this is unjust; as, for example, any extraneous judgment from the hands of either God or man. Thus the same writer remarks, (p. 155,) "The sick man is freed from pain by being freed from the disease by which the pain was produced. And" this "is in accordance with, and not opposed to, that organic law of the corporeal system which connects pain with disease.—Even so, when the man who is reformed and forgiven experiences a freedom from the evil or punishment of sin,—this is in accordance with, and not opposed to, that divine moral law which connects punishment with sin." Punishment is thus made to bear the same relation to sin, that pain bears to disease.

After the same manner, Mr. Whittemore represents

('Plain Guide,' p. 262,) punishment as "swift, sure, and inevitable; that sin goes hand in hand with wo throughout its whole duration; that *it is itself hell.*" If sin is itself hell, and hell is the punishment of sin, then sin is its own punishment, and every thing additional is manifestly, and in the highest degree, unjust.

That the natural pain consequent on sin is its punishment, is also the opinion of Mr. Skinner, as exhibited in 'Univ. Ill. and Def.,' (pp. 190, 191.) "Every passion of our nature," he says, "carried to excess is criminal; every passion carried to excess is painful. *This pain is* said to be *the punishment* of the passion.—The same is true of every evil propensity and habit whatever. All are attended with pain or inconvenience, which increases in proportion to the enormity of the evil." Sin, therefore, punishes itself in proportion to its own enormity or guilt.

This is the meaning which Mr. Fernald gives to punishment, when he says, ('Univ. against Partialism,' pp. 261, 262,) "Repentance will not absolve from the punishment of sins committed." "It never will atone for what is past. If an individual sins, he has got to suffer for it the whole penalty of the law. *There is no remedy for him.*—He may repent in dust and ashes; but this will never satisfy justice for the sin he has committed." "You may talk about sorrow and contrition, but this is nothing to the purpose." How completely does such a scheme "*shut a Savior out!*"

It is thus made plain, that it is extensively, if not uni-

formly, held as sound doctrine among Universalists, that sin adequately punishes itself. On this, in fact, they rely to uphold the doctrine that justice will have all its demands in this life. This last cannot be given up, or justice will punish in another world, and perhaps forever. So that the doctrine that I have now exhibited is essential to their scheme. They must defend it and abide by its consequences, or their whole system is defective—is false.

It follows inevitably from this doctrine that ALL THE PENALTIES OF HUMAN LAWS OUGHT TO BE FORTHWITH ABOLISHED. If punishment is inseparable from sin, as its necessary consequence, then it is impossible for the sinner to escape his full deserts. Let him do what he will, he must suffer—must pay the very last farthing. It needs not the interference of another power. The robber who goes "unwhipt of justice,"—human justice—till his last moment, is just as sure as any other to reap his full reward. If, when he dies, he has received his full deserts, as this system maintains, then if he had been apprehended, imprisoned, and tortured, he would have received *more* than he deserved. And so in every other case where the penalties of human laws are inflicted, had the sinner escaped such infliction, he would nevertheless have suffered his full punishment.

Now, if sin thus inevitably punishes itself, if the sinner can by no means escape his just punishment even if he be above or out of the reach of human laws, what need is there of these laws? Are they not perfectly useless? And are not the penalties which they inflict

unjust in the extreme ? What right has human authority to punish a man who has already been fully punished, or who will be fully punished, whether human power interferes or not, and none the less for such interference ? To be honest and consistent, therefore, Universalists ought to demand that all penal statutes should be at once repealed, and that society be left to regulate itself. Mr. Sawyer says to Mr. Brownlee, (XIX. 13,) "The time, I trust, is not far distant, when *the vindictive and sanguinary penalties* yet remaining on human statute-books *shall be blotted out forever.*"

Yes, if Universalism is true, every positive infliction of suffering by any human authority, whether parental, or magisterial, as a punishment for wrong doing, is unjust and cruel. Yea, *the statute-book of heaven needs revision.* How is God to be justified in enacting such a code of laws as that given to the Hebrews, in which he required the parent and the magistrate to inflict penal suffering on the transgressor ? This system either denies, that God ever does visit men with positive infliction of pain, other than the natural effects of sin, or maintains that he is guilty of the most outrageous injustice in exacting *double* for their sins. I leave the abettors of this scheme to settle their account with the Bible, on either supposition as they best can.

But another consequence that flows from this doctrine is worthy of serious attention. The natural results of sin are its just or adequate punishment. These results are two-fold; bodily and mental, or disease and misfortune on the one hand, and on the other *remorse.* The

The more one sins - the less he is punished.

latter occupies by far the largest space in their views of punishment. The former is almost overlooked. If now sin punishes itself according to its desert, then the greater and more frequent the crime, the greater is the remorse. But is this true in fact as well as in theory? Does not this scheme naturally lead to the conclusion that THE MORE ONE SINS, THE LESS HE IS PUNISHED? I say not, that they hold, or that their system teaches, that the *body* will suffer less as crime increases; but that they do hold a doctrine, which implies that the more a man sins, the less he will be punished mentally, —the less will his mind be afflicted with remorse This is so manifest that it scarcely needs to be argued. We know, many of us by our own experience, that what gave us at first great distress, because of the remorse that we felt in consequence, has afterwards, when it became habitual, lost its power to disturb our minds. The annals of our penitentiaries will show, that the hundreds who are yearly imprisoned for some glaring act of transgression, and have become hardened in crime, actually suffered less from their seared consciences because of the act which brought them to prison, than on the occasion of their first infraction of the civil law. Crime hardens the heart, and sears the conscience. Such, as all history shows, is the case in this world. How then can it be maintained, with any show of reason or truth, that the sinner is sure to suffer in physical anguish, a full recompense for every sin? How can that be called an adequate punishment which decreases in severity as the sinner increases in guilt?

The doctrine, however, is held as *a mere hypothesis.* It is a device by which to get rid of future punishment. The abettors of this device are not able to show that it is a *fact.* They cannot prove that men do invariably suffer as much from disease, misfortune, and remorse, as their sins deserve. There are some notoriously wicked men that are greatly prospered in this world. They are almost strangers to disease and misfortune. "There are no bands in their death; but their strength is firm. They are not in trouble as other men, neither are they plagued like other men." (Ps. 73 : 4, 5.) It is as true now as it was in David's time. How then are these men punished? The common reply to such a question is, "*We cannot tell* how much such men suffer from remorse." True, we cannot tell how *much* or how *little.* *You* and we are alike ignorant. You do not *know* that they suffer much, if any thing; much less that they suffer all that their sins deserve.

Thus these views are based on ignorance, and are a mere assumption of the whole ground in dispute. In order to determine that all men suffer here all that they deserve, we must first be able to determine the full desert of sin, and then that every individual does actually thus suffer, in this present life. Otherwise, we must, at all events, be left in doubt and fearful apprehension that punishment will be inflicted in another world; doubt, lest some, who had their good things here, will have their evil things hereafter; lest while the righteous, who suffered here, will there be comforted, the

Dreadful want of assurance.

wicked who were here "not in trouble like other men," will there be tormented. Such are the delightful assurances of this new sect. Such are their joy and peace in believing. They never can know that they have suffered, or will suffer, in this present life all that their sins deserve. Well may we exclaim, in view of such boastings and such miserable uncertainties, in the language of the poet,—

> "Oh! star-eyed Science! hast thou wandered there,
> To waft us home the message of despair?"

CHAPTER XI.

NO SUCH THING AS PUNISHMENT.

Design of punishment—A carnal scheme—Danger of misapprehending their admissions—What does sin deserve—Denial of all punishment—All suffering for sin is the fruit of God's love, and designed only for the sinner's highest good—Its removal, and not its infliction, a curse—All men the children of God—Mankind not divided into two distinct classes—Fearful language of Scripture.

"While man exclaims—'See all things for my use!'
'See man for mine!'—replies a pamper'd goose!"—POPE.

IT appears to be the constant aim of these writers to make their system as palatable as possible to a depraved heart. For this they make the fall of our first parents nothing more than a beautiful allegory, never meant to be regarded as a relation of actual occurrences. Thus they rid themselves of the original curse, or give themselves all the latitude that they can desire in interpreting its allegorical meaning.

For this, too, they discard original sin, or native depravity, and flatter poor man by assuring him that he comes into the world as pure as an angel. Instead of showing, as do all the sacred writers, that sin is "ex-

ceeding sinful," they will scarcely allow that the human mind, (or " intellectual phenomena," as they call the soul,) ever consents to sin. Sin is simply the want of conformity between a man's choice and his judgment, which choice results from the animal appetites, as God created them, and is to be regarded as a fulfilment of his will.

Having thus converted sin into righteousness, it seems rather strange that they should ever admit that man is liable to any punishment at all for doing that which he cannot help—to which his mind never consents, which is only the working of the animal nature, and accords perfectly with the Creator's design. But the Bible too expressly speaks of the punishment of the wicked, and gives too many fearful examples of it, for them boldly to deny in so many words all punishment. Perhaps, I may add, there is a voice within, a conscience, that, after all their refined speculations, accuses of guilt, and convinces of ill-desert. To save appearances, therefore, they must admit punishment of some kind; but only on two conditions: viz. the limitation of it to mortal life, or at most, the ante-resurrection state, and the absence of all penal inflictions.

In making these admissions,—so strangely incongenial to their whole system,—in order to blind the eyes of the people, they insist upon it, as has been shown, that all sin will receive its full deserts—that there shall not be the least abatement, on any account whatever, of the just punishment of sin. If now the reader, who has been accustomed to regard sin, as an

unmixed evil, in the highest degree offensive to God, deserving the most signal manifestations of his displeasure and wrath,(and if he has gathered his theology from the Bible alone, he cannot but thus judge,) he will be liable utterly to misapprehend the meaning of these admissions. Let him first unlearn the lessons of his childhood and youth, and then let him be taught to regard sin, as an infraction only of the law of one's mind, the resistance of an innocent animal appetite to the better judgment of a pure and noble and almost godlike mind; in short, let him learn that what they call sin is only a carrying out of the divine purposes of good,—a part of his glorious plan of benevolence, and indispensable to the greatest good both of the sinner and the world;—let him thus become a proficient in the art of making black white, and he will at once perceive that these new expounders of scripture venture nothing in admitting, that every sin will inevitably be punished to the full extent of its desert.

But what is that desert? What evil, after all, has the sinner done? Whom has he injured? Not God, they say, for this is impossible. Whom, then? Not his fellow-men, for "all things work together for good to them—." His sin injures only himself; and even this injury God is bound to make good, since he brought the man into being and gave him such a body of sin and death. How much then, does sin—thus understood —fully deserve? Who can believe that it deserves any punishment at all? How safe is it, therefore, for those, who have thus diluted sin until it can scarcely

An easy way to pay debts. All suffering the fruit of love.

be distinguished from righteousness itself, to admit that every man will inevitably suffer to the full extent of his deserts, for every sin that he commits! A very easy matter it is, truly, for a man to pay all his debts when he owes nothing!

It will thus be seen, that this strange system, after all its boasting about the full exaction of punishment, *does actually deny all punishment*, in the proper sense of the word. Such is the necessary inference from those parts of their creed which have already come under review. We are not left, however, to inference alone, in order thus to understand them. I shall now attempt to show that it is an essential part of their system, and an avowed article of their creed, that

XII. THERE IS PROPERLY NO SUCH THING AS PUNISHMENT.

The sufferings which mankind endure, they regard, or profess to regard, as an expression, not of God's anger, or displeasure, but of his *love*. They are all fruits of a Father's tenderest concern for the welfare of his children, designed not as a judicial infliction of punishment, but for the good, the personal good in every case, and the very highest good, of the sinner himself.

They are exceedingly tenacious of these views. They introduce them on every occasion. No matter what is the text, they are sure to evolve from it this doctrine. Take a few examples. In a sermon from Mal. iv. 1,—"For, behold! the day cometh that shall burn as an oven," &c.,—Hosea Ballou remarks,('L. Sermons,' p. 91,) "Now we know, that it is not the nature

of goodness to harm any creature, but to do good to all. From these plain self-evident facts we infer, that God will never administer any kind of affliction to any of his creatures, *which is not designed for their benefit.*" He then proceeds to show, (p. 92,) that by the burning up of the wicked is indicated their *regeneration.* So he explains the text; (p. 96;) "In the character of the proud and the wicked they must be destroyed, root and branch, and be translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son!"

In another sermon on the destruction of Sodom, he asks, (p. 283,)—"Why should our heavenly Father manifest any disapprobation of sin? Does he suffer any inconvenience from it?" And he adds, (p. 284,) "that God acted in this instance consistently with his nature, which is love, and with his character as a Father. He acted for the good of his creatures;"—those creatures, of course, whom he destroyed with "brimstone and fire!" The Lecture is styled, "Divine Goodness in the destruction of the Sodomites and *other* sinners."

Again, commenting on Zeph. iii. 8, where God is heard saying, "my determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour upon them mine indignation—even all my fierce anger; for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy;"—he remarks, (p. 350,) "In this most interesting representation we are led to contemplate the *happy issue* of the judgments of God, even all his fierce anger, in the salvation of his people, in their rest and joy."

"We may observe," he adds, (p. 351,) "that God's love towards mankind is a holy love, and all the desires of that love are righteous. These sanctify his severest judgments, and direct them all to the accomplishment of the desires of love."

Remarking on those fearful words—"*For our God is a consuming fire,*" he informs us, (p. 48,) that "the fire of Divine love seeks to consume nothing but that which is injurious to the *sinner*, who is the object of Divine love." "LOVE is a consuming fire to all the hay, wood and stubble, which error has introduced into religion! "How admirably does such an explanation accord with the admonitions of the Apostle, Heb. xii. 25—29!

Mr. Sawyer maintains the same doctrine, and claims that such are the views of the whole sect. "Universalists," he tells Dr. Brownlee, (XIII. 8,) "believe that all inflictions under the righteous administration of God, are designed to *benefit the punished.*" "This is the end, (p. 7,) the only end, as Universalists believe, for which God inflicts punishment."

O. A. Skinner declares, ('Un. Ill. and Def.' p. 184,) that "the constant manifestation of divine goodness to all men shows that God loves the wicked, that he has the same parental regard for them which he has for the good." "Punishment (p. 186,) is inflicted from purely paternal principles." "That God punishes (p. 188,) according to the deeds, clearly proves that he designs it for the good of the sinner, and punishes from the best of motives." "When we read—that sinners shall be

punished for their iniquity, we are to understand by it a corrective process, lopping off the unprofitable branches, which hinder the growth in grace and divine knowledge, and which prevent from bearing good fruit." God, he tells us, (p. 191,) "*can only* inflict a corrective punishment, a punishment that will aid in saving the sinner from the evil in which sin has involved him. We see here the error of supposing, that punishment is inflicted solely to maintain the honor of the Lawgiver, and the dignity of his government." "No more punishment (p. 195,) will be inflicted than *the good of the sinner requires.*"

This course of Divine procedure they claim as a right. Hear Mr. Williamson; "*God himself* ('Expos. of Univer.' p. 66,) *has no right* to punish in revenge, or with a vindictive spirit. He brought us into existence of his own good pleasure, and without our knowledge or consent, and *he is bound*, by the principles of his own nature, *to do us justice;* and he has no right, in the nature of things, to do an injury." He therefore proceeds to show, (p. 72,) that "all the punishments, that God lays upon men, are the well-intended chastisements of a merciful Father, and so many testimonies of his parental faithfulness and love." "Little does that man know (p. 74,) of the character of his heavenly Father, who views his punishments in any other light but the kind administrations of a friend, who seeks our permanent good."

Such, according to this creed, is God's design in connecting suffering with sin—the very same that moves

a kind parent to administer the bitter cup to a diseased child. But this is not *punishment.* Does the parent punish his child for being sick, when he requires him to take the healing yet bitter draught? Never. Then is it improper to call those sufferings, which man endures for sin, a punishment. There is no such thing in the Divine administration as punishments, properly so-called, if Mr. Ballou and his followers are right.

Accordingly, Mr. Skinner says, (p. 250,) "Punishment, we have seen, is corrective and limited. A remission of such a punishment would be a *curse* instead of a mercy, because a just punishment is as essential to our welfare, as anything that love can do." After the same manner remarks Mr. Williamson;—"When we say (p. 67,) that no man can escape the just punishment of his sins, the cry is raised that there is no mercy, and that we destroy the mercy of God! Why, my dear sir! do you not see that *the very punishment itself is inflicted in mercy?* The sinner is sick; 'from the crown of his head to the sole of the foot, there is no soundness in him,' and God, in his mercy, administers the medicine; bitter, indeed, it may be, but it is administered by the hand of a Father's kindness."

Again, (p. 68,) he adds—"From such a punishment, my position is, that man cannot escape, by any possibility; and, I may add, that, were it possible, *the escape would be a curse*, rather than a blessing, and man's rejoicings over it would be as ill-timed as those of a sick man, who should rejoice that he had escaped the taking of a healing medicine, forgetful of the truth that a deadly dis-

ease was left behind. I repeat again : sin is an evil, and punishment is a remedy, and it is a poor cause of joy, that we have escaped the Good Physician, 'who healeth all our diseases.' Better, by far, submit to the caustic, or the knife, if necessary, than bear about with us a gangrene that eateth to the vitals."

To this effect, S. R. Smith of Albany speaks, ('Mag. and Adv.' VIII. 218;)—"However immediate and tremendous the punishment of the wicked, it is plainly designed for their *individual* good." "Every moral pain we bear, every mental suffering we endure for our follies and our crimes, are the medicines to heal the diseases of the soul. They are the safe and finally-effectual prescriptions which wound but to heal, which kill but to make alive."

What now becomes of the oft-vaunted boast of the Universalist, that he alone, of all the sects, believes in the full punishment of sin? If we admit his definition of punishment, it is even so. But if we are governed by the universally-received sense of the word, as well as by that which is given to it in the Bible, it becomes apparent at once, that this theorist denies all punishment;—that he believes in the justice of God, only so far as justice consists with his own personal good in this world, and his perfect unending happiness in the world to come.

In order, however, to establish this favorite article of their faith they resort to the most unwarrantable and unpardonable wrestings of Scripture from its obvious intent. All those passages which speak of the *afflic-*

tions of the righteous as chastisements, designed for the good of them that love God, and in which there is an express limitation of the doctrine to those who love and serve God in sincerity and truth, they apply to all mankind indiscriminately. They utterly deny that the Bible separates mankind into two distinct classes. They teach their disciples to believe that they, and all the world beside, are the *children of God,* in the sense in which that phrase is used in the word of God; and that therefore all the promises are unlimited.

Among the 'Lecture-Sermons' of Mr. Ballou, is one entitled, '*All men the children of God;*' in which he declares, (p. 204,) that "the children mentioned in Heb. ii. 14, comprehend *the whole human family.*" "And he for whom are all things and by whom are all things, is the Father of these children. The children do not destroy this relation by disobedience." Again he says, (p. 209,) "This is the church which Jesus loved, when it was unsanctified.—*This church consists of every man, or the whole human family.*" The same thought is repeated, (p. 358); "*All men are,* therefore, *of his church.*"

Speaking of the orthodox views, he says, (pp. 263, 4, 5,) "The way in which this subject is generally held, supposes that there is one class of men who are exclusively righteous, and another class exclusively wicked." Having thus perverted the orthodox view by interposing the word '*exclusively,*' he proceeds to deny the correctness of their position;—"that the Scriptures—any where give support to the notion that one class of man-

kind is exclusively righteous, and another class exclusively wicked, is by no means acknowledged." He then proceeds, as if he had disproved the statement that the scriptures call one class of men *righteous*, in distinction from another, who are styled *wicked*. "We find the righteous and the wicked in *the same individual*." "The habit which professed Christians have so long indulged, of thinking and speaking of the wicked, as a class of people distinct from themselves, is a proof of the depravity of their own deceived hearts." To this remark it may be added, that the habit which this writer, and others of the same stamp, have, of flying in the face of Scripture, shows, that they are either deplorably ignorant of the Bible, or the most palpable falsifiers of its obvious truths.

The origin of this relation of all mankind to God as their spiritual Father, may be stated in the words of W. S. Ballou, of Randolph, Vermont, as they appear in the 'Universalist Union,' (IV. 51.) "If we are created in the image of God, there is a moral relationship existing between ourselves and the Father of our spirits —a chain which God has thrown around every soul, which forever connects them to his own throne." "Now on this fact is based the Scripture declaration, that we are 'the children of God.'—When we are informed, then, that we are created in the image of God, we have the assurance that we are *forever allied to a Father in heaven.*" "There has been a great inquiry with many, whether all mankind are the children of God, or possess by nature any divine principle that al-

lies them to heaven.—The professors of partial creeds have answered it in the negative, and have proceeded to cast off from God all those whom they viewed in the state of nature. Now it is unnecessary to state that such a hypothesis for ever absolves the sinner from any accountability to God.—All that is necessary to settle this inquiry—whether all are the children of God—is to ascertain *whether all are created in the image of God.* This the text makes certain."

Now who, that has ever read ten pages of the word of God, has not discovered, that the "children of the devil" are not the "children of God?"—that it shall be well with the *righteous*, and ill with the *wicked?*—that these (the *wicked*) shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the *righteous* into life eternal?—that, in short, nearly the whole book of Proverbs is constructed upon this manifest distinction? It is idle to say, that, in all those cases where these two characters are spoken of in contrast, the same individual is referred to. Which part of the individual goes away into everlasting punishment, and which into life eternal? The assertion that there are not two distinct classes of mankind spoken of in Scripture, to the one of which are addressed the promises, and to the other the warnings and threats, is too plainly false to need a denial.

By thus confounding things which differ, and applying to all mankind passages addressed only to the righteous, they make it out that God afflicts men only for their good, and that suffering has not in fact, in any case the nature of punishment. They thus deny,

that God is any thing else than a Father, that he has any right to cast off an incorrigible child, or that he can ever cherish any thing but the fullest love towards any of the human race. They represent God as being, acting, and living but for them and their fellow-men; as if he had no other concern than to gratify and glorify these worms of the dust.

If these views are correct, it seems very strange that the Apostle should tell his brethren, that "it is a *fearful thing* to fall into the hands of the living God;" or that God should say, "I will render *vengeance* to mine enemies, and will reward them that hate me; God shall cast the *fury of his wrath* upon him; He will repay *fury* to his adversaries, recompense to his enemies; *Indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish* upon every soul of man that doeth evil; *Fiery indignation* which shall devour the adversaries; The *wrath* of God poured out without mixture into the cup of his *indignation;* The *Lord will not spare* him, but the *anger* of the Lord and his jealousy shall smoke against that man, and all the *curses* that are written in this book shall lie upon him, and the Lord will blot out his name from under heaven:"—Or that it should be said, that "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in *flaming fire*, taking *vengeance* on them that know not God—who shall be punished with everlasting destruction." Strange language, all this, for a tender *father* to use towards a dear child! Which one of all those, who insist that God only acts towards man in the character of a Father, ever uses language

so full of fury, or would say to his child—'It is a fearful thing to fall into my hands?"

But it is sufficient merely to present their views. They speak for themselves. Their anti-Christian nature is seen at once; and especially in the fact, that they utterly take away all necessity for an *atonement* or *propitiation*. Man would be wronged, if deprived of the healing cup of fury and wrath. God is already well pleased with the sinner. Any scheme, therefore, which proposes to deliver the sinner from the sufferings which he deserves, (and such is the common doctrine of the Atonement,) must be a cruelty to the sinner himself, and so the Bible cannot reveal or countenance any such doctrine. These views thus strike a death-blow at the very vitals of Christianity.

CHAPTER XII.

DENIAL OF THE ATONEMENT.

No salvation from punishment, or deserved sufferings—Christ is not a Savior in this sense—Views of Murray, Winchester, Chauncy, and Huntington, on the Atonement—Christ saves no one from endless misery, or from deserved punishment—Nature of salvation by Christ—The sufferings of Christ have only a moral effect—No vicarious Atonement—No accounting for the Mosaic sacrifices.

> "These, in their wisdom, left
> The light reveal'd, and turn'd to fancies wild,
> Maintaining loud, that ruin'd helpless man
> *Needed no Savior.*"—POLLOK.

THAT "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law," is orthodoxy—is Christianity. This is the peculiarity of the Gospel. This is its power and glory. Take this away, and the gospel is gone.

But what is Universalism? A scheme, that denies that the law pronounces a single *curse* upon the transgressor—or that any of the sufferings, which man endures in consequence of sin, are any thing more than a healing and merciful medicine—or that these sufferings can be removed by Christ or any one else. These are its avowed tenets. What room is there here for any plan of salvation? Why is not the scheme just as perfect without Christ as with him? If Christ had never

been known among men, as he is now unknown by millions, this system maintains, that none would have perished—none would have gone to hell; all would have been as really saved from punishment in a future state as they now are.

Universalism therefore, as I shall now proceed to show, is *a bold denial of any salvation from the penalty of a broken law*, whether by Christ or any thing else. Instead of teaching *universal salvation*, properly so called, IT DENIES ALL SALVATION. It denies that Jesus Christ ever did, or ever will, deliver a sinner from a single consequence of his sins, or that such a deliverance would be either righteous, wise, or merciful.

Since the claims of this sect to be regarded as *Christian* must be determined by their views of the work and person of Christ, I shall now bring them to the test, and show what they think of Christ.

> "What think ye of Christ? is the test,
> To try both your state, and your scheme;
> You cannot be right in the rest,
> Unless you think rightly of him."

Let us, then, ascertain if we can, what they teach in regard to the work, office, and nature, of Jesus of Nazareth. That Christ is the Savior, the only Savior, of the world, every believer in the Bible most fully admits; and none more so than the Universalist, at least in word. But let the question be put—"What do you mean, when you say—'Christ is the only Savior?'—and it will soon be seen, that, in this respect as in others, they attach a meaning to the word entirely

different from that in common use. This will appear in illustrating the following article of their creed, viz.:

XIII. CHRIST SAVES NO ONE FROM ANY DESERVED SUFFERING.

In former days, when Murray, Winchester, Chauncy, and Huntington, were on the stage, and their writings were the standards of Universalism, such a doctrine, as that just stated, would have been regarded with abhorrence by the whole sect. The sentiments of Mr. *Murray* are thus stated by the Editor of his 'Life;' (pp. 279, '80.) "His views of the nature of salvation differ essentially from those now entertained by Universalists. He held that all were condemned in the first Adam; and justified by the *vicarious atonement* of the second, Christ. He held to a complete salvation from *punishment* through the merits of Christ,—an idea, which has been *very generally abandoned by Universalists*, as well as by many of other denominations, and superseded by the more rational and scriptural doctrine of salvation from *sin* through the medium of truth and grace as communicated by our Lord Jesus Christ. Indeed it is well known, that the method by which he proved the final salvation of all men, and his interpretations of Scripture, *differed essentially* from those of the denomination generally."

Between Mr. Murray, the founder of American Universalism, and his degenerate disciples, it is thus most plainly confessed there is but little, or no, agreement,

in respect to the *gospel-plan*. Almost the only thing in which they agree is the final '*result*.' This is the chain that binds them all in one bundle. Latitudinarian in the extreme, they seem to care not at all what a man believes on any point, if he only admits that all will be happy at last. If Mr. Murray were now to revisit the earth, with the same sentiments that he had when in the body, he would reprobate our Modern Universalists as but little better than infidels. Of them he would say, with even more emphasis, than he said once of those who held to purgatorial satisfaction—"In fact, ('Life,' p. 267,) *I know no persons further from Christianity, genuine Christianity, than such Universalists.*"

Winchester, though differing much from Murray, most fully attributed man's deliverance from deserved sufferings to the death of Christ. In his poem, called "The process and empire of Christ from his birth to the end of the Mediatorial kingdom," he represents the crucified Redeemer as saying,

> "For all your sins my blood hath now aton'd,
> And I am come to comfort all your hearts.
> Good-will, peace, pardon, love, and pow'r,
> Redemption and salvation I proclaim;"

and then represents him as going on a mission to hell to "to the spirits in prison,"—to release them from the awful sufferings brought upon them by their sins. Of these sufferings, he says (B. X.)

" What are all the pains and tortures borne
By martyrs, criminals, and wretched slaves,
Fires, racks, whips, chains, and deaths of ev'ry sort,
That ever men have felt, or did inflict,
Compar'd to what those wretches must endure,
Who to the burning lake shall be condemn'd ?"
" Combine the pain of hunger, sharpest thirst,
The keenest sense of shame and deep disgrace,
The pungent tortures of a guilty mind, . . .
And add to these the real pains of fire ;
Suppose a man in soul and body form'd
In such a manner as to feel the whole,
Without the least abatement, all at once :
Think what his pain and misery must be !
This is the *real state* of those who fall
Under the dreadful sentence of the Lord."

That Dr. *Chauncy* held the same sentiments is apparent throughout his works. " Salvation from *wrath* is one thing essentially included in that justification which is the result of true faith." (' Salv. of All,' p. 37.)

I have elsewhere shown that *Huntington* " held to the doctrine of the Atonement, whereby Christ suffered for us the penalty of the divine law, our guilt having been set to his account, as our federal head and sponsor, and his obedience in like manner transferred to us; a salvation for man solely on the ground of free grace and mercy." (' Mod. Hist., p. 384.)

But these views are now antiquated. No Universalist preacher of our day has any idea of such a deliverance from deserved sufferings. It is well known that all our Universalists expect a final and full deliverance from all sufferings. But it is not so well

known *on what grounds* this expectation is based. Universalists are much accustomed, in controversy, to appeal, in support of their hope that all mankind will go to heaven at last, to those passages which speak of Christ as the Savior of the world, and as dying for all —tasting death for every man, and the like. But no Universalist, at all acquainted with the prevailing scheme, believes that these passages have any thing to do with the matter. The salvation of which the sacred writers speak they understand, as taking place in, and limited in its effects to, *this world.* Of course these declarations of universal salvation have nothing to do with the question,—'will all mankind be happy at last.'

This will be better understood by attending to the following explanations of their views from their own pens. They begin with affirming that *Christ saves no one from endless misery.* Take the following examples from Mr. Ballou; ('Lecture-Sermons,' pp. 13, 244;)—"No such penalty of *endless misery* was ever connected with the divine law of heaven; and—*Jesus did not come into the world to save sinners from any such penalty.*" "The arguments to which we have attended are designed to show that the common notion of saving mankind from the wrath and curse of God *in the eternal world*, is without foundation either in Scripture or reason."

Of course, having denied, that man was ever exposed to endless misery, they cannot admit, that Christ saves them from that which they never would or could

have suffered. It is not therefore, because Christ is the Savior of the world, that no one of the human race will be doomed to endless punishment. Christ's salvation has nothing to do with this matter, as they think, one way or the other.

Thay also affirm that *Christ saves no one from any deserved punishment either here or hereafter.* "No," says Mr. Ballou, ('L. Sermons,' p. 13,) "nor did he come into the world to save the sinner from the *punishment* of his sins." "The fact is," so he tells us, ('Expositor,' I. 343, 7,) neither Jesus nor his apostles ever intimated that mankind were in danger of such a state of torment in the future world, as is represented by our divines, or *that God had made any provision to save us from such a calamity.*" "The Savior taught no such doctrine. He never intimated that his sufferings were necessary to *save men from punishment in the future world,* nor that it was necessary that men should believe in him for any such purpose."

He will, by no means, admit that what Christ did in this world had any efficacy in securing to any of the human family the happiness of heaven, or that it had any bearing on our future condition in another state of being. So he tells us, ('L. Sermons,' pp. 16, 17, 242, 3;)—"Was there ever a representation more *erroneous,* than that which has, for ages, led men to believe that there was a divine wrath in God, from which Jesus came to save sinners!" "The common doctrine, which teaches us that Christ Jesus came into this world *to save us in another world,* is contrary to all

the representations which are found in the Scriptures." "And you will further observe, that there is just as much propriety in exhorting people to get an interest in *Adam*, so that they may inherit from him the natural faculties of the *body*, as to exhort us to get an *interest in Christ*."

"It is an error of extensive magnitude to attribute to the manifestation, or appearance, of Jesus Christ, and *what he did in our world*, the cause of that gift which was made sure to us, in him, before the world began." "It seems that all, which the Savior did, was designed as a *manifestation* of those divine things which our heavenly Father had given us before the world began."

