LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
BX
7921
.L598
v.2

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/universalist02lond

A. Stewart-Frazer.

THE

UNIVERSALIST.

VOL. I.

LONDON:
H. K. LEWIS, 15, GOWER STREET, NORTH.
NEW YORK: HALLOCK & LYON. BOSTON: T. WHITTEMORE.

1850.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY H. K. LEWIS,
GOWER STREET NORTH.

PREFACE.

We were once conversing with a pious member of the Church of England on the many lamentable causes and deplorable results of those sectarian distinctions which obtain among the professed followers of the Lamb. We deprecated those divisions of which denominational distinctions were the deliberate and public avowal; of which many were the result of a difference of opinion of the utmost, sometimes almost ludicrous insignificance, when compared with those momentous principles by which they both still professed to be actuated. But so it is; and here we have another illustration of the proverb, "they strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel."

Our church of England friend reciprocated our sentiment; and lamented, as we do, the narrowing influence thus exerted over the heart, an influence which is one of the first fruits of such divisions.

We were right in our conjecture, that the title of our magazine was a designation our worthy friend had never thought of in connection with religion and theology; and, when we frankly told him we were Universalists, he looked thoughtful and exclaimed, "I like that term!" Not that it conveyed to him all that we associate with it; but by it were suggested principles in which his Christian charity and generous spirit fully sympathized—principles which, in their proper development and final results, embody our highest aspirations, and confirm our most holy faith.

To maintain, on the one hand, that we are not the advocates of party —that our object is unsectarian; and to assert, on the other, a distinct individuality by the assumption of an appellative which must distinguish us from any and all ecclesiastical bodies, may appear somewhat paradoxical. We observe, and we are anxious to be understood, that since a magazine, such as that with whose interests we have the honor to be identified, must have a name to distinguish it from others of the same species, just as the writer must have a name to distinguish him

from other men, that name was adopted which should most honestly, and most accurately express or suggest the principles we designed to advocate. And, so far from proposing to ourselves another addition to those ecclesiastical bodies, of which, as such, the New Testament knows nothing whatever, and to which we believe the Scriptures to be opposed, we have been anxious, and take this opportunity seriously to protest, against any such design. And it is a satisfaction to us to know, that, among our contributors and subscribers, there are members of various communities—Christians of different denominations.

Our great object is sufficiently made known in the pages of the volume which we now have the pleasure to present to our readers. And we verily believe, that the errors which we oppose are as much the cause and fuel of those divisions which disgrace the Christian world, as the truths for which it is our privilege to contend are antagonistic to the spirit of sectarianism and party.

We do not say that all differences of opinion must vanish upon a reception of the doctrine of Universalism; but we do hold that, while those differences may, nay must be materially lessoned, they will not, because they will have no power to diminish that charity which, linked to the throne of the Eternal, embraces all into whom God has "breathed the breath of life."

If Universalists, however, because they are Universalists, are to be cast out of the synagogue, as has been the case in instances which have come to our knowledge, their opponents must not charge them with sectarianism, if they meet together for mutual edification, and the worship of the great Father of all.

We have been accused of the undignified procedure of giving "nick-names," because we have sometimes used the term "*Partialist*" in contradistinction to *Universalist*. We can sincerely say that we never intended any disrespect towards those from whom we differed; and that the use of the term has been resorted to as a simple matter of convenience; just as the designation we have given ourselves best expresses the sentiment which we advocate. It is the regular converse suggested by avowed opposition; and was in use, moreover, long before we adopted it.

We cannot allow this opportunity to pass without congratulating our friends and ourselves upon the present position and cheering prospects of *The Universalist*. Considering the fewness of those who openly defend Universalism—the difficulty of securing publicity for a new periodical,—the few facilities at our command for obtaining an extensive circulation—the opposition with which we have had to contend—our best wishes and largest expectations have been more than realized.

We thank our friends, one and all, for the support and sympathy, the kindly-tendered counsel and forbearance, which we have received at their hands. We thank God, and take courage.

No material alteration will be made in the conduct of *The Universalist.* A greater variety and wider range of subjects may be intoduced, and a more popular style of treatment may be desirable: these we will endeavour to secure.

We propose to commence, in our next volume, an examination, in as plain a style as possible, in order that the unlearned reader may have an opportunity of examining and deciding for himself, all the passages in the Old and New Testaments which are supposed to teach, or imply, the doctrine of eternal torments. The Universalist will thus constitute a complete dictionary on the subject.

Our undertaking would be materially assisted, and our principles more widely diffused, if those who have the means and the opportunity would order one or more copies of each number, in addition to the copy they require for themselves, for gratuitous distribution. Thanks to those who have hitherto kindly acted upon this suggestion.

London, Dec. 1850.

CONTENTS.

—o—

THE

UNIVERSALIST.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
H. K. LEWIS, 15, GOWER STREET, NORTH.
NEW YORK: HALLOCK & LYON. BOSTON: T. WHITTEMORE.

1852.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY H. K. LEWIS, GOWER STREET NORTH.

PREFACE.

THE UNIVERSALIST originated in a desire to promote the discussion and diffusion of those views of the Deity—his will, his nature, and his works, which the existing periodical literature of our country not only failed to represent but to which it was generally opposed. It was suggested that a medium of intercommunication among Christians who believed in the universality of God's love and the divine efficacy and all-sufficiency of the atonement of the Lord Jesus, might be conducive to their mutual knowledge, edification, and comfort, and that such a periodical might be the means of drawing the attention of others to those Scriptures through which we have been led to rejoice in *the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.*

In this and the preceding volume we have attempted, however imperfectly, to realize these objects.

The defenders of the doctrine of Universalism have not, during any period of the Church's history, been numerous. Only here and there and at distant intervals, over the gloom and darkness by which "Christendom" has been enshrouded has light gleamed forth on this subject. God has never, probably, left himself *entirely* without witness. As in nature he is ever testifying to the universality of his providence, so by his word and through his servants has he been witnessing to the universality of his grace. In the past and during the present century various works have appeared on the doctrine in these realms. To the attention of our readers many of these (including nearly all that has been written during the last few years) have been commended, and to us this circumstance is a source of gratification; for, through our labors many have been made acquainted with the productions of writers which would otherwise have remained unknown. It is to be regretted that some of the ablest treatises on Universalism, such as Stonhouse, Chauncy, Relly, Douglas, and others, should by their scarceness, rarely be met with.*

* We are glad that our friend, Dr. Thom,—fully alive to this want—has recently published in the "Universalist's Library," an edition of Jeremiah White's admirable work. We would respectfully urge upon him the desirableness of a continuance of his efforts, and trust that he will be amply sustained by the support and encouragement of all who know and love the truth.

We are deeply sensible of the kindness of those friends who have assisted us by their free will contributions. Physical infirmities have deprived us of the continued assistance of one venerable, pious, and learned friend. (May his declining sun be the serene and peaceful calm of a day whose burden and heat he has borne with cheerfulness, courage, and self-denial.) The hand of death has separated us from another by whose gentle and friendly voice we have been encouraged, and by whose cultivated pen our pages have been adorned. To the Rev. David Thom, D.D, Ph.D, we are placed under lasting obligations; who, although unpledged for a single article, has been among the most strenuous of our friends, and has rendered essential service at the sacrifice of much valuable time, personal comfort, and, we fear, sometimes health. May this noble champion of the truth be yet permitted to wield the sword of the spirit with continued energy and increasing success. We could name many more who have with thorough disinterestedness placed at our disposal papers of much interest and value. But space forbids. We tender to all our best and most grateful acknowledgments.

Universalism is, with us, no human speculation, nor is it a mere sentiment. It is not a figment of our own brain, nor the mere wish of a generous heart. It is a fact—an absolute certainty—an uncontingent truth, divinely originated and divinely revealed. We may search for it in vain among human creeds; we may despair of finding any corresponding sympathy with it in the earthly, sensual, and devilish mind of man. But as true as *God is love*—IT *is:* as true as Jesus *is the Saviour of all men*—IT *is:* as true as *the whole creation groans*—IT *shall be delivered.* As true as Christians now *behold the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, shall* that *glory be revealed* that ALL *flesh may see it* TOGETHER. We rejoice in *the fact,* and would realize more than we have ever yet done the divine and heavenly principles by which it is to be finally consummated.

As it is not of human origin, so neither does its realization depend upon human efforts. We seek to draw the attention of our fellow mortals to the truth—it is well: we are no longer permitted to do so —it is still well. Human agency is nothing. Man, even in relation to inferior things, *is less than nothing and vanity*—towards the realization of Heaven's high purpose *infinitely* less than nothing. *All flesh is grass: the grass withereth, the flower fadeth,* BUT THE WORD OF THE LORD ENDURETH FOR EVER.

CONTENTS.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

JANUARY, 1851.

ON GEN. II. 7.—THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

I observed in the number for last March, p. 49, that "there are perhaps no instances in which the sense of Scripture is so much obscured as by the mistranslation of the words αιων and αιωνιος, so much so, that to this cause the doctrine of endless torment is to be chiefly attributed." Nearly connected with this, and attended with similar results, is the general misconception relating to the immortality of the soul; which, as supposed, is conferred on it, as a constituent of its nature by creation, and therefore indestructible by the most intense and unintermitting sufferings, and amid the total wreck of the material universe. This, however, is not the doctrine of Scripture, but of heathen philosophy: witness the well-known soliloquy, which Addison puts into the mouth of Cato.

"It must be so; Plato, thou reasonest well," &c.

It is also the common opinion, derived from the same corrupt source, that a suffering immortality will be the doom of the far greater part of mankind. But this, I say, is not the doctrine of Scripture, which, on the contrary, teaches that immortality is derived, not from creation, but from redemption—an immortality not of soul, but of a higher principle,—and, of necessity, a universal blessing, excluding all posthumous suffering, whether penal, purgatorial, or corrective. This will fully appear from a comparison of the principal texts relating to the subject, among which that stands first which records the creation of man.

"And the Lord God formed the man, dust of (or from) the ground; and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul,"—person, or animated frame. Gen. ii. 7.

Air is thus the animating principle of all living bodies; for "all have one breath." Eccles. iii. 19. In this there is an analogy between the habitation and the inhabitants: the former consisting of the *heavens* and the *earth*; and the latter of *breath* derived from the heavens, and *dust* derived fom the earth.

We also read thus in the prophet Ezekiel.

"Then he said to me, Prophesy to the wind (margin, *breath*), son of man, and say to the wind, Thus saith the Lord Jehovah, Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe on these slain, that they may live. So I prophesied, as he commanded me, and the breath came into

them, and they lived, and stood up on their feet, an exceeding great army." xxxvii. 9, 10.

This vision exhibits a circumstantial enlargement of the process in Gen. ii. 7, and exemplifies nothing above the reception of mere animal life. Surely it exhibited to the prophet's view men of the same kind as Adam; and yet it tells us of no animating principle beyond what came from "the four winds." He then proceeds to show, in ver. 11—14, that this principle is the type of that higher spiritual life, which God bestows on his people; and which is received only through the new creation in Christ. Paul also, to the same purpose, contrasts the *soulical* nature of Adam with the spiritual nature of Christ. "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening (or life-giving) spirit." 1 Cor. xv. 45. The former is soulical, and possessor of mere natural life; the latter is spiritual, and sole possessor and giver of life and immortality. So far indeed is the Adamic nature from possessing immortality, that we inherit nothing from it but sin and death; but, "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor. xv. 22. Under every point of view, we see the falsehood of the popular opinion. "Cursed is the ground," says the original sentence, "for thy sake, in sorrow thou shalt eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles it shall bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread, till thou return to the ground; for out of it thou wast taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." Gen. iii. 17—19. From this passage we learn, that the whole natural life is that which is sustained by natural food; that the whole natural death consists in the dissolution of the body; and hence this death does not lead to suffering, but that suffering leads to and terminates in death. *Divine philanthropy* (Tit. iii. 4.) has thus appointed the present earthly sinful, suffering, and transitory life, to enhance the value of that which is heavenly, holy, happy, and endless. Hence the call of the Psalmist to universal praise and thanksgiving—"Let everything that hath breath praise Jehovah." Ps. cl. 6,—a call, to which the beloved disciple witnessed, in vision, a universal response: "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. Rev. v. 12, 13.

R. R.

ON THE UNIVERSALITY OF GOD'S LOVE TO MAN.

God has given to us a revelation, in which he reveals himself as a God of Light (1 John i. 5), and by which it is manifest, that God is love (1 John iv. 8), by our minds being illuminated by that same power which said, "Let there be light, and there was light" (Gen. i. 3); for whatever makes manifest is light. Eph. v. 13. It is only by natural light, that we are enabled to see natural things; and it is only by spiritual light, that we can know anything of spiritual things.