The same views are presented by Hosea Ballou, jun., in the 'Expositor,' (IV. 34;) "The notion formerly current—at least the vulgar one—was, that to be saved, in the Christian sense of the phrase, is *to be rescued from exposure*,—and received into heaven. We suppose it unnecessary to show, in our pages, that this is not the meaning. *Few Universalists*, and probably none of our readers, *regard it as such*, or admit that man needs salvation from a doom which they do not believe was ever denounced." Yet the same writer admits that it is "the *common* sentiment that the term 'salvation,' in its religious use, has always a direct and immediate reference to our final condition after death." And such has, for so long a time, been the established import of the Scripture doctrine of salvation, that he is constrained to ask, "Does not this idea enter, more or

less into the habitual impressions of Universalists themselves, so as to affect their language and their forms of argument ?"

We are informed by Mr. Williamson, (' Exp. of Un.' pp. 14, 16,) that " the Scriptures certainly forbid the idea that it was any part of the object of a Savior's mission, to save men from the unmerciful wrath of God. Neither did Jesus come *to save from the just punishment of sin*, by satisfying the divine justice, and suffering the penalty due the sinner in his room and stead." " It was not necessary for Christ to come into the world to save men from a future endless hell, as a penalty of the divine law, for the good and sufficient reason, that no such penalty was ever annexed to that law."

The nature of that salvation of which Christ is the author they represent as but little understood, save among themselves. " In discussing the nature of salvation," says O. A. Skinner, ('Un. Ill. and Def.' p. 258,) " it may be well to ask—' What are the evils under which we are suffering, and to which we are exposed.' The common opinion is, that we are exposed to God's vindictive wrath, and to a state of endless punishment.—*We do not need salvation from these*, because not in any sense exposed to them." " Salvation, (p. 262,) is deliverance from ignorance, sin and death. It is to be taught of God, sanctified by the truth, and rendered immortal."

" Salvation," says Mr. Ballou, (' Lecture-Sermons,' p. 84,) " consists in *knowing God*, which makes it evi-

dent that the nature of God is salvation. As fast, therefore, as we advance in the knowledge of God, we enjoy the rich provisions which are made for all people." Again, (p. 237,) "This passage very plainly shows us the nature of that salvation of which our text speaks. It is a salvation from error, deception, ignorance, and all their evils, to truth, knowledge, understanding, and all their blessings."—"The salvation, (p. 244,) which the gospel of Jesus Christ effects for us, is a salvation from our sins, from our wanderings, from the darkness of our deceived minds, from all uncleanness, to righteousness, to reconciliation to God, to the knowledge of the truth, and to holiness of life;" but *not "from the wrath and curse of God in the eternal world."*

"Universalists believe," says Mr. Lewis, ('Mag. and Adv.' VIII. p. 18,) "that salvation is a deliverance from *sin, not deserved punishment.*" Mr. Williamson, however, confines this kind of salvation to believers, and calls it *conditional;* while he speaks of another that he calls *unconditional.* "In what sense," he asks, ('Exposition,' p. 167,) "is God the Savior of all men? Or what are the evils from which he saves them? I answer, from the power of death and the darkness of the grave, through the resurrection from the dead." But in neither of these does he admit that Christ saved man from the least deserved punishment. Indeed he says expressly, (p. 65,) as I have elsewhere shown, "that it was no part of the object, either of the labors, sufferings, or death of Christ, to open a way by

which the guilty could evade the rod of his Father's justice." Again, he says, (p. 52,) "The sufferings and death of Christ—were *not designed to placate the wrath, or satisfy the justice of God*, and thus open a way for the guilty to escape the just punishment of their sins."

Thus confidently do they affirm, that Jesus of Nazareth neither did, nor could, do or suffer any thing by which a single human being either has been, or will be, delivered from endless misery, or any punishment either in this world, or in the world to come. What he did, was the work of a *man;* the effect of his work was only a *moral* effect. It was designed to make men better not in another world, but in this; by the moral power of his instructions and life to dissuade men from yielding to the dictates of the flesh, and to persuade them to follow the better law of the mind—in other words, to induce them to cease doing evil, and learn to do well.

The reader will at once see, that this view of the case entirely "explodes" the common doctrine of the ATONEMENT. There is no room here for the idea, that Christ, a superior being, took the place of man, and suffered in his stead, as his substitute, for the sake of the guilty—the just for the unjust. Their denial of this doctrine is plain, direct, and unqualified. They take no pains to conceal their abhorrence of it. It is cruel, unjust, unreasonable, horrid, absurd. Since the "explosion" of the Atonement by Mr. Ballou, some forty years ago, they can see with perfect

clearness, that no such doctrine was ever taught by Christ or his apostles, and they are amazed that any man can be such a simpleton as to believe in it.

"Christians have for a long time believed," says Mr. Ballou, ('Atonement,' p. 122,) "that the temporal death of Christ made an atonement for sin, and that the *literal blood* of the man who was crucified has efficacy to cleanse from guilt; but surely *this is carnality*, and carnal mindedness." I suppose that among these "Christians," he includes one John, the son of Zebedee, who is known to have believed and taught that "*the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.*"

Again, he says, ('L. Sermons,' p. 315,) "Christ did not die for us, that we might avoid condemnation if we commit sin, nor did he suffer for us, that we might not be punished for faults if we commit them.—In place of his suffering in our room and stead, as our erroneous doctrines have taught us, he will render unto every man according to his works." By "*erroneous doctrines*" in this passage, he may have reference to an old Jewish notion, held by one Isaiah, the son of Amoz, who is generally understood to have taught, respecting the Messiah, that "*he was wounded for our transgressions*, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed. *All we*, like sheep, have gone astray, and the Lord *hath laid on him the iniquities of us all.*" What a pity that Isaiah could not have enjoyed the luminous teachings of Hosea, the Rabbi of the West!

Mr. Kneeland adopted the views of Mr. Ballou most fully, and sketched with a bolder hand, a more finished portraiture of the new doctrine. "There has been ('Lectures,' pp. 108, '9,) no occasion for an infinite sacrifice, nor for any sacrifice, to divine justice, in order to open a way for the forgiveness of sin, and reconciliation or salvation of the sinner. I am fully convinced, that the idea of a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, or to appease almighty wrath, is *a corruption of Christianity*, which crept in gradually, with other gross absurdities, some of which have been already exploded; (i. e. by Christians in general, especially in this country;) but others still remain."

Having shown what he regards as "the scriptural doctrine and nature of the atonement" he says, (p. 110,) "In all this, however, we see nothing of the nature of a *substitute*, suffering in our room and stead; nothing in the nature of a sacrifice offered up by the sinner; nothing in the nature of satisfaction to divine justice, without which God could not be just and yet forgive sin, or be the justifier of him that believeth; nothing like cancelling an awful debt, and delivering the sinner from deserved wrath and vengeance." He then proceeds (p. 114,) to the work "of exposing the glaring absurdity of considering the salvation of sinners to be a salvation from infinite and deserved punishment, which the sinner justly demerited in sinning against an infinite Jehovah." And then concludes, (p. 116,) "may God pardon my error, if it be one, when I say—there was *no necessity for the suffering of Christ, as a satisfaction to divine justice.*"

A most absurd dogma. A great disservice.

Once more, he remarks, (pp. 71, 72,) that, "the doctrine which teaches that God could not consistently with his character forgive sin, until a satisfaction had been made to his divine justice by suffering humanity, (an expression which I use to signify all that justice required of the sinner to suffer, or all that Christ endured,) is a doctrine no where contained in the Bible, and is as *repugnant to reason and sound sense* as it would have been awful in its consequences, admitting this supposed satisfaction had never been obtained."

The common doctrine of the Atonement Mr. Skinner of Utica classes ('Mag. and Adv.' VII. 279,) among "the *absurdest dogmas* that ever man believed, and which had their origin among the darkest ages the church ever witnessed." He adds, that such an atonement, "so far from being a satisfaction to justice, would have been a *most flagrant and eternal violation of every principle of justice.*" The younger Ballou, in an article on "the sufferings of Christ," says, ('Exp.' II. 116,) "It will be seen at once, that they cannot be regarded in the light of a *substitute* for the penalty of our sins."

We learn from Mr. Skinner of Boston, ('Un. Ill. and Def.' pp. 110, 113, 127,) that "Christ does not fulfil the law, by enduring its penalty in the place of the sinner. Neither is it necessary to the sinner's salvation, *that any one should suffer as a substitute.*—Every man must suffer in his own person all that the law threatens; and for Jesus to take the place of the sinner would be doing him the highest disservice." "*Christ does not die as a substitute,* to release us from

the punishment due to our sins.—This system has no foundation:—it is entirely wrong: all its essential parts are erroneous." "The system of vicarious atonement, is not the system of the Bible. Every part of it is wrong."

Not less positive is Mr. Williamson. He would have us believe, ('Exp. of Univ.' pp. 43, 44, 52,) that "the whole system of vicarious atonement is wrong —*an outrage upon all justice and right*, and, as such, is pronounced by the voice of inspiration, *an abomination in the sight of the Lord.* That—Christ died a vicarious sacrifice, to appease the wrath, satisfy the justice, or secure the favor of God, and the escape of the guilty, is most unequivocally denied.—My objections to the doctrine of vicarious atonement are, that it is *unjust in theory, impossible in fact*, and *pernicious in practice.*" "A sentiment unfounded in reason, scripture, or fact." What more could an infidel have said?

Let these examples suffice, to show how utterly Anti-Christian is this whole scheme. While it denies what is commonly called the "Atonement," it never grapples with the arguments by which that doctrine is vindicated and established. True, the first book that led the way to the adoption of *Modern* Universalism, was a 'Treatise on Atonement,' by H. Ballou. In such a work we might expect that the system of *bloody sacrifices*, as instituted and enjoined by God himself, and which for so many ages, seemed an indispensable part of the divine worship on earth, would have been thoroughly discussed. But no. There is scarcely an

allusion to it in the whole discussion. It would not have been known from this book that there ever was such a system. The same is true of all, or nearly all, the publications of the sect, which have come under my eye. The subject appears to have been most carefully avoided. I have found but one instance in which there is even an attempt to meet the difficulty.

In the 'Universalist Expositor,' for November, 1838, there is an article by S. R. Smith of Albany, on "the Old Testament doctrine of Sacrifice." It is there maintained, (pp. 394, 418, 424,) "that it does not appear that the legal sacrifices had, or were designed to have, any influence upon the Deity, or any bearing upon the credit of his law.—They appear rather to have been required as the symbols of the temper of mind—the tokens of the moral feelings of the offerer." Of the atonement and sin-offerings he says, "Both were palpably designed for man—to remind him of *what he owed to his fellow-man*, to keep alive the principles of purity and integrity in his own heart, and to cherish the feelings, and direct the spirit, of religion and devotion to God." "The conclusion is forced upon us, that, however proper and useful to *man* they were, *the Deity was never influenced* nor affected by them; and that he neither became more gracious for their observance, nor less benignant on account of their omission."

In this manner, he endeavours to show, that these sacrifices had no *expiatory* meaning. But throughout the article, there is not the least attempt to account for

the fact that "without *shedding of blood* is no remission." He does not tell us why for so many ages the blood of innocent animals *flowed* in ceaseless streams, and was demanded by a God of goodness and mercy. Nor could he have shown it, except as Paul has done in the epistle to the Hebrews. And what is even yet more remarkable, in the whole investigation of thirty-five pages, there is not an allusion, save to the amount of half a page near the close, to that masterly exposition of the ancient sacrifices, and their reference to that of Christ, which is found in the epistle to the Hebrews! Why this silence—this apparent unacquaintance with these matters? Have we not in this very fact, a plain confession of the weakness of their system?

But the question will most naturally arise in the reader's mind, "In what light do they regard the sufferings of Christ?" An answer to this will be given in the next chapter.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST NOT PECULIAR.

No peculiarity in the sufferings of Christ—Atonement the work not of Christ, but of the sinner—Christ suffered not as much as many others ; and in the same sense as his apostles did—The nature of his sufferings the same with theirs—He saved the world, just as the American revolutionary fathers saved their country—Agreement with Thomas Paine—Christ only saves men from deserving punishment—He is not therefore the Savior of the whole world—Specimens of false reasoning from the fact that Christ died for all.

> " Ye brainless wits! ye baptiz'd infidels!
> Ye worse for mending! wash'd to fouler stains!
> The ransom was paid down; the fund of heav'n,
> Heav'ns inexhaustible, exhausted fund
> Amazing and amaz'd, pour'd forth the price,
> All price beyond."—YOUNG.

THE sufferings and death of the author of Christianity constitute the chief theme of the epistolary remains of his apostles. They spake of his blood, as that, to which they and their brethren owed their whole salvation.—" We have redemption through his blood; the church which he hath purchased with his own blood ; in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins ; being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through

him; we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; having, therefore, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus." These forms of expression occur with great frequency in the Christian Scriptures.

In what light are these declarations to be regarded? Do they attribute to the sufferings and death of Christ any peculiar efficacy? Such has been the almost uniform opinion of the Christian world until latterly. There are those, who deny that we owe our everlasting happiness to what Christ endured on our account, and who say, that there was no more peculiarity in the sufferings of Jesus than in those of Peter and Paul. Such are our Universalists. They teach that

XIV. THERE WAS NOTHING PECULIAR IN CHRIST'S DEATH.

The Christian reader, who has been accustomed to regard this sect as a branch of the family of Christ, and to rank their ministers among the Christian clergy, will hardly be prepared to see the Redeemer thrust into the common rank of martyrs and confessors, whose blood flowed merely because they were overpowered by their persecutors, and loved their faith more dearly than life. Mr. Ballou finds fault with us, for over-rating these sufferings. "It does not appear," he says, ('L. Sermons,' p. 177,) "from the Savior's speech here recited, that his own sufferings were of that kind or degree that has been represented by Christian doctors. They have supposed that the sufferings of Christ were far beyond any possible comparison, even greater

than we conceive, and that this rendered them efficacious with his Father, to procure our pardon of sin." In the 'Treatise on Atonement,' he says, (p. 107,) that "God never called for a sacrifice to reconcile himself to man; but loved man so that he was pleased to bruise his Son for our good, to give him to die, in *attestation* of love to sinners. The belief, that the great Jehovah was offended with his creatures to that degree that nothing but the death of Christ, or the endless misery of mankind, could appease his anger, is an idea that has done more injury to the Christian religion, than the writings of all its opposers for many centuries." "To believe in any other atonement," he further adds, (p. 123,) "than the putting off the old man with his deeds, and the putting on of the new man,—is carnal-mindedness and is death."

In these passages, he first implies that the sufferings of Christ were not much, if any, greater than others experience, and then states that his death was merely an attestation of God's love to man, that God entertains no such displeasure against sinful men as to make an expiation necessary, and that *the only atonement possible is a change of heart*.

In Kneeland's Lectures, (p. 74,) we find the following statement: "The apostles considered their sufferings as filling up the measure of the sufferings of Christ; and in as much as they were so, for aught *we can know* to the contrary, (and Mr. Kneeland was a very learned man, they all said in his day,) "there was the *same merit* in them. And hence, we are assured,

they will meet with the same reward!" The same merit in the death of Paul that there was in the death of Christ? And the same reward too? If the man were not already an infidel of the vilest kind, I should certainly expect that he was on the very point of trampling the Bible under his feet.

Hear him again. "For aught I can see, (pp. 116, 117,)—God could just as consistently forgive sin before [the death of Christ,] as since; neither does he now forgive sin, on account of, or *with the least reference to, the sufferings of Christ;* any more than he does on account of the sufferings of the *apostles,* or any one else who has suffered in the same cause." I should not have made these references to Mr. Kneeland, were it not that the volume of his Lectures, from which these extracts have been taken, have from their first publication been regarded with the utmost favor by the sect, and at one time thought to be the most complete vindication, then extant, of their peculiar views.

Let us hear from Mr. Ballou in his old age. He has grown somewhat wiser, perhaps, in thirty years, or since he wrote and first published on the Atonement.

"We really do not comprehend," he says, ('Expositor,' I. 170,) "how it is that our heavenly Father cannot forgive the sins of his own children, without doing it in pursuance of such a sacrifice, as the executing of an Infinite being on a *gallows* erected in the centre of the Universe." "Nor can we understand (p. 171,) why our heavenly Father could, with any more propriety, pardon us after such an unaccountable

execution than before. Such an execution could not, as we can see, alter our moral condition." "That the Scriptures maintain, (p. 172,) that men are redeemed by the sufferings and blood of Christ, in a sense which we can understand, and on a just principle, on which it is *the Christian's duty to lay down his own life*, if called so to do, we did not know that any who profess Christianity deny.—*The sufferings which Jesus endured, and the sufferings which his apostles and disciples encountered, were all in the same cause, and required for the same end.*"

We are thus told, that the death of Christ was in no sense necessary to the forgiveness of sins, that it does not, and could not affect our moral condition at all, that it was no more necessary than the death of any other human being in like circumstances as a man, and that it was required for the same end as the death of the apostles and other martyrs!

"It is commonly supposed," says H. Ballou, Jun., ('Expositor,' II. pp. 106, 107,) "that the sufferings of Christ were of a peculiar character, different in their very nature from any thing ever endured by man. They are thought to have been so great, so amazing, as infinitely to surpass all human ability to sustain." "What do the Scriptures teach, respecting this point? They recognize the fact, as one which nobody then doubted or wondered at, that men, *mortal men, did frequently endure the same kind of sufferings with those of Christ*, and that they were capable of enduring them with patience." "The sufferings of Christ

(p. 109.) were not regarded as peculiar to himself, but as *shared, in all their detail, by his persecuted followers.*—There is scarcely a fact more frequently recognized in the New Testament, or introduced in a greater variety of relations. And with respect to the *intenseness* of his sufferings,—those he endured on the cross *did not equal, or at most did not exceed*, those which the inhabitants of Jerusalem were to experience in the approaching destruction of their city."

That the sufferings of Christ were directly inflicted by the Father is most fully denied by the same writer. "That there was a class of sufferings, (p. 111,) inflicted on Christ by the *immediate interference* of God, is no more intimated in the Scriptures, than that such was the case with the Apostles and early Christians." No, though Isaiah says, "*The* LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. It pleased the LORD to bruise him, he hath put him to grief." Notwithstanding what Isaiah thought and said, this wiser than the ancient seer avers, (p. 116,) "that we are absolutely precluded from all supposition of any other sufferings than those mentioned by the evangelist, or such as arose, *in the natural order of things*, from the circumstances in which he stood. Those that he actually bore, were *such as the apostles and early Christians were partakers of.*" The conclusion to which he comes, in regard to "the nature and design of Christ's sufferings," is, (p. 105,) that they were "the same, in their nature, with other sufferings for righteousness' sake which God ordains in his providence;" "a necessary, (p. 117,)

an unavoidable element in the execution of his general enterprise."

In other words they were merely *incidental* to the unpopular work in which he was engaged, just as in the case of the proto-martyr Stephen, and the more recent martyrs, Munson, Lyman, and Williams! "In this sense," we are plainly told, (p. 118,) "his sufferings were our ransom, our reconciliation to God, the price at which our salvation was purchased.—This is agreeable to the spontaneous and universal language of all ages, and on all subjects. We say of the American revolution, that *our fathers* purchased the independence of our country with their blood; that they *sacrificed* themselves for us; that they were our political ransom." That is, Christ is the moral ransom of the world, in the same sense in which the revolutionary fathers are the "political ransom" of this country.

All this is still more plainly expressed and avowed by O. A. Skinner. "Christ was a Savior; ('Univ. Ill. and Def.,' pp. 128, 129, 130,) and in the work of salvation he had to encounter error, bigotry, and sin.—What he endures is *incidental* to the work of opposing error, bigotry, and sin. He suffered, *as the apostles and Christian fathers suffered.*" "JESUS GAVE HIMSELF FOR THE REDEMPTION OF THE WORLD, *just as the revolutionary fathers* GAVE THEMSELVES TO EFFECT THE FREEDOM OF OUR COUNTRY!"

So also says Mr. Le Fevre. He maintains, ('Gospel Anchor,' II. 5,) that he "could not believe such a *monstrous hypothesis*," as the orthodox doctrine of the

Atonement. "The object of Christ's mission, life, sufferings, and death, was to reconcile man to God and to his fellow. In this cause he shed his blood. The subject may be thus illustrated. The *heroes of our revolution* shed their blood in the cause of freedom, and through their devotedness and sufferings, we enjoy all the advantages of civil and religious liberty. It may therefore be said, almost without a metaphor, *by their stripes we are healed.*" Vicarious Atonement he regards, as "*excessively erroneous, and dreadfully revolting.*"

Mr. Williamson has much to the same effect, and so have others; but I forhear to adduce any other witnesses. What we have is enough to break our hearts. —That men, professing Infidelity, should have thus made the cross of Christ of none effect would not have surprised us. But that men professing, and very tenacious of the claim, to be Christians, should thus have wounded Christ in the house of his friends, is heart-rending. We are confounded, overwhelmed, at such an unnatural spectacle. "Our only reply is—*a flood of tears.*"

Had Thomas Paine enjoyed the rare light of these luminaries, we should probably never have heard of "the Age of Reason." His account of the matter, (pp. 31–2,) is strikingly similar. "That such a person as Jesus Christ existed," he remarks, "and that he was crucified,—are historical relations strictly within the limits of probability. He preached most excellent morality, and the equality of man; but he preached also

against the corruptions and avarice of the Jewish priests, and this brought upon him the hatred and vengeance of the whole order of priesthood.—Neither is it improbable that Jesus Christ had in contemplation the delivery of the Jewish nation from the bondage of the Romans. *Between the two, however, this virtuous reformer and revolutionist lost his life.*" I can scarcely avoid the belief, that this last sentence, written and published in 1794, served as the groundwork of this new scheme of divinity; especially as Mr. Ballou, the founder of the order as it now is, confesses that it was his "reading some *deistical* writings" that tended to bring him upon his present ground.

It being thus denied, that the sufferings of Christ were peculiar either in kind or degree, or different from what others in like circumstances experience; that they were necessary to the forgiveness of sins; or that any are thereby delivered from deserved punishishment, it will be asked, Why is he called 'the Savior of the world?' To this, it is replied in the words of Mr. Sawyer, ('Let. to Remington,' pp. 30, 49,) "Christ did not come to save man from the punishment of his sin, the penalty of the broken law; but he came to save man from his sins, *from sinning*." "Christ came to save his people from their *sins*, and not from the punishment of their sins;—to save men from *deserving* punishment, rather than from punishment deserved."

"All those passages of scripture," says Mr. Ballou, ('Exp.' III. 65,) "which define the nature of salvation, agree that Jesus Christ saves man from evil which at-

taches to him *in the present world*, and which he suffers in his present state of being." This salvation has nothing to do with another world; the sinner suffers none the less in another world for what Christ did in this. And none the less in this world, except as he is induced by the example and instruction of Christ to cease from sin. "It thus appears," he adds, "that the salvation of mankind by Jesus Christ is a salvation from sin. And as sin is an evil which attaches to us in this present state, it appears that, instead of saving men from just punishment in the future world, Jesus came to save them from the *sin* which they commit in this."

Such is the uniform testimony of all their authors, as far as I have had an opportunity to consult them. They all maintain that the *only* sense in which it is proper to say that Jesus is the Savior of the world, is that just given; he saves them from committing sin, and from the temporal evils which would have come upon them had they committed the sin from which they are thus dissuaded. "The evils," says Mr. Whittemore, ('Plain Guide,' p. 254,) "from which Jesus came to save men *are in this world*, and for this reason he came into this world to save them."

But if such was the object of Christ in coming into the world, and if he saves men in no other way than by saving them from sin, ignorance, and consequent misery in this world, then I maintain that CHRIST DIED IN VAIN, as respects the vast multitude of the human race. The heathen, generation after generation, have

Christ saves none fully. A trap sprung.

never heard of Christ, much less have they been saved by him from their sins, or will they be, before death. Christ, therefore, is, in this sense, no Savior to them, nor is he to any others fully. Where is the man that doeth good and sinneth not? I know that the Perfectionists and some others hold that there are such; but, I ask, where is the man? I have never known one, of whom I had any reason to believe it, and, I am sure that no *Universalist* of my acquaintance could ever lay any claim to such perfection with a good grace.

If men continue still to sin, after they have known Christ, and cease not until death, and if the salvation which Christ effects has to do only with this life, then how is Christ in any sense the Savior of the world, or even of the elect? Is not *Death*, that puts an end to all sinning, according to their scheme, the great Savior after all? And what need was there for Christ to die, or suffer at all? For where Christ saves one man from his sins, Death, I repeat it, saves its hundreds. Why could not Death have dispensed with Christ?

Moreover, by teaching that the sufferings and death of Christ, affect man *only in this present world*, they absolutely exclude themselves from using a large class of texts, in proof of their principal doctrine, to which they have been accustomed most confidently to appeal. Let me recall the language of Mr. Whittemore above—"The evils from which Jesus came to save men *are in this world;*" and that of Mr. Ballou also,—"*All* those passages of Scripture, which define the nature of sal-

vation, agree that Jesus Christ saves man from evil which attaches to him *in the present world.*" Of course there are *none* in his estimation, which teach that Christ saves man from any evil in another world. Let there be no evasion nor prevarication here. Let the doctrine be well defined, and then let them abide by it.

What else, now, can it be but the most bare-faced deception in a Universalist preacher, who believes that our future condition is not at all affected by what Christ did, or suffered here, to appeal, in endeavoring to disprove endless, or limited, punishment in a future state, to those texts which represent Christ as the Savior of all men, &c.?

Mr. Whittemore, in his 'Plain Guide,' (p. 25,) attempts to show "the final happiness of all men," from the fact that *Christ will save* all men—and that God "will have all men to be saved." But how does this appear, if the salvation of the Bible has nothing to do with a future state, as is over and over again declared by these men in every form? Mr. W. pursues the same course in speaking of the death of Christ, (pp. 34–36.) And so, too, (p. 50;) "He will have all men to be saved, which is the highest proof of his regard for all men; and to this end he has sent his Son to die for all men, in execution of the divine purpose to bring all to the enjoyment of salvation." This argument he adduces "in support of their belief in the eventual holiness and happiness of all men," and therefore uses the term 'salvation,' as equivalent to endless happiness in a future state. But, according to their own showing, it can have no such meaning or reference.

Sophistry. False conclusions.

Such sophistry is scattered over nearly all Mr. Ballou's pages. In the 'Expositor,' (II. p. 355,) after refering to several texts, he remarks;—"The salvation of all men by Jesus Christ seems to be as fully and as explicitly expressed in these declarations, as it can be in our language.—No fair course of argument can disallow that his dying expressly for all men is favorable to the hope that all men will be finally saved by him." Here salvation is used again in reference to a future state, contrary to the avowed limitation of it to this world, by this writer and his brethren.

In like manner, also, Mr. Fernald asks, ('Univ. against Partialism,' p. 64,) in reference to the text,—'He gave himself a ransom for all'—"How inefficacious will his labors, sufferings, and death, prove, if a considerable portion, or any, for whom he died, are never to experience his salvation, *but exist for ever in misery and sin?*" The salvation of Christ is here opposed to an existence forever in misery and sin, and made to consist in a deliverance from endless misery. But if the statements above made are correct, the sufferings of Christ *will* prove thus inefficacious, having no bearing whatever on the future state of mankind.

In order to establish the doctrine of the final happiness of all mankind, D. Skinner of Utica remarks, ('Mag. and Adv.' III. 254,) "I cannot see how—any two propositions can be more clearly established than these —1. That Christ died for all, and—2. That he will save all he died for." Well, what then? Does it follow that all will go to heaven? No, for nothing that

Christ did in this world, as they maintain, affects our condition hereafter in the least degree!

Mr. Thomas very frequently falls into the same error. He refers in his 'Discussion,' (p. 264,) to the phrase—'the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the *world*,' "in proof of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind." How does it prove this point, when the salvation of the gospel relates only to this present world, and not at all to the final state of mankind?

Again the same writer observes, (p. 261,) "since Jesus gave himself a ransom for all, you must either admit that all will be restored, or consent to the appalling conclusion that Christ died in vain." But if Christ only saves men from sinning in this world,—the only world, according to them, in which sin can be commited,—is not this "appalling conclusion" taught by themselves.

So, too, in commenting on the words—'He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world'—he remarks, (p. 267,) "All I now contend for, is, that the salvation of all mankind was contemplated in the mission of Christ."—"And to grant (p. 269,) that sufficient provision has been made for the salvation of all, is equivalent to an admission that all men will be saved;"—but where? Not in a future state, but in this. Not from punishment, but from *sin*. Are then all saved from sin in this life? No. Then all *will* not be—*are* not certainly saved even in this world; and this salvation does not concern another world!

Shifting their position. Subterfuges.

But I need not cite further examples in point. Mr. Thomas' book, is wholly based on this fallacy. From beginning to end he refers to such texts in proof of the salvation of all mankind in another state. And I scarcely know one of their books in which this sophistry does not appear. They are continually shifting their ground —now maintaining that salvation has nothing to do with a future state, and that Christ's death accomplishes nothing for us except while we remain here in this world,—and then proving that all men will be taken to dwell for ever in heaven, freed from all sin and sorrow, because Christ died for all, and is, or was, the Savior of the world!!! Away with such dishonesty—such pitiful subterfuges—such tricks and double meanings. It shows that they do not believe their own definitions and doctrines, when they are thus driven to swallow their own words. A long schooling it needs, indeed, for men to unlearn the plainest lessons of common sense.

CHAPTER XIV.

DENIAL OF THE TRINITY.

No need of an Incarnate God—Christ only a man—No truth in the doctrine of the Trinity—Views of Murray—The Trinity exploded by Hosea Ballou—Christ superior to other men only by office—Christ not possessed of two natures, human and superhuman—Socinianism favorable to devotion—They profess to honor Christ more than others.

"They now are deem'd the faithful, and are prais'd,
Who, constant only in rejecting THEE,
Deny thy Godhead with a martyr's zeal,
Blind and in love with darkness! Yet e'en these
Worthy, compar'd with sycophants, who knee
Thy name adoring, and then *preach thee man!*"—COWPER.

UNIVERSALISM has no need of an Incarnate God. Man may be fitted to act the part of such a Savior as this system sets forth. The Savior of the Universalist is merely a distinguished philanthropist—an ardent lover of his race, and a pure specimen of human nature. He is superior to man, but only as one man is superior to another. He is exalted over even the highest, but this is owing to the fact, that God has anointed him with the oil of Gladness above his fellows. The orthodox Christian has learned from his Bible, that, "in the beginning was the WORD, and the WORD was with God, and the WORD was God;" that this same WORD,

that was God, "was made flesh and dwelt among us;" became incarnate, took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; so that "God was manifest in the flesh," God became incarnate—God became man. The Universalist, on the other hand, does not believe that Jesus of Nazareth, or any part of the spiritual nature of Jesus had any existence in the beginning, or even before his conception as a human being. He maintains that

XV. JESUS CHRIST WAS ONLY A MAN OF SUPERIOR GIFTS.

And consequently, that

XVI. THERE IS NO DISTINCTION OF PERSONS IN THE DEITY.

These two articles of their creed are so connected that it will be proper to consider them together. By holding the inferiority of the Son, they of course, exclude equality with the Father, and so deny the Trinity. In this respect they are Socinians of the lowest stamp.

"Father Murray" was a Sabellian—neither a Trinitarian, properly, nor yet a Socinian. The editor of his 'Life,' in an exhibition of his faith, represents him, (p. 264,) as a believer in the complex character of the Divine Being, after this manner;—"In process of time this august CREATOR, was to be enrobed in humanity, and become the SON born; was to be exhibited as a HOLY SPIRIT of consolation, taking of the things of Jesus, and exhibiting them to the mind, thus speaking peace."

"Mr. Murray was at the same time a UNITARIAN and a TRINITARIAN, constantly beholding the trinity in unity. —The Almighty, clad in garments of flesh, became the GOD-MAN, and speaking of himself *as man*, he says—'My Father is greater than I;' while reverting to the divinity he affirms—'I and my Father are one.' Was this true—or was Jesus Christ an imposter? In this view the Scriptures are beautifully consistent. 'I am God THE SAVIOR; a just God and a Savior; there is none beside me.'—Such were the comprehensive views of Deity, which became more and more luminous to the mental eye of the preacher."

Although Mr. Murray held the doctrine of the Trinity, if at all, only in a modified sense, he certainly regarded Jesus of Nazareth, as the SUPREME GOD INCARNATE. "It is manifest," he says, ('Letters and Sketches,' I. 81,) "that our Savior Jesus Christ, is both *God* and *man*. All fulness dwelleth in him. He was the God with us. The fullness of the God-head dwelling in him was the offended Being; the fullness of our humanity in him was the offending nature." The two distinct and independent natures of Christ, are here most fully and plainly set forth. "These sentiments," says Mr. Everett, the editor of the fifth edition of his 'Life,' "are held, (p. 279,) *but by few among those now denominated Universalists.*" This departure from their great leader will now be shown by a reference to their authorities.

It was owing to the superior discernment of Hosea Ballou, as I have already shown, that the doctrine of

The whole sect Unitarian. Ballou's views.

the Trinity was found to be erroneous, some forty or fifty years since; and through his influence "the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement, with all kindred notions, were *discarded by the whole denomination*, with a very few exceptions." ('Mod. Hist.' p. 432.) "I cannot say, for certainty," he remarks (p. 437,) "what year I became a Unitarian, but it was long before I wrote my Treatise on Atonement." When he wrote that Treatise, "although he fully believed, (p. 11,) in the dependence of Christ on his God and Father,—he entertained the opinion that he had a sentient existence before he was manifested in flesh." But in relation "to the preexistence of Christ," he now differs much from his former self.

In the fifth edition of his 'Treatise,' he ridicules the very idea of a Trinity, in language like this:—On the supposition "that the Mediator is really God,—then we contend, that if he be the *Son* of God, he is the son of himself, and is his own father; that he is no more the Son of God, than God is his son." Speaking of "the personage of the Mediator," he says, (p. 113,)—"We shall contend that the Mediator is a *created, dependent* being." "The reader will then ask, (p. 114,) if we would consider the Mediator *no more than equal with men?* We answer—'Yes,' were it not that our Father and his Father, our God and his God, hath anointed him above his fellows." Mark this admission; Christ "is no more than equal with men," by *nature*, but for certain reasons of *office*, or state, he has been elevated to the highest seat among men. He afterwards com-

pares him to an ambassador sent to a foreign court, who "is, in his *official character*, the *power* that sent him." He admits of no other distinction than this. As when he states, ('Lect. Ser.' p. 208,) that "it is plain that the *nature* of the relation of *Jesus* to the Father is the nature of the relation of *every man* to the Father of our spirits," and adds a caution to the hearer "against supposing that he means to level the blessed Redeemer to no more than an equality with ourselves," since for his *office's* sake "God hath highly exalted him" above his original equality with us.

We find these sentiments running through all their subsequent standards. Among the first to make a bold stand publicly against the Trinity, and the divinity of the Mediator, was Abner Kneeland. "The supposition," ('Lectures,' p. 142,) "that the Mediator possessed *any thing essential to the Deity*,—or that he was essentially God,—*involves us in absurdity*." He speaks of the doctrine of "*the simple humanity of Christ*," as "the doctrine which I believe, and the doctrine which I mean to preach *as long as God spares my life*."—(Poor man! he is long since dead, though he lives.) After what he regards as a somewhat full discussion of the subject, he adds, (p. 159,) "from the above, and from all that has been said, it is evident that the apostles, and all who conversed with our Lord, before and after his resurreetion, considered him *in no other light than simply a man* approved of God."

He speaks his mind most fully on this subject, in the following passage :—" The error (p. 112,) to which most of the absurd notions in divinity may be traced, is as I humbly conceive, the supposition that sin is an infinite evil, which demanded infinite satisfaction to divine justice. This led the way to the supposed necessity of an infinite sacrifice: and, as Christ was supposed to have been this sacrifice, this led to the supposition of his *divine nature;* which, in their train, led to other notions, inconsistent with themselves, *palpably absurd, contradictory and ridiculous!*"

The 'Universalist Expositor,' asks (I. 343,)—" In what part of the New Testament do we learn that either Jesus or his apostles labored to prove that he was God, the Creator of all things?" It would, of course, be of no use to refer such an inquirer to John i. 1—3, 14; Col. i. 16; Heb. i. 2, 8, 10; iii. 1—4; for he has set such evidence aside; he knows more about it, or knows better how to express his thoughts, than either John, or Paul, or the Holy Spirit speaking through their lips.

Mr. Grosh says, ('Mag. and Adv.' III. 397,) " We believe that the *nature* of Jesus was strictly the *human nature only*, while on earth,—that he had *no existence, before his earthly existence*, except in the purpose and counsel of God,—that he was the chief (or beginning) of the creation of God only by the powers and *office* with which he was gifted, and by his resurrection." He speaks of the *Trinity* as a "*heathen tradition*," incorporated into the Christian system," which

"has bewildered many sincere believers, and rejoiced not a few hearts among skeptics who opposed Christianity."

Mr. D. Skinner, also of Utica, speaks ('Mag. and Adv." III. 333,) of "the mysterious and inexplicable doctrine of the trinity," as "a doctrine that was unheard of during the three first centuries of the Christian era;" and classes it with others, which, he says, "find no support in the word of God, are not sanctioned by the Gospel of our salvation, are not taught either in the Old or New Testament, are the traditions of men, doctrines of human invention, unknown in the days of primitive Christianity, and, must finally go down to 'the tomb of the Capulets'—their primeval nonentity." The other doctrines, of which he thus speaks, are "the popular doctrine of the fall;" Adam's being "transformed from an immortal to a mortal being," and conveying "the taint of natural and moral death through all his unborn posterity;" "the doctrine of total depravity;" "the doctrine of election and reprobation;" "the doctrine of endless misery;" "the existence of a personal devil;" and "the doctrine of vicarious atonement." All—all wrong, unscriptural, unreasonable and absurd!

The present generation of Universalist preachers can see neither sense nor reason, much less scripture, in the doctrine of the Trinity. Speaking of "the favorite doctrine of the Trinity," S. R. Smith, of Albany, says, ('Mag. and Adv.' VIII. 121,) "there is something so *revolting to reason*, so *repugnant* to all our ideas of number and consistency, in this prevailing dogma, that it is

matter of wonder, not that so many, but that so few, comparatively, reject the whole system, of which this is supposed a part." He calls it (p. 122,) a "*singularly absurd* doctrine," denies "that this *absurd dogma* constitutes any part of Christianity," and declares that "the Trinity was never a doctrine of the Bible."

"The popular doctrine of the Trinity," says S. Cobb, ('U. Exp.' II. 135,) "involving the proper deity of Christ, seems to us as unscriptural as it is unreasonable." He maintains (pp. 137, 9,) that "Jesus himself clearly disclaims all pretensions to proper deity." He explains "the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person," to mean that "Jesus Christ came unto mankind in the spirit, the disposition, the *moral* nature of God. Here we have, [in the excellent *moral* traits of Jesus' character,] the image of the divine *moral* perfections, a ray of the divine brightness."

The author of 'Universalism Illustrated and Defended,' says, (p. 57,) of the doctrine of the Trinity, "the first principles of this [doctrine] involve contradictions, so that none can receive it without first making *an entire surrender of the understanding*." "When we consider," he adds, (p. 60,) "the peculiar and strange nature of the doctrine, it seems as though a bare statement of it is sufficient to refute it." "The Trinity cannot be true," he says, (p. 63,) "because it teaches that Christ is God and man at the same time," and (p. 72,) "is opposed to all our ideas of God, and to the uniform language of the Bible." In speaking of

what he calls the *divine* character of Christ, "we shall not be understood," he says, (p. 137,) "to mean that he was God; for we have shown that he did not possess the *attributes* of Deity." This *divine nature* he speaks of in four particulars; his entire devotion to his work, his unbending adherence to moral principle, his love and his impartiality. *In the same sense,* it is said by Peter, that *all believers may "be partakers of the divine nature."* Here then, is nothing but "simple humanity."

When Christ is spoken of by Paul, as "being in the form of God," this writer tells us (p. 142,) "by 'form of God,' the apostle means *intellectual and moral likeness.*" That is, his mental and moral character so nearly resembled the Father's, that he may be said to have been "in the form of God."

A writer in the 'Universalist Union,' (IV. 239,) remarks, that "itis one of the strangest wonders of the world, that the doctrine of the trinity should find a resting-place in the Christian Church. *Nature, reason, and revelation, are alike against the monstrous dogma.*" He intimates that trinitarians are *children* now, and that bye and bye, they will "become old enough to detect and abandon the error." A pretty compliment, truly, to the venerable fathers of the Church in this and former generations, who thought, spake, and wrote, unmoved by the fear of man.

Another writer in the same volume, professes (p. 401,) to have discovered that it was a "prejudice of

the pagans" that "first suggested to the Christians the idea of calling Jesus a God.—We can view him *in no more favorable light*, than as the *man* Christ Jesus." "The supernatural knowledge of our Savior (p. 402,) is to be understood *in the same way* with that possessed by other divinely-inspired persons.—If the knowledge, possessed by them, does not entitle them to an equality with God, neither does it in the case of our Savior.—In both cases the knowledge was obtained in a similar way.—So it was with the *miraculous powers* they exercised." In respect to the possession of two natures by Christ, he says, (p. 403,) that "the evidence is not to be found in the sacred record. The doctrine is attended with insuperable difficulties."

The conclusion to which this writer comes, is, "that the Savior was not God; that he did not possess but one nature, and that a *human nature like our own*, under the influence of the divine spirit, which enabled him to perform mighty miracles, and to know all things, which his natural faculties did not enable him to know." Such are the unblushing avowals published to the world as the tenets of Universalists in this metropolis, through the columns of a periodical, of which *Mr. Sawyer* is the principal editor.

From Mr. Williamson, we learn, through his 'Exposition of Universalism,' (p. 13,) "that Jesus of Nazareth was a created and a dependent being, deriving all his wonderful powers from God." "If you ask me," he says, "if he was *no more* than a man, my answer is,

in the language of Scripture, 'He was made, *in all things*, like unto the brethren,' but was 'anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows,' and endued with power greater than any other man.—He claimed (!) no higher title than the humble one—'the Son of man;' and if he claimed no more for himself, it is a misguided disciple that claims it for him." "His meat and his drink (p. 30,) was to do the will of God, and the spirit of the Lord dwelt richly in him. In this sense, and this *only*, he and his Father were one." "The idea of a Trinity," he maintains, (p. 33,) "is destructive of *real*, *pure*, *heartfelt*, *devotion*, to one only living and true God!" Devotion! What does the Universalist know of devotion? Where shall we go to find, among either their people or ministers, instances of real, pure, heartfelt devotion? Men, that do not even maintain closet-prayer, not to speak of family-prayer, and whose whole conduct is any thing but devout, set themselves up to teach a Baxter, Edwards, Whitefield, Brainard, Payson, Martyn, and Taylor, what "heartfelt devotion" means?

> "It moves me more, perhaps, than folly ought,
> When some *green heads*, as void of wit as thought,
> Suppose *themselves* monopolists of sense,
> And wiser men's abilities pretense"

And what makes the matter worse, is the fact, that these men pretend to *honor the Savior more* than we.

They honor Christ most. We a thousand times less.

They are his genuine disciples—they, above all other men, possess his spirit, imitate his virtues, magnify his office, exalt his character, and glory in his cross !!! "Let it not be said," exclaims Mr. Williamson, (p. 35,) "that these views are calculated to degrade the Savior in the estimation of the world, or to undermine the foundations of confidence in his power to save. His example and character are not the less lovely because presented in the person of our *elder brother.*" "Glory be to him who hath loved us, and died, that he migh return us to God.—I say, with the full heart, glory and honor be to Jesus the Savior :—"

"Who knee
Thy name adoring, and then PREACH THEE MAN !"

Similar language is used by Mr. Manley, of Gainesville, Genesee co., N. Y., whose sentiments were given above from the Universalist Union. "The charge may be urged," he says, (p. 403,) "that the view we have presented degrades the Savior—that it tarnishes his character—that it brings him down from the high station to which his nature and mighty works entitle him. We reply—*not so.* The representation we give of him *exalts him a thousand fold above the common doctrine.* It by no means diminishes the lustre of his fame, but adds to its brightness and glory.—We think truly, that *the supposition that Jesus was God, degrades his character ;* while the opposite supposition reflects upon him the brightest glory ! ! !"

In the language of Scotland's bard, I say, in respect to such pretended preachers of Christ,—

"God knows, I'm not the thing I should be,
Nor am I even the thing I could be,
But twenty times I rather would be
An ATHEIST clean,
Than under gospel-colors hid be,
Just for a screen."

CHAPTER XV.

GOD'S FAVOR NEVER LOST.

Recapitulation—God's favor can neither be gained nor lost—God never displeased with sinners—Not at all affected by our sins—Never our enemy—All love—Prayer has no effect upon God—These views popular with the vilest of men.

> "That plea refuted, others quick they seek—
> *Mercy* is infinite and man is weak;
> The future shall obliterate the past,
> And Heav'n, no doubt, shall be their home at last."
>
> COWPER.

THE developments already made of the heresies taught by Universalists have, doubtless, prepared the reader for all that may follow. Having removed all the ancient landmarks, and hurled to the ground the pillars of truth, they find nothing too sacred for mutilation or destruction. The way is thus cleared for the erection of such a structure as suits their corrupt notions—in which they may entrench themselves beyond the reach of every foe. From sin they have nothing to fear, for it is only a finite evil, and hardly an evil at all. Its results, certainly, as Mr. Streeter of Boston maintains, ('Mag. and Adv.' III. 290,) are properly no evil, inasmuch as they are the means of the greatest good. "God does not produce," he says, "nor

permit any affliction or trouble as an ultimate end. Under his administration *all evils* are partial and momentary, and designed to *terminate in a greater good.*—The anger of God and the afflictions endured by mankind are the same thing.—He exercises feelings of compassion towards us in our deepest sufferings, *in whatever way they may have been brought upon us*, and is determined—to deliver us out of all our tribulations."

Hence, as I have elsewhere shown, they hold that it would be a real unkindness in God to prevent the infliction of these apparent evils, or to deliver any of our race from the sufferings naturally consequent on their sins. There being, therefore, no need of any substitution of another in our stead, no place is found for the doctrine of vicarious atonement, and it is discarded. The sufferings of Jesus are next deprived of all their peculiarity, and he becomes simply *a revolutionary hero*, or, at the most, a distinguished *martyr* for the truth. Henceforth he is no longer to be regarded as "GOD OVER ALL," as having had any real existence before his appearance in the flesh, or as anything more than *a mere man*—our elder brother.

The traditions of the elders being thus 'exploded,' Universalism proceeds to take the high ground, that

XVII. THE FAVOR OF GOD CAN NEITHER BE GAINED NOR LOST.

It matters not how man conducts himself, whether ill or well, the great God regards him with the same complacency and pleasure. God's mind is not in the

least degree affected by our sins; he always loves us, and all of us, with his whole heart and soul, and none the less because of any sins that we may have committed in this frail state.

It is not to be supposed by a good Universalist, however conscience may trouble him, and remorse may seize upon him, that God can ever be displeased with the work of his own hands. No, not even with Pharaoh, when he poured on Egypt the vials of his wrath; nor with Israel when he swore in his wrath that they should not enter into his rest; nor with Korah and his crew, when the earth opened and swallowed them up; nor with the nations of Canaan, when he gave them to the exterminating sword; nor with Ahab and Jezebel; nor with that generation of Israel, that went into captivity; nor with that which "killed the Lord of life;" nor with that which witnessed the destruction of Jerusalem, and felt its accompanying and unparalleled horrors and woes!

All this was LOVE—the means of still greater good—a light affliction, working for them 'a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.' It is out of the question, say they, that God can ever become unreconciled to man, whether he be a Herod, a Nero, or a Cæsar Borgia.

"It is plain," says Mr. Ballou, speaking of Adam's first sin, ('Treatise on Atonement,' p. 102,) "that a material change had taken place in Adam: but can we prove, that *any alteration* happened in *God?* It is very evident, that Adam was unreconciled to God; but

it is equally as evident, *that God was not unreconciled to him.*—To say that God loved man any less *after* transgression than before, denies his unchangeability." Just as if the unchangeability of God required him to love *sin* just as much as holiness! But proceeds Mr. B. (p. 104,) "God being infinite in all his glorious attributes, he can by no means love at one time, and hate the same object at another.—The Almighty had *no occasion to dislike Adam after transgression*, any more than he had even before he made him!" This view upturns orthodoxy at once, and convicts, if true, even prophets and apostles of heresy.

The same sentiments he presents again and again. "If we carefully examine the conduct of the Divine Being towards Adam, before and after transgression, ('Lect. Sermons,' pp. 25, 26,) shall we find any thing to justify the belief, that Adam was not *equally the object of divine favor after he sinned as he was before?*—Was Saul less the object of divine favor before conversion than afterward? Were we less beloved by him [Christ,] —before he washed us than afterward? The hearer will easily perceive that these queries all tend to show, that *no change in man can effect any change in God.* —His love to his creatures can never increase nor decrease." He adds, (p. 27,) that "all are equally the objects of divine love;" and (p. 28,) that "the common doctrine, which teaches that our Father, who is in heaven, loves those who love him, but has treasured up everlasting vengeance against his enemies, is subversive of the gospel and religion of Jesus."

But what does God mean when he says,—"If I whet my glittering sword, and mine hand take hold on judgment, I will render vengeance to mine enemies?—and in another place, "who shall be punished with everlasting destruction?" Which of these is the best authority?

The hearers of this prodigy in theology are cautioned (p. 32,) against "any belief, which—involves the notion that God ever was, or ever can be an *enemy* to any of the works of his hands." He maintains, (p. 152,) that "the opinion that our Heavenly Father became *inimical* to man in consequence of his sin is—repugnant to the essential character of the Divine Being;" and (p. 309,) "that neither sin nor any thing else was ever the cause of enmity in God towards man." Mr. O. A. Skinner goes so far as to tell us, ('Un. Ill. and Def.,' p. 116,) that "the Scriptures no where style God our enemy;" no, not even when God says, (Ex. xxiii. 22,) "*I will be an enemy* to thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries;" nor (1 Sam. xxviii. 16,) when Samuel says to Saul, "the Lord is departed from thee, and is become *thine enemy;*" nor Isa. lxiii. 10,) when it is said of God, "therefore he was turned to be their *enemy*, and he fought against them." Now whom are we to believe—Messrs. Ballou and Skinner, or "holy men of God," who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost?"

Mr. Williamson assures us, ('Univ. Union, VI. No. 7,) that "such is the love of God, *sin and iniquity and the most vile ingratitude in all their aggravation and ex-*

cess cannot turn it away. It pours its wondrous flood over all the earth, and reaches, with its healing waters, the case of the most desperate child of sin and sorrow. I am aware," he adds, that *many*, [all the world beside,] "suppose sin has power to interpose an effectual barrier to the love of God, and cause him to forsake his creatures. But you will not fail to perceive that such a sentiment would falsify the position laid down in the text." The vilest sinner, therefore, need not fear, that he has forfeited at all the favor of God.

One more example from Mr. Ballou will suffice. "The necessity and utility of religion, ('Expositor,' I. 28,) according to common opinion, is on the one hand, to obtain or secure the divine favor; and, on the other, to be screened from the displeasure of the Almighty. But if our deductions are allowed to stand, it is very clear that the *divine favor can neither be gained nor lost.*" Which is the same as to say—let man do what he will, he cannot alienate from him the love of God; it will make no difference in the feelings of God towards the sinner. A sentiment than which it would be difficult to find one more directly contradictory of the plainest teachings of Scripture.

Accordingly they infer from this doctrine, that *Prayer has no effect on God.* "*The whole effect of prayer*," we are told, in 'the Universalist Manual, or Book of Prayers," (pp. 27, 28, 39,) "*and of every other religious duty*, must be upon *ourselves*, and not upon the Supreme and independent Creator." "But it may be inquired—If prayers have no effect on God, in what

does their utility consist? We answer as before—In the effect they have upon *ourselves* and upon *community.*" "Without, therefore, supposing any alteration to be effected in the disposition or the purposes of the Almighty, in relation to mankind, by prayer or other religious devotions, their utility may be inferred from their being divinely enjoined, and from their influence upon the minds and the conduct of men." "It should be considered a great privilege as well as a great duty. *Not*, let it be repeated, with the view *that it will effect any sort of change in the Supreme Being in his disposition, in his will, or in his purposes.*"

What wretched work does this make of all those promises which are based on the condition of our *praying?* Does not such a view make prayer utterly useless as far as the Divine Being is concerned? He is not, in the least degree, more favorably disposed to any of us, whether we pray or not! Can it be any longer thought wonderful that prayer is almost unknown among Universalists, except in public worship? Very rarely do even their ministers maintain family-prayer, or ever give thanks at their meals, or observe the form of entering their closets, and praying secretly and vocally to their Father in heaven! And why should they? If a child knew that it made no kind of difference with his parent whether he asked, or not, for what he wanted, would he trouble himself to ask? What a mockery such prayer would be!

Now all this must be 'glad tidings,' indeed, of

' great joy,' to every blood-thirsty, polluted, and abandoned wretch on earth. And no wonder is it, that such men are such warm adherents to our Modern Universalism. Glad enough are they to find that the Bible can thus be explained to favor their carnal and vile propensities, to give the lie, not only to orthodox preachers—those great troublers of the world, but to a greater troubler still—their own *conscience.*

Universalist preachers, though they often endeavor to evade the force of the fact, are not ignorant that their doctrines find most favor with such men. Speaking of the most abandoned class among the Jews in the days of our Savior, Mr. Whittemore remarks, (' Parables,' p. 195,) that "this class of people became exceedingly fond of the society of Jesus, and listened to his instructions *with great delight.*—Despised as they were by the leading religious people of the age, accustomed to reproach and contumely, *they rejoiced to find their cause espoused* by the great teacher sent from God. *His doctrine met and satisfied their desires*, and they received it with joy.—We learn from this, *what class of people it is, among whom at the present day, the doctrine of the impartial Savior shall flourish in its purity.*"

Yes, if any one wishes to find the genuine patrons of Universalism, let him go among the lawless, intemperate, and profane. It is such, who first congregate, as we all know, in every village and town in the land, around the first preachers of this ' impartial' doctrine, and form the *nucleus* of almost every Universalist So-

ciety in the whole country. And what is equally manifest they love the doctrine most, when most wedded to their sins.

"—— neglecting a' that's guid,
They riot in excess!
Baith careless and fearless
Of either heav'n or hell,
Esteeming and deeming
It a' an idle tale."

CHAPTER XVI.

THIS LIFE NOT PROBATIONARY TO ANOTHER.

Sense of accountability in a future state nearly universal—Effort to get rid of this responsibility—Mortal life not probationary to another—Conduct here nothing to do with condition hereafter—Boston Discussion—No punishment after death essential to the system—Folly to talk of securing an interest in Christ—Paul and Nero fare alike hereafter.

> "The voice of nature loudly cries,
> And many a message from the skies,
> That something in us never dies;
> That on this frail uncertain state,
> Hang matters of eternal weight;
> That future life, in worlds unknown,
> Must take its hue from this alone;—
> Whether as heav'nly glory bright,
> Or dark as mis'ry's woeful night."—BURNS.

THEY, who have believed in a future state of being, have, with very few exceptions, in every age of the world, whether Jews, Pagans, Moslems, or Christians, regarded human life as a state of probation for eternity. The common sense of the world, as well as their knowledge of the Bible, has taught them to expect that their happiness, or condition, hereafter, depends on their conduct here—that the character formed in this life

Probation, exploded.

gives character to their eternal being. On this point the agreement is wonderful;

"'Tis the divinity that stirs within us,"

that thus teaches us to shape all our conduct here, so that we may be happy hereafter.

But what truth is too sacred for those who are determined that there shall not be the least probability of punishment in a future state, and who, to quiet their own conscience, try their utmost to lull the consciences of their fellow-sinners to sleep also? There is no end to their discoveries in theology. One antiquated tradition is no sooner 'exploded,' than another receives the same treatment. They care but little how prevalent the doctrine may have been, even among the learned, the wise, the good, the holy, and the venerable. The fathers were but babes compared with these. Giants there were in those days, but these have far outstripped them. They are the people, and wisdom must die with them. How blessed are we who are permitted to walk in the light of such luminaries,

"Which kings and prophets waited for,
And sought but never found!"

The next great discovery to which the reader's attention will be directed, concerns the connection of time with eternity. They have ascertained, and are endeavoring to act in accordance with the supposed fact, that

No trial for eternity. The case settled.

XVIII.—Mortal life is not, in any sense, a state of probation for another state of being.

They have discovered that nothing, that a man does here, affects in the least degree his condition hereafter; he is not on trial for eternity; it matters not, as far as another world is concerned, how he lives or dies.

Speaking of the common views in regard to a "*day of probation*," the author of 'Lecture-Sermons' says, (p. 85,) "*this subject is erroneously represented*, as if we were to receive eternal life as a reward for knowing God in a certain given time, called the time of our probation." "The common doctrine of the church (p. 369,) contends that if men do not repent of their sins in this life, they will not be allowed the privilege of repenting in a future state, and therefore must remain sinful forever. Now all these notions are *the offspring of imagination*, and have *no foundation in reason nor in the Scripture of truth*." Again he says, (p. 337,) "there surely is *not the shadow of propriety* in supposing that a state of permanent felicity in the eternal world is according to our works in this."

It will readily be perceived that, if this be the case, it settles at once the meaning of those knotty words 'forever,' 'everlasting,' and 'eternal.' Of course, they can have no possible reference to another state of being, when applied to the consequences of human conduct, if that conduct has no connection whatever with the future state. It saves much trouble in the philological, or exegetical, argument. He, who denies that this is a

state probationary to another, never can be brought to admit that such words relate to that other state at all. The controversy, therefore, must be carried back to the very principles of religion.

So lately as December 26, 1840, Mr. Ballou has published to the world in the 'Trumpet,' "the most recent improvements" of this doctrine. "It appears," he remarks, "that *man's final destiny does not depend on man*, but on God who made him. Among the numerous errors, which have by men been imbibed, *none have been greater* than the supposition, that revealed religion was designed, by the Creator, for the purpose of securing to us a state of immortality beyond our present mode of existence. Such a supposition conflicts with the fact, that man's immortality was embraced in the purpose of God originally. And the opinion, that the accommodations, or enjoyments in a future, immortal state, *depend either on what men believe or do in this mortal state*, is an opinion which sets aside any original purpose, will, or determination of the Creator, respecting these weighty matters."

"As man is heir, by the law and constitution of his nature, to all the benefits resulting from a knowledge and use of the sciences and arts which have been discovered and improved, so also is he, by a divine arrangement, heir to all which constitutes the well-being and felicity of his moral nature. And as he had no agency in constituting himself an heir to the first mentioned inheritance, *so has he no agency in making himself an heir to the last*."

Heaven a free gift. Human deeds limited to this life.

Here we are told that we have no more to do with fitting ourselves for the resurrection-state, or the state of being after the resurrection, than we had in fitting ourselves to be born into this world. In plain words, *we have nothing at all to do with it.* Whatever we do, our condition in a future state will not be affected in the least degree. Such is the import of the following language also from the same Essay :—" All which belongs to man, in this natural world, his being and all his faculties, he must have received, as a free gift from God, before he could even attempt any work of his own. If what the gospel of Jesus Christ teaches is true, if through it life and immortality are brought to light, and man is to exist hereafter and forever, that state of being, all the powers and faculties which in that state man is to possess, must be the free gift of God, *independent of human agency.* As man's natural, moral, and religious duties, in the present state, are all required for his benefit and enjoyment, while he is in this state, and as they all grow out of those powers which he here possesses, as the free gifts of God, so it is reasonable to expect that man's future state of existence, and all the powers and faculties he may there possess, will be the free gift of God ; and that his duties there will be according to that state, and according to his powers and faculties there given, and for his use and benefit while he continues in being."

It cannot be admitted for a moment, by the leaders of this sect, that the consequences of human actions in this world are unlimited—that they extend beyond the

present life. "All the *moral* faculties of man," says Mr. Kneeland, ('Lectures,' p. 65,) are as limited in their very nature, as his natural faculties; and hence, the *consequences* of all our moral actions, whether in themselves good or evil, are as limited as the consequences of our natural actions, which we know, or at least have every reason to believe, are limited to time; and, so far as respects the individual who performs them, to his own natural life." This, of course, shuts out entirely the idea that mortal life is a state of probation for eternity.

A discussion was held at Boston, commencing March 18, 1834, and continuing three days, on the question, "Do the holy Scriptures teach the doctrine, that men will be punished and rewarded subsequently to this life, or after death, for the deeds done in this life?" In other words, has man "any thing to gain or to lose after death by his conduct in this life?" or, is man on probation for eternity? The affirmative of this question was advocated by Mr. Adin Ballou, one of the little band of Restorationists, who had broken off from the sect of Universalists. The proposal came from Mr. B., and was addressed to the "Rev. Fathers and Teachers in the Israel of *Universalism*." "I believe," he says, "*what you disbelieve*—that the holy Scriptures teach the doctrine of *a future righteous retribution*. You consider my belief 'a relic of heathenism:' I consider your disbelief a proximate species of *anti-Christian scepticism*."

It was then distinctly understood that "Universal-

ism," properly so called, denied all future retribution in another state of being for the actions of this,—and that they regarded such a doctrine—both "Fathers and Teachers" as a "relic of heathenism."

Mr. Daniel D. Smith, of Boston, defended the negative, denying that man is to be either rewarded or punished hereafter for what he does here. In defending his position, he would not admit, (p. 12,) "that Christ was rewarded in a future state for his doings here;" and maintained (p. 13,) that, when the Savior said to his disciples,—"*great is your reward in Heaven*," "it was *in their own minds*, in the consciousness of their own rectitude, that they had their reward;"—that (p. 22,) when the Savior said of "the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind,"—"they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just," "Christ intended to be understood, that, in the course of time, and the order of Providence, those poor people whom they might entertain, would be raised from the obscurity of their present condition, and would fully recompense the favors they might have received in the times of their lowliness!"—"We are informed," he adds (p. 26,) "that the future life is the free gift of God.—If such is the case, if it is the free gift of God, how can it possibly have any thing to do with this life, or be in any way whatever connected with it? If you would connect the life to come with the present life, you must show that it is, in all respects, like the present life." He concludes the discussion by averring, (p. 86,) "I think I have shown,

that the doctrine, which my friend maintains, was a tradition of the Pharisees, and as such condemned by Jesus Christ."

We are told of Mr. Le Fevre, ('Gospel Anchor," II. 289,) that "he does not believe that men are probationers here for eternity. Our good conduct here is not our passport to heaven and immortality hereafter; neither will our bad conduct here cause us to be raised up immortal sinners and immortal sufferers. The gift of immortality is the gift of God totally unconnected with our conduct in the flesh." He tells us himself, that ('Universalist Union,' IV. 302,–'3,) "there is no opinion more current in the church, than that man is, in his present existence, 'a probationer for eternity,' and that according as he conducts himself in this 'probationary state,' so will his everlasting destiny be determined. *Universalists deny the correctness of this sentiment*, and they do so on what to them appears sufficient grounds—first, it is contrary to reason, and secondly, it is unsupported by Scripture."

The categorical manner in which Mr. Whittemore disposes of this question ('Plain Guide,' p. 271,) is curious enough. "Who says, the present is a state of of probation? Answer. The writer of the objections before us. Does the Bible say so? *No.*" Mr. Thomas declares, ('Discussion,' p. 280,) that "the testimony of Jesus—destroys the popular notion, that the condition of man in the future state will be determined by his character or conduct in this." He speaks also

of " the folly of the inquiries which are so frequently made as to the condition in which a man has died."

Mr. O. A. Skinner tells us, (p. 173, b,) that he " cannot believe that our eternal interests are hung upon life's feeble strings." Mr. Fernald is quite indignant at our doctrine. He cannot endure it. " We deny," he says, (p. 264,) " that our eternal destiny hereafter is to depend upon our characters here. A *more monstrous idea could not be conceived*, upon the subject of our salvation." Mr. Williamson is very plain : " The popular sentiment (p. 96,) is, that we are, in this world probationers for eternity, and that the punishment of sin is reserved to another world and will be endless in duration. *Our* views are widely different from this. *We do not believe there is the least possible Scripture for saying that man is placed in this world as a probationer for another.*"

Mr. Lewis, in an exposition of the ' Universalist Belief,' affirms, (' Mag. and Adv.' VIII. 26,) that " Universalists believe that although salvation in this world is evidently conditional, that is to say, is enjoyed only by means of faith, good works, &c., yet that salvation in a state of immortality, is, by no means suspended upon any exercises or acts of the creature, while in this state of being.—The object of pure religion, as possessed and practised in this life, is *not to purchase or secure the blessings of an hereafter-state of being*, but to benefit mankind *here*, by rendering them better and happier."