Man by his nature is opposed to God (Rom. viii. 7, Eph. ii. 3), and it is only by the light of the Scriptures that he can know anything of himself as to what he really is; or of what God really is (Jer. xvii. 9, Matt. xi. 27, xvi. 17). By divine illumination he is given to know (2 Cor. iv, 6), that the light in him is but gross darkness (Matt. vi. 23); that his wisdom is not only foolishness but enmity to God (1 Cor. iii. 19, Rom. viii. 7); that he can in no degree testify of God; that his reason cannot comprehend revelation (1 Cor. ii. 14); and that it is by faith only, he can know that God created the worlds, by the power of his word, and that because God himself hath said it (Heb. xi. 3, Ps. xxxiii. 6).

Though man cannot testify of God, he by the Scriptures testifies unto man by Jesus Christ, that his love is the great cause of our existence; that it was his especial purpose, before time began, to manifest himself to us his creatures, as a God of Love (Eph. chap. iii.); by his creating the world (Is. xlv. 18), and more especially in his forming man, a being possessed of soul (1 Cor. xv. 45), whose fleshly mind is enmity to God, not subject to his law, nor able to be so (Rom. viii. 7); and yet a being made specially and expressly after the image and likeness of him (Gen. i. 27), the second man, the Lord from heaven (1 Cor. xv. 47), who in the beginning was the word, who was with God (John i. 1), and who was God made manifest in flesh (John i. 14); who was the first born of every creature (Col. i. 15); who created all things, and in whom and by whom all things exist (Col. i. 16, 17); and consequently a being destined by grace and the purpose of God, to be in due time conformed to his Maker, and enjoy him throughout eternity; not by being restored to the state that Adam originally had before his fall; but by being newly created in Christ Jesus, by being put to death in his flesh, and quickened by his spirit, and consequently elevated to a state far superior to any that Adam could of himself, by any possibility have enjoyed. 1 Peter iii. 18.

God formed man of the dust of the ground. and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life only: and man became a living creature (Gen. ii. 7), and was therefore a proper subject to be placed under a negative and prohibitory law, which would have been impossible had he been possessed of real life itself, which is spirit (which is God) because spirit knows no law, for law worketh death. Rom. chap. vii.

Had man obeyed that negative and prohibitory law which God addressed to him, "of all the trees in the garden thou mayst freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die" (Gen. 2. 16, 17), he would have continued at the best but a fleshly minded man; not only entirely ignorant of, but deprived of all immortality and life—which were brought to light only by Jesus Christ and his gospel (2 Tim. i. 10), which alone is the wisdom and the power of God unto salvation (Rom. i. 16, 1 Cor. i. 24), and would have realized at the most but a continuous animal existence.

God displayed his love to man by issuing to Adam that prohibitory law, that he might shew the inability of man to abstain from violating even one prohibition, and that addressed merely to his appetite: that by his act of disobedience he should incur death, and be prevented from taking hold of the Tree of Life himself—lest he should eat thereof and have lived for ever a guilty man (Gen. iii. 22); in order that God might then proclaim his love to him still further in the promise, that "The Seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent, through the bruising of his own heel (Gen. iii. 15); thus the law entered, that the offence might abound,that where the sin of the creature abounded, in the transgression of a single negative and fleshly law, the grace of the glorious Creator might much more abound, in the complete fulfilment of positive and divine laws, by Jesus Christ, to the honour and glory of God, by him, humbling the creature and exalting the Saviour; in depriving the former of his natural life in order to bestow him

through the latter, eternal life as his gift; by putting him to death with Christ in his flesh, to be quickened with Christ in his resurrection by his spirit. Rom. v. 20, 21; vi. 23; 1 Peter iii. 18.

Adam was the source of all mankind; and he, by disobedience to the first prohibition, brought into the world sin and death, and so death passed upon all men (Rom. v. 12): for the whole human race sinned in Adam, for they were all in him, and were possessed of the same common nature with him (Acts xvii. 26, Mal. ii. 10): and consequently the whole world became guilty before God (Rom. iii. 19—22), who hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all (Rom. xi. 32); that the free gift of righteousness, might not be as the offence by the one (Adam) was, namely, sin and condemnation; but that it might be unto the justification of all men unto life, by the reigning of the righteousness of one, even Jesns Christ (Rom. v. 15—21) our Lord. Acts ii. 36.

Adam had in him the seed of death; for he was made of the dust of the ground, and was destined to return to the ground as dust (Gen. iii. 19); he was the clay in the hands of the heavenly potter, who made him first a marred vessel of flesh and blood (Jer. xviii. 4); and as such he could not enter the kingdom of heaven (1 Cor. xv. 50). In order to do so, he had to become changed—his natural body into heavenly body; his natural mind into heavenly mind; and this, by his undergoing death (1 Cor. xv. 53, 54), and by being newly created, and made a partaker of the resurrection state of Christ (Rom. xiv. 8, 9), with mind and body assimilated to him of whom Adam was the type, figure, and shadow, reflected by Christ Jesus the substance. Rom. v. 14.

God executes all his threatenings, and fulfils all his promises.

He caused the kingdom of God to be preached by John, until whose coming the law and the prophets were; and as it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail (Luke xvi. 16, 17); therefore it is, that in due time the seed of the woman appeared. God took upon himself the nature of man (Heb. ii. 14, 16) with sin attached—was born of a woman, and consequently was under the law, Gal. iv. 4. It behoved Christ to be born of a woman, in order to become subjected to law. He appeared in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom. viii. 3), but was sinless himself (1 Pet. ii. 22, Heb. iv. 15); and became emphatically the God-man, God with us, Mat. i. 23. The word was made flesh (John i. 14), to whom law was meat and drink, his meditation and delight (Ps. cxix. 97); for his whole life consisted in living in perfect obedience, in thought, word, and deed, to all God's statutes, judgments, and ordinances; for he had the mind of God, by which he crucified the flesh, with its affections and lusts, Gal. v. 24, vi. 14.

It was to Christ, the faithful and believing one, that all divine law was properly addressed; and it behoved him to fulfil all law (Mat. v. 17, 18); and to be delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification (Rom. iv. 25); that all things might be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning him, Luke xxiv. 44—46.

God having declared that the sacrifices of bulls and of goats satisfied him not Is. i. 11—14; and that it was impossible for their blood to take away sins (Heb. x. 4), and yet without blood being shed there could be no remission of sins (Heb. ix. 22); provided himself a special sacrifice in his own well beloved son, who appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself Heb. ix. 26; and through the eternal Spirit, to offer himself without spot to God (Heb. ix. 14), to whom he saith that sacrifice and offering for sin thou wouldst not (Ps. xl. 6), neither hadst thou pleasure therein (Heb. x. 8), 'Lo I come in the volume of the book it is written of me to do thy will O God" Heb. x. 7.

In due time Christ was to give himself a ransom for all (1 Tim. ii. 6) to die for the ungodly (Rom. v. 6). although he had obeyed every law positive and negative, that by dying and tasting death for every man (Heb. ii. 9) he might by this last act of obedience, destroy law by fulfilling it, and become the end of

it for righteousness unto every one that believeth (Rom. x. 4); and that he might by his being raised from the dead, and made perfect (Heb. v. 9), through the righteousness of his faith (Phil. iii. 9), bring in everlasting salvation to a guilty and condemned world; for God so loved the world, that he sent his only begotten Son into the world (1 Jo. iv. 9). to be the propitiation for its sins (1 John iv. 10), to die the just one (Acts iii. 14, vii. 52, xxii. 14), for the unjust (I Pet. iii. 18), that by his lifting him up and raising him from the dead (Acts ii. 24), the prince of this world should be cast out (John xii. 31). and all men be drawn to himself (John xii. 32), and be saved by the ressurrection life of Christ and know that which the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh (Rom. viii. 3). Christ himself did; he put away sin for ever, through the offering of his body (Heb. x. 10); that the gospel might be there proclaimed.

Be it known unto you men and brethren that by this man is the forgivenes of sins (Acts xiii. 38), whose name is called the Word of God (Rev. xix. 13), and whose testimony is the spirit of prophecy (Rev. xix. 10).

As it is appointed unto all men once to die and after that its execution; so Christ was once offered (Heb. ix. 27, 28) on the accursed tree, being made a curse for us (Gal. iii. 13), that he might redeem us, the whole family of man, from the power of the law which is death; and this he did on the cross when he cried it is finished (John xix. 30). He was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; therefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God (Phil. ii. 8—11): this hath the Lord, the just God and Saviour, sworn by himself Is. xlv. 21—23.

Christ was faith itself embodied (Heb. xi. 1, xii. 2): he believed in God and therefore he knew his body would be redeemed from the power of the grave (Ps. xlix. 15), and his soul raised from hades the third day, and that God would receive him (Matt. xvi. 21). He died, he brought law to an end in himself by fulfilling it, and he made it honourable; he destroyed law also, by becoming the end of it, and thereby destroyed sin itself; for the strength of sin is the law (I Cor. xv. 56); and where no law is there is no transgression, Rom. iv. 15. He by his death reconciled a guilty world to God, and destroyed death in himself (2 Tim. i. 10). and him that had the power of death, that is the devil (Heb. ii. 14, Rev. xii. 9), he also underwent the punishment of hades and destroyed its power, Rev. xx. 13, 14.

The death of Christ was introductory to his resurrection from the dead (John x. 17, 18, xii. 24, 25), and his ascension to his father. He had power to lay down his life and had power to take it up again; no man took his life from him, he was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Rev. xiii. 8), the type and antitype of the slain female lamb (Lev. iv. 32), and of every Jewish sacrifice.

In due time God raised his soul from Hades (Acts ii, 31), and did not suffer his body to see corruption (Acts xiii. 37); He rose from the dead triumphant over law, sin, death, and hades, leading captivity captive (Ps. lxviii. 18, Eph. iv. 8), and was received into glory, 1 Tim. iii. 16. By his resurrection, he destroyed completely the power of the grave over the bodies of men; and by destroying death, by undergoing hades, also destroyed its power over the souls of men (Hos. xiii. 14), and became an ocean of life to pour out his spirit upon all flesh, Joel ii. 28.

In his resurrection soul became deified, and body became glorified; he ascended to heaven with glorified body and glorified mind, to sit for evermore at the right hand of God, Mark xvi. 19. Heb. x. 12.

As Christ's body was laid in a grave, in which no man had before lain (John xix. 41); so his death was one through which no man had ever before passed; it was a death peculiar to himself, and in rising from that death, he became the first fruits of them that slept, 1 Cor. xv. 20. He died as the Son

of man, Mary being his mother; he was raised from the dead as the Son of God, God being his father; and it is Christ who liveth, and was dead and is alive for evermore, who has the keys of hades and of death (Rev. 1. 18). He ascended to his father and to our father, to his God and to our God (John xx. 17), and gave gifts unto men (Ps. lxviii. 18), that where he is in spirit, we, all his creatures, ultimately may be also, John xvii. 24. Herein the wisdom of God is love to the world: for Christ is the power and wisdom of God (1 Cor. i. 24), and is our righteousness and sanctification (1 Cor. ii. 30, Jer. xxii. 6), the Saviour of all men but especially of them who believe, 1 Tim. iv. 10.

The specially saved of God are his elect ones (Is. lxii. 12), whether Jews or Gentiles, for they were redeemed from among men and nations as the first fruits unto God and to the Lamb, Rev. v. 9; xiv. 4. They are the true Israel of God, the leaven that ultimately leaveneth the whole lump of humanity, and are they who are kept by the power of God through the faith of Christ unto salvation and glory, 1 Peter i. 5.

The love of God is manifested by the whole work of him, the Righteous one, the Prince of peace (Is. ix, 6), the only true God and eternal life (1 John v. 20), who declared, because I live, ye shall live also (John xiv, 19,); He did the will of God who sent him, and finished his work (John iv, 34), even the works of his heavenly father, John ix. 4, xvii. 4.

(To be continued.)

A LITERARY EVENING WITH THE REV. DR. THOM OF LIVERPOOL.

BY A DOCTOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG.

The winter evening closes in. Sigismund, my friend, is with me: we are looking silently into the depths of the red-coal fire, for the fanciful faces of the wild and the grotesque; and our German meerschaums, now smoked out, are lying on the stand before us. Two strokes on the door knocker, and a quick departing step—it is the postman! the bearer of a letter with a Chinese device. I break, and read.— Sigismund, old college friend, cast aside thy grim reveries —see no more faces of the grotesque from out the live coals of my fire; here is an invite from our friend Dr. Thom. One evening, dear Sigismund, with such a man, is worth myriads of nights with your world's witlings; so speed the time till then, then to be most repaid. The interim has flown; and we, —that is to say, Sigismund (pure lover with a worship true of the great and good wherever found) and myself—stand within the garden gate of 3, St. Mary's Place. *Open Sesame*, hall door, and door of parlour, and, the centre of a group of eager listeners, we come at once upon the Doctor; an elderly man, say in years about fifty; in height, slightly above the middle; in figure, moderately spare; and in face, bearing a striking resemblance to the late Sir Walter Scott. A forehead, strikingly bold and well developed; high, broad, and full; disfigured, however, most abominably, by an execrable old scratch, red Welch wig, or rather brown George, put on we should say without the slightest reference to back or front; and which said antiquated peruke, we are necessitated to believe, the Doctor must have picked up in the purlieus of rag fair. O that a head so great should be imprisoned in a wig so vile! The eye though! well said Lavater, that it was the window of the soul. It is so here indeed! A light, keen, sparkling grey, ever shifting, never at rest—fitful as a summer breeze; a nervous eye—most nervous, falling before you, with an odd kind of abashment when you try to meet it, and felt to be probing you, and searching down into

the chambers of your spirit, when your glance is averted from it. But softly, and while we are sipping our coffee, made and poured out by the hands of the Doctor's amiable lady, let us reconnoitre the group around us.

There are many around; but there are three, that it would be *unpardonable* to pass. Look at that tall, gaunt, sun-burnt, man; straight as a dart—flexible as a bow—slender as a reed; unlicked looking as a backwoodsman, and supple as a king's wrestler; sparing of speech as an oracle, and as more than an oracle gifted. That is Emerson, the transcendentalist. He has been lecturing to the members of the Roscoe club (now broken up, for this is nigh four years back); and has now come to sup with Dr. Thom, prior to his departure for America; his sentences are jerked out; his tone is monotonous in the extreme; but the twilight of heaven is in his eye, and his words are as "*apples of gold, set in baskets of silver.*"

Observe yon pale, thoughtful, quiet personage, with voice low and gentle, and converse high as with the gods.—"O! broad, globe-like, massive forehead, stored with tomes of thought; what working brain is chronicled within thee?" —That of Philip James Bailey. The author of *Festus* stands revealed!

And, who is that exceedingly pompous, but exceeding gentlemanly man, who talks so loud, and so nasally, and takes snuff, direct from *Taddies*, out of those two immense boxes;—a most aristocratic handsome man in appearance indeed! —a princely autocrat with a fine old officer-like air with him that stamps him with a most courtly impress; forehead high and pyramic; hair and whiskers white and silvery; and converse, elegant and well-read? That is Edwin Atherstone the poet, the author of *The Fall of Nineveh*, a poem, which in so far as mere painting and beautiful colouring is concerned, stands almost unsurpassed.

But stay, yet once more, what elderly gentleman is that who is now speaking to Dr. Thom, with curly grey hair, stooping gait, white cravat, and the most benevolent air that it is possible to conceive. If ever the milk of human kindness does indeed flow, in angel channel, through the midst of human soul, we cannot resist, as we gaze upon him, feeling certain, most certain, that it flows free and full, and meandering, through the entirety of the heart, to which that face belongeth.—Whose face is it? That of Principal McHveen, of the Lower School of the Liverpool Mechanics' Institution. And of what is he speaking? Upon human nature! he is the champion of the humanities—he is telling what God made man—but, somewhat, says he, "lower than the angels," and he is urging, what God's boundless love may *yet* do, for the first fruits of his creation; that life is an education designed to renovate, ultimately, and that man, shall in the end, come out like gold tried in the fire. We say not that we are with him, nor do we assert the converse; but whether or not, his philanthropy and benevolence is undoubted.

But our honoured host, were he longer forgotten, "*it were as a gap in our great feast and all things unbecoming.*"—Dr. Thom shines in the pulpit; he is without doubt the finest analytic and exegetical preacher that we have ever heard. Yet, when we see him *here*, the vesper-star of the domestic and the literary circle, we are tempted to believe that he shines even still more, though with another kind of radiance.

Kind, nay affectionately so, he puts everyone at perfect ease in a moment—and, with the nicest and most delicate consideration, his sole aim seems to be, to elicit the peculiar talent of each, be it what it may.—"You Sir, are a Conchologist, let us ramble upon the shore together"—"a geologist, you my friend, let us delve into the marls and stratas"—ah! "and you are a poet too; your latest song, I pray, and what of Tait and Bentley"? So in effect says the Doctor to each of his guests, adapting himself with a most rare felicity to the peculiar talent of each, guaging as it were intuitively each one's mind, and *not* "fooling" it, but exhibiting it most advantageously, to the top of its bent. By so doing, Dr. Thom causes as it were, each of his guests, to be *in love with each*, merging

himself, in intent, but only to glow with a brighter, though most self unconscious light; this, in an host, is a most rare quality to meet with, and Dr. Thom possesses it to a most remarkable extent, in fact it is characteristic of the man; and by this most happy knack of action on his part, he makes each of his guests feel as if the entertainment had been given and got up expressly on his, or her, account: nor is it on high, literary, and scientific subjects only, that he can elicit the sense of each; he can *descend*, nay, such is his good nature, and so manifestly great his desire to make each at ease, with each, and with himself, that we firmly believe, that if a fishmonger were present, the Doctor would have from him the full price current of haddock, mackerel and turbot, and the state of the Billingsgate market. No courtly grandee, in a word, no fine old nobleman of a bygone school, could more completely do the honours of his castle, than does Dr. Thom go through the ceremonies of 3, St. Mary's Place. What is this? the tray! yes! for even Philosophers must eat, and the best of poets, are not chameleons. What! oyster patties? yes, even so, and cheesecakes dainty enough to tempt an anchorite with: tongue too! a work of supererogation that! for we have had the best all evening; a little honey, nuts, and almonds also? yea! and washed down with a goodly vintage! But hark! the chimes of Edgehill church are ringing twelve, and we have a duty to perform. It is Dr. Thom's birthday! we must drink his health! Principal McHveen says that I am to propose it. I speak feebly and hurriedly, something I know not what, for my spirit is stirred within me, and my heart is in my mouth, and the tears are in my eyes. But, I know what I *wish*, if I know not what I speak, "Health! Health! In body, soul, and spirit, to one of the great good men of God's creation, and each future birthday happier than the last.

It is over: our *nox* "*ambrosianæ*" hath ended!! Sigismund and I, are home again. And, hark! Sigismund, dear friend, a *word of words*, in your ear, "We will no longer look for shadows in the sea-coal fire, for their are warm hearts in the world *yet*, and the age of intellects has *not* departed."

Liverpool, December 18th, 1850.

Wednesday Night.

OF THE USE OF PASTORAL IMAGES IN THE FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE OF SCRIPTURE.

Continued from Page 204.

In continuation of the subject of the use of pastoral images in the figurative language of Scripture, according to our promise as given in the last September number, it is intended to enter into some more minute particulars respecting pastoral life in general with its various circumstances, as typically used in Scripture; to exhibit some slight views of that life such as it was and still is in the East; and also to make some farther reference to the typical character of the natural sheep.

There are certain conditions of the shepherd's life, not only in the East, but in most continental countries which never can have come under the observation of such persons as have had no experience beyond our British Islands; in which protected regions, though there may be many extensive sheep walks, there can be none which are infested by savage beasts—none in which the shepherd is liable to fight to the death for his sheep, or in which the sheep are in actual peril of their lives whilst seeking their daily sustenance.

It needeth to go beyond the sea-girt shores of Britain to form by experience

any correct ideas of the habits and dangers of the shepherd and his flock, in countries yet uncultivated where there are immense tracts of waste land and deep forest coverts, where it is impossible to protect the pasture grounds on all sides from beasts of these deserts and the coverts of these forests—where the shepherd must be not only a watcher but a warrior, and where, in the faithful pursuit of his calling, he must not only oftentimes peril his life but endure perpetually all those sufferings so pathetically described by Jacob in his address to Laban, Thus I was—In the day the drought consumed me and the frost by night, Gen. xxxi. 40. In his wanderings, the pastor must sometimes encounter those frozen blasts, which, passing over the fields of eternal snow, in some Alpine eminence above the clouds, rush down the gullies of the mountains into his pastures, freezing the brooks and streams in their passage and turning them as it were into stone; and, again, he must be parched and dried up with the burning breath of the deserts of the south—a slender tent, a den or cave in the dust, or the shadow of a rock, being his best temporary residence, whilst his food and clothing must be uncertain and scant as those of him "*Whose garment was of camel's hair, and his meat locusts and wild honey,*" his life in no way resembling that of the shepherd of the Arcadian fancy—which in very truth might better fit the condition of those shepherds of Israel to whom woe is proclaimed in Ezekiel xxxiv, because they feed themselves and do not feed their flock; the whole existence of the shepherd being one exercise of anxiety for the preservation of his sheep—of which the best that can be said is, that they know his voice, and when they hear it that they follow him, for so he teaches them to acknowledge him though not so as he knoweth them, for the shepherd knows all his sheep individually and cares for those especially which are most in need.—Luke xv. 4—6.

The instrument with which the shepherd rules and defends his flock is that which is commonly called the crook, the figure of which is adopted and used universally in the formularies of the great Anti-christian hierarchy. Who has not heard of the pastoral staff?

The ideal meaning of this word staff or rod, in its largest sense, is an extension of power; the length of the rod being added to that of the arm, extending the power and influence of that arm by the length of the rod itself. The figurative signification of this natural object depends upon the character of the hand that wields it, and according to this nature is the translation given in many instances, as that of sceptre when it is placed in the hand of a king, that of rod of correction in the hands of a magistrate, that of an extension of a family when spoken of a son or descendant of such family, &c.; and when applied to pastoral images, being no other than the shepherd's staff or crook as is proved in several pasages, especially in Psalm. xxiii. 4, "*Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death*"—"*thy rod and thy staff they comfort me;*" and again Micah vii. 14, "*Feed thy people with thy rod, the flock of thine heritage which dwell solitarily in the wood in the midst of Carmel &c.*

As it behoved the Lord the Saviour in his Divine and human nature to fill all space, so is he the antitype of every beautiful and desirable type, and hence in our view of pastoral imagery we find him as the *rod* or *crook*, or as it were the created instrument in his own hands; as the shepherd, the uncreated or divine

essence. In the shepherd's tent we find a figure denoting the wandering, unsettled and very uncertain nature of the shepherd's life, extending to that of the life of every man in the flesh, not excepting that assumed by our Lord, as saith Isaiah xxxviii 12, "*Mine age is departed and is removed from me as a shepherd's tent:*" neither is there any doubt, were there leisure to pursue the subject, that there is no particularity in the accustomed mode of the shepherd's life which might not be used with advantage in helping the apprehension of this same subject in a spiritual point of view. That our Lord is the true shepherd there can be no dispute amongst Christian men, his own declaration being sufficient to set the matter at rest at once and for ever; and that he is the Pastor of all the human race, which shall hereafter be as one fold under himself, the one shepherd, is also declared. Yet it is certain that the extension of his rule as a shepherd does not now appear, and in fact is not understood to exist at all, by any of those men who are of the world and only of the world. Of these many doubt the very existence of any flock of the Saviour's keeping; and we, as believers, are also taught that this flock is very small, and has been so and shall continue to be so till the time of the further manifestation of the true shepherd shall arrive. On this point there can be no question; for there is not now and never has been any time or place in which the true sheep of his flock (that is those whom he has marked with his own signet) could gather together, nor even can be, until their covenant head, their chief shepherd shall appear—notwithstanding which—that is, this discouraging view of the case at this and at all times of the present dispensation, there is no order of figures, taken from natural things which by their use in the spiritual language of Scripture gives more glowing, more overpowering, more extensive assurances of the divine love than the one under present consideration; the subject beginning as it were with the most touching instances of individual love, as in Isaiah. xl 11, and going on to such expressions as could not, it might be thought, be limited or made exclusive by any ingenuity which could be used by those most incapable of admitting any enlarged ideas of divine love. Let us refer to Ezekiel xxxiv, which whole chapter speaks of the dealings of the chief shepherd with his flock and with those who rule among them as inferior shepherds; or rather as persons taking upon themselves to act as representatives of the chief shepherd, in which chapter, as if it were to silence the scoffer for ever, this expression is used in the last verse, "*And ye my flock, the flock of my pasture are* MEN *and I am your God saith the Lord God.*" Ezek. xxxiv. 31.