Another writer in the same volume, (p. 284,) re-

Probation neither wise nor good. A palpable incongruity.

marks, that "the doctrine of probation, and the doctrine of endless misery, are fundamentals in a system, which acknowledges that God is good and just! How do they harmonize? Where is the wisdom or the goodness of forcing into existence a race of beings for the only purpose of ascertaining whether in another state of being they are fit to be made happy or miserable? Is it either wise or good to sport thus with the destiny of intelligent beings?—Away, then, with a system which ascribes to God a character, which we should be ashamed to bear ourselves!"

One of the correspondents of the 'Universalist Union,' (IV. 157,) holds the following language in relation to the common doctrine of probation:—"It does not appear to be founded on a just view of the nature of man, under the moral government of God; nor does it accord at all with the divine attributes.—We dissent from this opinion, and we have many, various, and strong reasons for so doing. One, and a sufficient reason is, that it makes the future world exactly like the present, than which *there cannot be a greater mistake*, view it as we will."

In the 'Trumpet' of Sept. 26, 1840, is an article, copied from the Nazarene, which scouts the very idea of such a probation. "Some people suppose the divine purpose in creation was to place man in this world to make preparation for eternity. Now although this doctrine is quite common in Christendom, it would be difficult to conceive of any thing *more palpably incongruous and absurd.* God could not have intended that

man should be the subject of trial, and a probationer for eternity in this life!" The writer of this article denies that the Scriptures teach "that God has placed our immortal interests in our own hands." "Where," he asks, "in all God's truth do we read that the great business of life is to prepare for eternity, and that our endless weal or wo will be decided by our own uncertain choice!"

These numerous references must surely satisfy every reader that this is a fundamental point with our modern Universalists; they seem to be wonderfully agreed in maintaining that this life is not, in any sense, probationary to another state of being. Let this matter, then, be well understood, and borne in mind. It serves to throw light on some other parts of their creed which are not so boldly asserted.

I have been the more particular in bringing forward numerous witnesses, in reference to this peculiarity of their creed, that I might show how general is their belief in *no punishment after death.* Such unanimity on the subject of probation certainly shows equal unanimity in the disbelief of any punishment hereafter—in the limitation of all punishment, such as it is, to this life. It is thus made clear that *no punishment after death,* however unwilling they may be to admit it in so many words, is an essential article of their creed. It follows inevitably from their system.

Entertaining such views of human life, it is no wonder that they are opposed to revivals of religion, and all those preachers whose rousing appeals wake up

The true ministry. Not set to watch for souls.

the community to a deep concern for their future well-being. It is easy to account for the fact that they undertake no mission to heathen lands, nor attempt to establish themselves among the aborigines of our own neighborhood. They ridicule the gospel-ministry—men whose shoe-latchets they are unworthy to loose—as visionary fanatics. "Nor is it the work of the *true* gospel-ministry," says their oracle, (Parables, p. 36,) "to initiate mankind into any scheme by which they may secure to themselves the love, favor, or mercy of God; or whereby they may obtain an heirship with the sons of God." None are *true* ministers but they. "When the preacher forgets Christ, and preaches, exhorts, and warns the people *to secure an interest in Christ*, and sets forth the awful consequences of neglect, he is very far from being a faithful and true witness." Do you hear that, Paul? How could you be so unfaithful as to ask that searching question—"How shall we escape, if we *neglect* so great salvation?" and to utter so many other warnings against those who reject the gospel? The "true and faithful witness," Hosea Ballou, takes rank before you. Henceforth, men will ask, not 'What does Paul say?' but—'What says Hosea?'

Hear, too, how Walter Balfour, the perfection of learning, condemns those of us who fear that the blood of our fellow-sinners may be required at our hands.—"It is a false notion, ('Essays,' p. 31,) that ministers are appointed to watch over the immortal souls of their hearers, and if any of them should go to hell through

their carelessness, they have to give an accouut of this in a day of general judgment at the end of this world." This he says in the very face of that declaration of Paul,—" They watch for your souls as they that must give account." But what is Paul to him? Is not Walter the wisest of the two? Has he not had the advantage of the noon-day light of the 19th century? Paul was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel; but Walter sat under the shadow of Hosea himself.

For this reason he is able also to see through the folly of sending missionaries to the heathen to save their souls from hell. " So far," he says, (p. 113,) " as the object of missions is to save immortal souls from an endless hell, or any punishment whatever in a disembodied state, *a final end is put to all* missionary zeal and exertion.—What immense sums have been expended in endeavoring to accomplish what never needed to be done! The object proposed is entirely imaginary, and it is high time a stop should be put to this soul-saving business, and the zeal and money expended turned into a better channel."

With these men, it is no matter whether a man dies happy or not, though they are continually trying to impose their creed upon the community by long stories about Universalists who have died in peace. Mr. Balfour says, (p. 117,) " If my views are correct, people's anxieties and fears, relative to the condition of their souls after death, are for ever put to rest. Men have been taught that their immortal souls must go to heaven or hell at death. To die right then, must be

the first object of concern." "Their minds are directed (p. 118,) to a mere *heathen notion*, and no wonder it should give little solid satisfaction, either in life or death."

How lamentably, criminally, and stupidly ignorant, according to these men, must the Christian world be, of the very first principles of religion! What folly is it to administer an oath in a court of justice, if the actions of this life have nothing to do with another world! Or what need a Universalist care for such an oath?—Most men expect that they will be either better or worse in another state of being, for their conduct in this. But this is all wrong, if this life is not a state of probation. In that case, John, the beloved disciple, and Judas, will be exactly on a par in the future world. *Paul* will fare no better than *Nero*. Godliness hath promise of the life to come no more than ungodliness. Apostates will receive the crown of life just as well as those who are faithful unto death; and they that hate God as truly as they that love him. They that turn many to righteousness will shine as the stars forever and ever, and so will they that are ringleaders in dissipation and crime;

"*Live as you please*, yours is th' immortal prize."

And are there found, in this community, men who, with the Bible in their hands, stand up and proclaim all this as Christianity—the religion of Jesus of Nazareth?—And do they think that we are all such simpletons, and have such confidence in their superior dis-

cernment and piety, that we will all run after them like a flock of sheep? Hearers they will find undoubtedly; for we are told that "the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but *after their own lusts* shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." Such hearers they may and will continue to have. But the world must run back into barbarism again, before a creed, that so outrages the plainest teachings of the Bible, and common sense, can obtain 'universal' credence.

CHAPTER XVII.

FAITH NOT NECESSARY TO FUTURE HAPPINESS.

Future happiness not dependent on faith—Faith is simple belief in evidence—Faith not distinguished into various kinds—Religion here not necessary to happiness hereafter—Faith not necessary to justification—Universalism aims only to do men good here—Their indifference to the woes of the heathen—Have much the same anxiety as the apostles had—But never show it.

"What signifies his barren shine
Of moral pow'rs and reason?
His English style an' gesture fine
Are a' clean out o' season;
Like Socrates, or Antonine,
Or some old pagan heathen;
The *moral* man he does define,
But ne'er a word o' FAITH in
That's right that day."—BURNS.

If it be admitted, that what we do in this world has nothing to do with our condition in another, as Universalism maintains, then, it follows without doubt that, so far as a future state is concerned, it matters not what we believe. A man is none the better for another world by believing Universalism, or Orthodoxy—Christianity, or Infidelity. He may be a Deist, an Atheist, or a Pagan; and yet fare just as well in the resurrection-state, as though he were a Christian. The conse-

quences of his faith are all limited to this mortal life. Let us hear how confidently they affirm that

XIX.—FAITH HAS NO CONNECTION WITH HAPPINESS IN A FUTURE STATE.

Writing to Dr. Ely, in 1835, Mr. Thomas, then pastor of a Universalist society in Philadelphia, uses this language; (p. 284;)—"And, sir! a faithful examination of this subject in the light I have presented it, will satisfy you that *the happiness of the future state is not dependent on the exercise of faith in any doctrine whatever.*—Were it otherwise—were the immortal condition of man contingent of *faith*, or of the performance of good works, there would be no *certainty* of the salvation of any of our race." So (p. 283,) he says, "The popular estimate of faith, and of the benefits accruing therefrom, is *radically erroneous.*—Faith is simply the result of evidence which the mind deems conclusive.—Truth exists independently of the evidence of it, and independently also of the action of the mind." Therefore, as he tries to show, the welfare of the soul hereafter cannot be affected by its own action, its belief or unbelief.

Similar language is used by Mr. Balfour in his Letters to Hudson. "You seem to intimate," he remarks, (p. 33,) "as if I granted, that *faith* and obedience here are absolutely necessary to partaking of the immortal life by Jesus Christ beyond death and the grave. But here lies another of your mistaken assumptions.—I maintain that faith and obedience are absolutely neces-

sary to a participation of the privileges and blessings of Christ's kingdom on *earth*, and the enjoyment of the *hope* of future immortality *in this life*. But *it is not faith and obedience*, Sir! but being raised immortal in the resurrection, equal unto the angels of God, *which fits men for the resurrection-state*. It is being children of the resurrection, *not sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus*, prepares men for this state things. Without this, *the believer is no more fitted for it than the unbeliever*."

In the same way he reasons in his 3d Essay; (p. 238,) "The resurrection of all in the last day depends entirely on the fact, is Christ risen from the dead? But, I ask, does the faith or unbelief of any man, in any shape, or in any degree, affect the truth of this fact? No; but he that believes enjoys the hope and consolation it is calculated to impart; and he that believes not abides in darkness, and is made wretched by his very unbelief." A man's faith only affects his present condition—not at all his future. So says Mr. Balfour.

Says O. A. Skinner, (pp. 324, '5, '6,) "What is the foundation of *hope?* We answer, it can be nothing connected with human merit or faithfulness." "And yet, when Christians talk of getting a hope, they mean they get that virtue and *faith* which will carry them to heaven.—How different from the apostle." "To obtain a hope is to be made acquainted with this plan [of grace,] and learn the evidences of universal happiness." It matters not what the character of the man is, if he only believes that all men will be forever happy. Then he

Faith defined. Nothing but simple belief.

may hope. And this is what the scriptures speak of when they tell us of a "good hope through grace!"—Again he says, (p. 266,)—"So far as admission to endless glory is concerned, *the saint and the sinner stand on a perfect level.*" But as no one can be a saint without faith, it is perfectly immaterial, as "far as admission to endless glory is concerned," whether a man believes in Christ or not! How scriptural!

The faith of the Universalist appears to differ not at all from, or to be any thing more than, *simple belief in evidence.* It is merely the assent of the mind, for sufficient reasons, to the truth of a particular statement or proposition. "Christian faith," says Mr. Williamson, ('Exposition,' pp. 184, '5,) "is a belief in the mission and teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ, and so far as the *nature* of the thing itself is concerned, it differs not from faith in any thing else.—The only imaginable difference, in different cases, is not in the thing itself, but in the subjects upon which it is employed.—By evidence the judgment is convinced, and from its throne gives out the decision—'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' This is faith, and it is produced by the same means, and is in its nature the same as faith exercised upon any other subject.—With such evidence men may believe with an undoubted faith, and there is no more need of a miracle, or of *any supernatural agency* to produce faith in Christ, than to secure faith in any thing else which you receive on the strength of evidence." Mere *intellectual* faith, then, constitutes a man a true Christian, if we may believe Mr. W. He insists

upon it, (pp. 186–8,) that all "distinctions between various kinds of faith" are "a mere play upon words without profit. All faith is one and indivisible in nature." "Christian faith—is, in its nature, *simply the assent which the mind gives to the truth* of these things [respecting Christ] from the force of evidence, and will, in each case, be weak or strong, in proportion as the evidence is understood and appreciated." He then proceeds to show the "fallacy" of the position, "that *no man can be saved without faith*, and that the eternal destinies of the world are suspended upon the conditions of faith or unbelief." "The sentiment which teaches—that men are to be saved in another world, because they are fortunate enough to *believe* it so, or lost because they believe it not so, *is grossly absurd and utterly unphilosophical.*" And yet, if there is any certain meaning in language, Jesus Christ held and taught, and commissioned his apostles to teach all nations, that very sentiment.

It seems, however, to be but a small matter with these men to ascertain what Christ preached, if they can only know how Father Ballou believes and teaches. If *he* says it must be so and so, Mr. Balfour sets himself to work with Greek and Hebrew characters, and bye and bye, it is found that all the laws of criticism require, that we should understand even those passages that seem most directly opposed to such a view, just as Mr. Ballou has said it must be. We are, therefore, to look to Mr. Ballou for the key-note of all their strains.

Hear then the oracle; "No mistake can be greater ('Exp.' I. 28,) than the supposition that the Divine Being is induced to bestow his favor upon us, because he discovers in us the *religion* which he approves." But "without *faith* it is impossible to please God." The religion which he approves is *faith*. Therefore it is the greatest of mistakes to suppose that our faith has anything to do with our procuring the favor of God.—Again, (p. 178,) he says, "The common method of urging the necessity of being *religious*, or of *having religion in order to be prepared to die and to be happy in the future state*,—we are apprehensive exerts an influence, which they themselves would deprecate, were they sensible of it." It matters not, then, whether a man has religion or not in this world, in order to his being happy in the future state!

It has been thought heretofore, that no doctrine is more clearly taught in the word of God than *the necessity of faith in order to justification*. "That God might be just and the *justifier* of him which *believeth* in Jesus," Christ was set forth a propitiation. "Therefore being *justified by faith*, we have peace with God." "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but *by the faith* of Jesus Christ, even we [Jews] *have believed* in Jesus Christ, *that we might be justified by the faith of Christ*. Even as Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." "Foreseeing that God would *justify the heathen through faith*." "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ that we might be *justified*

by faith." Such was the preaching which the Romans and Galatians were accustomed to hear.

But a greater than Paul is here. A prophet has risen up in our day, who has discovered that our justification does not depend on that exercise of the mind which is called 'faith,' or believing; but that it is already secured, whether we believe or not, by the doctrine of Christ, or "the faith in Christ," as the whole system of Christian doctrine is sometimes called. He treats Paul as he would a mere simpleton. Paul has said that Abraham's believing was counted unto him for righteousness. But Ballou says, ('Lect. Sermons,' pp. 306–8,) "It is an egregious mistake to suppose that Abraham's believing in the promise of God is the righteousness of faith by which he was constituted the heir of the world." Contrary to all common sense, he makes Paul to speak of the faith by which we are justified, as the same thing with the fact of the resurrection. Paul had said, referring to Abraham's act of believing, "Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also to whom it shall be imputed, IF WE BELIEVE on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification.—Therefore, being justified by faith, &c." Now a child must be blind not to see that we are justified "*if we believe* in him that raised up Jesus from the dead," and that therefore it is said that Christ was raised again for our justification, because his resurrection is

the crowning proof of that which we are to believe—of that which believing we are justified.

But Mr. Ballou will have it, (p. 307,) "that this faith by which we are justified *is not our act of believing*.—It is evident that the inspired apostle makes the resurrection of Christ and the faith by which we are justified the same; by which it is evident, that by faith he no more meant the act of believing, than he meant that the resurrection of Jesus for our justification was the act of our believing." Here faith and the resurrection are the same thing. But in the very next sentence he forgets himself and says, "This faith *which is the covenant of promise*, the apostle distinguishes most clearly from the act of believing." And he thinks it "needful to be thus particular," in order "to expose the common *error*, which supposes that our act of believing is required as a condition of our justification before God. This error has so confused the minds of professors of Christianity, that they know not how to explain their own thoughts. They believe that God requires our act of believing as a condition of our justification." But *he* is wiser than all who have gone before him! He is not so foolish as to believe such an absurdity! To be sure, Christ charged the apostles to admit none to his kingdom, unless they *believed*—exercised faith: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." But what is that to this illustrious founder of modern Universalism?

An infidel could say no more than Mr. Ballou says,

(p. 366;)—"*The notion* that this doctrine consists of a long string of abstract articles of faith, which have been written into human creeds, *the belief* of which is proposed in the gospel as a condition of our being made eternally happy in a future state, *is so perfectly destitute of reason*, and so foreign from the nature of events which take place in the system of causes and effects, that it is by no means entitled to any share of our confidence." Why does not the man say at once, that the whole Bible is entitled to our confidence no further than it suits us to believe it? For surely, in his view, it is a very small matter whether a man believes any part of it or not.

From such evidence it would be an easy matter to show that *devils are Christians;* for "the devils also believe and tremble." "And, behold! they cried out saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God?" "I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God." The answer which the eunuch gave to Philip,—"I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," —was not more explicit. But Philip said—"If thou believest *with all thine heart*, thou mayest." This heart-work is all that is wanting to make the devils Christians. Shall I say the same of these Universalists, or not? Let the reader determine.

Universalists, it is well known, are very anxious to obtain converts to their faith. But when the question is asked them, "Where is the need of your preaching and urging others to believe as you do?"—instead of

declaring that those who believe will, in that case, be happier in another state of being, they uniformly reply —"for the enjoyment to be derived from it *in this life.*" "We believe," says one, ('Gospel Anchor,' II. 68,) "Christianity is important, all-important to the religious hopes, duties, consolations, and happiness of mankind. We would spend and be spent in spreading a knowledge of it to the world. Its value in every point of view is inestimable—its price is infinitely above rubies. But we do not believe that those who die without a knowledge of it will be miserable to all eternity—no! no!" It is good enough for this world, but not at all necessary to one's happiness in another.

In answer to the objection, 'If Universalism be true it is of no use to preach it,' another remarks, (p. 41,)— "Whence is this gross mistake?—I apprehend, it comes from a false notion of the nature and design of Christianity.—*Universalism does not propose to save men from the wrath of their Maker in the eternal world*, but from their ignorance, superstition, and sin, and the consequences of these in this life.—*Universalism aims to do men good in this world, not in the next.* —It seeks man's present improvement and happiness; it pretends not to know futurity any further than God has revealed it; and when its eye looks beyond the dark, impassable gulf, which separates time from eternity, it sees *only* that glorious immortality which is brought to light in the gospel."

Thus they tacitly admit that it is of no use to preach

Their benevolence partial. No pity for the heathen.

Universalism, as far as another world is concerned. Whether men believe as they do or not, they will be none the less happy hereafter.

But if this be the true reason, why is not their benevolence equal to their faith—why is it not universal? Why do we never hear of Universalist missionary societies? Why are Universalist preachers never heard of, except where orthodoxy has lifted up her voice, and sounded an alarm in the ear of the guilty? If, as they say, "they would spend and be spent in spreading a knowledge of it to the world," why do they never go among the *heathen?* Have they no pity for the miserable Hindoo, the stupid Chinese, the infatuated Parsee, the blood-thirsty New Zealander, and the hunted African? Is not the condition of the most deluded Christian almost infinitely raised above even the best of those pagan tribes? And how can they hope to make the world believe that their sole aim, in abusing, reviling, and railing at us Christians, is to make us happier in this present world, when they never stir hand or foot to bring the light of the gospel to shine on "the dark places of the earth," which "are full of the habitations of cruelty?"—when they oppose, with all their might, all our efforts to send the Bible to "all the world," and to "preach the gospel to every creature."

They give themselves great credit for their zeal. "*All know*," says O. A. Skinner, (p. 180,) "*that* UNIVERSALISTS HAVE MUCH OF THE SAME ANXIETY MANIFESTED BY THE APOSTLES!!!" This is news indeed!

When was a Universalist minister ever known to weep over his hearers because they would not believe? When, to exclaim with one, "Oh! that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people?" Who among them all could ever say—'Remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears?' Not one. The principal aim of nearly all their sermons appears to be to cheer up their hearers with the notion, that there is no hell for the wicked after death, and that all will go to heaven at last.

But hear Mr. Skinner further. "How can it be otherwise when they see that the happiness of their friends, and the prosperity of their country depend upon the attention paid to religion?—What misery is to be compared with that arising from the wickedness of our friends? Is it strange, then, that there should be tears, and prayers, and watchings, and trials, in laboring to restore a sinner? Surely there is something that can fill the mind with anguish, besides the fear that we, or our friends shall drop into endless woe!" But why all this for *friends* only? It was not so with Christ, nor with the apostles. Gentiles as well as Jews shared in the sympathies of Paul, and his tears were shed mostly for poor heathen.

Let us have something more than words. A well-organized and well-conducted system of missions to the heathen, patronized by the whole sect, would do more

True source of their zeal.

to convince the world of their sincerity, than the loudest professions.

"No wild enthusiast ever yet could rest,
Till half mankind were like himself possess'd.
Fresh confidence the speculatist takes
From ev'ry hair-brain'd proselyte he makes;
And therefore *prints. Himself but half deceiv'd,*
Till others have the soothing tale believ'd."

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE NEW BIRTH.

The New Birth—Not necessary to future happiness—Regeneration not a change of nature—Not a superhuman work—No change but that of the Resurrection needful for entrance to Heaven—The New Birth really denied—Common doctrine ridiculed—Mysteriousness of Regeneration denied—The fact of Regeneration easily known—To be hereafter experienced by all—Regeneration nothing more than Reformation, or a change of party—Experience of all the saints contradicted.

"And is the soul indeed so lost? one cries,
Fallen from her glory, and forbid to rise?
Torpid and dull beneath a frozen zone,
Has she no spark that may be deem'd her own?
Grant her indebted to what zealots call
Grace undeserv'd, yet surely not for all—
Some beams of rectitude she yet displays,
Some love of virtue and some pow'r to praise;
Can lift herself above corporeal things,
And soaring on her own unborrow'd wings;
Possess herself of all that's good and true,
Assert the skies and vindicate her due."—COWPER.

In a former chapter, it was shown that Universalists maintain the native purity of every human being. They teach that man comes into the world as free from taint as the spotless snow. He forms his own character en-

tirely, unaffected by the fact that he is born of woman. If he sins, (and who, that knows his right hand from his left, does not?) his sins are the work of the flesh; the mind never of its own accord defiles itself—never consents to sin. It is the flesh that is to blame.

With such notions of man, how can the Universalist receive the common doctrine of *Regeneration*, or the New Birth? In such a system, what place can be found for what is called *a change of heart?* The heart, surely needs no change, if neither originally, nor totally depraved. All that is needed is, for the mind to be enlightened, divested of prejudice and ignorance, and then, the pathway of happiness being laid open, the man will enter and run the race with joy.

Nor, as we have seen, is such a change needed in order to be happy hereafter, if this life be, in no sense, a state of probation for another. In that case, it will profit nothing in the world to come, to have been born again, or regenerated here. Paul, with all his holiness of heart, his untiring zeal, and self-denying labor in the service of his Master, will occupy a seat in heaven by the side of the traitor Judas. His conversion, his new birth, his being a new creature, will do him no good there. Ahab, and Judas, and Nero, having laid aside their corruptions in the grave, will in the resurrection rise as pure and glorious, as David, Paul, or John.

The reader must not, therefore be surprised to find that Universalists affirm that

XX. Regeneration is merely a change of party.

In denying the doctrine of the Trinity, they, of course, deny the personality and divine agency of the Holy Ghost, as commonly received by the orthodox. Consequently, they cannot admit a doctrine, which attributes to this divine agent, as distinct from the Father and the Son, a renewing, or regenerating, of the human soul, mind, or spirit, so making all things new. From all that can be learned by means of their writings, preaching, and discourse, they are entire strangers to any such change of the heart. They even ridicule those for it, who profess to have experienced such a change. Those revivals of religion, too, in, and by means of, which so many profess to have been made experimentally acquainted with this great change, they scoff at, as altogether the work of deluded and deceitful men.

It is, by no means, intimated, that Universalists deny in words the doctrine of the new birth. This would never answer, without a new translation and an emendation of the original Scriptures. Accordingly, we find Mr. Le Fevre very anxious to throw off such an imputation. "It has been erroneously supposed," he says, ('Gospel Anchor,' I. 61,) "that the advocates of Universalism do not believe in a new birth, or regeneration. This is a very gross mistake; they consider it as necessary as any class of Christians; but *their views of it may materially differ from those generally entertained.*" "Let no one accuse the Universalists of denying a change, regeneration, or the new birth.

Not a radical change. Their views superficial.

They may be said to be the only denomination who contend for its actual necessity and unlimited influence."

But what is the character of that regeneration, in which they so boastingly believe? Is it the same that is ordinarily meant by these terms? No, this they will not say. It differs "materially" from what is "generally entertained." They hold, that in order for a man to be a "disciple of the meek and lowly Jesus, and obtain citizenship in his kingdom" here on the earth, he must become a Universalist—so full of love, as not to believe "in a God of fury and wrath," and not to find "in the gospel a message of damnation." Let a man embrace their sentiments, and show much love to his fellow-men, and, in their eyes, he is regenerated.

"This use of the term *regeneration*," says Mr. Le Fevre, "has often been happily and appropriately applied to *nations*, with a view of conveying *a similar sentiment*. A nation that has been sunk in bondage, her liberties in the hands of a despot, her population debased and slavish, when, in her might, she shall rise from her degradation, burst the fetters of tyranny, throw off the yoke of oppression, and assert her *unalienable rights*, that nation is very properly said to be *regenerated*. She is born into a new state of political existence; she has experienced a regenerating power, which has elevated her to a new rank among the nations of the earth." Similar, he would have us to believe, is the regeneration, or new birth, spoken of in scripture.

But, superficial as is the change here admitted, even that is required only as a condition of discipleship *on*

earth. Whatever change may be needed in order to happiness in heaven, man has no agency in bringing it about. "It has been generally taught," he adds, "that unless a man is born into Christ's kingdom here on earth, he cannot be received into his eternal kingdom hereafter. It is farther taught, that comparatively few in the world are so born. We are aware that these are the doctrines of men, but certainly they are *not the commandments of God.*—We must confess, that it appears somewhat preposterous to make the birth apply to this world, and the kingdom in which the new-born creature enters, to be in another world." In short, they believe that no other change is necessary in order to enter the kingdom of endless glory, than that which will be effected by the resurrection, without the slightest agency or responsibility of the creature. They say with the apostle, "we must all be changed." "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. It is in view of this obvious truth, that they teach a *radical change* to the whole human race."

What perfect trifling is this. They are much offended if we accuse them of denying a change, (meaning, of course, a change of heart, in this life,) and they reply—'Oh! we believe in a change as much as any one does; for "we shall all be changed" in being raised from the dust of death!'—We ask, Do you believe in the necessity of a change of heart in this world in order to be happy in another, and the answer is, 'Oh! yes, we believe in the *Resurrection*!!!' Is this the way in

which they preach? And are the people silly enough to content themselves with such guides?

The language of Mr. Williamson is still more explicit. Remarking ('G. Anchor,' II. 253,) on what is called a "change of heart," he says, "We have placed this caption at the head of this article, to designate what it is usually supposed to mean, viz.—the radical change of the whole moral nature of man, brought about by the agency of the Holy Ghost, and amounting to a new creation. Whether men do actually get changed in this manner, or not, we shall not attempt to inquire. We only observe that in our intercourse with the world, we have seen many who professed to have experienced such a change, but we were never able to discover it in their lives, or conversation. However the matter may stand in our day, one thing is very evident, that is, in Solomon's time no such marvellous changes occurred. Solomon, with all his wisdom, had never seen such wonders as are told by modern Christians. Hear him: 'I know that whatsoever God doeth it shall be forever, nothing can be added to it, nor any thing taken from it.' Now we presume it will be admitted that the creation of man, in the first instance, was the work of God. Well, was it done forever? 'No,' says common doctrine; 'he must meet with a total change.' Well, can you add any thing to this work of God? 'Yes, we can add a new heart.' Can you take any thing away? 'Yes, we can take away the old one.' Such notions poorly harmonize with the wisdom of Solomon."

Thus, in terms the most plain, he denies both the necessity and possibility of that, into the reality of which he professed not to inquire. The reader is desired to bear in mind, in this connection, those memorable words, (Ezek. xi. 19,) "And I will *put a new spirit within you*, and I will *take* the stony heart *out* of their flesh, and will *give* them an heart of flesh;" and, (xxxvi. 26,) "A *new heart* also will I give you, and a new spirit will I *put within* you, and I will *take away* the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will put my Spirit within you."

If any still doubt, whether, or not, these innovators deny the doctrine of the new birth, as it is commonly understood, let them read the following, from the pen of Mr. J. Lewis. He makes bold to say, ('Mag. and Adv.' III. 33,) that "the doctrine of the new birth, under the form in which it is generally taught, and very generally received amongst Christians, is doubtless as clearly explained, and as well understood, as any *irrational*, *unintelligible*, *incomprehensible dogma* can be." "Though much is said in the religious world about *regeneration*, and being born again, we apprehend that the Scriptural import of these expressions is little understood; and that, although it is generally agreed that the new birth is indispensably necessary, few people entertain clear, much less consistent, views respecting its nature." Which is the same as to say, that with the exception of the few indoctrinated Universalists, Christians, in general, know nothing at all about it.

Mr. Lewis then proceeds to say, "that to be born of

God, or to be the children of God, or, in literal terms, to be like God, we must love all mankind, even our enemies," i. e. if we are genuine *philanthropists*, we are born again, or regenerated. He also states, (p. 34,) that "the new birth, according to the Scriptural representation of it—is the enlivening and strengthening of our *affections*, the directing of them towards their proper objects, and the extension of the same to all our brethren of the human family. It consists, therefore, in universal love and good will.—It is not any thing *mysterious*, in the common acceptation of that term; not an unknowable, indescribable something, absolutely impenetrable by the human understanding; but a process *just as susceptible of being understood as any operation of the mind whatever.*" And all this, in the face of that declaration of our Savior, (John iii. 8,) "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but *canst not tell* whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; *so is every one that is born of the Spirit.*"

We are also told by Mr. Lewis, that "the new birth is not an operation about which we need to harbor *anxious doubts*, whether we are its subjects. A person may as truly know, and can with as much ease and certainty determine, whether he has experienced the new birth, as he can, whether he is honest, or industrious, or virtuous in any other respect. Wouldst thou know whether thou art born of God? Ask thy own conscience the serious question—'*Do I love my fellow-creatures?*' The answer thou receivest will *decide respecting thy spiritual condition.*"

But what if the individual finds that he is not born again? Will that affect his condition hereafter? Not at all in the estimation of Mr. Lewis and his brethren. "It is a doctrine commonly taught at the present day," he adds, "that none will be happy in the future state, but those who partake of the new birth in this. According to such a sentiment, the purpose for which our Creator bestows the new birth, is to constitute its subjects the exclusive heirs of salvation. But the apostle James gives, we think, a different account respecting the design of God in this matter.—The whole of our race, are, at length, to become *characteristically* the children of God," or partakers of a new birth, not indeed here, but hereafter, in another state of being;—a change as necessary for those, whom they believe to be born again in this life, as for those, who have never "so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost."