Observe again what David says, Ps. xcv. and c. in which last especially, all nations are called upon to make a joyful noise unto the Lord, that is, because they with all of us are his people and the sheep of his pasture. Isaiah also says chap. liii. in speaking of his fellow men, "*All we like sheep have gone astray,*" &c. If more were wanting to prove, who are meant by the flock in the largest sense, we need only consult many passages in the New Testament and especially the latter part of the 10th. of St. John.

It must however be carefully observed, that although there is full assurance from Scripture that all mankind will be ultimately admitted as members of one flock under one shepherd (else how would God be all in all?) yet that they are not so now—there not being a place on earth, as there never has been a time

since the Apostolic age, in which there has been more than two or three as it were met together in the name of the Lord Jesus; and the reason of this is that the little flock on earth now in this present day has no visible head, therefore as the prophet writes, Ezek. xxxiv. 5, 6, *And they were scattered because there is no shepherd; and they became meat to all the beasts of the field, when they were scattered. My sheep wandered through all the mountains and upon every high hill: yea my flock was scattered upon all the face of the earth, and none did search or seek after them.*

But in order to do justice to this subject of the use of pastoral images in Scripture the discussion should rather extend over volumes than a few sheets, for if we have touched a few of the most important points we have done justice to no one of them, not even such justice as we could have done with more space: and others there are, to which we have not even alluded. One of these is the distinction between the goat and the sheep, both of which creatures, as victims under the Mosaic ritual, typified our Lord, and therefore neither of them is naturally significant of what is evil, though when both appear in Matt. xxv. the one is excluded from and the other admitted into the kingdom of heaven until the end of the age of that kingdom, a difficulty, which with some others, has already given way under the examination of a certain class of types which bear, though somewhat indirectly, on our present subject.

We here conclude with this humble petition in behalf of that little flock, of which we trust that some of us at least are the members through the favour of that Lamb who now stands on Mount Sion, that we may not be permitted to mingle with those of our brethren in the flesh who thrust with side and with shoulder, and at the diseased, with horns; but ever be as those with whom our Shepherd has made a covenant of peace, and so shall we dwell safely in the wilderness and sleep in the woods.

M. M. S.

A STORY OF GRACE.

CHAPTER I.

The family of the Richardsons was the most ancient in the town of B——. The old house, which for many generations had been known as their residence, well represented to the eye, with its gables and antique window-casements, what the name of Richardson conveyed to the ear. There was antiquity in both: and in both, the present James Richardson cherished a pride and satisfaction which it was very natural to entertain. Who would ridicule him for attachment to a home with which time had entwined so many interesting associations? and who would chide him for partiality to a name untarnished by dishonour, and brightened by a thousand kind and generous actions?

Like his ancestors, Mr. Richardson was a tradesman, and carried on an old established business by which he was enabled to bring up his family respectably, and provide for them a more liberal education than most people moving in a similar sphere cared to do.

At the time our narrative commences, the elder son had been long enough in his father's employment to prove a valuable assistance; and the younger,

who was just leaving home to be placed in a house of business in London, was the object of unusual parental solicitude, lest he should be led astray by the temptations to which he might be exposed, unguarded by those wholesome restraints, and unaided by the good example which home supplied. George, now a youth of fifteen, was not wanting in respect for his parents, and appreciated the anxious interest they manifested in his behalf.

Mr. Weldon, the party to whom he was to be apprenticed, was slightly known to his father, and by the high recommendation of a mutual friend, he readily placed confidence in him; and, at the appointed time, he accompanied his son to his new situation; nor did he part from him without affectionately reminding him of those wise counsels he had been exhorted to follow.

Mr. Weldon was a man of integrity; but so absorbed was he in his business that he found little time for the cultivation of his mind; and, though a member of the Christian society, meeting at the Tabernacle, Moorfields, recently formed by that remarkable individual, the Rev. George Whitfield, his regular attendance in his place on Sunday, and at the communion once a month, was all the manifested sympathy he had for the church to which he belonged. We would not say that he was deficient in Christian principle, but it did not assume that form, which, in the eyes of his fellow members, consistency with his profession required.

Mr. Richardson requested Mr. Weldon to take his son with him to his place of worship, without thinking it of consequence to ask him of what persuasion he might be; and accordingly George accompanied his master to hear the great preacher. Hitherto he had troubled himself but little about religion; he had been trained to venerate the Church, and might be said to *imitate* his father in the decent observance of those duties which sufficed to satisfy the requirements of their religion.

It is not necessary to narrate all that subsequently transpired between this period and the time when George began to think and judge for himself, as one personally interested in the subject of religion. He pleased his master, and was comfortable in his situation; and his friends were gratified by intelligence of his well-being, and by his occasional visits amongst them.

The period of apprenticeship was rapidly drawing to a close; and George was anticipating manhood, independence, and self-support.

Mr. Weldon had for some time observed an unusual seriousness in his young assistant, and was glad of an opportunity which ere long presented itself, of enquiring into the cause of it. George was naturally open-hearted, and did not hesitate to admit that he had latterly lost that vivacity and buoyancy of spirit which had distinguished his character; and acknowledged that the subject of religion was the cause of perplexity and anxiety. He had recently heard a sermon which had had the effect of making him feel how ignorant he was of that which now appeared to him of the greatest importance; and he appealed to his master for advice and guidance.

It would be unjust to say that Mr. Weldon had no sympathy whatever for a person in George's state of mind; but the absorbing nature of his business, engrossing the multitude of his waking thoughts, unfitted him for the position in which he found himself suddenly placed. Feeling awkward and perplexed,

he resolved as most convenient under the circumstances, to refer the case to one of the officers of the Society. He therefore proposed to the young man an interview with one of the deacons, and kindly recommending the study of the Word of God, and private prayer, terminated the conversation.

Some weeks elapsed before the interview took place, during which time George failed not diligently and prayerfully to read the Word of God. It is not surprising that one great source of inquietude was the impression produced by those urgent appeals, those vivid representations of the dreadful condition in which man is placed by the corruption of his nature and his actual transgression against God's holy law; and the tremendous consequences in which all was to issue in a future world. Frightful were the pictures which had been presented to his mind; and while they filled him with alarm, he felt at a loss to reconcile them with the character of God, which the preacher as well as the Scriptures declared was love and pity to the guilty and the lost.

The first interview was followed by others at no distant intervals; and, at length, George was proposed for membership in the Whitfield Society. He had, according to the report of the worthy deacon, become "hopefully converted," and "a new creature in Christ," and according to the testimony of his master, he had "become himself again." In truth George had gone through a great deal; and it was a slow and laborious process by which he had at length attained a sort of conviction that he was of that little flock which God had exclusively loved from all eternity, and for which Christ had shed his blood. And tremblingly did he taste the consolation which he was told it was now his privilege to partake. Had it not been for a kind and benevolent heart—a prominent feature of the Richardson character—he might have grown indifferent to the condition of those who were supposed to be uninterested in the covenant mercy of God—who were shut up—not to the faith—but to the doom which their original depravity and consequent sins had assigned them.

His term of apprenticeship had expired; and, by the high recommendation of his late master, he had obtained a responsible situation in a house in the same line of business, but carrying on much more extensive transactions. Here he acquitted himself honourably and secured the confidence of the partners of the firm. It was George's delight to study the Word of God; and, as doctrines which were regarded as essential truths of that Word presented themselves more clearly to his mind, and as their mutual relation began to be perceived and gathered up into something like system, he was pleased when he could get the opportunity of conversing with the deacon who had had the interviews with him previous to his admission into the Tabernacle Society, and who had ever since taken a lively interest in his spiritual welfare.

Actuated by a sincere desire to live to the glory of God, he had become an honourable and active and useful member of the church to which he belonged; and had so far advanced in the acquirement and experience of the religious views which were current among them, as to be looked up to as an "established Christian." Considering how much there was in his adopted creed to depress, his consolation might be said to abound; and it was thought that he enjoyed as much of the light of God's countenance as was consistent with his personal safety! He was humble and simple; and without submitting his feelings to a

very strict analysis, he had as good a hope through grace as he thought it was the privilege of any uninspired man to enjoy.

But ere long his mind was to become the arena of another conflict. A circumstance was about to transpire in connection with the society which was to lead him to a thorough sifting of his present views and very materially affect his future course.

REVIEW.

Why is Popery Progressing? By David Thom, D.D. Ph.D. Second Edition. London: H. K. Lewis.

It comes not within our province, and it is not therefore incumbent upon us, as Universalists, to take part in the strife which is now agitating the mass of the people of this realm.

We cannot, however, but feel an interest in passing events which are more or less to influence and mould the future of men's minds, religious opinions, and ecclesiastical institutions; and gloomy and fearful as are the forebodings of the enemies of Rome, we are sanguine as to the good which sooner or later, under the all-wise and sovereign controul of the Almighty, will be evolved.

To get attention drawn to the subject of religion is good; and if, by means of the agitated waters of ecclesiastical commotion, they should be led to seek the side of the still waters of the sacred scriptures, there to see the calm placid reflection of eternal truth, an invaluable end will be secured.

Of the *brochure* which now claims our attention, and which first appeared some fifteen years ago, the well-known and justly-esteemed writer has now most opportunely published a second and cheap edition.

That popery has been making considerable advances in this country during the last quarter of a century, and progressing each year at an increased ratio is not denied by any party. But *why is popery progressing?* This is the question our author proposes to answer in his pamphlet. This is the question which, during the last few weeks, has been answered a thousand times and in almost as many different ways. An answer has been returned from the Vatican. Providence has been singularly indulgent!—England has been most mercifully dealt with; rarely has a country which has once been cut off on account of her sins been grafted into the good olive tree again. And his Holiness wonders at the amazing forbearance and goodness of the Almighty in achieving what has just been consummated on behalf of England, now restored to her orbit amongst the fair countries under the protection of the great head of the visible church.

Angrily and loudly do the anti-Roman-Catholic emancipationists announce the accomplishment of their predictions. It is just what they knew and said would happen! They foresaw it all, and they said so at the time. Cut down those parliamentary bulwarks of our protestant constitution, and what can you expect but to have the enemy coming in like a flood? alas! for the spurious liberality and truckling policy of a vacillating ministry!

Why is popery progressing? And who answers next? The party to whom attention is drawn by the last reply, to be sure. It is, of course, quite preposterous to suppose that the prime minister of England should have contemplated the fact upon which the question is raised, and which he will now answer forthwith. While he is careful to make known that his antipathy to the scarlet lady is extreme, he does not fear foreign aggression a bit, but he *will* answer the question (better let it alone, perhaps, we should have said had we happened to be of the cabinet) and what does he say? Traitors in the camp —unworthy sons of the church, with their intoning of prayers, their mummeries,

vestments, candles, auricular confession, &c.—dreadfully alarmed at this, and not at all to be wondered at that the Pope should, &c.

Ten thousand voices echo the reason assigned in the letter to the Bishop of Durham. The premier has struck the right note surely, and is not unhappy to find himself so well sustained!

But another reply is given even while we are considering what next, and this is specially addressed to the ear of the noble Lord, who is by this time well nigh overcome by his intoxicating popularity, and in accents loud enough for any one to hear who will listen. The answer comes from St. Barnabas, the edifice which the noble Lord had the satisfaction to assist in rearing, the edifice in which for seven long years the noble Lord has been accustomed to say "amen" to Mr. Bennett's "mutterings," in the support of whose institutions and peculiarities the noble Lord has, according to the Rev. Mr. Bennet, taken a lively interest. And what answer does Mr. Bennett return to our question? That the Reformed have gradually departed so for from the doctrines and practices of their own church, that dissatisfaction has been raised in the minds of many of the faithful who, since to restore the established system to purity seemed to them utterly impossible, have betaken themselves, for relief, to that "branch of Christ's Universal Church" of which his Holiness is the infallible head. That they should do so, is naturally very much to be deplored; and he would put a stop to such secessions by holding yet more tenaciously and practising yet more scrupulously all that the rubric, approves, enjoins, or allows. The premier may make the best he can of the disclosures of Mr. Bennett's letter. And so far from meriting the censure passed upon him, Mr. B. is entitled to the warmest thanks of England's church.

Other voices are ready to respond,—but enough. Let us now hear one who for many years has occupied a position from which he might take an impartial and comprehensive view of the whole question. To do him justice it would be necessary to quote at considerable length from his pages, but as this is impracticable on account of our limited space, we trust our readers will procure the pamphlet and read it for themselves. We will do no more than intimate what the Dr. most eloquently and forcibly maintains to be the greatest cause of the extension of the pope's power within these realms.

He points out and corrects the mistake which attributes to the Reformation that perfection and completeness which it were preposterous to expect. It was not likely that every error would be detected, and it was as unlikely that every truth would be discovered. The Reformers were men of like passions with ourselves, and would yet cling to principles and usages repugnant to the purity and simplicity of the doctrine of Christ. Our protestant contemporaries make a capital mistake in regarding the Reformation as the *ne plus ultra* of perfection.

In creeds, confessions, catechisms, and such like protestant defences, he points out a coincidence between the claimed infallibility of the pope and the self-asserted orthodoxy of protestants. The pope says—"dare to think or take a step farther than I prescribe, at your peril." Now if the creed means anything it means this too. No matter how diversified and contradictory of each other these creeds may be; each asserts, for his own, divine authority, and in this feature the family likeness is very strong.

> "Since they are only all agreed
> In damning one another's creed."

Our author further traces in the unscriptural practices of protestants—the performances of ceremonies, the services and offices, the observance of days and seasons, the priestly administration of ordinances, the ordination of bishops and ministers, &c., a vast amount of corruption and error, in all of which the essence of popery, and popery itself, find sanction and encouragement. And this not in the church of England only; dissenters and members of the establishment are both implicated.

To their less obvious origin and recondite first cause the Dr. then goes on to

trace those corrupt and earthly systems of religion, that sisterhood of harlots, of whom he regards the church of Rome not as the mother but the eldest sister,* of whose final overthrow the word of God abounds in unmistakable predictions. As temporary, external, and human, and consequently opposed to the spiritual and the divine, they must eventually perish. The prospect is animating. His hope is not in any human power; "to the word of the living God" he observes, "and to it alone do I look, for an effectual stop being put to the onward march of popery." This surely is the only ground upon which we may place any confidence; "the word of the Lord endureth for ever."

We heartily wish for this pamphlet a wide circulation. Let those who have the opportunity employ it in giving it distribution, and thus draw attention to a view of this all-absorbing subject which shall lead protestants to reflect whether they may not be doing more to promote popery than Pio Nono himself has it in is power to effect.

Z.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Sir,—There are various points of view in which the same truth may be exhibited; and each is calculated to produce its effect on different minds. Those who reject salvation as the work of God, perfected in Christ crucified and raised from the dead —as a work wrought for us, (and *in* us who believe,) by infinite love; and with which the work of man, excepting as an instrumental or ministerial power, hath nothing to do—these, I say, create a hell of eternal torments for those whom they (in their Godlike charity!) are pleased to judge worthy of such a doom.

Now we would say to these, God manifests himself to man in the works of creation. For, as by analogy, the heavens and the earth that now are seen, are for a sign of that new heavens and new earth which is to be. Behold, then, this earth which we inhabit, as it rolls in mid space, surrounded by the vault of heaven, within which, as in the womb of a mother, it lives, and moves, and has its being! Behold these heavens, the symbol of the eternal glory, surrounding us on every side, as with the outstretched arms of the Almighty—and into which the earth *must fall,* if it fall from its sphere! Behold them, and say, Whither shall I go from thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there! and if I make my bed in the grave (hell), behold, Thou, in the person of my Redeemer, art there! If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, (the image of death), even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy *right hand* shall support me.

Say, then, Christian-infidel, where is this hell of yours to which, in the pride of self-righteousness, you consign your brother? Is it in heaven, where love dwells? Or is it in the earth where sin dwells, and where you dwell? If in the earth, and in the earthy—which is to say in the carnal mind—will not God, the Judge of the World, when he shall come to destroy the earth, destroy this hell of yours, and fill the void with His presence, as with the spirit of love?

Hell is in the heart of those who, like to Cain, *hate* another—as Christ, in the power of the Holy Spirit, the spirit of divine love, dwells in all who love their neighbour as themselves. *Love,* that thinketh no evil, even *in death,* said,—Love all men, as I have loved you. Do this, and then shall even this earth, be as the kingdom of God and of his Christ; for the kingdom of God is the presence and the power of love.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
J. W.

P.S.—Will any of your readers inform me what advantage the Christian hath over the Jew, if Christ be not received *by faith,* as the Saviour of a world of sinners? For under the law it is written, we were shut up to faith. Are not, therefore, they who deny Christ to be the Saviour of the whole world, as in 1 John ii 2, Jadaizing Christians — the heretics, or Anti-Christs who should come? as in 1 Cor. xi, 19, 1 John ii, 18. This place of torment is said to be "outer darkness." And where is outer darkness? We answer —*Where God is not*—in the light of love, as seen in the face of Jesus Christ.

---

* We must refer the reader to his "Advertisement" for the Dr.'s matured views of the statements of Scripture on this subject.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

FEBRUARY, 1851.

ON DEUTERONOMY XXXII. 22, AND PSALM. IX. 17.

It is commonly supposed, that three kinds of death were incurred by the fall: death natural, death spiritual, and death eternal. It could not be death eternal, as neither the phrase nor any other equivalent to it occurs in the whole Bible; in proof of which the reader is referred to the leading article for April, 1850, p. 73. It could not be death spiritual; because "that was not first which is spiritual," (1 Cor. xv. 46) and therefore Adam could not lose what he did not possess. Death natural was therefore the whole penalty. So much is added in confirmation of the explanation, given in our last number, of Gen. ii. 7.

The passages in the Old Testament supposed to teach, or countenance, the doctrine of endless torment consist, for the most part, of those in which the word שאול *(sheol)* is translated *hell.* It occurs 65 times, out of which it is 3 times translated *the pit*, 31 times *the grave*, and the rest *hell;* of which last 2 are also rendered *the grave* in the margin. It "signifies," says Doctor Campbell, (and his assertion remains uncontradicted,) "the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery." Dissert. Vol.1 . p. 274. The word *hell* indeed appears to have changed its meaning since the received translation was made; so that whether we consider its etymology, or the sense which it evidently requires in some places, (for example in Ps. xvi. 10,) it is difficult to say how or when it came to bear that of a place of torment commonly annexed to it.* Such however being the case, I shall notice two which have been urged in its support with some show, at first sight, of plausibility.

Deut. xxxii. 22.—"a brief, but very strong prophetical outline of the character and fate of the Jewish nation. And first, as to the disobedient portion of it (ver. 5): *They have corrupted themselves, their spot* is *not* the spot *of his children;* they are *a perverse and crooked generation.* We then have a recital of the favours conferred on them generally, as chosen to be the people of God (6—15). *But*, it is added, *Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked*, &c. In ver. 21, the calling in of the Gentiles, *to move them to jealousy*, is brought before us (comp. Rom. x. 19, &c.), as noticed by St. Paul. We then have (ver. 22) the fire

* שאול (sheol) literally signifies the *sought*, ἅδης (hades) which corresponds to it in the New Testament, the *unseen*, and *hell* (from the Anglo Saxon *hel-an*, or German *hullen*, to cover) the *covered*—place or state understood. Hence also the words *heal* and *health.*

predicted which should *burn to the lowest hell, consume the earth (land?), and set on fire the foundations of the mountains.* Not, be it observed, so to consume *the physical world*, and set on fire the foundations of its mountains,—which is perhaps impossible,—but to destroy that disobedient people by fire, sword, pestilence, and famine, and to scatter them throughout the whole earth, as the following verses expressly tell us (25—27)." Lee's Inquiry, p. 24, 25.

Doctor Lee adds, in a note on ver. 22, "This is the first place in which this destruction by fire is mentioned. We shall hereafter find it frequently repeated in similar terms, which some have imprudently imagined foretells a conflagration of the physical world. Hence, no doubt, the notions of the Stoics, that the world should be destroyed by fire."

Ps. ix. 17. "The wicked are not only to be punished here; but hereafter; and I think this passage proves a future state of misery. For could the author possibly mean no more than that the wicked should be brought *to the grave?* All are brought there; so that this could, of itself, be no mark of divine judgment." Boothroyd. According to this, there is no difference between the man who dies of old age, and the man who is executed, or who shortens his life by evil courses. The words "turned into שאול" express judicial and untimely excision; and are equivalent to the declaration, "Bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days." Ps. lv. 23. He adds, "I have retained the word *hell*, as evidently intended." A translator should not exceed his province by making the text express his own disputable sense. This indeed is a fault of most translators of the Bible, in which it ought to be especially avoided. "Translators," says Primate Newcome, "should be philologists, and not controversialists"—an indispensable rule, but not always observed by the Primate himself.

Boothroyd is not consistent with himself, as he translates a nearly similar passage in Ps. xxxix. 17, "Let the wicked be ashamed, and go down into hades;" and observes, in a note, that "The sense is, let them be so far from succeeding in their designs as to perish and die through them."

The retribution, in Ps. ix. 15—17, corresponds to that in 6—8; and the whole Psalm, like many others, relates to Gospel times, and the excision is that of Jewish and Heathen persecutors.

R. R.

ON THE UNIVERSALITY OF GOD'S LOVE TO MAN.

Continued from Page 6.

The love of God as regards time, is known and enjoyed only by his church; to the believing ones it is given to taste of the things of God. Man naturally is his own lawgiver, being subjected to his own conscience (Rom. ii, 14, 15), and is also his own idolater: for he sets up an imaginary god and worships it (Is. xliv, 17), in the hope of reward; he sitteth in the temple of his mind and is a god to himself. He does uot know that he is already dead in trespasses and sins (Eph. ii, 5, Cor. ii, 13), but ignorantly fancies that the God of Scripture is such an one as himself.

It is God who giveth man to know that, as a descendant of Adam, he is a guilty and condemned being; hating God's law, not loving it; that Adam's sin is his sin and that the wages of sin is death (Rom. vi, 23) to the infant, as well as to the adult: for all flesh is guilty before God, and remains subject to death and hades, until Christ, the living one and the just one (Ezek. xviii, 3—9), shall newly create all things to himself (Is. xlv, 7, lxv, 17—20), when that which is shadowy and temporal shall be superseded by that which is substantial and eternal.

It is God who giveth man to know that righteousness is not of the law; that by the law is the knowledge of sin; that the law was given by Moses, and that grace and truth came by Jesus Christ (John i. 17); that sin reigned only till the death of Christ (Rev. 21), that grace might thenceforward reign through his righteousness unto eternal life; that Christ is the spirit and the truth, the Lord and giver of light and life; and is the beneficent one. (Mark x. 18.) It is he, who gives his elect to know that even now in time, they have righteousness in him, not their own which is of the law, but that which is of God through the faith of Christ (Phil. iii. 9); that they are also justified by his faith (Gal. ii. 16), and have a victory over law, sin, death, and Hades, in that when Christ rose from the dead with righteousness received from his heavenly father Jehovah, who was the God of his salvation, (Is. xii. 2, xliii. 2, 3) they rose in him, and in virtue of that resurrection have passed from death unto life (John v. 24, 1 John iii. 14).

God gives his church to know that in Christ Jesus were all the requirements demanded by the justice of God fulfilled, that in him who loved and served God with his whole heart, and mind, and soul, and strength, and who loved his neighbour as himself (Mark xii. 30, 31, Matt. xxii. 37), mercy and truth met together; righteousness and peace kissed each other (Psalm xxxv. 10); and that God is just in the fact of his justifying the ungodly (Rom. iii. 19—26) for it is God who created darkness and formed light; who created evil and made peace; he Jehovah doeth all these things (Is. xlv. 7).

It is by the love of God being manifested to us individually, that we know God is our Father; that we have the witness in ourselves (1 John v. 10), that we love God because he first loved us (1 John, iv. 10 19, John xv. 16); that by his word enlightening our hearts and consciences, through his chastening and our possessing thereby the peaceable fruits of Christ's righteousness (Heb. xii. 11), viz. faith, joy, and peace in believing (Gal. v. 22, Rom. xv. 13), we are made a willing and faithful people in the day of his power (Psalms cx. 3), and each of us enabled to say he hath led me into his banqueting house, and his banner over me is love (Cant. ii. 4.). We are each possessed of that same I AM principle of love wherewith God loved Christ (John xvii. 26).