How perfectly evident is it, from their own showing, that neither Mr. Le Fevre nor Mr. Williamson, nor Mr. Lewis, have ever experienced that which Christians are accustomed to call *a change of heart!* In our sense of the phrase, they are unregenerate men, as are all their brethren who agree with them in the views above expressed. And if unregenerate, how totally unfitted are they to be teachers of the people, in things pertaining to God! The poorest Christian among us, who can barely say—"One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see,"—knows more about it, from sweet experience, than even their '*General Convention.*'

Another writer in the same volume, Mr. Hammond, simplifies the matter still more. "To be born again," he assures us, (p. 370,) "could mean nothing less than coming forth to a knowledge, or a belief, in the doctrine of life and immortality, through the medium of the Savior of the world." "In all this, (p. 371,) we see nothing mysterious or unaccountable; but we readily perceive a cause for this change of *opinion*, consequently of affection, which, in my humble opinion, constitutes a regeneration or new birth. Mankind must know God before they can love him. To arrive at a knowledge of truth is to be born to it. Thus the propriety of our text—Except a man be born *to a knowledge of the everlasting Gospel*, how can he see the kingdom of God?" Let any one, then, be *made acquainted* with the gospel, and *he is born again!*

The 'Plain Guide' tells us, (p. 158,) that while some believe that the New Birth is "a total change of nature," "others" (referring to Universalists) "believe it a change of principles, motives and habits." By which he evidently means nothing more than such a reformation as takes place in the case of a reclaimed drunkard, robber, or cut-throat; such as we often see in the case of many, who, from leading a dissipated life, have become very moral and strict in their deportment, but without any experience of what is called a change of heart. He further maintains that the New Birth, "is necessary to make us happy here, and fit us for life's duties and enjoyments; and that *our final condition is in no way dependent on our being born again here.*"

When our Savior said to his disciples,—" Except ye be converted," &c., the ' Plain Guide' tells us, (p. 109,) that he simply meant,—" except ye curb this ambition, and cultivate the meek, lovely spirit of a little child, ye cannot be my disciples, nor subjects of my moral reign." Not a word here of their turning to God. Mr. Skinner, on the same text says, (p. 311,) " conversion consisted in becoming humble.—When a proud man becomes humble and feels his dependence, he is converted." The same writer tells us, that " the difference between the penitent and impenitent is not in their natures, but in their principles and motives." This he advances in opposition to those by whom—" repentance is commonly supposed to be a total change of our nature," and by whom it is thought, " that before it takes place, we are totally corrupt." He avers (p. 310,) " that man *has naturally good powers* which are capable of being restored to their proper use.—Hence repentance is not a total change ; neither is it a change of nature."

That Mr. Skinner and his brethren do not mean by their ' conversions,' any thing more than a mere change of sentiments, leading to the adoption of new principles, &c., is obvious from what follows. " Can we suppose,—"he asks, (p. 313,) " in the work of conversion that there is *any supernatural influence* exerted ?" He then refers to several texts, and says,—" Now all these passages contradict *the idea of a supernatural influence.*" He then adds. (p. 314,)—" THUS WE ARE CONVERTED IN THE SAME WAY WE ARE REDEEMED FROM

ANY ERROR IN SCIENCE, OR GOVERNMENT!" That is, in plain words,—A man becomes a Christian, just as a child, who has always supposed that the sun goes round the earth, becomes a convert to the Copernican or true, solar system; or just as a federalist becomes a democrat! Thus, too, he says, (p. 219,) "To constitute man *a true Christian*, it is only requisite that his higher powers should be properly developed and cultivated."

What perfect ignorance of any thing like a spiritual change is manifested in the following language of Mr. Grosh! Referring to John iii. 1—13, he remarks, ('Mag. and Adv.' III. 268,)—"The birth by the Spirit named by Jesus, in contradistinction to being born of the earth, earthy, probably refers to the earthly hopes entertained by the Jews respecting the Messiah—that they should not look for an earthly, but a spiritual kingdom—they must be born not merely of the water, but of the spirit." Thus Regeneration is made to consist in a mere change of views, respecting the nature of Christ's kingdom on the earth!

"What is conversion?" says another, ('Univ. Union,' IV. 235.)—"It is *reformation*. It requires no miraculous power to bring it about, no *super-human* effort, but simply, a new course of faith or practice, as the case may be.—The idea that regeneration is a mysterious work, and that it is wrought on certain conditions by *the mighty power of God*, who interferes especially in behalf of the penitent sinner, is an error which has done an immense deal of injury to the cause of rational

Christianity. Let it suffice, Christian reader! if 'you do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with your God.'—'What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord.'"

It is not to be regarded as strange that these men should thus speak. They cannot go beyond their own experience. They have no knowledge of any other change than what they have described. Were they honestly to confess this to their admirers, it would be well. But when they go beyond this, and declare that *there neither is, has been, nor can be,* in this world, any other, their arrogance is unpardonable. Thousands and tens of thousands, and thousands of thousands rise up and exclaim—'*We know better ;*' we have experienced vastly more than is "dreamt of in your philosophy." The very thing that you deny and ridicule we know, by our happy experience, to be a positive fact! And so an innumerable cloud of witnesses, of saints in all ages, stand ready to testify to the same fact, The learned, the wise, and the good, in every age, have with one voice declared that—'it is even so. We know it, we feel it.' And yet these upstarts in theology, merely because they themselves are unregenerate, in the ordinary sense, are determined that all the world beside shall be as they are. Are we, are all God's people, then, deluded? Is there no reality in that professed change, for which our thanks are daily poured out to the Giver of all good? You may sooner convince us that matter itself has no existence, save in the human fancy,—that we ourselves never had an existence on the earth.

Superior information. Throwing off the mask.

Yet these men pretend to know more about the matter than all who have gone before them! Are they, with their confessed inexperience of such a change, more worthy to be believed than those who have experienced it and therefore speak? It is true, indeed, that "charity believeth all things;" but he must have more charity, and less love for the truth, than Paul or John had, who can believe that such expounders—nay, such "exploders"—of the word of God, are the successors of the apostles, or the true disciples of Christ. Too long have they deceived the people with their vain pretensions. Let them throw off the mask, and appear in their true character.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE RESURRECTION-STATE.

Resurrection—Time of it indefinite—Its nature—Resurrection of the whole man—At death man annihilated—Man and beast perish alike—Resurrection is a new creation—Resurrection denied—The same body not raised again—All equal in the Resurrection.

> "Is that, all nature starts at, thy desire?
> Art such a clod to wish thyself all clay?
> Nature's first wish is endless happiness;
> *Annihilation* is an after-thought,
> A monstrous wish, unborn till virtue dies."—YOUNG.

HAVING disposed of man during his mortal life, and seen that he has no concern with another, that his whole existence is bounded by the grave, except as, at some period far distant, God shall be pleased to renew that existence, let us extend our view forward to the end of time, and learn what Universalism teaches in regard to the *resurrection.* However much they may differ as to the time when this event may take place, they agree that

XXI. ALL MANKIND WILL BE EQUAL IN THE RESURRECTION.

That they have not settled the question as to the

time when the resurrection will take place, appears from the following statement. "Universalism involves," says Mr. Cobb, ('Expos.' III. 31,) "the doctrine of a resurrection of the human race from the state of death into a state immortal, where they shall all at length know, and love, and enjoy God. But whether the resurrection *instantly succeeds the death of the body*, or whether it is a progressive work in the hands of God, performed upon different individuals at different times, as he shall please to raise them, or whether it is to take place with all simultaneously, at some future time, Universalism, as such, does not decide. Different individuals have their different opinions on this question." What can the man mean? Universalism, he tells us, does not decide whether the resurrection of the dead "instantly succeeds the death of the body, or not!" Let him go and ask the charnel-house, where the bodies of the generations past have slept for ages, and never more assert so foolish a thing. Universalism must be the very quintessence of scepticism, if it cannot decide a question so simple.

But it is proper to consider *what it is* that shall be raised in that day. What kind of a resurrection do the Christian scriptures reveal? Plainly a resurrection of the *body* alone. "With what *body* do they [the dead] come? It is sown a natural *body;* it is raised a spiritual body." It is called "the redemption of the *body*." The change that is to take place at the resurrection, is a change of the *body:* "Who shall change our vile *body*, that it may be fashioned like unto his

glorious body." At the time of the resurrection of Christ, it is said that "many *bodies* of the saints arose." Now, 'body' is, in all these and similar passages, spoken of in distinction from soul or spirit. It would be difficult to show that Paul did not believe in the separate conscious existence of the soul, when the body should be dissolving in dust. "Knowing," he says, "that whilst we are at home *in the body*, we are absent from the Lord; and willing rather to be *absent from the body*, and to be present with the Lord." It is the body, and not the soul, that dies and is to be raised up at the last day. It is the body alone that is then to undergo this wonderful change. The soul retains its conscious existence through the intermediate state, and when restored to the body after the latter has undergone this great change, the identity of the man will be preserved most perfectly.

But this is not the resurrection in which our Universalists believe. Theirs is a resurrection of *the whole man.* That which we call soul, they maintain dies with the body—returns to dust, for it is *matter* also. At death man is so far *annihilated*, as to be deprived of all conscious existence; to crumble, the whole of him, to dust, so that he never would exist again but for the resurrection. Universalists not only "wish themselves all clay," but actually profess to believe that they are such, and only such. They who died before the flood, and they who have since followed them, have perished. They are as much out of existence—Moses, David, and Paul—as the brutes that perish.

Their life was nothing but breath, which God takes back at death; and this they say is the spirit which "shall return unto God who gave it."

On this point, hear what Mr. Balfour teaches: "What, say some, ("Three Essays," p. 36,) is there no difference between men and beasts? I answer, yes; but man's pre-eminence consists in his superior powers of mind, and in his being raised again from the dead incorruptible and glorious. The beasts totally *perish*, and so would man, if Jesus Christ had not risen from the dead. If it is contended that man exists after death, because he has a *spirit*, it ought also to be contended, that beasts live after death, for 'they have all one breath or spirit.'" And this is the same as to say that Balaam has now no more existence than the animal on which he rode, by whom he was rebuked. All mankind who have deceased, are as truly annihilated as the beasts that have perished. As to what will be hereafter, we shall see presently.

Commenting on the text, 'the spirit shall return unto God who gave it,' he says, (p. 37,) "We have no more reason to conclude from this text, that the spirit will exist distinct from God after death, than that the body will exist distinct from the ground after it returns to the dust. And we may with equal truth believe in *pre-existent* spirits, as in disembodied spirits. In short, we may as well assert the pre-existence of *bodies* and spirits before God created man, as assert the separate existence of either after death. Both return to their original condition.—But we have seen, that

beasts have the same breath or spirit. Why not affirm, also, that their spirits shall be happy or miserable in a disembodied state?"

Thus they maintain that man and beast perish alike at and after death. Man is as much annihilated as matter can be, and nothing remains of him after death but the original elements of which he was created. And these soon return to their unformed and chaotic state again.

Now, it is the doctrine of Universalism, that this whole man, body and spirit, shall be raised again at the resurrection;—that what shall then be raised will be vastly different from what died;—that there will then be an entire new state and constitution of things —that the minds of what shall then be constituted will not be at all affected, as, at least, to their moral character, by what these particles of matter thought, and felt, and did, in another state; and that they will then be so constituted as to be not at all exposed to sin.

But is it proper to call this a *resurrection* of the dead?—a resurrection of our identical *selves?* Wherein consists that identity? Not in the sameness of either mental or moral character: for no informed Universalist pretends that even the best of men will have the same moral character there that they have here. They must all be *changed.* And as to the *mental* character, they either pretend not to know what it will be, or that it will differ essentially from what it was here. Now, how shall the beings who shall then be brought into existence know that they are the same

who once lived on earth,—when they have no common basis of moral responsibility, no common consciousness, and, for aught that appears, no memory in common? Wherein will this transaction differ from a new *creation?* Why is it not as really so as was the creation of Adam from the dust of the earth? The beings that will then exist will be created of the same material, and until God breathes into them the breath of life, as he did in the case of Adam, they will continue inanimate.

How, then, can we avoid the conclusion, if these things are so, that we who die do actually perish—are annihilated; and that instead of being all of *us* taken to heaven at the resurrection, other beings, other distinct existences, will then be created, and enter heaven in our stead. In this case, the UNIVERSAL SALVATION, of which these writers boast, and in which they glory as taught only by them, *is* NO SALVATION AT ALL. Instead of saving all or any, they destroy, annihilate the whole, and create new beings in our stead. The heaven, therefore, of which they preach, will be enjoyed, not by us, or any of Adam's mortal race, but by another and an entirely distinct race of new-created beings, whose characters will depend, not even in the slightest degree, on what ours were in this world.

This system, then, teaches, as fully as ever the Sadducees taught it, that THERE WILL BE NO RESURRECTION. This consequence of their system some of them perceive, and are honest enough to avow.

Take an example from the ('Universalist Union,'

IV. 234,)—"For several centuries past, a large portion of the Christian world has entertained the opinion that the bodies of men are to be raised; that in the consummation of all things, the *matter* composing the physical body at death, or the clay the spirit tenanted here, will then be moulded into its original form, and animated by the same spirit. The learned, with most other Christians, have lived and died in the belief of this doctrine. Now, without casting a single reflection as to their sincerity, the opinion is liable to many and serious objections.—If we admit this doctrine we must give up one of the soundest principles of physiological inquiry."

He then proceeds to state, that our bodies here are continually undergoing changes, and taking parts, as it were, of what were formerly numerous other bodies; then makes the supposition, of the present thousand millions on earth, "that in the resurrection they are to possess the *identical matter* that this moment forms their bodies. Now, then," he asks, "as it cannot be denied in strict truth, that much of this matter formed antecedent bodies, or bodies in every generation preceding this, what is to be done? Shall thousands of spirits be deprived of their bodies to supply the present generation? Can this objection be in any way obviated? Is there not a very great inconsistency in this doctrine? And yet of what practical use can we make it? What care I, whether I am to possess the same body I now have, providing another be given me as good, or even better? No, if I can have a better, I will most gladly give up the one I now have."

Having indulged in some further calculations, he adds—"These speculations may be considered foolish, but no more so than *the doctrine is absurd.*—The question is, do or do not the Scriptures warrant the opinion that the bodies of men are to be raised? *I think they do not.*—I understand that the heavenly body is entirely distinct from *earthly* matter, flesh and blood."

It is not affirmed that the views now advanced have become general, or rather that they are generally avowed. But that they will be adopted by the sect I have no manner of doubt. They may call it a resurrection of the dead, but what claim it has to such a cognomen I am not able to see.

But let this pass. The resurrection-state, as they call future existence, demands our attention. To this they look forward as all their hope. *This it is that constitutes salvation.* Universalists expect to be saved from death and to obtain endless happiness, not by reason of what Christ did for them on the earth by suffering for sinners, but by, what God will do, by the means of Jesus Christ, in raising all men from the dead to a life of endless bliss.

"Many good people," says Mr. Balfour, ('Three Essays,' p. 186,) "affirm with great confidence, that unless men are sons of God in this world by faith in Christ Jesus, they must be miserable forever. Observe here, that our Lord says nothing like this, but affirms—'they are the children of God—being the children of the resurrection.' If they are raised from the dead, by him, they are his children. They are then begotten from the

dead to an immortal, incorruptible life, which their believing here could neither procure nor prevent." They are his children then in *an entire new state and constitution of things.*" Thus the Resurrection, not a life of faith and holiness on earth, fits men completely, according to this doctrine, to dwell for ever in heaven.

That, in the future state, all the distinctions of moral character, which separated men here on the earth, will be entirely unknown, they plainly declare. Mr. Whittemore says,—('Plain Guide,' pp. 263, '4,) "that the sacred writers contemplated mankind as divided into two distinct classes, is not correct.—The same man may be righteous at one time and wicked at another.—This is the only sense in which the righteous and wicked are mentioned in the Bible.—The Bible does not support the doctrine of distinctions among mankind; either in the grave or *beyond it.*" And having quoted a few texts, he adds, "Could any careful person gather from this language the notion that there will be two classes of mankind, the righteous and the wicked, after the resurrection? It is in vain to pretend it."

Mr. Skinner, having shown that all will be raised from the dead, says of all those raised—"It is this that makes us children of God; children in the highest and most endearing sense.—The resurrection introduces us into the kingdom of endless blessedness.—Every one that is raised, is raised into the kingdom of immortal glory.—*We shall all be equal in the resurrection;*—all alike, all equally honorable, glorious and happy." He

does not believe that there "one star differeth from another star in glory." ('Un. Ill.' pp. 288, '9.)

As to the resurrection, Mr. Williamson knows ('Exposition,' p. 127,) that "this is the sum of the matter;—When a man dies, no matter who he may be, it is for God to say whether he shall live again; and, having decided that he will raise him from the dead, it is for God, and God alone, to say what shall be his condition; and man has, in justice, no right to a voice in that matter at all." And again he concludes, (p. 139,) "Here I rest upon this point; if there is truth in the testimony of Paul, or in the words of the Savior, then it is settled, that the state of man, in the resurrection, is one of immortality, incorruption, glory, and power, such as is enjoyed by the angels of God which are in heaven; *nor is there the least possible authority* for saying that man shall be raised in two classes, one like the angels of God in heaven, and the other like the devils that are in hell." "Enjoyed by the *angels* of God in heaven!" Will Mr. W. explain? What does he mean by *angels*, when he does not believe in such spiritual beings, fallen or unfallen?

When the Savior says, "all that are in the graves shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation," he does not furnish us with the *least possible* authority to believe that mankind will be raised in two classes! "Not the least possible authority," when nearly every scholar and commentator, as well as the unlettered, have regarded it

as the *highest* possible authority for such a doctrine. So, too, there is not the slightest ground for supposing that the prophet had any such thought in his mind, when he said, "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt!" Strange that any one should ever have thought so! Mr. W. must have a very mean opinion of their discernment! According to him and his brethren, neither of these passages has any reference to a future state.

What says Paul of such? "Shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness, and their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymenæus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying,—That *the resurrection is past already;* and overthrow the faith of some."

CHAPTER XX.

THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

Accountability confessed, but not as to a future state—Views of the Pharisees in the Savior's day—Scripture language about the Judgment—How understood at the time—The Day of Judgment not in a future state—Mr. Balfour's labors—Heb. ix. 27—*The common doctrine discarded by them all.*

"No more shall Atheists mock his long delay,
His vengeance sleeps no more—behold the day!
Behold! the Judge descends; his guards are nigh;
Tempest and fire attend him down the sky:
When God appears all nature shall adore him,
While sinners tremble, saints rejoice before him."—WATTS.

IT requires no small effort to shake off that sense of *accountability*, which is universally and deeply impressed on the human mind. That "God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil," is a truth that none but the reckless and abandoned can deny. Universalists maintain it, as they say, more strongly than any other people. They hold that this world is the theatre, and this life the state, of equal and exact retribution.

But this sense of accountability with most men has to do chiefly with another world. They expect that a strict account will be required of them in another state for the deeds of this. That such were the prevailing opinions of the Jews in our Savior's day, even Universalists are constrained to admit. Referring to the doctrine of the soul's immortality, and retribution in a future state, Mr. Balfour remarks, ('Three Essays,' p. 94,)—"The only thing which remains to be shown is, how these heathen *traditions* came to be incorporated with the Christian religion. *It is evident they prevailed many ages before Christ appeared, and prevailed both among Jews and Gentiles at the commencement of the Gospel dispensation.*" In his 'First Inquiry,' (p. 58,) he says—"Now I admit that to this heathen notion, [*the idea of Hades being a place of punishment after death,*] our Lord might allude in the parable before us. *The Jews had, in our Lord's day, imbibed* many heathen notions, and *this* one among the rest." He regards this as "the language of the *popular opinions of the day.*" He says also, (p. 64,) that to speak of "Hades or Sheol" as "*a place of torment after death,*—was in accordance with current opinion—in perfect agreement with popular opinion. The opinion was current, but it wanted the stamp of divine authority."

The mass of the Jewish nation were unquestionably Pharisees. Yet Mr. Whittemore affirms, ('Plain Guide,' p. 43,) that they "are *well known to have believed in endless punishment.*" In the discussion between Messrs. A. Ballou and D. D. Smith, at Boston in 1834, the

former has these words ;—" Permit me (p. 7,) to remind you of one great fact, viz. that the Jews of our Savior's time, with the exception of the small sect of Sadducees, believed in the doctrine of future retribution. This, I believe, is acknowledged on all sides." Nor does his opponent at all dispute the truth of the observation.

Such being the opinion of the Jews of our Savior's day, in regard to this doctrine of a future retribution, it is to be supposed that the language of Jesus and his apostles on such a subject would be such as would not readily be misunderstood. How, then, I ask, would their hearers, Jews or Gentiles, have understood such language as the following ?—" Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof *in the day of judgment.*—As Paul reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and a *judgment to come*, Felix trembled. —He hath appointed *a day* in the which he will *judge the world* in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.—As it is appointed unto men once to die, but *after this the judgment.*—It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom *in the day of judgment* than for thee.—The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust *unto the day of judgment* to be punished.—And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains unto darkness, unto *the judgment of the great day.*—For we must all appear

before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in the body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."

How else could such passages be understood by those to whom they were addressed, than as teaching the doctrine of accountability to God in a future state for the deeds of this? If they had gathered their ideas of a future judgment from the heathen, must they not have understood, both from Christ and his apostles, that those ideas were correct—that there is to be a day of judgment after death—that this judgment will be universal, and that it will be followed by an impartial retribution? Most unquestionably. Nor can we escape the alternative of imputing to Jesus and his apostles the dreadful guilt of deceiving the people on a point of infinite concernment, unless we admit that what the Jews must inevitably have understood from such language was indeed the truth.

Now, in the very face of these facts and declarations, though in perfect consistency with their scheme, Universalists most positively affirm that

XXII.—THERE WILL NOT BE A DAY OF GENERAL JUDGMENT IN THE RESURRECTION-STATE.

This denial follows, as a matter of course, from their teaching that this life is not probationary to another. And yet it may be well to look at the confident manner in which they speak of it; as though the question were settled beyond the possibility of a reversal.

In this fearful path Mr. Ballou as usual leads the

way. "It seems worthy of special notice," he remarks, ('Atonement,' pp. 157, '8,) "that in every instance in which Jesus spake of his coming to judge men, and to reward them according to their works, he expresses himself with peculiar emphasis, in *limiting the time to the generation in which he lived.*—We think we are safe in saying, that on no other one subject did Jesus express himself with more cautious emphasis. Have we not, then, great reason to marvel, that so many of those who are the professed disciples of Jesus, and who profess to preach his word to the people, should ever have so misconstrued his testimony, as to represent his coming with his angels to reward men is to take place in some time which is now future, and in another state of man's existence?"

Again, (p. 164,) he says, "After having satisfied our minds respecting the time of the coming of the Son of Man to judge and reward men according to their works, and being assured that that event took place *when Jerusalem was destroyed*, and the Jews dispersed, it remains an easy task to settle the question respecting the meaning and fulfilment of all the passages in the New Testament which speak of that judgment, and the awful calamities which fell on that people. But we must always keep in mind the fact that all those Scriptures were fulfilled in that generation in which Jesus and his disciples lived."

The work, thus begun by Mr. Ballou, must be carried on. To this Mr. Balfour diligently applies himself.

"Hence comment after comment, spun as fine
As bloated spiders draw the flimsy line:
Hence the same word that bids our lusts obey,
Is misapplied to sanctify their sway:
If stubborn Greek refuse to be his friend,
Hebrew or Syriac shall be forc'd to bend:
If languages and copies all cry—No!
Somebody prov'd it centuries ago.
Like trout pursued, the critic in despair
Darts to the mud, and finds his safety there."

The result of his diligent investigation is an Essay of eighty-five pages, 12mo., in which he professes to have examined "all the places where the words rendered 'judge, judgment, condemned, condemnation, damned, damnation,' &c., are used in the New Testament." The conclusion to which he arrives, is the same as that with which he started. He went through the New Testament for the purpose of bending it to his purpose, and, therefore, we must not be surprised to hear him say, at the end of his journey, (pp. 304, '5,) 'The sacred writers—never express a judgment or punishment beyond death by these terms.—Heb. ix. 27, is *the only text in the Bible which speaks of a judgment after death*, and we leave it with every candid man to say, if we have not shown that it has no reference to punishment in a future state." He speaks of it as a "grand mistake," to "apply the passages which speak of this judgment to one in another state of existence."

It may gratify the reader to learn in what manner he disposes of that knotty passage—Heb. ix. 27,—which he allows, does "speak of a judgment *after* death."—

"What judgment, then," he says, (pp. 270, '1,) "comes after death?—I answer, the judgment God pronounced on all mankind, Gen. iii. 19, '*dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.*' Here is a judgment which comes after death, which is visible, universal, certain, and disputed by no man." But it seems to have escaped the recollection of Mr. Balfour that, according to his system, the return of the body to the dust is not to be regarded as a judgment. It is according to a natural constitution of the human frame, they say, and would have taken place had man never sinned.

For this reason, because it involves the idea that death or the consequences of death are a judgment, this exposition, though so satisfactory to Mr. Balfour, that he says, (p. 305,)—"we leave it with every *candid* man to say, if we have not shown, that it has no reference to punishment in a future state,"—has met with but little favor among his brethren. There can be, therefore, but few *candid* men among them!

The explanation, most popular among them, of this stubborn text, is the following:—The word 'men,' should be translated *the men*, meaning "the priests under the law;" the death, here spoken of, is the death of the high priest, who "is represented as being slain in those sacrifices that were offered,"—a figurative, and not a real, death; 'the judgment' refers to the high priest's entering into the holy place, bearing the breastplate of judgment, and obtaining acceptance for himself and all the people. Thus the passage is stripped of all reference to a future state; and may be

paraphrased thus; 'Plain Guide,' (p. 268,)—"As it is appointed unto men, [the high priests] once to die [in their sacrifice], and after this the judgment [which they bore upon their breasts]; so Christ was once offered," &c.

Now "this" explanation, Mr. Whittemore says, or this reference of the whole passage "to the sacrificial death of the high priests under the law," *any* person will perceive *at once*, who will read the whole passage!" And yet this explanation, so far as can be learned, never occurred to a single mortal, until it was invented by Hosea Ballou. His account of the matter is this: "When I lived ('Fut. Retribut.' p. 182,) in Portsmouth, N. H., some fourteen or fifteen years ago, (i. e. about 1817 or 1818) I was made exceedingly glad, by discovering, in my study on Heb. ix. 27, 28, what I now believe to be the true application and use of the passage.—I immediately communicated my thoughts on this text,—and all accepted the exposition with approbation and delight." And now they are willing, one and all, apparently, to risk a future day of judgment on this far-fetched, strained, unnatural, and recently-invented explanation of a text which plainly declares that "it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment!" O the credulity of Ballou's disciples! And so far from Mr. *Balfour's* perceiving it, "at once," he appears to have been wholly dissatisfied with it, and so to have wrought out his own in its place.

But, however they may disagree as to the best manner of disposing of some hard sayings in Scripture,

they are determined that there shall be no such thing as a day of general judgment for all mankind at the end of the world. "As we do not believe," says Mr. Ballou, ('Expositor,' I. 66,) "that this commonly-received doctrine, concerning what our Christian doctors call *the last day*, is taught in the Scriptures; and being persuaded that much injury has been done to the cause of pure religion," [Universalism] "by its having been inculcated and believed, we feel it a duty incumbent on us to endeavor to convince them that their views are *erroneous*; and that they are *contrary to Scripture, and inconsistent with themselves.*"

It is said by Mr. Whittemore in the 'Danvers' Discussion,' (p. 28,)—"I wish to know where he finds any thing said in the Scriptures about a day of judgment after death? The Bible speaks of a judgment, and a day of judgment, but it *no where* tells us that this judgment is to take place in the future state." Of the day of judgment he remarks, ('Plain Guide,' p. 187,) "At the destruction of the Jewish nation, there was a general judgment among the nations of the earth." For which we have only the word of Mr. W. History says nothing about it.

"The scene (p. 239,)of the events described in" Rev. xx, "is laid upon the earth, and does not appertain to another state of being." So dogmatically they can speak in order to get rid of that striking passage—"And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God," &c. But at other times they are free to admit that the book is beyond their comprehension.

"The famed *hypothesis of a future general judgment*," says Mr. Balch, ('Expositor,' II. 311,) "and the argument founded upon it in favor of a future world in which to rectify the mistakes of the present, *is a bold reflection upon the purity of God's character, and the equity of his government*.—We find it impossible to reconcile such views with the acknowledged justice and equal administration of the divine Being.—To what extravagance and folly, not to say, *blasphemy*, has not the wisdom of this world driven its deluded votaries!"

But the junior preachers are much more positive. They can scarcely endure it, that their fellow-men should be so silly as to adopt so foolish a notion. "There is *neither reason nor consistency*," says Mr. O. A. Skinner, (p. 229,) "in the idea that a day has been set apart in eternity, for the judgment of the world.—We find the work of judgment *always* represented as taking place in the earth. Not an instance can be found, in all the Scriptures, where it is declared to be in eternity." "The day of judgment—(p. 240,) is not yet future, but took place nearly two thousand years ago!" "The Savior (p. 241,) judged the world when the Jews were destroyed." "No *reference* (p. 243,) is made to eternity in any thing connected with the judgment.

We are assured by Mr. Williamson, ('Exposition,' pp. 115, '6, '7,) that the belief of it" [the common doctrine of the day of judgment] "does no good, but *much positive injury*, and the thing itself is as utterly useless, as faith in its existence." "I hold the common doctrine of a day of future judgment not only useless, but

An indefensible position. A piece of absurdity.

unjust and *abominable.*" He calls it "an *absurd* and indefensible position." "I am free to admit," he adds, "that the Scriptures speak not only of a day of judgment, but of *many* and different days of judgment; and that the writers of the New Testament speak of one of these days by way of eminence, as '*the* day of judgment.' But—you will find that *all* these days are *in this world*, and that it is men in the flesh and not immortal spirits in the resurrection, that are to be judged."

One more witness will surely suffice. Mr. Sawyer says, ('Letters to Remington,' pp. 109, 111,) "*It is not true* that there is to be a judgment, or that he [Christ] is to act as a judge, after he descends from the mediatorial throne.—There is *not a particle of evidence*, either in the Bible or to be derived from the nature of the subject, *that there is to be a general judgment*, or any judgment, after the close of Christ's mediatorial reign." "You assume that there is to be a great day of general judgment after Christ descends from his mediatorial throne, and delivers up his kingdom, and God is all in all," and he calls this, "*a piece of absurdity*, destitute, as it necessarily is, of every shade of countenance from Scripture." He refers in this language, as appears from p. 112, to what is usually called the *final* judgment, when Christ will act no longer as a Mediator, but a divine Judge; and this he calls "*a piece of absurdity!*" May neither he nor his brethren find it, to their *sorrow*, a day of dreadful doom!

If it be, as the wisest and best of men believe it to be, a doctrine most clearly revealed, and fully establish-

ed, how dreadful must and will be the doom of men that blind the eyes of their fellow-men to such awful danger! In case it is true, then to them it may truly be said, "Ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men; for ye neither go in yourselves, *neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in!*"

CHAPTER XXI.

DEVIL AND HIS ANGELS.

English Translation of the Bible—Mr. Kneeland's version—neither angels nor devils—Satan a symbolical being only—Angels only our fellow-men—Devil is the carnal mind—No agreement as to the identity of the devil—Variety of definitions—Sadduceeans.

"Oh! what a scene is here!" "Two warring worlds
Of more than mortal mounted on the wing!—
High hov'ring o'er this little brand of strife!
This sublunary ball!—But strife for what?
In their own cause conflicting? No; in thine,
In man's. His single int'rest blows the flame;
His the sole stake; his fate the trumpet sounds,
Which kindles war immortal. How it burns!
Tumultuous swarms of deities in arms!"—
"Think not this fiction:—'There was war in heav'n.'"

YOUNG.

ONE of the greatest hindrances to the spread of Universalism in our land is, the wonderful and universal influence of our Received Version of the Bible. Every body knows, that our English translation of the Scriptures was made by men who most thoroughly believed the orthodox creed, concerning hell and damnation. The vast learning, which they brought to the work of

translation, and the diligence with which they pried into the meaning of the sacred oracles, seem but to have confirmed them in this belief. They accordingly produced a translation, the reading of which, in every subsequent age, has tended to lead both old and young into the same belief.

In order, therefore, to build up Universalism, it becomes necessary—indispensably necessary — for the preacher to throw down this strong foundation. Consequently, in all his sermons, you find him arraigning this dreadful translation. It seems to be no small part of his work utterly to destroy all confidence in such a version. '*This* is wrong, and *that* is wrong'—is so often repeated that the poor hearer knows not what to believe. The preacher flies off to Hebrew and Greek, where he knows that his hearers cannot follow him, and finding the coast clear, he expatiates, with all the gladness of a liberated slave, in his freeedom. Most probably, he could not tell an *Aleph* from a *Beth*, if his life depended on it. But the people think him wondrous wise, and this is enough for his purpose. "Gashmu saith it."