The knowledge of God is eternal life now to us who believe (1 John v. 13, 20); for we are saved from the effects of law, sin, death, and Hades, by the faith of Christ according to his will and purpose (Eph. 1—7, 11) before the worlds were framed (2 Tim. i. 9), and are sanctified by Christ's fulfilling God's will through the offering of his own body (Hebrews x. 14, 1 Cor. vi. 11), whereby he was perfected, and became the author of eternal salvation (Heb. v. 9). We are set free from the law (Rom. viii. 2) and made free indeed (John viii. 36), are separated from the world by his truth (John xvii. 17, 19), and placed above all law; for the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set us free from the law of sin and death (Rom. viii. 7), and is to us a privilege and a blessing; even a law of love, which constrains us to live not unto ourselves, but unto him who loved us and gave himself for us (Gal. i. 4, ii. 20). We are made new creatures in him (2 Cor. v. 17), and are now possessed of the earnest of the divine nature (2 Peter i. 4, 1 John iv. 13), even the earnest of the spirit (2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5), a principle of life and love, an heavenly attribute which cometh down from above, whose author and perfecter is God (James i. 17).

It is by the love of God we know that we are complete in Christ (Col. ii. 10); that we were baptized and buried with him in his death, which is the

true baptism (Psalm xlii. 7, Col. ii. 12, Luke xii. 50. Rom. vii. 3, 4, 5) and antitype of John's baptism. In Christ we have the one spirit, the one faith, the one baptism, and the one Lord (Eph. iv. 4, 5), the one God and Saviour (Isaiah xlv. 15) and Father of all (Eph. iv. 6).

It is written "blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, for they rest from their labours, and their works do follow them (Rev. xi. 4—13). When Christ died, we died in him; for if one died for all, then were all dead (2 Cor. v. 14); and when Christ rose from the dead we rose in him, through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead (Col. ii. 12). We are also crucified with him (Rom. vi. 6) and live; yet not we but Christ liveth in us; and the life we now live is by the faith of the Son of God (Gal. ii. 20, Hab. ii. 4), being born again of incorruptible seed by the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever (1 Peter i. 23).

The love of God is infinite; for when we were enemies, he reconciled the world to himself by the death of his Son, that the world might be saved by his life (Rom. v. 10, Col. i. 22, 1 John iv. 14); and as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; therefore the love of God constraineth us to live now unto Christ, the first sheaf of the harvest, as obedient children of his resurrection, by the grace now brought to us, by the revelation of Jesus Christ (Rom. xvi. 25, 26, Gal. i. 12, 1 Cor. ii. 10, Eph. i. 17—23), having our minds renewed by the spirit of the living God.

By the light of God's love we know that it is like himself unbounded; that as Christ himself is the first begotten from the dead (Rev. i. 5), and is the first fruits of the harvest unto God (1 Cor. xv. 20), so will God who raised Christ from the dead, also quicken our mortal bodies (Rom. viii. 11), and by his spirit will deliver the creature from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God (Rom. viii. 21).

By the love of God shall all flesh know the Lord (Is. xlix. 26); for his knowledge shall be extended to the uttermost parts of the earth as the waters cover the sea (Hab. ii. 14); and every creature which is in heaven and on the earth and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, shall be heard saying "Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever (Rev. v. 13).

The whole creation shall then be delivered from its present groaning (Rom. viii. 22); and every creature see the manifestation of God (Isai. xl. 4, 5, lii. 10) and be made alive in him, who is not the God of the dead but of the living (Luke xx. 38), and is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever (Heb. xiii. 8).

Then shall this mortal have become immortality, and this corruptible, incorruption (1 Cor. xv. 53); not by our being unclothed but clothed upon; by the superseding of the old man, by the putting on of the new man; which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness (Eph. iv. 24); then shall we bear in fulness the image of the heavenly Christ Jesus, as we now bear the image of the earthly man-Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 49), to the honor and praise of him, who shall have then made us one heavenly fold under one heavenly shepherd, with glorified bodies and glorified minds like unto the Son of God (Phil. iii. 21), enjoying heavenly blessings throughout eternity.

Then shall the new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness, have superseded the old heavens and the old earth (2 Peter iii. 13), and time shall be no longer (Rev. x. 6): for all that is shadowy shall then have been swallowed up by that which is substantial and eternal.

Behold what manner of love the Father will then have bestowed upon us, for we shall have been received into his glory, and have been made like unto Christ seeing him as he is (1 John iii. 2)—a God of Love, and this because Christ himself—who was the heavenly grain of wheat (John xii. 24), sown in corruption and mortality, even in the earthly ground of humanity, whereby he became one with us, for he had Mary for his mother—died, in order to be raised from the dead in incorruption and immortality; that we, the earthly seed, sown in him the heavenly ground, whereby we became one with God, for he

had God for his father, might die in him also, to be raised with him in incorruption and immortality (1 Cor. xv. 53) to a heavenly inheritance which fadeth not away (1 Peter i. 4).

So God thus takes back to himself the marred vessel: even the first man, the first Adam, made perfect in Christ Jesus, the perfect vessel; even the second man, the second Adam: and we all shadows of men only, being one in the first Adam, and also one in the second Adam, are destined to be made substantial in God, who is substance, in whom there is neither male nor female (Gal. iii. 28), but all one, as God is one (Gal. iii. 20, Isab. xii. 2, xxvi. 4) who then, as the heavenly reaper, will have reaped unto himself his heavenly harvest; for God is love (1 John iv. 8); love to you, love to me, love to all; and this because he was love to one, who is the Amen, the faithful and true witness; the beginning of the creation of God (Rev. iii. 14), even Jesus Christ (John xvii. 24, 16) our Lord (Acts ii. 36) and our God (Acts ii. 39, Mark xii. 29, Rev. xix. 1).

A STORY OF GRACE.

CHAPTER II.

The assumptions of the Church of Rome are opposed by Protestants on the ground that those assumptions are unsupported by the great and final standard of appeal—the word of the living God. The word of God is with them so far paramount. But, not finding the principle which induces them to turn their backs upon the communion of the Church of Rome broad enough or strong enough to bind them together in visible fellowship, protestants must needs supplement it with something else—that something else proving the immediate source of division, and the prolific cause of *churches;* all holding one principle in opposition to Rome, but each defending different views in opposition to the rest. And, while, as against one *pseudo* church they will confederate together, as among themselves they must needs come to their creeds, and confessions, and church standards. O! Protestantism! we can bear with the diversities of opinion among thy children—nay, we love thee much for permitting them; but we grieve to think, that those who bear thy name should so attire Thee in the garb of "articles of faith" wrought in such strong anathematizing texture as to make Thee oftentimes appear a very popish Guy!

Hence a means by which a difficulty is most easily overcome, when a member of such a church discovers (whether right or wrong, no matter now) a discrepancy between his church creed and the word of God, an appeal, not to the latter, but to the creed, in opposition to the individual, is made. And so the *something else*, or church creed, takes the place of the word of God: a fact, which may be corroborated by the history of all protestant churches, and which we strongly suspect is essential to their existence.

Let those who feel the truth of these remarks ponder them; while in excuse for this digression, we must plead what follows.

A report had for some time been afloat in the Whitfield society, that an excellent and talented individual, who had for a considerable period been one of its influential members, had attended the Meeting of James Relly, a man who was regarded by the church as a person of most corrupt morals, and a

preacher of the most licentious tenets. More than this—he was suspected, and not without reason, of having favoured his sentiments, and by some it was affirmed that he had openly defended the doctrlne which Relly proclaimed. The report spread, and it soon became evident that the matter must be brought formally and finally to an issue. Grief was expressed by some, that so good and useful a man should have been "led away." Others, as bitter against Relly as they were ignorant of his doctrine, longed for the expulsion of an individual, who, like a diseased limb, might soon infect the whole body with the virus of his dreadful distemper. But there were many, and among them was George Richardson, who, knowing his blameless character, and believing him to have "the root of the matter" in him, were anxious that he should, if possible, be retained in the fellowship of the Tabernacle; and who anticipated that he would so far submit to the voice of the church, as to suppress, if not abandon, that which it was reported he had embraced. Great was the surprise which was felt generally that one, who had actually been deputed by the church to "reclaim" a young lady who had recently abandoned the Whitfield Society for that of the Rellyan congregation, and lead her out of her "error," should have fallen into it himself; and vastly perplexed were some pious persons at "the mysterious providence" which allowed such an one to be entrapped by the pernicious Relly!

"Alas!" said one of them, who had accompanied him on his errand, when he heard of the meeting which was to be held for the purpose of considering what must be done with their wandering brother, "alas! that to get a fellow creature out of the mud, one should run so dreadful a risk of sticking in it oneself. Grievous is it to think that one so promising, should, in the very act of attempting to draw others out of 'the miry clay,' only plunge into it himself; nevertheless, if it be so, the church would lamentably fail in its duty, if it did not act, and that, too, decisively and immediately; for who knows, but that if

'One sickly sheep infect the flock
'T will poison all the rest.'

The regulations of the society must be employed speedily to clear us of so dangerous an enemy!" And with the determination of seeing cut off from the fold his recent friend, companion, and counsellor, but now the object of his dislike and even his dread, he found himself at the meeting at which the subject was to be discussed.

John Murray—"the father of Universalism in America," was summoned to answer the charge of having countenanced the doctrine of Universal Salvation. The charge was preferred; but, being highly esteemed by the people generally, for his many Christian excellencies, his talents, and his usefulness, he was censured; and a proposal was made to him, that he should remain a member of their communion only on condition of his maintaining strict silence on the subject of Universal Salvation—a proposal reflecting as much discredit on those who made it, as it would have been to his disgrace had he so far violated Christian principle as to accede to it. The noble man had too much good sense, and truth had too strong a hold of his heart to allow him to sacrifice his conscience to such a compromise. He loved the people; and *their* principles, except as they were to some extent modified by his universalism, were still

his: he was reluctant to be severed from them, and shrank from the apparent disgrace and its attendant evils to which an expulsion would expose him. His path was plain, though it might be rough; and his reply was briefly given. Unhesitatingly, yet modestly, he declined their offer: the price was far too high for the good he would still retain; and, to his great grief, a very small majority secured his expulsion, as his own very interesting autobiography shows.

That night, George Richardson returned to his lodging thoughtful and sad. He had had but little intercourse with Murray, but he knew him to be a thorough, honest, warm-hearted, Christian man. He had looked up to him, as his fellow-members had done, with sentiments of veneration, as to a father in the Church, and to see the disgrace into which he was thrown by this act of the Society was overwhelming. What had Murray done? Had he committed any great sin? It could hardly be so; for the Church would not propose a compromise with an open transgressor. Murray was not charged with any sin, but with *false doctrine*—doctrine which he might keep shut up in his own bosom if he pleased, and retain his place among "the people of God." And why, thought George, should he be allowed to retain it in his heart, if out of the abundance of his heart his mouth might not speak? Why tolerate him in drinking of polluted waters, and forbid his offering them to others? Does not their unaccepted proposal afford some sanction to that which they have just been condemning by Murray's expulsion? And should they allow a man to cherish a serpent even in his *own* bosom? This they were willing to do: possibly the serpent might not be venomous! These reflections tended to shake George's faith in the elders of the Society. He could not bring his mind to justify the condemnation that had been pronounced upon him; and, though the doctrine of universal salvation, as he understood it, was awfully bad, he had so far decided at the meeting in favour of the accused as to hold up his hand against his expulsion; and it was some consolation to think that he had thus protested against his condemnation.

Of Relly's opinions and practices, George had heard but little. That he was a bad man, that he encouraged people to live in sin, that his congregation consisted of the dissolute and the profane, and that all that perverted ingenuity could do to turn the grace of God into licentiousness Relly did, was what he simply believed upon the authority of Christian brethren who mentioned not the name without recoiling with evident horror at the thought of so much wickedness. Murray cannot, he argued, as he still pondered the matter, have sanctioned all that these people say and do; he cannot have run to the same excess of riot; he cannot have said, as *they* say, "Let us sin that grace may abound;"—or the Church would never have proposed that he should remain among us on any condition. He can only have adopted their theory of the salvation of all men. And what is that? George had never given the matter five minutes serious attention until now. And the question forced itself upon his mind.

But it was growing late. St. Paul's had struck twelve. To his sadness and thoughtfulness were added perplexity and confusion. He could not perceive the principle upon which the Church had acted in regard to John Murray.