To remove this difficulty, Mr. Kneeland, "entering into the work of the ministry totally ignorant of the dead languages," set himself, "through indefatigable labor and toil," to obtain sufficient knowledge for the work of a new translation—one that should be worthy of the confidence of the world. Into whose hands could such a work be committed with more hope of complete success? Mr. Kneeland had long been known

as one of the most devoted advocates of Universalism. He was received into fellowship as one of their preachers in 1803, and in 1811 "was appointed the first *standing* clerk" of the General Convention, of which he was chosen Moderator in 1813. In 1823 he completed the work of translating the New Testament, which was shortly after given to the public, in two 12mo. volumes of parallel columns of Greek and English. He designed the work to "be instrumental, in the hand of God, of correcting some of the *monstrous errors* that now exist in the Christian church, and of establishing the truth of that gospel which was preached to Abraham;" [Universalism.] Of course, no one would suppose that Mr. Kneeland, after preaching the doctrine twenty years, was in the least degree *prejudiced!* The English translation was printed separately in one column, and designed utterly to supplant the Received Version.

But, alas for the blindness of the world! The work fell almost still-born from the press, and is now among the things that were—much like its author. Even the ungrateful Universalists refused to substitute it for the book of their childhood, and Mr. Whittemore says of it ('Mod. Hist.,' p. 416,)—"The 'Improved Version' is closely followed, except in a few attempts at emendation, *of which we can say little in praise.*"

My object in referring to it in this connection is, to show the manner in which the author, in common with his brethren since, who have profited by his labors, disposes of the "*Devil and his Angels.*" This I propose

to do in proof of their having adopted the following article of belief: viz.

XXIII. THERE ARE NO MERELY SPIRITUAL BEINGS CALLED ANGELS EITHER HOLY OR UNHOLY.

The 'devil' and 'Satan' are by Mr. Kneeland converted into an 'impostor' and an 'adversary.' The temptation of Christ he regards as 'a visionary scene,' and remarks (I. 23,) that "the introduction of the impostor, or devil, into this scenical representation, no more proves the real existence of such a being, than the introduction of the lamb or the red dragon, in the apocalyptic vision, is a proof of the real existence of those symbolical agents."

Again, he says (p. 25,), "That lunatics and epileptics were possessed by *devils*, or *fallen angels*, (though it is an opinion which prevailed early,) is nowhere asserted, nor even hinted at, in the New Testament, and is totally destitute of foundation both in reason and revelation." Where our Lord says—'The enemy that sowed them is the devil,'—he remarks, (p. 56,) that the devil here means—"*the principle of evil personified.*" "*Satan,*" he tells us, (p. 233,) is the "personification of the principle of *opposition.*" When Satan enters Judas, it is nothing more (p. 263,) than "an *evil disposition*, a covetous spirit." When the Savior tells the Jews—'Ye are of your father the *devil*'—he speaks of (p. 312,) "the principle of moral evil personified;" the devil is only a "*symbolical person.*"

'The prince of this world' is (p. 328,) "the Jewish

hierarchy and magistracy." The devil, who put it into the head of Judas to betray Christ, was (p. 330,) " his own bad passsions." The angels, who are called upon (Heb. i. 6,) to worship the Son, are *messengers*, or heralds of God's word, or prophets ; *i. e.* he says, (II. 294,) " Let all the prophets and messengers of God acknowledge him as their superior." The " ministering spirits" in v. 14, are the prophets also ; " Here (p. 295,) the former prophets are called ministering spirits." The " angels," whom " God spared not, but cast down to hell," were (p. 349,) " the *spies* who were sent to explore the land of Canaan !" " But," he adds, " if the common interpretation be admitted, it will not establish the popular doctrine concerning *fallen angels*." " He who committeth sin (p. 358,) is of the devil"—" the impostor, not a real, but a hypothetical and fictitious being." " The angels who kept not their own estate" are (p. 368,) " the messengers who watched not duly over their own principality, but deserted their proper habitation," whom " he kept with unknown chains under darkness (punished them with judicial blindness of mind) to the judgment of a great day, *i. e.* when they were destroyed by a plague. Alluding to the falsehood and punishment of the spies." " By the synagogue of the adversary (Satan) are to be understood those of the Jews who opposed the Gospel." (p. 378.)

Such are the ways in which this *learned* expositor made the word of God of no effect. And his example has been widely, yea, with scarcely an exception, followed in the sect. His own cue he, doubtless, took

from the arch-"*messenger*," Hosea Ballou. We are told, 'Atonement,' (pp. 27, 8,) "by angels are meant messengers, who are employed by God, for the information of their *fellow-men*." He declares (p. 30,) "I have not even the shadow of evidence, from Scripture or reason, to support the sentiment" that man was tempted to sin by a fallen angel. "Perhaps, however," he adds, (p. 47) "the reader may be surprised to find, that we do not believe in the existence of a being so universally acknowledged among Christian people." "We have no objection (p. 48,) to believing that there is such a devil as the Scripture speaks of. He is called the Old Serpent, and is the same we have described which beguiled the woman in the beginning; and it is *the carnal mind* which is enmity against God!" That is to say—the devil of the Bible is the carnal mind! And this carnal mind the woman had, before she sinned!

The same language he uses in his 'Lecture Sermons,' (pp. 212, 213,) "That the devil was ever a holy angel, we have no account in the Scriptures; that any man was ever tempted by an agent distinct from the powers of flesh and blood, we have no reason to believe." "The word 'devil' or 'Satan,' means an anversary, an enemy, an opposer. And this character every man find sin himself." "This 'carnal mind,'—this 'enmity against God,' is the devil."

This definition he does not hesitate to apply to the case of the Savior himself. He maintains, that Jesus was tempted, ('Atonement,' p. 49,) by "fleshly appetite,—natural ambition,—and presumption—in all points, as

we are yet without sin." Who before ever dared to impute to the holy Jesus, a *carnal mind*, which an apostle says, 'is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be?' But the reader has ceased ere this to wonder at the daring of these theological desperadoes.

Mr. B. is still more positive, ('L. S.,' p. 72:) "The opinion which has long maintained, that the first temptation which led to the introduction of sin into our world, was the instigation of a fallen Angel, appears to be *without foundation* or authority in the Scriptures, which plainly indicate, that the constitutional infirmities of flesh and blood are, in fact, the source from whence *all* sinful temptations rise." And so, too, of sin since the fall, he says, (p. 73,) "that the common notion which Christian people entertain and cultivate in the minds of their children, of an invisible agent, who was once a holy angel in heaven, that now continually accompanies people, wherever they go, and is all the time tempting them to sin, is nothing more than *an invention of the wisdom of the flesh*, and is supported by no other means than superstition."

But to make assurance doubly sure, since the prejudice was deeply rooted, Mr. Balfour again sets himself to work, and produces his 'Second Inquiry,' called 'An Inquiry into the Scriptural doctrine concerning the Devil and Satan." Of which it is very modestly said, ('Mod. Hist.,' p. 460,)—"in this work the common doctrine of a superhuman devil, who, it is thought, was once an angel of light is *exploded*," very much to the relief unquestionably of the whole order. Having

abolished Hell in his 'First Inquiry,' what else could be done with the 'Devil and his Angels,' but to explode them, since 'there was found no place for them?'

After stating the common doctrine, he proceeds to call in question and deny, that Eve was tempted by a fallen angel, and says, (p. 26,) "that we are indebted to Milton, rather than Moses, for the common opinions entertained on this subject." To the question, 'What was it that deceived Eve,' he replies, (p. 27,) "I answer—*lust*, or desire in Eve." The Satan who "provoked David to number Israel," was (p. 43,) "some evil passion or desire in his own mind." "The account of Satan," in the commencement of the book of Job, he thinks, (p. 53,) "is introduced to be condemned and not sanctioned,"—"for the very purpose (p. 54,) of refuting such an opinion," as "the existence of such an evil being." He professes, (pp. 64, '5,) to have shown "that the Old Testament gives no countenance to the common doctrine of a fallen angel, under the name serpent, Satan, or any other." "The Jews," he adds, (p. 66,) "before they entered Canaan, knew nothing about the devil," and "were obliged to go to a foreign land to find the devil;" and concludes that "they became acquainted with the doctrine of the devil" in Babylon.

The New Testament, he maintains, is as silent as the Old in respect to this personage. But in order to get rid of him, he is obliged to give him as many *aliases*, as the most notorious culprit in Sing-sing. He calls him, (p. 100,) "the unbelieving Jews;" (p. 103,)

Numerous aliases. Hard to cast him out

"a spirit of infirmity," "the rigidity of the back bone;" (p. 105,) "the spirit of opposition to Jesus and the secret purpose to betray him;" and a "fixed determination to *execute* his purpose;" (p. 108,) "lust or love of money;" (p. 109,) "the darkness of ignorance, superstition, and wickedness;" and "the persecuting Jews; (p. 111.) "the adversaries of the gospel;" (p. 112,) "lust or sinful desire;" and "an unforgiving temper of mind;" and (p. 113,) "the messenger of Satan" he calls "a false teacher."

What a queer book the Bible must be in the eyes of a Universalist! Like the Sibylline leaves, he makes it speak just according to his notion, and seldom twice alike. Mr. Balfour, however, inclines to the opinion, that "the opposing Jews" are most frequently honored with this "Babylonish garment." "They," (p. 123,) "were the *adversary* the *devil*." But as such an interpretation would often be ridiculous, he is obliged to give the devil as many shapes almost as the ancient witches are said to have assumed. The merest child can see that he is often hard pushed to "cast out the devil" from the Bible, and rid "the order" of such an impolite intruder. Such a use of metaphorical language, as he supposes the historians and divines of the New Testament to have employed, is without a parallel. "It is scarcely necessary to say," says the mighty Robert Hall, ('Works,' III. 48,) "that a more untenable position was never advanced, nor one which evinces a more unpardonable inattention to the operations of thought, and the laws of composition."

Encouraged by the boldness of Mr. Balfour, and delighted with his wonderful discovery, the whole brotherhood can now laugh as good-humoredly about his Satanic Majesty as though Mr. Balfour had actually annihilated "the prince of the power of the air." They seem to have in consequence forgotten the advice of Paul, (Eph. vi. 11, 12,)—"Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the *devil;* for we wrestle NOT AGAINST FLESH AND BLOOD, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness [wicked spirits] in high places."

The calamities brought upon Job, according to Mr. Rogers, had no connection with the agency of a personal devil. "In bringing these evils to pass," he says, ('Pro and Con of Universalism,' p. 289,) "God employed the agency of *Sabine and Chaldean freebooters*, as well as *winds and fire and disease.* These agencies are, in the Bible, personified under the name of *Satan;*"—four more *aliases.* How wonders multiply!

The same writer assures us, (p. 256,) "that *common sense utterly repudiates the idea*, that any high order of intelligences should prove themselves such idiots as to engage in an open war with Omnipotence. I assign to the popular notion, therefore, concerning personal devils, an eminent and undoubted place amongst old wives' fables." Undoubted? Does the man think to impose upon us? Does he not know that such a sentiment as he advances, has been doubted the world

over, in every age, until recently? Said Robert Hall, who knew as much about common sense, doubtless, as Mr. Rogers or his brethren, "the attempt to set aside, (III. 43,) the doctrine on this subject, derived from Scripture, under the notion of its being unphilosophical, is puerile and unmeaning;" and "to suppose our own species, (p. 41,) to be the highest production of Divine power, would indicate *irrational and puerile presumption*."

But these writers cannot apparently believe in the existence of any intelligent beings but God and man. They, as well as the ancient "Sadducees, say that there is neither angel nor spirit." "What did Jesus intend by the *Angels*?" asks Mr. Whittemore; ('Plain Guide,' p. 103.) "Familiar *traditions* have confined the application of this word almost exclusively to superhuman beings." But Mr. W. knows that by angels who are to destroy the enemies of Christ, "is certainly meant, (p. 104,) *the Roman armies!*"

A writer in the 'Gospel Anchor,' (II. 126,) thinks the story of the fallen angels, "one of the most absurd notions ever started by the wild imagination of man." If so, what wild visionaries are all the orthodox, even the most learned and judicious? It were well for us all to go to school again, and under the luminous teaching of Messrs. Kneeland and Balfour, we might soon learn to despise such silly notions as the fall of angels, the existence and agency of Satan, and the "everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels."

CHAPTER XXII.

CHRISTIANS HAVE NO ORDINANCES.

RESULTS—*Christian Institutions—The Sabbath a human device—Our Sunday not the Sabbath—The Sabbath ceased with the Mosaic dispensation—Our Sunday a weekly festival but not holy—Sabbath-journeying Baptism—Not indispensable to Church-membership—A rite of initiation only—Never intended for our observance—Lord's Supper—Various opinions—Not binding on the conscience—Most of them repudiate it—Those who do believe in it do not make it a test of fellowship—Churches rare—A matter of expediency—More than two-thirds of the Societies have none—They are never large.*

> "O Italy! thy SABBATHS will be soon
> Our Sabbaths, closed with raillery and buffoon;
> Preaching and pranks will share the motley scene,
> Ours parcel'd out, as thine have ever been,
> God's worship and the mountebank between."
>
> COWPER.

HAVING seen what are the cardinal doctrines of Modern Universalism in America, and how essentially they differ in all, or nearly all, matters of faith from those generally received, let us now look at some of the RESULTS of this strange system. It cannot be thought strange, if we discover, in this respect, a wide departure from the acknowledged fruits of holiness.

I shall, first, direct the reader's attention to their no-

tions, respecting what have commonly been regarded as *Christian Institutions.* It cannot be expected, that these should have much attraction for men, who can so easily discard long-cherished, and deep-rooted, opinions of divine truth itself. Christian Institutions are seldom savory to an unregenerate heart. And such hearts have they, unquestionably, in *our* sense of the word, inasmuch as they utterly deny the common doctrine of, and so cannot have experienced, the New Birth.

To the heart of the true Christian, the *Sabbath-day* is the

"Day of all the week the best."

It is the Lord's Day—sacred to his service, never to be devoted in whole or in part to secular labors. The Christian remembers the Sabbath day to keep it holy. The day of the Lord's resurrection, when his Savior rested from all his works of atoning mercy, is dearer to him, and more sacred, than was the seventh day of the week to the ancient Israelite.

But the Universalist has no such feelings. He observes the day in some sense, it may be, but not as a day set apart by God for himself. He affirms, that

XXIV.—The Christian Sabbath is a mere human device.

The "Observance of Sunday among the Primitive Christians," is the title of an article in the first volume of the "Universalist Expositor," from the pen of Hosea Ballou, jr. There, if any where, we may expect to

find the current views of the sect. The following extracts will show, in what light the "observance of Sunday" is now regarded by Universalists.

"It is a custom," he remarks, (p. 45,) "almost universal, to call our Sunday by the sacred appellation of *The Sabbath*, and to represent it as identically the institution, which God delivered, under that name, to the Israelites at Mount Sinai. Excepting the single circumstance of its *alleged* transfer from the seventh to the first day of the week, it is supposed to remain unchanged under the gospel dispensation, retaining its *original divine character*, and possessing all the sanctions with which it was first established and enforced." "Such is the opinion, which has prevailed in the church for several ages. One object of this article is to point out its *incorrectness*. We do not mean (p. 46,) that there is any impropriety in our setting Sunday apart from the rest of the week, as a season for religious improvement and public worship.—But, then, such a use of the day does not involve the notion, that it is the ancient sabbath, and, consequently, subject to the laws of that institution, or *that it has been made peculiarly holy time by any positive ordinance from Heaven. For this, there is no proof.*"

He calls it (p. 47,) a "popular but *unsupported* opinion" "that Sunday is the Sabbath." He says, (p. 48,) "There is no command, not so much as a formal recommendation, recorded for keeping Sunday as holy time." He represents Paul (p. 49,) as holding the opinion "that the observance even of the Sabbath was

like circumcision, a matter indifferent in itself;" and that, by this he means the *institution*, and not merely the particular day, is evident from the fact, that he denies, (p. 47,) "that the sabbath was ever transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week. The assertion," he remarks, "so often made, of that change, is, like many other current stories, *a mere fable.*"

In answer to the argument, that "if we have not the precept of the apostles, we have what is just as valid their example, for keeping Sunday," he remarks, (p. 49,)—"True, we have their example for holding meetings, at least sometimes, on that day; but not for keeping it as the Sabbath." "That they abstained from their ordinary employments through the whole of the day, we have no evidence; and the want of such proof renders it rather probable that they did not." (p. 50.)

Referring to "the Christians of Justin's time," (p. 53,) he observes—"They did not consider it as having any connection with the sabbath, or as deriving any sacredness from the injunction laid upon the Jews to hallow that day." "The amount of the whole is, that the Apostles and primitive Christians understood *the divine institution of the sabbath to have expired with the rest of the Mosaic economy;* and that without any express ordinance, *it grew into a custom* with them, in appointing a day for their religious meetings, to choose Sunday, from respect to Christ's resurrection."

Such, according to the younger Ballou, was the origin of our present Sabbath. The sacredness of the day is thus entirely taken away, and the day itself brought

down to a level with our Anniversary of the declaration of Independence. Sunday is no more sacred than the Fourth of July! Hear him:—"In selecting Sunday for the public services of the sanctuary, we but follow the same general principle on which our citizens commemorate *the landing of the pilgrim-fathers, or the birth of American Independence!*" (p. 54.)

Let these sentiments prevail—as they will wherever Universalism prospers, and as they have already extensively prevailed in Germany,—and our Sabbaths will not be at length as much respected as our Thanksgiving-days. As it is, Universalist preachers do not hesitate to travel on Sunday, whenever it suits their convenience. Yet they find it necessary, at times, to apologize for such conduct. "I regretted the necessity," says Mr. Skinner, ('Mag. & Adv.' VIII. 102,) "of traveling on Sunday; for I always endeavor to avoid that, where praticable. I consider the *custom* of setting apart one day in seven, for rest and for purposes of religious worship and moral instruction, as founded in wisdom, sanctioned by reason, and approved by every true religionist and philanthropist. Nevertheless, the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. It is lawful to do good on Sunday, but it is not lawful to do evil, either on that, or any other, day. Moreover, I was encouraged by the prospect of being able to reach New York in season to attend public worship in the evening."

Here is no recognition of the divine authority of the Sabbath. It is only the creature of "custom." And a

man may, if he please, do any thing on that day, which is not unlawful on any other day. So that Mr. Skinner could take a steamboat at Verplanck's landing on the Hudson, at 11 A. M., and spend the remainder of the day until sunset in reaching the city. If it suits them, they can set out on a journey as well on Sunday, as on any other day. In the 'Universalist Union,' (IV. 223,) Mr. Le Fevre publishes, beforehand, his intention to leave the city for Rochester, "on Sunday,—by the evening boat."

There is, however, but little said about the Sabbath in any of their publications. Now and then we find a recommendation of its observance, but only, except in a rare instance, as a good thing, a very useful institution; not as demanded by divine authority. Thus Mr. Whittemore says, ('Plain Guide,' p. 315,) "The Christian Sabbath is too good an institution to be neglected and misspent by those who might otherwise be improving themselves in Christian knowledge and grace." It is "good," but not *sacred.*

A writer in the 'Gospel Anchor,' (II. 325,) observes, "To the Christian philanthropist, and to the moralist, a proper observance of the Sabbath will ever be an object worthy of approbation." "The *expediency* of resting on the seventh day does not appear to be so imperative, or so generally acknowledged," as to labor six days. Of course, he refers here to Universalists. For the orthodox not only admit the expediency, but the positive obligation to obey the divine command. The writer proceeds to give several reasons "for the

observance of the Sabbath," such as the promotion of bodily health, grateful feelings, social affections, and wordly prosperity; but not one word about its *divine authority*, which would have been the best reason of all.

The only exception to these remarks that I have found, is in the case of Mr. Skinner, of Boston, who has advanced some sentiments which meet with but little favor among his brethren, in relation to the divine appointment of the Christian Sabbath. And even he is much afraid of having it observed in such a way (p. 340,) as would "make the day unsocial and gloomy," and keep up "the austerity and sadness of former times." He has evidently no fondness for such a Sabbath as the Pilgrim-fathers of former times delighted to observe. Were these men the only guardians of this blessed institution, it would soon, with all its hallowed influences, be stript of its sacredness, and made as common as any other day in the week. Even now, in Universalist families generally, and especially among the more wealthy, it is the *gayest* of the seven.

Let us now proceed to ascertain in what manner other Christian institutions are regarded. What do they think of *Baptism?* Is it a Christian ordinance or not? How do they regard the *Lord's Supper?* Is it binding on the followers of Christ, or not? To these questions they reply,—

XXV. Church-Ordinances are of doubtful utility.

Baptism has, every where, and at all times, among Christians, been regarded as the door to the visible

church, and as indispensable to membership in the household of faith. But our Universalists, even in this respect, beg leave to differ from nearly all the Christian world. They consider its observance as a very indifferent matter. Their ministers will baptize both parents and their children, if it is desired; but, in case of objection to the administration of the rite, they treat it as a matter of very little consequence.

"*Baptism*," says the author of the 'Universalist Manual,' (pp. 114, 115,) "*was not, even in the days of the Apostles, regarded as an indispensable requisite* of Christian faith and practice." "But, if Baptism was not strictly necessary and obligatory in the times of the apostles, *it has not been so since, and is not so now.*" "If the original design of Baptism was the public avowal of the Christian faith, *its necessity and use would seem to have nearly or quite ceased*, where Christianity is the known and general profession of the religious community."

The author of this 'Manual' would not have felt warranted in making such assertions in a book designed as a 'Prayer-book' for the denomination, had he not known that they would be well received by the order. He is borne out, moreover, in these statements, by Mr. Grosh, who gives his opinion in the 'Magazine and Advocate;' (III. 268, 9.) "Having satisfied our mind," he remarks, "respecting *all ceremonies, we care but little about them*, and have avoided controversy on the subject, not believing them worthy of it, and deeming the effects of such controversies worse than the per-

formance or non-performance of the ceremonies can be. But having frequently been asked our views on the subject of *Baptism*, we will now briefly state our views on the subject."

He then proceeds to state, that, as an initiatory ordinance, it may have been enjoined on the *Jews*, "but after they had been initiated, the rite could be of no use to them or their descendants, because it is merely a rite of initiation." He thinks it, therefore, evident, that, in the case of "one brought up in a knowledge of Christianity," "baptism is of no meaning;" and further, "to descendants from Jewish Christians, *baptism is no longer of meaning, use, or binding force.* But to *Gentiles*, we believe that baptism *never* was of use, meaning, or binding force." Compare, now, with his statement, our Savior's own words, in Mark xvi. 15, 16: "Go ye into *all the world*, and preach the gospel to *every creature;* he that believeth and is *baptized* shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." If this is not a command to baptize "every creature," in "all the world," that should believe, these words have no meaning. But this passage Mr. G. does not notice.

His conclusion is, that "water-baptism ceases to be binding, if it ever was so, on either Jews or Gentiles, to all who are reared up in a knowledge of the only creed of primitive and uncorrupted Christianity—that Jesus is the Christ—the sent of God—the Savior of the world. If Pagans, Mahommedans, or Jews, were now converted to Christianity, it *might* with *some*

plausibility be urged, that they should be baptized with water—born of water—'in the name of the Lord Jesus;' but *on no grounds, that are at all plausible*, in our view, *could it be urged that water-baptism is binding on any other persons, or in any other cases.*"

He tells us also, (p. 221,) that "those who oppose outward baptism, as firmly believe it *abolished* by our Lord, as is circumcision—and it would be as wrong to insist on their being baptized, as it would to insist on Baptists *not* being baptized." "I wish my brethren, every where, would cease the practice of water-baptism, which was *never intended for their observance*, and is contrary to Christianity—but if they will continue water-baptism to accommodate 'a *spurious* conscience,' let them not force others to do the same."

So numerous are they who agree with Mr. Grosh in these views of the design of baptism, that they seldom, if ever, make it a test of church-membership. In "the Profession of Faith of the Universalist church in Utica," the matter is thus stated:—"As there is a difference of opinion, ('Mag. and Adv.' III. 21,) among the *sincere* followers of Christ," [Universalists,] "in regard to this ordinance, and this difference ought not to separate true disciples one from another; we believe it is the duty of every one to follow the dictates of his or her conscience, leaving each to judge both of the subject and mode of Baptism, as shall seem most consistent with Scripture and reason." We learn also that such is the custom of Universalists generally. So says Mr. Skinner; (pp. 20, 21;) "*Universalists in general*, so far as we have

been acquainted with them, have been accustomed to 'think and let think;' and *have never*, to our knowledge, *made the ordinances alluded to,*" [baptism, and the Lord's Supper,] *either a bar against, or test of, fellowship;* justly considering them not as the fundamentals of religion, but appendages to be used, or not used, according to the conscience of each sincere Christian."

Similar are their views in regard to the observance of the LORD'S SUPPER.

The 'Universalist Manual' observes, (pp. 102, '3, '4,) that "there are some varieties of opinion in the denomination of Universalists in relation to this Christian institution called the Lord's Supper. Some consider the observance and the due celebration of it, to be equally binding upon Christians in all ages of the Christian church; whilst others think its obligation was only temporary." "There are *many* of our ministering brethren, and others, who, although they do *not* consider the celebration of the communion, *strictly obligatory* on Christians at present, are yet in favor of its regular observance; believing it *expedient*, and calculated to be useful as a means of edification." "It is on the same ground, namely, of *expediency* and utility, that I would choose to place the present and continued observance of the institution of the Lord's Supper."

Some of their preachers openly declare, that the authorized observance of the rite ceased with the Jewish dispensation. Mr. Rogers says, ('Mag. and Adv.' VII. 5,) "We *know* that the coming of Christ to close the Jewish dispensation, *annulled the obligation of the eucha-*

ristic rite." He thinks, however, that it may even now be useful. "If I am persuaded of its utility, (and I am, decidedly,) I will, for the utility's sake, encourage its continued observance." To which Mr. Grosh replies, —"Br. Rogers' rule of action, as I understand him, is a good one. Acting on it, and *believing the observance of the eucharist of very doubtful utility, I cannot observe it.*" He says, (III. 221,) "we have never tried to convince our readers, that the institutions of water-baptism, and *the eucharist*, are not now binding on any people—nor have been since the second coming of Jesus, 1700 years ago, *as we firmly believe.*"

"With respect to the communion of the Lord's Supper, we may be told," says H. Ballou, jr. ('Plain Guide,' p. 326,) "that it is questionable, whether this institution was intended as an *absolute ordinance*, that is, as perpetually and universally obligatory by force of a positive command. *We think so too.* We have doubts of the existence of ordinances in Christianity; we mean, in the usual technical sense of the term."

Those among them, who believe that the observance should be continued, as enjoined by the Savior on all his disciples in every age, as is the case with the two Messrs. Skinner, Messrs. Whittemore, Balfour and some others,—are yet very indulgent to their brethren who differ from them. "We know many estimable and worthy Christians," says the elder Skinner, ('Mag. and Adv.' III. 21,) "both Universalists and Limitarians, who do not view this subject in the same light that we do. *Nor do we esteem them any the less on that ac-*

count." In other words, it is a very small matter, whether they observe the ordinance or not, they are just as good Christians, just as worthy of esteem, as though they did! "It is the spirit of *Universalism* (p. 22,) to allow every sincere believer in Christ to think and practice as conscience shall dictate." To such, it seems, there is no law—no rule: the command of Christ may be utterly disregarded, simply because a man takes it into his head, not to believe that it is a command.

That the number of Universalists, who believe either in the authority, expediency, or utility, of the eucharist, is small, appears by their own confessions. They admit that their *churches* are few in number. Of *societies* they boast many. But a society is not a church, though many of them endeavor to think so. "There was, it is said, ('Exp.' IV. 216,) but one body, originally, in the Christian community—that is, the church; and why, it is asked, should we have more than one body now—that is, the society, or congregation?" These societies are made up of all sorts of persons, save the rigidly and devout orthodox. The younger Ballou says, as quoted in the 'Plain Guide,' (p. 325,) that "in New England, and, we believe, in most other places," "the society is gathered indiscriminately," and "consists of all who choose to belong to it, from whatever motive, or to share in the pecuniary burdens or profits of building," &c. Societies thus composed would very naturally be opposed to an "*imperium in imperio*"—a church-government distinct from a society-government.

"Some object to churches," says Mr. Balfour, ('Exp.' II. 35,) "beause they make a separation in the society." "Some also object to churches, because their establishment would drive away from the societies the richest men, who are the chief supporters of preaching." And "some (p. 36,) object to churches as unscriptural. Few, if any, would boldly affirm that churches never were scriptural institutions; but it is alleged, that *they, with the Lord's Day, Lord's Supper, yea, all Christian ordinances are now useless;* or, if attended to, are mere matters of *expediency.*"

For these, and other reasons, Universalists, for the most part, are unwilling to establish churches distinct from, and within their societies. Of "many" of the sect, Mr. Balfour remarks, ('Exp.' II. 50,)—"A large meeting-house and a popular preacher are matters of far more concern to them, than having a church among them, *obeying the commandments of Jesus Christ.*" "Is it not a fact, (p. 54,) that *hundreds* of them can live—their whole life-time, neighbors to each other, yet pay no attention to churches and the observance of Christ's ordinances? Is this like Christians? Is it not more like heathens, persons who do not believe the gospel, or regard Christ's authority?" We have, here, a beautiful comment on the *devotional* tendencies of Universalism, of which we shall see more presently. Well might Mr. Balfour say, (p. 33,)—"Our enemies have reproached us with neglect of churches and church-ordinances: and too much occasion has been given them for it. Churches have indeed existed in many places among

Universalists, but not so generally as they ought." "The neglect of churches seems now to be perceived, and the evils, resulting from it, to be felt." Again, (p. 36,) "If churches are scriptural institutions, *Universalists* have too long neglected God's authority about them. This neglect, in many instances at least, has arisen, not so much from want of proper persons to compose churches among them, as *from want of attention to the Scriptures.*"

The extent of this neglect may be inferred from what Hosea Ballou, jr., says; ('Plain Guide,' p. 325,) "Now, *it is an ominous fact*, that in a *very large* proportion of our societies, *probably in more than two-thirds of our eight or nine hundred, there are no churches, no associations of the kind whatsoever!*"

Of course, by all these the observance of the Lord's Supper is neglected. I cannot find, that it is administered, except where churches have been organized. And even where there are churches, but a small part of the society belong to them, (though the terms of admission are very simple,) or come to the table. And in the case of church-members, not all these regard it as a duty to attend the communion. It is sometimes expressly provided, as in the case of a Universalist church in this city, that "a participation in the ordinances shall *not* be considered necessary to constitute church-membership." And Mr. D. Skinner testifies, as we have seen above, that "Universalists in general have never made the ordinances either a bar against, or test of, fellowship."

Such tests would be most firmly resisted by the most of them. They cannot endure it, that such invidious distinctions should be made in the societies. In relation to a plan started a few years since, "of forming societies under church-government and discipline," Mr. Grosh says, ('Mag. and Adv.' III. 14,)—"If the ordinances are to be made in the least degree obligatory, either by moral or disciplinary influence, on persons becoming members of the societies, it would be calculated to prevent many from becoming members—we allude to those who are conscientiously, or from principles of propriety and policy, opposed to forms and ceremonies. Such distinctive measures we hope will never be introduced among our brethren."

"We regret," says Mr. Whittemore, ('Plain Guide,' p. 332,) "the present distinction of Christians into two parties, the church and the congregation; and we recommend a measure which will abolish the distinction. Let *all* Christian believers join the visible church. This act is saying to the world, 'I believe in Christ,—I am willing to have it known,—I am not ashamed of my Lord,—I love the fellowship of his disciples,—and I respect his ordinances.' If this recommendation should be followed, the wall of separation between the Christian church and the Christian congregation would be thrown down; and of the twain there would be one flesh. *All then*, (excepting children not arrived to years of sufficient judgment,) *would join the celebration, as they certainly should.* It is too often the case now, that when the Supper is administered, *five-sixths* of the

Christians present, *and sometimes more*, rise and leave the house, as though they had of right no part nor lot in the matter whatsoever. 'These things ought not so to be.' It is radically wrong, and the *practice* ought to be changed as speedily as possible. It is wrong in itself, as well as wounding to the feelings of the officiating clergyman, and to the members who remain, thus to be forsaken, as it were, by their *brethren*."