He could not understand how the pious and consistent Christian could be beguiled into such a pernicious belief as that of which he believed Relly to be the defender. The compromise proposed by the Church had produced on his mind an impression that *possibly* there was no great harm in cherishing *some* such belief in *some* way; and the question, whether such a belief was sanctioned by Scripture in *any* way or not, could not be dismissed. That Jesus Christ had shed his blood for the guilty, and that his sacrifice was the only ground of a sinner's hope towards God, was not a more essential part of his creed than was the doctrine that the Church—consisting of those only who were chosen of God's "mere good pleasure from all eternity"—and the church only, were redeemed by his blood. A *universal redemption*, and an endless hell of unsaved sinners were doctrines utterly repugnant to his sense of God's justice and the Redeemer's merits. A *universal salvation* appeared to him to be opposed to the doctrine of election, and its collateral doctrines, as well as subversive of morality and virtue. He bowed his knee before his Heavenly Father, and fervently implored his grace, light, and guidance, that he might be preserved from falling into error; not forgetting to commend to the tender mercy of the Great Shepherd and Bishop of souls, the individual who had so displeased the Church as to render it necessary for them to withdraw from him, and who, as he greatly feared, must have made shipwreck of faith and a good conscience. By this devotional exercise his agitated spirit was somewhat calmed and tranquilized, and he retired to rest with the resolve, that he would understand the merits of Murray's case, and the cause for which he suffered; not doubting that the Church would be found to have acted for the good of its members, as well as for the glory of God.

(To be continued.)

A WORD TO CHRISTIANS OF EVERY CREED.

Beloved Brethren,—we are called by the gospel of the grace of God, to be "followers of God, as dear children," and to walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savour. Seeing that this is our special calling, we ought therefore to be found loving one another with pure hearts fervently. It is our *duty*—it is more, it is our *interest*. It is every man's highest interest to love every other man as himself. We can recognize no opposition between our duties and our interests. Our God and Father has not made our duties to lie in one direction, and our interests in another, so that we must turn away from the one in order to attend to the other. From the beginning of the world till now, it has been the great work of the devil, the father of lies, to persuade men that it is not their interest to do what God would have them to do; and those who feel and act as if their duties and interests clashed with each other, do so because the devil has so blinded their eyes, that they cannot discern what their true interests are.

True love has its sorrows as well as its joys. The deepest of all sorrows is the sorrow of wounded love. There is no sorrow like Christ's sorrow: "His visage was so marred more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men." It is well that we should count what loving one another is to cost us; lest beginning to build we be not able to finish, lest love should make demands upon us that we did not calculate upon; and therefore will not be

prepared to meet. Yet, on the whole, it is best to love. In being called to love, we are not called to serve a master who sends any a warfaring upon their own charges. The joys of love are greater than its sorrows—if not always so, just now, yet we are persuaded that the joy will *outlive* the sorrow. This is what we all believe. I am not going to say anything that any Christian will controvert. We all believe that God will, some time or other, wipe away all tears from our eyes, if we be followers of Christ. *How* the Father of the spirits of all flesh will do this, whether by making an end of the things which pain and grieve love, or in some other way, known or unknown, is a question upon which we are not at present to enter.

But the sorrow, that is, the suffering of love, even while it lasts, is not to be regarded as an absolute evil. The evil is not in the suffering, but is in the evil things which cause love to suffer. The suffering itself is an indication of a healthy state of the inner man. It is only a well-conditioned spirit that can taste of these sufferings. The better the heart is, the more that the divine principles of Christ are developed in the heart, the more the sufferings of Christ will abound. It is the suffering of love, be it remembered, and love is the best thing! for God is love!

But why should we shrink from love's sufferings, seeing that the capacity for enjoying love's eternal joys, is in the capacity for suffering love's momentary sorrows? Whatever gives pain to a spirit, the reverse of that thing must give pleasure; and of what gives no pain, the reverse can afford no pleasure. For example, were we so constituted that a brother's unkindness and hatred could not painfully affect our spirits, then neither could his kindness and love afford us any pleasure. The very thing that lays us open to be hurt by a brother's hatred, is that which makes us capable of receiving joy and pleasure from his love. If sin does not fill us with sorrow; then holiness, the reverse of sin, will not fill us with joy. Reflect upon it, dear reader, how can it? How was it that the elder brother in the parable of the prodigal son, was unprepared for the father's joy, which burst forth upon the prodigal's return? How was it that he could not sympathize with his father's joy? The very thing that saved the elder brother from partaking in the father's sorrow for the prodigal, when away in the far country wasting his substance in riotous living, was that which made him incapable of tasting the father's joy, when the lost one was found again. If the elder brother had been mingling his tears with the father's tears over the lost one when away, then, instead of finding him standing without wondering at, and even finding fault, with the father's joy, we should have seen this elder brother running after the father, rejoicing with the father, to meet his brother. Whatever we may think of this elder brother (and we have no wish to make him worse than he is), it is evident that he neither knew his father's heart, nor loved his brother; for had he known the father, and loved his brother through knowing the father, he would not have murmured at the reception which his erring brother met with; he could have prophesied that the father would not frown his repentant child from his presence, and send him back to the land of famine to die there, but would receive him with joy.

Friends, that which is to solve our doubts and clear our inward sight, is love. Love is life; and the life is the light of men. And, if we would love one another, not in word nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth, we must have the love of the Father revealed to our spirits, for the Father is the fire that must warm us. G. G.

PORT NATAL.

By the kindness of our highly esteemed friend Dr. Thom, who has placed it at our disposal, we are enabled to present to our readers the following interesting communication from the pen of Mr. James Riddall Wood, the author of

"*Angel Visits,*" and formerly the conductor of a popular literary journal in this country. As affording *authentic* information on the subject of emigration it is important. Mr. Wood left our shores in the autumn of 1849, and is not aware of the existence of the *Universalist;* but he carried with him the same scriptural faith for which we count it our privilege to contend; and while we rejoice to think that, in a distant land, he will not hestitate, as opportunity offers, to proclaim the gospel fact that "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof," we are persuaded also that it would afford him sincere gratification to know that he was the means of imparting pleasure and instruction to his friends at home. A second letter will appear (D.V.) in our next number.

My dear sir,——If I have not written to you earlier it has not been that I have forgotten you; for the glorious truths, with which you stand indissolubly connected in my mind, have brought you to my recollection more frequently and with greater satisfaction than any or all else that I have left behind me. Of our voyage I can scarcely bear to think, owing to the suffering, mental and bodily, to which Mrs. Wood and the family were exposed. Before leaving the Downs a case of scarlet fever broke out on board, which proved rapidly fatal, and by the time we reached Plymouth several other cases made their appearance. Notwithstanding this, together with the fact that the number of children on board exceeded by twenty the proper compliment, two or three families more were thrust on board at that port, and the Government Inspector allowed the ship to proceed to sea after a day's demur. In a few days the fever spread, and one after another of the children of the passengers were consigned to the deep. My wife was very ill, and notwithstanding every precaution, four of my own children were attacked. In addition to my labour and anxiety about my large family, and my nephew and nieces, I had the onerous duty of chief constable thrust upon me, which required me to superintend the whole of the steerage passengers, to see that their berths were cleaned out daily, that their bedding was brought on deck whenever the weather permitted, &c. In the meantime the surgeon was quite unequal to his post, and whether it were from apathy or intense selfishness, I know not, but he grossly neglected the sick, and seemed afraid to administer medicine or medical comforts. In fact, upon my urging him one day on this point, he said, in excuse, that the disease assumed a form he never saw before, and besides he had sprained his ancle and could not be expected to go round to see his patients. During this time the disease was progressing; some families lost two children, one lost three, and then the father fell a victim to diarrhæa after some day's illness, the doctor only having once seen him. True, he prescribed for him upon my stating the symptoms, opium and brandy, and the patient at length sank, as I believe, from overdoses of opium. I took the prescribing for my own children into my own hands, and I am thankful to say they all recovered. We were, however, called on to part with one dear little girl, the youngest but one, who (always delicate) could not bear the fatigues and privations of a voyage, and she gradually sank in a sort of decline without suffering much pain. Almost her last words were, "I want to go home."* We buried her in the blue waves

* The accompanying lines in memory of my beloved daughter, Lizzy, suggested by the last words she was heard to utter, were written with the hope of affording some consolation to Mrs. Wood.

'I want to go'—'I want to go'
From these scenes of noise and strife,
'Where the heart is sick with sights of woe
And the waste of human life.

'I want to go' from the heartless gaze
Of cold unfeeling eyes,
To the cherished home of other days
And early sympathies.

'I want to go' the green fields among,
Where I spent my infant hours,
Mid the hum of bees, and the linnet's song,
And the scent of lovliest flowers.

'I want to go' to my home of peace,
With holy affections blest;
There wicked men from troubling cease
And weary ones find rest.

'I want to go'—and that plaintive cry
Was heard in realms above,
When the Saviour hushed her latest sigh
In the bosom of his love.

of the Atlantic in lat. 5 18, long. 30 49, in the "sure and certain hope of a glorious resurrection" when "the sea shall give up her dead."

During the remainder of our voyage (of 14 weeks), deaths were constantly occuring, and on our arrival many were landed sick. In all we lost eighteen on the voyage, and five have died since. In addition to this, we had a fearful calamity off the Cape of Good Hope by the washing overboard of two of the apprentices in a heavy gale of wind. The ship was at the time plunging fearfully, and running at a fearful rate before the wind, under close reefed maintopsail and forestaysail. It was mid-day, and the sun was shining brilliantly, although most of the passengers were compelled to keep their berths, as there was neither sitting nor standing, when the hoarse cry rose amid the howling of the winds and the roaring of the waters, "Boys overboard!" striking dismay amongst the crew and passengers. The only thing was to bring the ship to the wind, an operation of no little peril. Before this was effected the two poor fellows were lost sight of. When last seen, the elder (about twenty years old), was sustaining the younger, and the albatrosses were hovering close overhead; indeed one or two of the passengers say they distinctly saw one of the albatrosses pounce down upon them. With the exception of a tropical thunderstorm, during which the vessel was struck by lightning and several of the crew and passengers were slightly injured, we escaped further disasters.

On our arrival we found new troubles; for, instead of Mr. Byrne's agent being there provided with temporary dwellings for our reception, he was up at Peter-Maritzburg, and we were set on shore about sunset, two miles from the town of D'Urban, without bed or bedding, and in the midst of the rainy season, the rain just beginning to fall for the night. With one child on my back, and Mrs. Wood having the baby, we set forward, having brought all the younger children with us, and left my two eldest boys and two eldest girls on board to see after the luggage, and it was, owing to the weather, four days before they could be landed. D'Urban we found to consist of a few mud huts (dignified here by the name of "wattle and dab") scattered among the bushes on a vast plain. Being dark and wet, we made to the first light, and were told that we should not get shelter, as there was not room for the emigrants who had preceded us; we were, however, referred to the hotel, to which we wended our way, and found it to be still only a "wattle and dab," although it boasts of a billiard room. Here we saw some of the young men, our fellow-passengers, who had engaged every available space, and we were compelled to sally forth again. Leaving Mrs. Wood and the children under a bush with the umbrella, I proceeded to look out for lodgings, and after an hour succeeded in obtaining a table for Mrs. Wood and baby, and another for the little ones to lie upon, under the shelter of a "wattle and dab." The next day I was considered extremely fortunate in getting a "wattle and dab" for a month, at 2*l.* per month. It was neither larger, better finished, nor cleaner than an ordinary Irish cabin. Here we were compelled to lie on boards lent us by the landlord till our children brought the bedding from on board, and about a fortnight afterwards I got my tent ashore, under which I am still living until our house is finished which I am building with the aid of my son and a single Caffre, to whom I pay 5s. per month and two pints of maize per diem. That you may form some idea of a "wattle and dab" I may just tell you how we proceed. Having fixed upon a site, my son and I sally forth into the bush with the Caffre and cut down trees sufficient for our purpose, which, being prepared, we hire a wagon (drawn by from twelve to sixteen oxen) to bring them in. These we plant about three feet deep and two feet apart for the outside walls. We then get branches or bamboos and interweave with these something after the manner of bleaching hedges in England; upon this we lay a coating of clay, followed, when dry, by a coating of earth from the outheap, and over this a coating of cow-dung. This is white washed and the walls are completed. As a protection from the weather (for the "wattle and dabs" soon separate with wet), I am running a verandah round, and the whole is thatched with rushes,

which we get from a swamp in the neighbourhood. The floors are dabbed like the walls. For the first few months these erections look neat and comfortable, but they soon require patching. Little did I think two years ago that I should become the architect of my own house of which I sometimes feel inclined to boast, but at which my friends in England would, I fear, be disposed to smile.