We have, in this extract, a very plain confession of the slight hold, which the ordinance of the Lord's Supper has even on those congregations where churches are established; and an urgent appeal to all the congregations, with no further change than that of *practice* in this particular, to adopt the name of a church; for they are all spoken of as "brethren;" and Mr. W. does not believe in what we call a change of heart:— "As to a radical change of nature," he remarks, (p. 331,) "it is impossible in itself, and cannot, therefore, be regarded as a qualification." "The only qualification, (p. 332,) required by the primitive disciples, was a rational and practical faith in Jesus, as the Son of God and the Savior of the world."

Such are the devotional tendencies of this "*purer faith*." Such is the manner in which Christian Institutions are regarded. Some believe in them, at least for form's sake, and some care nothing about them; and these last are by far the majority; while some are decidedly opposed to them. Now as all the tendencies of this sect are antipodal to the orthodox, as they appear to strive to have but little, either in faith or

practice, in common with others, it cannot be regarded as doubtful what they will at length become, in respect to the ordinances. The day is not far distant, when notwithstanding the efforts of a few among them, the ordinances will be almost or quite unknown. If none but themselves were left in charge of the observance of the Sabbath, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, how long would it be before the very remembrance of such antiquated customs would cease from among men? Thank God, all are not such.

CHAPTER XXIII.

FRUITS OF UNIVERSALISM.

Moral efficacy—Fruits of Orthodoxy—Ministry of Christ and Paul—Such should be its fruits if true—Their own concessions—Want of piety—No public measures of usefulness—Dark prospects—Relish for piety not common—Disguised Infidels—Character of leaders—Ropes of sand—A lifeless theory—Sleepy Congregations—Hirelings poorly paid—Prayer-meetings rare—Disastrous tendencies—Hypocrites—A good description—Mr. Balfour's forebodings and experience—Philadelphia—New York—No memorials of good done—Affinity with infidelity—No secret, nor family-prayer—Too great a risk.

> "From thoughts so dreadful and profane,
> Corrupt discourse proceeds;
> And in their impious hands are found
> Abominable deeds."—WATTS.

IN our inquiry concerning the *fruits* of this system, it has been ascertained that one of the results of the general adoption of this scheme of doctrines would be the prostration of every institution peculiar to Christianity. The very bulwarks of religion, being thus overthrown, what is to hinder a general depravation of morals, such as is the case wherever the Sabbath is unknown, and the ordinances of Christianity are disregarded, or held in contempt.

Moral efficacy. What it should be.

It becomes, therefore, a very important inquiry,—*What is the* MORAL *efficacy of* Modern Universalism? Under the preaching of what is called orthodoxy, we are accustomed to witness remarkable reformations of life, and transformations of character, directly traceable to the influence of these doctrines. No orthodox preacher can be content without such testimonies to his faithfulness as an ambassador of Christ. Such unquestionably were the results of our Savior's preaching, of the ministry of the apostles, and also of their coadjutors and successors. To the Corinthians Paul writes—(1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, 11,) "Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. *And such were some of you.* But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."

Paul's preaching produced, or was followed by, such remarkable conversions. If Universalism is the *very* doctrine preached by the Apostle, we may certainly look for similar results to follow its faithful promulgation. Yea, we may expect that in this respect it will exceed every other creed; that it will number among its adherents, those, in considerable numbers, who, having been fornicators, adulterers, thieves, and drunkards, have, by the mere influence of its peculiar doctrines, become entirely changed in all these respects. Let us then proceed to the investigation. "Ye shall

know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles ?"

I shall continue to avail myself of their own statements and confessions, well knowing that in nothing are men more liable to prejudice, than in judging of the conduct of others. The following remarks from the 'Magazine and Advocate,' (VIII. 4, 5,) may throw some light on this matter. "I aver," says Mr. Rogers, ("that laborious and distinguished defender of Universalism, who has traveled more than any preacher in the denomination," see 'Trumpet,' XIII. 122.) "that *the mere extension of our faith—will not, to any great degree, improve public morals.*—Its bearing upon *morals* will be scarcely perceptible, except something more is done. Is this denied? Why, then, do we find *so many who entertain a firm faith in our doctrines, and are not perceptibly influenced* in their general practice by that faith ?" This is not the language of an enemy, but of one of their own preachers. It is an undesigned confession of the impotence of the system.

Again he asks,—"As a Christian *body are we not too indifferent to experimental piety?* Does not our horror of fanaticism carry us too far into the other extreme ? Our love to God; is it not too closely allied to a mere abstract and philosophical admiration ?" Appealing to his brethren he adds,—"Do we not want to be *useful? What are we doing toward this object?* What public measures have we taken to this end ? I do aver that *it is high time that our principles were more palpably visible in their bearings on the moral in-*

terests of society." This language speaks volumes in regard to the "palpably visible" results of this new scheme.

Mr. Rogers stands not alone. The fact is apparent to the most of them. Many of them are sick at heart with their own adherents, disgusted at their utter indifference to all but *doctrinal* preaching, and exceedingly apprehensive that the days of the sect are numbered. Mr. Balfour's concessions, considering that he is one of their main pillars, are to be regarded as of great importance. "Whether Universalism," he remarks, ('Exp.' II. 32,) "shall go on prospering as it has done, depends in a good degree, on Universalists themselves. *Unless they give heed to their ways, and follow God's directions, as given in the Bible, they need not expect increasing prosperity.*" And yet no man among them has done so much to sap their confidence in "God's directions as given in the Bible."

Again of those in other churches who believe in Universalism, but join not the sect, he says, (p. 33,)—"It will be time enough to blame them, when churches are established, and *a relish for personal piety and devotion* BECOMES COMMON *among us.* The many merely nominal Universalists, in some places, must give *a revolting view of Universalism* to many sensible piously-minded people. They judge of the whole by the specimen before them, and conclude *we are only disguised infidels.*" Nor has Mr. Balfour judged wrong. Such men, as he here denounces, we do see, and in considerable numbers, flocking to hear Universalist preachers, and glorying in their doctrines; and the view is revolting;

leading us to conclude, (with how much reason let this exposition show,) that they are "only *disguised infidels.*"

Alluding to the "rich profane swearer, drunkard, and semi-infidel," he says, (p. 36,)—"It is seeing *such*, in some cases, the *leaders and managers* in our societies, which makes Universalism *a hissing and a by-word* in some places, and prevents many persons from uniting with us." "A large meeting-house (p. 50,) and a popular preacher are matters of far more concern to them [many Universalists,] than having a church among them, *obeying the commandments of Jesus Christ.*" How little regard can they, then, have to the authority of the Savior!

What wonder can it be that such societies should soon crumble and cease, when they have, confessedly, so little regard for Christ? "I may add another fact," says Mr. B. (p. 34,) "which makes the hearts of many Universalists sad,—They see *numerous* Universalist societies formed, and meeting-houses built; but what is the result? After a few years, some meeting-houses are sold, or shut up. In some others they have only occasional preaching. And some societies, after a lingering consumption, die, and the place which once knew them, knows them no more. *Like ropes of sand* they have fallen to pieces, and hardly a fragment of them remains." Such examples, as every reader must know, are by no means rare. But it is not always that the fact is so plainly confessed. How wonderful must be the vitality of such a system!

Even the wily Mr. Whittemore, who, on one page can say,—"It is but seldom, ('Plain Guide,' p. 282,) that we now hear the objection urged against Universalism, which was formerly urged with frequency and confidence, that it had a *licentious* influence on those who believed it,"—on the very next page is constrained to remark,—"The morals of the Universalist would, and must, in the very nature of things, be purer than the morals of those operated upon by different opinions, were it not that he makes his religion too much a *thing of theory*, and *too little a thing of practice.* This is the fault of *many* Universalists." He thinks that they *ought* to be the most moral, but where are the facts to confirm his theory?—where? He cannot but be sensible that as a sect they are very deficient in even the appearance of piety. Therefore he says, (p. 293,) —"If there be any one thing which *particularly* concerns the *substantial* interests of the Universalist denomination, it is the *formation of Vital Godliness.*" Well may he say—'*formation;*' for such a thing, in such a place, may well claim to be regarded as a new creation.

The following from the same pen, (p. 307,) may be regarded as a very graphic description of a large proportion of their societies:—"When he [the preacher] goes to conduct the services of public worship, he sees about half as many people as there are pews, scattered over the house, some below, and some in the gallery; no singers, so that the joyful part they perform must be omitted. He begins with a prayer, but there is no feeling; *he knows not what to say;* he labors through

it, and it seems to every one a long, dull, and unsuitable one. He announces his text, and endeavors to preach, but it is *lifeless reading* after all. His congregation have fixed themselves in a situation to suffer the least *torture;* if in summer, they sleep and nod; if in winter, they bury themselves in their cloaks, and go into a torpid state." Here is a picture evidently drawn from nature. Both Mr. W. and his brethren are too familiar with such scenes not to know how to sketch them. But what an animating doctrine it must be to produce such affecting interest!

"A wise observer," he tells us, (p. 312,) "has said, —'In many of our country societies, and among the professed friends to our doctrine, where no society exists, are to be found certain narrow-minded brethren, who can talk much about the 'glorious gospel,'—and how refreshing it is to them to hear the glad tidings proclaimed; but who never seem to think that five dollars will go further than ninepence in the payment of a poor itinerant preacher, when they are amply able to pay the former sum a dozen times in a year!'" How Universalism opens the heart, and prompts to wondrous deeds of benevolence! "What tales of sadness," adds Mr. W. (p. 313,) "some of our poor itinerants could tell, who have traversed hill and dale with the gospel-message on their tongues, for which they have had the privilege of obtaining about *half enough to meet their expenses.* I have heard some of their narratives; and I always feel, when I listen to them, as though they had not only *entered* the kingdom 'with

much tribulation,' but had found a good share of it *within*." Had they carried the true gospel with them, they would have found that "the laborer is worthy of his hire."

The absence of vital godliness among them may be further shown from their want of interest in meetings of a merely *devotional* character. "A good, social, meeting," Mr. W. observes, (p. 316, 17) "of Christian friends will do much for the spiritual advancement of all who enjoy it. *There is a lamentable indifference on this subject.* Too much is thought of mere minister-meetings; as if no others could be tolerated." How rarely do we hear of prayer-meetings among our Universalists! That Universalists, with all their professions of love, are very deficient in affection to their religion, appears from what H. Ballou, jr. says ('Plain Guide,' p. 328;)—"Most of the other sects never form a society without a church. Has it not been observed, that in general, (there are exceptions,) they rather excel us in strong enduring attachment to their religion, and to their social institutions?" "We have *a deep and increasing presentiment*, that there must be a *thorough change* of this state of things," "or that its prosperity [the society's] will not be permanent. At any rate, we cannot conceive of general neglect, without the most disastrous tendencies." But general neglect of churches there will be among a people who maintain that "all men are of the church;" and these disastrous tendencies must operate.

To the question,—"What are we doing?"—Mr.

Gurley replies, ('Univ. Union,' IV. 43,) some are alive in the power and spirit of the gospel; but too many are cold and indifferent. There is a *lamentable deficiency in many places of the fruits* of a living faith. *Multitudes have a dead faith.*" "I cannot, I confess, account for so much coldness, only on the ground that *a religious and devotional spirit has not been sufficiently cultivated among us.* Anti-endless misery is a very different thing from Universalism; and I very greatly fear that the number is not small who have mistaken the former for the latter." There cannot, then, be so much Universalism in the land, as is pretended. Indeed it can scarcely be found at all, except in the form of anti-endless misery and anti-all-future misery. But this is not Universalism!

We find, too, a great many *hypocrites* in this curious sect. "I doubt not," says Mr. Ackley of Hamilton, New York, ('Univ. Union,' IV. 162,) "we have as many [hypocrites,] in proportion to our numbers, as other denominations." "Is not that man a dissembler who professes to believe the Abrahamic faith, and to love the glad tidings of a world's salvation, and, at the same time, *spends the sacred day at the tavern, the grog shop, or in other places of wickedness;* and to whom the Lord's day is a weariness, instead of delight; his holy sanctuary a prison-house, instead of the very gate of heaven to his soul; the Bible a dead letter, instead of his only chart and compass?—*There are not a few, of these views and habits, who profess to be Universalists.*" Again he says—(p. 161,) "There are *thousands*

who endeavor to shelter themselves under the wings of our faith, who are so afraid of being burned to death in the hot fire of fanaticism, with which they are surrounded, that they have stood aloof, halting between two opinions, until they are now frozen with the cold frosts of criminal neglect, and are dead weights in our cause." This is a doleful picture, truly, of a church that professes Apostolical purity of doctrine!

We are told, (p. 166,) that "a Universalist *now* is something different from what was supposed to be a Universalist a few years since. A Universalist, formerly, in the judgment of the world, was a good-humored *swearing*, laughing, joking, *Bible-neglecting*, *Sabbath-disregarding*, accommodating, and neighborly sort of being, that had owned and lost 'Ballou on Atonement,' heard three Universalist sermons, and argued all the orthodox out of *all the bar-rooms* in town." The reader will be apt to think that the description still holds good, especially after what has just been detailed of the leanness of the sect.

Even in Connecticut, that church-going land, they can hardly persuade their adherents to keep up public worship. From the Southern Association of Connecticut, we learn, ('Union,' IV. 243,) that "it is sometimes the case that individuals, known to be Universalists, seldom attend church more than half a day, and sometimes not at all. *They seem to prefer almost any thing to religious devotion.*" And yet they are "*known* to be Universalists!"

After such exhibitions of the emptiness of Universa-

lism, it may be well to introduce the prophetic declarations of Mr. Balfour, ('Univ. Union,' IV. 306, '7,) in respect to the future fortunes of his adopted people. To the question—"Will the cause of Universalism go on to prosper in time to come, as it has in times past?"—he replies very doubtingly. He questions much whether the "*means*" will "be continued and increased in the time to come." The "means" are preachers, books, and periodicals. But "will men enter into the *ministry* equal to the increased demand for them, as in time past? We must doubt this, unless a *radical change* takes place. Few men of talents, unless mere loiterers, will seriously engage in the work *until they see more love and zeal among Universalists to provide for them and their families.* They see *many* of their present preachers spending their time and strength in the work, in poverty and comparative *misery*, and die probably in debt, with a wife and family to mourn their loss." "They," [the preachers of some societies,] "drag out for a year or two, a *miserable existence* as preachers in a place, leave it probably in debt, hoping to find some other place, where Universalists have more *common sense*, if not more of *true Christianity* among them." "Until this shameful evil is removed, let us be more sparing of our boasting about the rapid progress of Universalism." "Let preachers' love and zeal for the cause of Universalism be what you please, they must get discouraged, in seeing so LITTLE EVIDENCE OF ITS FRUITS in their hearers. In some places, particularly cities and populous towns,

preachers are *decently* provided for, but this is *by no means generally* the case with our preachers throughout the country."

He speaks also, of "their constant removal from one place to another," as one of the "evils which ought to be removed." "But why is this the case? Sometimes the people want him to go. They look on him as a hired man by the day or year; and like children tired of an old *play thing*, dismiss him. They hire another, and are soon tired of their new *rattle*, and he is again dismissed for another, perhaps not so good as the two former." "*I am surprised that* ANY *preacher continues in the ministry*, or that any should enter it under such a state of things, unless it be for the purpose of changing them for the better."

Here, then, is a doleful prospect as to a future supply of preachers, and a sad comment on the ingratitude and unfruitfulness of those who hear them. What, when they owe all their hopes of future bliss to the oft-repeated assurances of these very preachers, can they not keep them from want and begging?

> "By me thy greatness grew; thy years grew with it,
> But thy ingratitude outgrew them both."

Mr. Balfour proceeds, in the next place, to show the improbability of much advance in the *publishing* line, and to give some account of his own sad experience. "Few, if any, among Universalists, have published more books of this kind than myself." But, "so far from my publications being a profit to me, they have

only been a bill of expense, and much perplexity, in addition to all my labor in writing them, so much so, that *I have been tempted to curse the day I ever published a book.*" (The day is coming when he *will* curse it bitterly!) "Many Universalists seem to feel little interest in reading and improving themselves as to their professed faith." (Why should they? they have learned to *think for themselves?*) "What is still more painful, some, *not a few*, have got my books, and, either from *want of honesty*, or carelessness, have forgotten to pay for them." "Who will be *such a fool as I have been*" (truly!) "to publish books on Universal Salvation, if this is the way their labors are to be rewarded? I AM HEART-SICK OF IT; and to be told, my books have contributed much to the rapid spread of Universalism, has no tendency to remove this kind of sickness." Hence he concludes that there is but poor encouragement to write such books, and that thus one great means of spreading their tenets will be discontinued. How strong must be the love of the people for their religion, when their poor authors, who labor night and day to build them up in the faith in spite of the English Bible and the orthodox, must pay their own expenses, and die with a broken heart! If such has been Mr. Balfour's experience,—a man who has deserved more of the sect than any other man—what must be the fate of the "lesser lights."

It is not strange that, as Mr. B. remarks, the life of a Universalist, "who publishes a book on Universalism and sends it to persons indiscriminately, who send for

it to sell on commission,—*is a life of misery*, and gives him far more painful labor than the writing of it." He thinks that there is so little ground for confidence among his own people, that were he to commence his "writing-life" again, he would sell none of his books on credit, "except to persons" he remarks, "whom *I knew* to be trust-worthy, either from my own personal knowledge, or from the testimony of others on whom I could depend." Now as the orthodox seldom either buy or sell his books, these remarks must relate entirely to Universalists, and show how little confidence they have reason to have in one another. What an admirable system! How "worthy of all acceptation!"

The fate of their *periodicals* has been much the same. "Very few of them have been a source of much profit to their proprietors; many of them have been a dead loss and abandoned; and some of them are struggling for life, uncertain but death will be the issue." And this is owing to the fact "that we have *much chaff* among us."

From this review of the past and present, Mr. B. concludes that "the same means, and the same degree of them, will not answer as in times past. The tree of Universalism has put forth *leaves* and *blossoms;* but people *now* look for *solid* fruits from it. People must *live* Universalism as well as talk it, showing out of a good conversation their *works* with meekness of wisdom. They must turn their attention to every other part of the will of God made known in the Bible, and

not suppose that it only teaches Universal Salvation. They must show that they *are* saved,—shine as lights in the world."

It is, then, admitted by one, who has every reason to know, who has given the sect a fair trial, that this glorious doctrine has hitherto brought forth little else than "leaves and blossoms." The "*solid fruits*" are yet to be seen. Alas for the barren fig-tree! 'Why cumbereth it the ground?'

It was confessed by Mr. Fuller of Philadelphia, in 1839, ('Univ. Union,' IV. 342,) that their "two places of public worship—were, *ten years ago*, as well attended, or nearly so, as they are now;"—that (p. 327,) as to one of their societies, "those they deemed their *right-hand men*, have deserted from their ranks, or abandoned their posts in the citadel of truth, for the barbarous habit of spending their Sundays in rambling for recreation, or in lounging and loitering for ease." And of those who remain in the two societies, it is said, (p. 342,)—"some attend, say once in four weeks, some once in twelve, some once or twice a year, and some, when some celebrated brother visits us." And (on page 388,) we are told that "there are many people calling themselves 'liberal' in this city, who seldom or *never* favor us with their company at church, nor do they in any way aid our cause," and yet they are "great Universalists," in their own estimation. "Not more than one-half of the nominal Universalists in this city, who are abundantly able to pay for one of our best weeklies, take one of them." The writer

thinks, (or did think, for he has since deceased,) that it cannot be for want of time to read them, "especially where (p. 359,) people READ THE BIBLE SO LITTLE AS UNIVERSALISTS GENERALLY DO, who take none of our papers."

Are these the fruits of Universalism? They are, if we may believe those who ought to know best. This is not 'orthodox slang,' but genuine Universalist truth. What is here said of Philadelphia, it is thought would hold good of *New York*. Fifteen years since the prospects of the sect were at least as good as, if not better than, they are now. Then a flourishing society of *Trinitarian Restorationists* were accustomed to assemble in Duane street; and their place of worship was overflowing. This society has become entirely extinct; and their house of worship is now in the hands of the Roman Catholics.

The *first Universalist* Society of Unitarians separated from the former, and built a large brick church in Prince-street, where for a time Mr. Kneeland preached. This society has also become extinct, and their former house of worship is owned by Associate Presbyterians.

The *second Universalist* Society was formed by a secession from the first, under the counsel and conduct of Mr. Kneeland, and worshiped for a time in the Masonic Hall, until, Mr. K. having declared the Bible to be a *fable*, the key was turned upon him by the Treasurer of the Society. The fragments of the body, which was then broken in pieces, were afterwards gathered together, and now form the *second* society under the care of Mr. Sawyer, worshiping in Orchard-street. A *third* was

organized a few years since, and erected a large house of worship in Bleeker-street, but are without a pastor, very few in number, burdened with an enormous debt, and unable to pay it. Their house will probably have to be sold. A *fourth* was organized in November, 1838, and was, until last July, under the charge of Mr. Whittaker, and worshiped in the house formerly occupied by the Restorationists. But the house having now been sold, they are left without a home, and will find it, feeble as they are, a difficult matter to hang together. Their present preacher is Mr. Williamson. There is, therefore, now in reality but one Universalist Society in this city, that may be regarded as fully established. The remaining two are sickly infants.*

Thus in fifteen years they have either lost ground, or gained but little, if any thing; while in the same time the population of the city has nearly doubled, and orthodoxy in all its branches has made rapid advances. This is surely poor encouragement, and augurs darkly for the future.

*Since the above was written, an individual, engaged in school-teaching in Chambers street, and holding fellowship as a preacher among them, has opened a hall in the Dry Dock section of the city, and has preached three or four weeks to a society, recently and in consequence organized, in that neighborhood. With two other societies in the city struggling for existence, it may well be regarded as a Quixotic adventure. There are, however, infidels enough in the neighborhood to furnish, for some time, a congregation, respectable at least for numbers. The hall in which they meet is quite contracted, and so easily filled.

What now, I ask, *has Universalism done for the good of the world ?*—what, that would not have been better done without it ? Where are its memorials—its living witnesses ? What drunkard has it made sober, whom orthodoxy had given up ? What debauchee, utterly incurable by the latter, has been made whole by the former ? What backslider has it ever induced to rear again the family-altar, and become a serious and devout Christian ? The Rev. Mr. M. H. Smith, formerly a Universalist preacher, recently stated in a public lecture, as reported by the ' Congregational Observer', that "*during a ministry of twelve years he had never known a single instance of a reform—of an* IMPROVEMENT even—under his preaching. And he never heard of any real reform under the preaching of any others of his persuasion. He had seen men growing worse, but he had never seen any growing better. He had known repeated instances of transition, in those who became Universalists, from that doctrine to Infidelity and thence to Atheism. *Its tendencies were all and always downward.* Its strongest supporters were in reality in very many cases nothing less than disguised, if less than avowed, infidels. Of its ministry, he said, within six years past, he had known *twenty-six* abandon the doctrine, and for the most part in disgust with the morals of its professors." (See ' N. York Observer,' XIX. 1.)

A similar statement was made to myself by the Rev. Mr. Whittaker of this city, on the very day of his renunciation. In a conversation a few days afterwards

with Mr. Sawyer of this city, I urged him to tell me what had been the moral results of his own preaching, and could obtain no satisfactory answer. He thought that he knew of those who had been made better, but not an instance was given; and the absence of such results was attempted to be accounted for, by the belligerant attitude which the sect have been obliged to assume, from its rise until the present time.

It is not said that they never preach against sin—that they never warn men against immorality. This they may do, but such preaching has hitherto, unaccompanied by the mighty sanctions of gospel-truth, proved, and must ever prove, utterly powerless. I cannot remember to have seen in all my researches, in any one of their publications, one single exhortation from one of their number to a faithful discharge of the duty of *secret vocal prayer*—or any attempt to inculcate the duty of *family-prayer;* though in some instances I have seen an attempt to ridicule the latter, as altogether too Pharisaical for a liberal Christian. "Do not those," says Mr. Sawyer, ('Letters to Remington,' p. 145,) "who assume much of the religion of the land, the pious and *praying* people, (I mean such as have piety and *prayers to boast of*,) oppose and persecute Universalists, and for the same reasons that the Pharisees of old persecuted the disciples of Christ?" They want no "*prayers to boast of*," and verily they have it according to their wish.

I have been informed by one that had much oppor-

tunity to know, having himself been one of their preachers, that it is a very rare thing to see the household of even one of their ministers called together for family-prayer, and that, when it is witnessed, it is only, for the most part, on extraordinary occasions, and not as a daily duty; that it is even rare to hear God's blessing invoked at the table of his bounty; and that, judging from his own habits, and what he knew of his former brethren, he had no reason to believe that even their preachers are accustomed to maintain closet-prayer. And yet these men pretend to know better the will of God, than they whose daily delight it is to hold communion with God in secret, and seek by earnest prayer the guidance of the Holy Spirit! And this, they say, is the religion taught by Christ and his apostles!

"——Credat Judæus Apella,
Non ego."

Let the credulous debauchee, the profane libeler of the humble followers of Jesus, the careless devotee of Folly and Fashion, believe in such expounders of the mind and will of a holy God, if they can; and trust their souls to such prayerless preachers, if they will. But we have learned to set a higher value on our souls, and on the promise of God to hear and answer prayer, than to look up to men as our spiritual guides, whose closets are never visited to seek and obtain the wisdom which cometh from above, who never advise their hearers to utter prayer in secret, and who even ridicule those, who

so feel their own weakness, and so rely on God's promise, as to pay their vows every morning and evening at their private altar, and pray to him who has promised to reward them openly. To those who urge us to follow such leaders we must therefore say—"*Have me excused.*"

CHAPTER XXIV.

LEARNING OF UNIVERSALIST PREACHERS.

The work done—The charge conceded—Utterly unlike every other scheme—A mass of heresies—A man's creed of no consequence—Latitudinarians—A modern Pantheon—Is this the Bride?—Their peculiar claims on our confidence—Literary character of James Relly—Of John Murray—Of Hosea Ballou—Of Abner Kneeland—Of Walter Balfour—Of the junior preachers—Qualifications necessary to their preachers—Of A. B. Grosh—Of J. D. Williamson—Of their whole ministry—Final appeal to the reader.

> "But muse! forbear; long flights forbode a fall;
> Strike on the deep-ton'd chord the sum of all;
> Hear the just law—the judgment of the skies:
> He that hates truth shall be the dupe of lies;
> And he that *will* be cheated to the last,
> Delusions, strong as Hell, shall bind him fast."
>
> COWPER.

THE work is done. Modern Universalism in America has passed in review before us. It has been permitted to speak for itself. We have seen the TREE and ITS FRUITS—the doctrines and their results. We have listened to its arrogant claims, and have suffered ourselves for the moment to be unchurched. The learning, and wisdom, and piety of all past time have been made

foolishness by its unbounded pretensions. Truth appears to have fled the earth, until it found a resting-place in the breast of Mr. Ballou!

"Now, Truth! perform thine office." Say to what belongs this scheme? Whence came it? Whose is it? Are they, who espouse it, all right, and all the world besides in error? That they stand out alone from all the Christian world, they themselves confess. "There is no denomination," they say, ('Mag. & Adv.' III. 349,) "to take us by the hand, acknowledge us as a member of the Christian family, admit any of our *peculiar* opinions as even the *shadow of truth*, or in any wise, to feel towards us the least degree of friendship or fellowship. It is the doctrine, the whole doctrine, and nothing but the doctrine, that draws down on us disfellowship, reproach, and persecution. OUR FAITH, as of old, IS OPPOSED, IN EVERY MATERIAL PART THAT CAN AFFECT THE HONOR OF GOD AND THE HAPPINESS OF MAN, TO THE FAITH OF THE RELIGIOUS WORLD."

That this declaration is true must now be apparent to every reader. There is no "material part" of Christian faith which these innovators have not done their utmost to subvert. Let this concession never be forgotten.

Other systems of error have, for the most part, contented themselves with a *single* departure from the faith. But this is a complete MASS OF HERESIES. It openly advances, as constituent parts of itself, the very worst features of Pelagianism, Antinomianism, Saddu-

With whom they hold fellowship. The great st latitude allowed.

ceeism, Arianism, Monophosytism, Socinianism, and Materialism. It embraces within its ample arms all, no matter what they else believe, or how abhorrent their other views may be, who believe in the final holiness and happiness of the human race. It professes to regard it as of no consequence whether a man be a Trinitarian, Arian, or a Socinian; a Materialist or Immaterialist; whether he believes one creed or another, provided, though even this affects not at all his future welfare, he agrees with them in the result. They, the followers of this creed, maintain fellowship with Deists, and Libertines, and Atheists, but withhold it from Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists. While they ridicule the devout, and earnest, and zealous labors of the latter, they join hands with the former in laughing at, what they call, the bigotry and superstition of your "pious and praying people." They make common cause with the infidel, by their constant efforts to unsettle the confidence of their hearers in the common translation of the Bible, delighting to make use of those texts which most plainly speak against their doctrine, and so to torture them as to

> —— "Make the worse appear
> The better reason, to perplex and dash
> Maturest counsels."

Of all Latitudinarians these are the most worthy of the name. No heretic can wish more liberty than is here allowed. As in the ancient Pantheon, every prin-

cipal *heresiarch* may here find a niche for himself, and receive the homage of his followers. The greatest amity pervades the brotherhood, whether Jove, or Venus, or Bacchus be the presiding deity. Nor must the lines be tighter drawn, lest some good free-thinking brother take offence and desert the holy cause!

Is this the Bride? Is this the reality of what John saw in vision, when one of the seven angels said to him —"Come hither, I will show thee the Bride—the Lamb's wife!" Where is the "fine linen, clean and white," arrayed in which she then appeared?

"If thou beest she! but Oh! how fall'n! how chang'd!"

Is this she that is "comely as Jerusalem, terrible as an army with banners?"—to whom the Bridegroom says, "thou art all fair, my love! there is no spot in thee?" Alas! "all her beauty is departed." "How is the gold become dim! how is the most fine gold changed!"

But, ere we receive this system as true, as the very system of Christ and his Apostles, we may be permitted to ask—What *peculiar* claims have its advocates to be regarded as the only true expounders of Scripture? As we have already seen, in its present form it has not seen a quarter of a century. Some of its peculiar doctrines have been professed in former ages, but, always, by only a small portion of the Christian world. Not one of them has ever been the exposition of the *church*. Not one of them has not been again and again condemned by the vast body of professing Christians. The multitude in every age since the earliest

have given their voice against it. How is this to be accounted for?

I know, that "the voice of the people" is not always to be regarded as "the voice of God;" and that it is written, "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil." But what has been believed in every age, in all circumstances of the church, in every land where the Bible is read and studied, bears on its very face the marks of truth—of common sense. At all events, it is not to be railed at; it is not to be discarded, as unworthy notice, "absurd and ridiculous;" it is not to be set aside, unless those who advocate a contrary opinion can show, that they have had superior advantages for arriving at the meaning of the sacred oracles.

Who, then, are these Universalist authors and preachers, that they should lay claim to such superior wisdom? Are they, or have they been, the most profoundly versed of all men in the knowledge of either their own language, or the original languages of Scripture?—men of the most shrewd, and penetrating intellects?—the most subtle of logicians?—the most unfettered by prejudice, superstition, or bigotry?—the most free to think, and determine for themselves?—the most humble, spiritual, devout, and prayerful of men?

Who are these Universalists? The founder of the sect in England was *James Relly*. But who was James Relly, that he should have known more than all the wise men who flourished in the days of Watts, Guyse, Gill, Secker, Potter, Doddridge, Newton, Wesley, Whitefield, Edwards, Jenyns, Witherspoon, Hopkins,

Styles, Watson, Paley, &c. &c.? Mr. Relly was a preacher or exhorter under the direction and patronage of Mr. Whitefield in the first instance, destitute, as far as I can learn, of all knowledge of any other language than his own, of which he knew just enough to enable him to speak and write passably. Such was the man who set himself in array against the giants of that age, as the only one to whom the true meaning of the Bible was known! Will it be said, that Mr. Relly was the only one of that age, who dared to think for himself—an age so fruitful in free-thinkers? The very supposition is absurd.

And who was *John Murray?* Let any man read his "Life," and he will find enough to warrant the conclusion, that Murray was possessed of nothing more than a *very* common English education, utterly unversed in theology—a perfect changeling—a creature of circumstances, and utterly unfitted for the work of expounding the sacred oracles. This last charge is now confessed by our modern Universalists, who are fully persuaded that his views of Scripture were all wrong, save in the one particular of Final Universal Salvation. They have discarded all but that. Neither Relly nor Murray, from aught that appears, had any, even the slightest knowledge of the Hebrew or Greek languages, but gathered their system from the English translation alone.

But neither of these were properly the sires of the race whose tenets we have now considered. Who, then, is Hosea Ballou? His books speak for them-

selves. They show no acquaintance with any language but his vernacular, and of this, even at the present period, a very imperfect one. When he embraced Universalism, he had "never read any thing on the doctrine, the Bible excepted," and was so uninformed, that he did not know, "that there was any thing published in its vindication in the world." In the process of discarding "the doctrine of the trinity, and the common notion of the atonement," he "had the assistance of no author or writer." Nine or ten years after he began to preach, as I have been informed, and after he had embraced most of his present views, he set himself *to learn the English grammar!* Even to this day, Mr. Ballou makes but little pretensions to learning, and of scholarship he has none. Yet he knows better what the Bible teaches than the most erudite scholar of the age! This is the man who has given form and feature to the whole system that has now passed in review before us!! They who have come after him have only polished the rude materials received from him.

Is it not the very height of presumption now, for one of such very humble attainments, one, who, to say the least, is not remarkably distinguished for piety, to set up his own judgment in opposition to nearly all the learning, wisdom, and piety of this and every preceding age, and require us all to follow where he leads? And is it not the extreme of *credulity* for any one to put more confidence in him than in all his coevals and predecessors? Until Mr. Ballou can show us some more valid reasons for reposing in his superior judgment, and knowledge of the will of God, we must be allowed to

" stand in the ways, and see, and ask for *the old paths*, where is the good way and walk therein."

Nor have we any better reason to confide in Mr. Ballou's *disciples*. With a very few, if any, exceptions, they are devoid of all claims to our confidence as expounders of Scripture. Some there are, a very few, who have some acquaintance with the original languages of the Bible. But these, the most of them, acquired that knowledge after that they had embraced Universalism, and sought it for the very purpose of making the people have a greater regard to their preconceived opinions of truth. Like Mr. Kneeland, they were " denied in early life the benefits of a classical education, entering into the ministry totally ignorant of the dead languages." Many of them previously seem to have been " to nothing fixed but change ;" as in the case of Mr. Balfour, who, bred in the church of Scotland, next became an Independent, or Congregationalist, then a Baptist, and at last a Universalist ;—so as to give occasion to an opponent to say that he changed his " opinions annually." This is the *erudite scholar*, to walk in whose light the whole Universalist denomination have forsaken all the ancients and nearly all the moderns ; a man whose " First Inquiry" amounted to no more nor less than this : viz. that the doctrine of future punishment must rest on *Gehenna* alone ; that this word will bear no other application than to the destruction of Jerusalem, and that therefore, as one has it, " there can be no punishment after death for any individual, because Jerusalem was destroyed in this world !"

His writings characterized. Unblushing arrogance.

His "Second Inquiry" is no *inquiry* at all, but a *defence* of views already cherished as he tells us in his Introduction, p. 7; "*believing* that the common doctrines of the devil and eternal punishment have long been a disgrace to the church of God, I have ventured *to attempt their removal.*" His whole labors in these Inquiries have well been characterized by one of the greatest Biblical scholars of the age as "rash and adventurous criticisms, evidently the offspring neither of patient investigation, nor yet of serious desire to know what the Bible has decided, but intended *only* to remove the difficulties which the Scriptures throw in the way of his opinions." His "scholarship" has been well characterized by another, and a Restorationist too, as follows:—"though he makes a *great display* of Hebrew and Greek learning, whoever will take the trouble to examine his writings will readily see, that a great part of his criticisms are quotations from other authors; as to his own criticisms, they are almost invariably criticisms upon a single *term.* And *any novice* who knows the Hebrew and Greek alphabets, can take Parkhurst's Hebrew and Greek Lexicons, and criticise in the same manner." Yet the same writer adds, and very justly, "that his writings show more learning than *judgment!*" But the Universalists are determined to have it that he is *the wisest man of the age;*—"*to whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying 'This man is the great power of God.'*"

Nothing can exceed the assurance, with which nearly every upstart Universalist preacher in the land now

decries the orthodox ministry as blinded, bigoted, and ignorant of the obvious meaning of Scripture-words. They can talk most learnedly of Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna, Satan and Diabolos, Olam, Aion and Aionios; and yet not one in ten of them can tell an Alpha from an Omega, and not one in twenty, if as many, a Beth from a Daleth!

What are the qualifications necessary to become a preacher of this sect? A few years since one of their associations established a rule to require "the study of *theology*, for *six months*, under a Universalist preacher, an acquaintance with English grammar," "logic," and "rhetoric," and "the delivery of a moral or religious essay before a committee." And yet, meagre as was the requisition, it drew forth a loud remonstrance. The first requisition was pronounced ('Mag. and Adv.' III. 335,) "absolutely *useless*," "one of the *abominations* of Partialism," "threatening ill to the welfare of our order," and "the beginning of an evil that will ultimately drive from our order the honest, liberal, and independent-minded, and sink us into the intolerance and despotism of our Partialist brethren." Nay, more, in relation to the requirement of "an acquaintance with the *English Grammar*." Mr. Grosh further observes, (p. 342,)—"We do consider this an *absurd requisition for the candidate* for the ministry—particularly when MANY OF OUR BEST AND ABLEST PREACHERS COULD NOT, EVEN NOW, PASS THE REQUIRED EXAMINATION" !!! The other requisition he considers equally useless, (and so do we,) for a *Universalist* preacher.

Their most popular preachers. Of Mr. Grosh and Mr. Willian son.

In the 'Gospel Anchor,' (II. 141,) we perceive it remarked by a correspondent of the 'Christian Messenger,' that "at the present time (1832,) MANY OF OUR MOST POPULAR AND MOST USEFUL PREACHERS have no pretensions of that sort, and ARE IN FACT UNABLE TO WRITE A SERMON CORRECTLY, that is, *without gross violations of the most common principles of rhetoric and English Grammar!*" And though the editor is "of the opinion that this remark is incorrect," (and the opinion of the one is just as good as that of the other,) he is free to say—"We have no doubt the time has been when a preacher of this stamp might have been popular and useful!" The only difference between the two, is not in the fact, but, in point of time. Such either are, or have been, the men by whose labors Universalism has been promoted. The reader will probably determine, from his own observation, that they both have been and still are. The editor, moreover, observes, concerning this test of ministerial fellowship, (p. 157,) —"This act of the Association seems likely to meet with a pretty *spirited opposition from many of our ministers and editorial brethren.*" Both Mr. Grosh and Mr. Williamson confess that such a test would have excluded them from fellowship at the time they were received; and the latter states expressly, (p. 157,) that he entered into the ministry utterly unqualified to discharge its duties with credit to the cause;" and, he adds, "we sit not down to write a sermon without deeply feeling our want of a more liberal education, and a mind better disciplined and improved by study." This

is the man, who in an 'Exposition of Universalism,' largely quoted in this work, having preached but little more than ten years, with such *wonderful* previous advantages, does not hesitate to pronounce the contrary scheme of doctrine, unscriptural, unreasonable and absurd.

But what shall we say in regard to the distinguished claims of the Universalist ministry, when we hear this same editor confess as follows? (p. 165,) "It is true that committees have been appointed [by the associations,] for the purpose of examining candidates for the ministry, but these committees have never been told, whether they must require a man to be *able to read or write. The consequence has been that every man who has applied has received letters of fellowship;* or at least, *we have never known an instance, where a man has been told that he must qualify himself better in a literary point of view, before he could be placed in the ministerial office!!!*" And to crown the whole, any young man among them may preach, if he please, without fellowship, and before he has attained these wonderful qualifications required by the "Hudson River Association" of Universalists, if he can induce any to hear him.

Must we be called bigoted, superstitious and intolerant, because we decline receiving such men as our spiritual guides, and to admit that they only have arrived at the true meaning of the sacred oracles? Must we be required to forsake the wisdom of all past ages to sit at the feet of such teachers—meekly receiving all their dogmas as inspired truth? Must we give up

long-established principles of interpretation and all confidence in the best lexicographers, Hebrew, Greek, and English, for the oracular lessons of men, who cannot agree that a correct knowledge of English grammar is essential to the Christian ministry? "THEY BE BLIND LEADERS OF THE BLIND; AND IF THE BLIND LEAD THE BLIND, BOTH SHALL FALL INTO THE DITCH."

In now taking leave of the reader, I cannot forbear a word of admonition. Nothing but a thorough conviction of the dreadful delusions of this vaunted creed, and a most ardent desire to do something to open the eyes of the community to the fallacy of this system, and the danger of listening to its syren songs, would have induced me, in the midst of other very numerous and arduous avocations, to have given this exposition to the world. To none of the followers or advocates of Universalism do I owe the least ill-will, or aught but love. "My heart's desire and prayer to God for" them "is, that they might be saved." And for this I have written, labored and pleaded. Having undertaken the investigation for my own satisfaction, I have felt it due to my own congregation, and the community with which I am associated, to spread before them the results of this investigation, and some of the authorities from which my conclusions are drawn.

The reader can now see what Universalism is;—not as represented by its opposers, but as it is exhibited by its founders and warmest friends. Let me ask—Is it "worthy of all acceptation?" Can you lay your hand on your heart and say, that, if you had never heard a

Universalist preacher, or read a Universalist book, or talked with one of their sect, you would have gathered such a scheme from the pages of the Bible alone ?—Nay more; Do you not even now, if you have embraced the doctrine, find it extremely difficult to make it coincide with the plain, direct words of the Bible ? Are you not driven to depend almost entirely on what you either read or hear from your preachers, in order to answer your opponents and stifle the rising doubt in your own bosom ? Have you ever seen the time when, for any considerable period, you were perfectly at rest, and free from all doubt of the truth of this system ? Has not the intelligence of a sudden and awful death frequently disturbed your composure ? Can you say that you are now fully and perfectly confirmed in this faith ?

If you can answer all these questions with perfect confidence in the truth of your creed, it by no means proves that your faith is in accordance with Scripture. You may be of the unhappy number of whom it is said,—(2 Thess. ii. 11,) "For this cause God shall send them *strong delusions, that they should believe a lie.*" And how can you be assured, while under the influence of this blinding spirit, that your faith is not a "strong delusion ?" The firmness with which you believe it is no evidence of its truth. Millions have more firmly believed a grosser falsehood. Do you appeal to the judgment of Christians of all ages ? Alas! your *scheme* was unknown until the present century. The best of men in all ages have condemned your peculiar

A rash confidence. A better way

doctrine. Do you rely on the superior wisdom, learning and piety of your preachers? But ah! you have vastly more reason to believe that they themselves are all the victims of this strong delusion, than that they alone,—few in number, and confessedly, with here and there an exception, illiterate in a shameful degree,—have been able to read and understand the word of God aright. The wise, the learned, the profound, the intelligent, and the mighty in every age are against you. Who are the deluded? Which is the safer scheme—the scheme that presents the strongest claims to your better judgment? With such men and such multitudes of sincere and humble Christians of all sects against you, can you believe that the creed of the Universalist is true? Is it not subjecting yourself to a hazard too dreadful, to trust your interests for eternity to such a forlorn hope?

Oh that you would but make a trial of our faith, our hope, and our joy! One at least of your number, who for years professed not only but preached your faith, and who has since made trial of that which he then despised and destroyed, has assured me again and again, that while a Universalist he was a perfect stranger to that peace, which subsequently has filled his soul to overflowing. Thousands can say the same. And so will it be with you, if you, too, become a humble follower of our Lord and God,—Jesus Christ. "COME THOU WITH US AND WE WILL DO THEE GOOD."

BOOKS OF REFERENCE.

1. The Modern History of Universalism, by Thos. Whittemore: Boston, 1830.

2. The Life of Rev. John Murray, written by himself; Fifth edition, with Notes and Appendix by Rev. L. S. Everett: Boston, 1833.

3. The Plain Guide to Universalism, by Thomas Whittemore: Boston, 1840.

4. The Gospel Anchor; (a weekly periodical;) Clement Le Fevre, Isaac D. Williamson, Editors; Vol. II.: Troy, N. Y. 1832-3.

5. An Exposition and Defence of Universalism, by Rev. I. D. Williamson: New York, 1840.

6. The Universalist Expositor; (a bimonthly periodical;) Vol. I. H. Ballou, and H. Ballou, 2d, Editors: Boston, 1831.

7. The Expositor and Universalist Review; (a bimonthly periodical;) Vols. II. III. IV; Edited by Hosea Ballou, 2d: Boston, 1838, 1839, 1840.

8. A Discussion between Ezra Stiles Ely, D. D. and Abel C. Thomas, both of Philadelphia: New York, 1835.

9. The Universalist Companion, with an Almanac and Register, containing the Statistics of the Denomination for 1841; A. B. Grosh, Editor: Utica.

10. Letters addressed Rev. W. C. Brownlee, D. D., by T. J. Sawyer: New York, 1833.

11. Letters to the Rev. Stephen Remington, by T. J. Sawyer: New York, 1839.

12. A Treatise on Atonement, by Hosea Ballou; Fourth Edition: Boston, 1832.

13. Penalty of Sin ; a Sermon by T. J. Sawyer, Pastor of the Orchard-street church : New York, 1839.

14. The Universalist Union ; (a weekly periodical ;) conducted by P. Price ; Vols. IV. V. VI. ; New York, 1839, 1840, 1841.

15. A series of Lecture Sermons, delivered at the Second Universalist Meeting, in Boston, by Hosea Ballou, Pastor ; Third edition, stereotyped : Utica, N. Y., 1840.

16. Notes on the Parables of the New Testament, by Hosea Ballou ; Fifth edition, stereotyped : Boston, 1832.

17. Reply to Professor Stuart's Exegetical Essays on several words relating to Future Punishment, by Walter Balfour : Boston 1831.

18. Salvation for all Men, Illustrated and Vindicated as a Scripture-doctrine, by one who wishes well to mankind—[Charles Chauncy, D. D.,] ; Boston, 1782.

19. Letters on the Immortality of the Soul, the Intermediate State of the Dead, and a Future Retribution, in reply to Mr. Charles Hudson, by Walter Balfour : Charlestown, Mass. 1829.

20. Evangelical Magazine and Gospel Advocate ; (a weekly periodical ;) Aaron B. Grosh, Dolphus Skinner, and Stephen R. Smith, Editors ; Vols. III. VII. VIII. : Utica, 1832, 1836, 1837.

21. Universalism Illustrated and Defended, by Otis A. Skinner, Pastor of the 5th Univer. Soc. in Boston ; Boston, 1839.

22. An Inquiry into the Scriptural import of the words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna, all translated ' Hell' in the common English version. By Walter Balfour ; Second Edition : Charlestown, Mass. 1825.

23. Notes and Illustrations of the Parables, arranged in the order of time in which they were spoken, by Thomas Whittemore : Boston.

24. A series of Lectures on the Doctrine of Universal Benevolence, by Rev. Abner Kneeland ; Second edition : Philadelphia, 1824.

25. An Examination of the Doctrine of Future Retribution, by Hosea Ballou : Boston, 1834.

26. An Inquiry into the Scriptural Doctrine concerning the Devil and Satan, by Walter Balfour. Second edition : Charlestown, Mass.

27. Three Essays, by Walter Balfour : Charlestown, Mass. 1828.

28. Universalism against Partialism, by Woodbury M. Fernald : Boston, 1840.

29. The Process and Empire of Christ, from his Birth to the End of the Mediatorial Kingdom : A Poem, in 12 books, by Elhanan Winchester.

30. Theological Works of Thomas Paine : Boston, 1834.

31. Letters and Sketches of Sermons, in 2 vols. by John Murray.

32. Universalist Manual, or Book of Prayers, and other Religious Exercises, by Menzies Rayner : New York, 1840.

33. Trumpet and Universalist Magazine; (a weekly periodical;) by Thomas Whittemore. Vol. XIII. : Boston, 1840.

34. The New Testament in Greek and English, by Abner Kneeland. Vols. I. II. : Philadelphia, 1823.

35. The Works of the Rev. Robert Hall, in 3 vols. Vol. III. New York.

36, Pro and Con of Universalism; by G. Rogers; Cincinnati, 1840.

37. New York Observer; (a weekly periodical;) Vol. XIX.; New York, 1841.

J. A. HOISINGTON,

THEOLOGICAL, SCHOOL, CLASSICAL, AND MISCELLANEOUS BOOKSELLER,

No. 156 Fulton Street,

THREE DOORS EAST OF BROADWAY,

NEW YORK.

WHERE BOOKS MAY BE HAD AT VERY REDUCED PRICES.—Students, Clergymen, Literary Gentlemen, and Booksellers from the country, are respectfully invited to examine the subscriber's stock, among which are the following:

Scott's Family Bible in 6 vols. and in 3.
Henry's Family Bible in 6 vols. and in 3.
Clarke's Commentary on the Old and New Testament.
Cottage Bible, 2 vols.
Mant and D. Oyley's do. 2 vols.
Gill's Commentary in 9 vols. and in 3.
Comprehensive Commentary complete in 6 vols.
Encyclopedia of Religious knowledge, 8vo.
Bush's Illustrations of the Scriptures, 8vo.
Companion to the Bible.
Robinson's Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible.
Horne's Introduction to the study of the Scriptures.
Dwight's Theology, Dick's Theology, and all the other systems of Theology now in use.
Baxter's (Rev. Richard,) Works, 4 vols. 8vo.
Stackhouse's History of the Bible, 1 vol. 8vo.
Cruden's Concordance.
Gill's Body of Divinity.
Rev. Wm. Jay's Works, 3 vols. 8vo.
Rev. A. Barnes on Isaiah.
Rev. A. Barnes' Notes on the New Testament, 5 vols.
Hegstenberg's Chrystology, complete, 3 vols. 8vo.
Milner's Church History.
Rollin's Ancient History, various editions.

1

Cudworth's Intellectual System, 2 vols. 8vo.
Jahns' Biblical Archaeology.
Bloomfield's Critical Digest, 8 vols. 8vo.
Bingham's Christian Antiquities, 8 vols. 8vo.
Appleton's (Rev. Jesse,) Works, 2 vols. 8vo.
Mellvill's Sermons, 2 vols. 8vo.
Fox's Book of Martyrs.
Campbell's complete Works, 2 vols. 8vo.
The whole works of Mrs. Sherwood, in 15 vols. 12mo.
The whole works of Hannah More, in 7 vols. 12mo.
The whole works of Mrs. Edgworth, in 10 vols. 12mo.
Robinson's Greek and English Lexicon.
Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon, by Robinson.
Dwight's Theology, 4 vols. 8vo.
Webster's quarto and octavo Dictionaries.
The whole works of Rev. Jacob Abbott.
The whole works of J. S. Abbott.
Encyclopedia Americana, 13 vols. 8vo.
Waverly Novels, complete in 5 vols. 8vo.
Waverly Novels, complete in 27 vols. 12mo.
Leverett's Latin Lexicon.
Southey's Poetical Works.
Dick's (Rev. T.) Works, uniform in 7 vols. 12mo.
Works of Rev. R. Hall, 3 vols. 8vo.

1

Murdock's Mosheims Ecclesiastical History.
Watson's Body of Divinity.
Jones's History of the Church.
Sherlock's Works, 5 vols.
Godman's Natural History, 2 vols
Goldsmith's Animated Nature, 4 vols.
Goodrich's Pictorial Geography, 1 vol. 8vo. plates.
Aikin's British Poets.
Sale's Koran, 2 vols.
Bloomfield's Greek Testament, 2 vols.
Townsend's Chronological Old & New Testament.
Malte Brun's Geography, complete, 6 vols.
Blake's Biographical Dictionary, 1 vol. 8vo.
Marshall's Life of Washington, 3 vols.
Burke's (Edmund,) Works.
Butler's Ancient Geography and Atlas.
Josephus' Works.
Scott's (Sir Walter,) Works, 7 vols. 8vo.
Irving's (Washington,) Works, 12 vols. 12mo.
Coit's Edition of the Bible.
Webster's, do. do. do.
Brooks' Universal Gazatteer.
Robinson's, Malcom's, and other Dictionaries of the Bible.
Curiosities of Literature.
Uphams' Mental Philosophy.
Stuart's do. do.
Brown's, do. do.
National Portrait Gallery, 3 vols. 8vo.
Works of the Rev. John Howe, 2 vols.
Works of the Rev. John Newton, 2 vols.
Magee on the Atonement, 2 vols. 8vo.
Goodrich's Ecclesiastical History.
McKnight on the Epistles.
Watts' (Rev. Isaac,) Sermons.
Massillon's Sermons.
Bishop Berkeley's Works.
Warburton's Divine Legation, 2 vols. 8vo.
Gurnall's Christian Armour, 2 vols. 8vo.
Campbell on the Miracles.
Hugs' Introduction to the New Testament.
Selections from German Literature, by Profs. B. B. Edwards and E. A. Park, Theol. Sem. Andover.
Storr and Flatt's Elements of Theology, translated by Prof. S. S. Schmucker.
Stowe's Introduction to the Study of the Bible.
Stuart's Comment'ry on Hebrews
" " on Romans.
" Hebrew Grammar, 6th edit.
" " Chrestomathy, 3d edition.
" Course of Hebrew study.
" New Testament Grammar.
" Ernesti on Interpretation.
" Letters to Channing.
" Letters to Miller.
" On Greek Accents.
" Study of the Original Languages.
" On Baptism.
Coleridge's Aids to Reflections.
Buttmann's Larger Greek Grammar. Translated from the 14th German edition, by Prof. Robinson. Second edition.
Bush's Hebrew Grammar.
" Notes on Genesis, 2 vols. 12mo.
Campbell's Four Gospels, 2 vols. 8vo. *cloth.*
Cicero on the Immortality of the soul. With notes by Prof. Stuart.
Porter's Lectures on Homiletics and Preaching, 1 vol. 8vo.
Porter's Lectures on Eloquence and Style.
Porter's Analysis of Rhetorical Delivery. Eighth edition.
Porter's Rhetorical Reader; adapted to High Schools and Academies.

Wiseman's Lectures on the Connection between Science and Revealed Religion. With Map and Plates, 1 vol. 8vo.
Woods' Letters to Unitarians,
Woods' on Infant Baptism.
" on the Inspiration of the Scriptures.
Works of Rev. Jesse Appleton, D. D. late President of Bowdoin College, 2 vols. 8vo. with Portrait.
Tyndale's Newe Testamente, with Marginal Readings.
Elements of Popular Theology, by S. S. Schmucker, D. D. 1 vol. 8vo.
Harmony of the Gospels, in Greek with Newcome's Notes. Edited by Prof. Robinson.
Gibbon's Rome, 4 vols. 8vo.
Russell's Modern Europe, 3 vols.
Robertson's Historical Works, 3 vols. 8vo.
Hallam's Middle Ages.
Prideaux's Connections.
Saurin's Sermons.
Plutarch's Lives.
Good's Book of Nature.
Robert Hall's Works 3 vols.
Crabb's Synonymes.
Wesley's Works, 10 vols. 8vo.
Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella.
Bancroft's History of the United States.
Lowth on Isaiah.
Geisler's Ecclesiastical History, 3 vols.
Tholuch's Commentary on John.
Baxter's Saints Rest.
Doddrige's Rise and Progress.
Hume, Smollett, and Miller's England, 4 vols.
Rev. Robert Philip's Works.
Memoirs of the Rev. Wm. Milne, Missionary to China, 1 vol. 12mo.
The Life and Times of Whitefield, Compiled from Original Documents, by *Robert Philip*, 12mo. cloth.
The Life and Times of John Bunyan, by *Robert Philip*, 1 vol large 12mo.
Lady's Closet Library.
The Marys, or Beauty of Female Holiness, 1 vol. 18mo. cloth extra.
The Marthas, or Varieties of Female Piety, 1 vol. 18mo. cloth extra.
The Lydias, or Development of Female Character, 1 vol. 18mo. cloth extra.
Devotional and Experimental Guides, by Robert Philip, with an Introductory Essay, by Rev. Albert Barnes, 2 vols. 12mo. containing
Guide to the Perplexed,
" " Devotional,
" " Thoughtful,
" " Doubting,
" " Conscientious,
" " Redemption.
Young Man's Library, by Rev. *Robert Philip*, with an Introductory Essay, by Rev. *Albert Barnes*, 1 vol. 12mo.
Love of the Spirit, traced in His Work; a Companion to the "Experimental Guides," by *Robert Philip*, 18mo.
Redemption, or the New Song in Heaven, (*Philip's Guides*,) 18mo. cloth.
Physical Theory of Another Life, by the Author of "Natural History of Enthusiasm," 2d edition, 12mo.
Home Education, by *Isaac Taylor*, author of "Natural History of Enthusiasm," &c. 12mo. cloth.
Rev. J. A. James' Works.
The Young Man From Home; in a Series of Letters, by the Rev. John Angell James, 1 vol. 18mo.
James' (*John Angell*,) Anxious Inquirer After Salvation, directed and encouraged, 12mo. cloth.

James' Christian Professor, 3d edition, 18mo. cloth.
Dr. Sprague's Works.
Southgate's Travels in the East. Narrative of a Tour through Armenia, Kurdistan, Persia, Mesopotamia, and other parts of Asiatic Turkey; by the Rev. Horatio Southgate, 2 vols. 12mo. numerous plates and cuts.
Scripture and Geology, on the Relation between the Holy Scripture and some parts of Geological Science; by *John Pye Smith*, D. D. F. G. S. 1 vol. 12mo.
Hare's Parochial Sermons. Sermons to a Country Congregation; by the Rev. *Augustus William Hare.* 1 vol. large 8vo.
Guizot's History of Civilization. General History of Civilization in Europe; by M. Guizot, 12mo. second edition.
Griffin's Remains of the Rev. Edmond D. Griffin—compiled by Francis Griffin, with a biographical Memoir of the Deceased, by Rev. John Mc Vickar, D. D., 2 vols. 8vo.
Bickersteth's Complete Works,—Library edition, 1 vol. 8vo. sheep.
Library of Religious Knowledge, 12mo.
Vols. 1, 2, 3, Tyerman and Bennett's Journal.
Vol. 4, Bates' Harmony of the Divine Attributes.
Vols. 5, 6, Wilson on the Evidences of Christianity.
Worcester's Watts' Psalms and Hymns, entire, with 476 Hymns from various Authors, 12mo.
" " " 18mo.
" " " 32mo.
" Select Hymns, separate, morocco.
Kingsley's Social Choir, vol. I.
Kingsley's Social Choir, vol. II.
Kelley's First Spelling Book, 18mo.
Cogswell's Manual of Theology and Devotion, 12mo.
" Theological Class Book, for Bible Classes and Sabbath Schools, 18mo.
Stowe's Edition of Lowth's Hebrew Poetry, 8vo.
Butterworth's Concordance to the Holy Scriptures, with considerable corrections and improvements, 8vo.
Baxter, Richard, Life, Times and Writings of, 2 vols. 8vo.

SCHOOL BOOKS.

Adam's Latin Grammar, sheep.
" Roman Antiquities, new edition, plates, sheep.
Blair's Lectures, 18mo. with questions, sheep.
Bonnycastle's Algebra, sheep.
Blake's Geography, numerous plates, half-bound.
Bennett's Book-keeping, half roan
" Arithmetic, half roan.
Beck's Chemistry, new edition, sheep.
Blake's Conversations on Chemistry, sheep.
Cobb's Juvenile Readers, No. 1, 2, and 3, half-bound.
Charles XII., French, sheep.
Day's Algebra, sheep.
" Mathematics, sheep.
" Trigonometry, half-cloth.
" Mensuration, "
" Navigation and Surveying, half-cloth.
Emerson's Arithmetic, Nos. 1, 2, and 3, half-bound.
Gale's Natural Philosophy, for schools, sheep.
Græca Minora, sheep.
Græca Majora, 2 vols. sheep.
Hale's United States, with Questions, half roan.
Jacob's Greek Reader, sheep.
" Latin Reader, sheep.

Kirkham's Grammar, sheep.
Leusden's Greek and Latin Testament, sheep.
Lempriere's Classical Dictionary, sheep.
Levizac's French Grammar, sheep.
Lacroix's Algebra, last edition, boards.
Murray's Grammar, 12mo. sheep.
" Exercises, " "
" Reader, " "
" Sequel, " "
Mair's Syntax, "
Neuman and Barreti's Dictionary 18mo. sheep.
Olmsted's Natural Philosophy, 2 vols. 8vo. sheep.
Ostrander's Mensuration, boards.
Olmsted's Astronomy, 8vo. sheep.
Playfair's Euclid, sheep.
Patterson's Cæsar, "
Paley's Philosophy, 12mo. with Questions, sheep.
Ryan's Astronomy, sheep.
Recueil Choisi, "
Valpy's Greek Grammar, sheep.
" Virgil, "
Whelpley's Compend of History, and Questions, sheep.
Webster's United States, 18mo. sheep.
Woodbridge's Geography and Atlas, half bound.
Whateley's Logic, last edition, sheep.
Angell's Union Series of Common School Classics, being a complete series of Spelling and Reading Books, in six numbers, by Oliver Angell, A. M. Principal of the Franklin High School.
Union Series No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.
Frost's Easy Exercises in Composition.
Parley's Common School History.
Smith's Introductory Arithmetic.
Smith's Practical and Mental Arithmetic.
" Productive Grammar.
" Geography and Atlas.
National Reader, by Pierpont.
Introduction to National Reader, by Pierpont.
Young Reader, by Pierpont.
American First Class Book by Pierpont.
Brown's Grammar.
Willett's Geography and Atlas.
" Arithmetic.
Bently's Spelling Book.
Webster's " "
Cobb's " "
Town's " "
Woodbridge and Willard's Geography and Atlas.
Olney's Geography and Atlas.
Mitchell's " "
English Readers.
Daboll's Arithmetic.
Andrew's and Stoddard's Latin Grammar.
" Latin Reader.
" " Exercises.
" Keys to the above.

Quarto Bibles, plain and extra from $1 75 to $10, Pocket Bibles and Testaments of every description.

N. B. All new works of interest received from the different publishers in Philadelphia, Boston and Baltimore, as soon as they are issued from the Press.

Colleges supplied with Libraries and Text Books, on the most accommodating terms. Teachers supplied at wholesale prices.

Country merchants will find it to their advantage to call at 156 Fulton street, 3 doors East of Broadway, before making their purchases. Orders from the country promptly attended to.

J. A. HOISINGTON,

KEEPS constantly on hand all works needed in the various departments of education.

All the different kinds of Bibles, from the plain or Polyglot 32mo. (50 cts.) to the elegant folio, Bagster's London edition, ($50.)

All the Biblical Commentaries in common use: A variety of Hymn Books, with a general assortment of Miscellaneous Works, for sale in any quantity at lowest market prices.

BARNES' NOTES on the New Testament, for Sabbath Schools, Bible Classes, and Families. This work consists of two 12mo. volumes, making about 800 closely printed pages, on the Gospels—one on the Acts of the Apostles—one on the Romans, &c. They are bound uniformly, to sell in sets or singly, as preferred. This familiar Commentary has been found to be admirably adapted to the wants of this age of Sabbath Schools, and has met with unparalleled success.

QUESTION BOOKS about the size of those of the Union Question Books have been prepared also by Mr. Barnes.

CALMET'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, 8vo, and also abridged for young persons, 18mo.

BUTLER'S ANALOGY, with Barnes' Essay; a stereotype edition of this valuable standard work.

RHETORICAL READER, by the late Dr. Porter. Stereotyped.

JAY'S EVENING EXERCISES, for the Closet.

All the Andover Sacred Classical Works for sale at the lowest prices.

JACOB ABBOTT'S FIRESIDE SERIES, with steel engravings.

Vol. I. Fireside Piety.

Vol. II. Mother's Friend.

Vol. III. China and the English.

Vol. IV. Real Dialougues on the "Evidences of Christianity."

JUVENILE FIRESIDE SERIES, just commenced, expressly designed to improve the taste and morals of the young.

Vol. I. The Way for a child to be Saved, with engravings.

Vol. II. Every Day Duty, " "

P. S. These books are from the most popular and successful writers of the day, and well fitted for the Domestic and for the Sabbath School Library.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01029 3332