In consequence of Mr. Byrne's agent informing us that he was not prepared to locate us, we are detained here, which is a sad business for the emigrants, as they are spending their little all, which was intended to enable them to cultivate their respective allotments. We are told we shall get our allotments to which we are entitled in virtue of our passage money; but it may be some months first, as the matter will in all probability, be referred to the Home Government. Finding this to be the case, I obtained situations for three of my children, by which they will be able to support themselves. I opened an evening school in my tent, and Mrs. Wood a day school, and she has now got six scholars, and I five young men, who are learning mathematics, arithmetic, and French. Mrs Wood's terms are 6s. per month, and mine 5s. per month. After I had been open a fortnight, a merchant kindly offered me the use of his store (a large " wattle and dab" until I get my own house ready. I hope to get employment for the day as soon as my house is finished, as I have had one or two jobs already in drawing and calculating average papers, &c. My nephew and nieces have got employment; the two latter as nursery governesses, and the former as teacher at Peter-Maritzburg.

Of my prospects here I cannot speak with much certainty at present. I hope, in a short time, to be able to get forward, and shall be glad to have occasion to communicate such intelligence. Much misrepresentation is abroad respecting Natal; the good has been enlarged and exaggerated, the evil has been altogether kept out of view. The climate is certainly delightful, although much warmer than has been represented; but the temperature is kept down by the fine breezes which almost invariably blow during the day. We are now at the end of the rainy season, and during the greater part of the time, have lived in a tent, which I was advised in London to bring out; and certainly it has been of great service. The occasional hurricanes have tried it, and we have sometimes expected that it would be blown away; but thanks to our Heavenly Father, we remain all safe. The country is most beautiful in many parts, assuming a park-like scenery, with gentle undulation of fine grass, spotted with clumps of trees, so arranged as to give a most picturesque effect. The soil is capable of producing plants of both the temperate and tropical regions. The cotton tree, the mimosa, gigantic cacti, aloes, the castor oil plant, tobacco, are found growing wild in the bush, with many other plants which in England require the greenhouse.

Among the evils of the colony I may mention the bad water, although this is confined to D'Urban alone; the abundance of serpents, the tigers, elephants, &c. which, with alligators, render a residence in a lone district, upon a river, sufficiently unpleasant. Then we have the Natal "tick," an insect which buries itself in your flesh unless you extract it in time, producing very annoying sores. called Natal sores, something like boils in England. As to cotton-growing, I fear the strong winds will be against it; and the difficulty of procuring available labour will render it, at present, a hazardous enterprise. The abundance of insects is another drawback; for it appears that many seeds, particularly those of slow growth, are eaten up; hence wheat has not been found to succeed, although some parties allege that it will do better at a distance from the sea.

Provisions (except meat) are dear. Flour 6d. per lb.; the coarse black sugar of Mauritius, 6d. per lb.; butter, 16d. per lb.; milk, 4d. per quart.; tea, 2s. 6d to 3s. per lb.; beef 2d. to 3d. per lb.; mutton, 6d., when it is to be had. Pumpkins, Indian meal, &c., are generally cheap; but at present owing to the influx of emigrants, the prices are somewhat high.

And now, my dear Sir, I shall dismiss these matters, and hope to have something to say on better things than these when next I write. I have during the voyage, gone through the new edition of your "Three Questions proposed and answered" and your "Dialogues on Universal Salvation" with increasing delight. I meet with no one like-minded. Here we have a good number of Wesleyans, and some Churchmen. Each of these has a place of worship—both recent erections. Of these matters further particulars in my next.

Mrs. Wood and the family unite with me in kind regards and desire to be remembered to all friends.

With sincere prayers for the spiritual and temporal welfare of yourself and family, believe me ever, Yours very sincerely,

Dr. Thom. JAMES RIDDALL WOOD.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SHOULD THE DOCTRINE OF UNIVERSAL SALVATION BE PROCLAIMED TO THE WORLD?

To the Editor of The Universalist.

SIR,—In No. X. of the *Universalist* there is a review of "Ireland as I saw it," by D. T.; and in this truly valuable review we find the following sentiment—"We object to the system of God's universal love being taught to the world at all." This sentiment was questioned by *Anetazo*, whose objections we have in No. XII. Since their publication, *Anetazo* has received a letter from one of his most beloved brethren in the faith and hope of the gospel; the writer of which, in referring to the above sentiment, says, "I quite agree with D. T. in the sentiment you criticised; as I think the doctrine of the salvation of all men one adapted for the joy and comfort of the believer of the gospel, and not for proclaiming to the world. Not that I would conceal it, or make any mystery of it; but I would not make it a prominent doctrine to press on the attention of the world.....I do not think that you have brought forward a single argument at all to the purpose in your article. You have cited and quoted a number of passages of Scripture, which are addressed to professed believers in the Messiah, either before or after his advent; but the apostles nowhere in the New Testament are recorded to have proclaimed to unbelievers that all men should be saved. They proclaimed forgiveness of sins to *sinners*; to those they were addressing they proclaimed the forgiveness of sins; but they did not proclaim that Christ had died to save all men. I grant readily that this is true; but they did not say so to the world. If they did, I shall be glad to learn where to find the passage....You speak of it being justifiable to parade before the eyes of unregenerate men *then* (in the days of Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles), the universal love of God. Will you give me one passage of Scripture which shews this? The love of God to *sinners* is proclaimed openly and without reserve; but until a man sees God's love to *himself* a sinner, I care very little about telling him of his love to all men. The chances are, if I do, that he will see neither one nor the other; but, instead of seeing God's love to sinners, he will contract some notion of God's indifference to sin." *Anetazo* had written a reply to the above privately; but, it occurred to him, that there may be a number, both of real and nominal Christians, of the same mind as his dearly beloved brother; and the subject being one of first importance, he has resolved, with your permission, to answer his brother and his companions in sentiment, through the medium of your columns.

In the first place then, let it be asked, can the gospel of the grace of God be proclaimed in its integrity, without proclaiming the universal love of God? Now if this question is answered with NO, as some think it must be, then the first proclamation of the gospel to any man, to all men who ever heard it, *must* have been a proclamation of the universal love of God to the unregenerate. What saith the Scriptures?

In the last two verses of the first chapter of Genesis, we have a proclamation of the love of God to *all* men, and every creature that has soul or breath—an unconditional and irreversible grant of every herb bearing seed, every tree bearing fruit, and every green herb, to man and the other breathing creatures alike—no exception. In this *man* hath no preeminence above a beast; all alike have a right to the things of this life.

The next proclamation of the universal love of God is to the serpent in the garden of Eden: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed

and her seed; he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." This was a proclamation of the gospel—of God's universal love. Did not the woman understand it to be so, when, in beholding her first-born son, she said, "I have gotten a man, the Jehovah?" Was the serpent, were Adam and Eve *regenerate* when this was first proclaimed to them? Was it not a proclamation of God's universal love to the world? The whole of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament is nothing more nor less, nor else, than a true and divine testimony of the unlimited love of God to men, and of the enmity of the seed of the serpent—the enmity of men to God.

Again,—God preached the gospel to Abraham, proclaiming his universal love, saying, "in thy seed, (which is Christ), shall all families of the earth be blessed." Abraham believed that what God had promised he was able also to perform, and it was counted the same as if it had been actually performed. He saw the day of Jesus when he would be set forth a propitiation for the sins of the whole world; when the righteousness of God in performing his promise and oath would be declared for the remission of sins. When this proclamation of God's universal love was made to Abraham, there is no proof from Scripture that, *before* he first heard it, he was *regenerated*.

Nicodemus was probably a professed believer in a Messiah to come; but he did not believe in Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah, for Jesus said to him, "Ye receive *not* our testimony." Nicodemus was not born again when Jesus proclaimed unto him the universal love of God, saying, "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life. For God *so loved* the *world* that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life. For God sent not his son to *condemn* the *world;* but that the *world* through him, might be *saved*." John, iii. 14—17. The serpent in the wilderness was a figure of the human nature of Jesus Christ upon the cross, by which the enmity of human nature was slain, nailing it to his cross; by which both Jews and Gentiles were reconciled to God, and peace proclaimed both to those afar off and nigh. The old man—the serpent—satan, or human nature, was crucified with Christ—was bruised—cast out. And, having been planted together in the likeness of the *death* of Christ, we shall be also of his *resurrection*. Eph. ii. 15, 16; Rom. vi. 5; Col. ii. 14. He who denies that God's universal love was proclaimed to Nicodemus while in an *unregenerate* state, surely does not understand the true meaning of John iii.

To a multitude of both Jews and Greeks Jesus said, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw *all* men unto me." These Jews most probably professed to believe in the Messiah; but they did not believe that Jesus was the Christ, therefore were not born of God—were unregenerate; and to these was the universal love of God, in the salvation of all men, proclaimed. At another time, Jesus said to an assembly of these unregenerate Jews, "I came down from heaven not to do mine *own* will but the will of *him* that sent me. And *this* is the Father's will who hath sent me, that of *all* those he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day." Now we know, that the heathen have been given to Jesus for an inheritance, and the uttermost ends of the earth for a possession—yea all things are delivered into his hand, and God wills that *all* men be saved. All this is assuredly done by him who came to do the will of God; for *all* power in heaven and on earth is given unto him. Is not this a proclamation of the unlimited love of God?

The Apostle Peter, when addressing those who denied the holy one and the just—who killed the Prince of life, preferring a murderer to him, declared to these bloody men, these unregenerate murderers, that this same Jesus whom with wicked hands they had slain, was he who had fulfilled *all things*, which God before had shewed by the mouth of his prophets should be fulfilled, by him whom the heavens must receive till the times of the *Restitution of all things*, which God had spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets since the world began (Acts, iii. 18), &c. Is not this a proclamation of God's universal love, to the unregenerate? Moreover this same Peter preached that God is no respector of persons, and had taught him to call no man common or unclean.

Paul, when at Antioch, in the audience of a great multitude of contradicting and blaspheming Jews and idolatrous Greeks, not knowing of one regenerate man amongst them, proclaimed unto them God's universal love. "Be it known unto you that through this man is proclaimed unto *you* the forgiveness of sins." The Jews understood it to be a universal proclamation, and could not bear the idea of sinners of the Gentiles being forgiven, who were possessed of no *worthiness* in them to deserve such love. Again Paul, at Rome, for two years expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets; and receiving *all* that came unto him. There need be no doubt, he preached the *Gospel*, and consequently the universal love of God; nor can we safely conclude that *all* who came to him were, *before* they came, born from above.

After all—to be really consistent—those who object to the system of God's universal love being taught to the world, must also object to the putting into the hands of the unregenerate who can *read*, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament,

except "with caution and a certain degree of reserve."

Is it possible that any man can see God's love to *himself, a sinner*, who does not see God's love to *all?* The possibility of this may be doubted. There is a great difference between the expressions, "God loves and forgives *sinners*," and "God loves and forgives *all*." In the one case, there is a possibility that God may love and forgive *sinners*, and yet neither love nor forgive *me;* while, in the other, there is an assurance that *I* am loved and forgiven, because he loves and forgives *all*. He who sees not that God loves and forgives all, may love God in a certain sense; but it cannot be with a *perfect* love, a love that casteth out fear which hath torment. *We love him because he first loved us.* 1 Jno. iv 19.

It is possible that in some things Anetazo may have gone to an extreme. He speaks as to wise men; judge ye what he has said.

Most Limitarians have so guarded the door of faith that it is impossible that any can enter in because of the terrible guard—neither do they themselves enter; but remain in outer darkness, doubts, and fears.

Most Universalists are not ashamed to confess that they are the saved of the Lord, and ready to give a reason of the hope that is in them with meekness; but a few of them seem to be afraid of showing to the uncircumcised in heart and ears, the gold, silver, and precious stones, of the heavenly Jerusalem; and the glory, light, and unlimited love of the Lamb who is the Temple of it lest these Babylonians should abuse the holy things, and profane them in the worshipping of the idols in which they delight themselves, even in worshipping *themselves.*

Had the gospel contained anything like a *command* to men to *do* or *believe* anything as a *condition* of their salvation, it were not only vain but absurd to parade it before the unregenerate; but the gospel being simply a proclamation of what God *hath done* and *will do* in manifesting his universal love, let every guard and shadow be cast away, and the true light allowed to shine in the darkness—though still, as in the days of John, the darkness comprehendeth it not. With love to all whom God loves, and especially to all who love God,

Yours sincerely,

Jan, 11th. 1851. ANETAZO.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

SIR,—The question whether the doctrine of universal salvation should be proclaimed to the world is as interesting as it is important, and I am glad to find that your pages are open for its discussion.

The interests of morality, we may be sure, are never opposed by the declarations of God respecting his grace; and, if we know anything of the truth, we know well that *the grace of God which bringeth salvation to all men, teaches us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, and righteously, and godly in this present evil world.*

If the reviewer of Balch's "Ireland as I saw it," who appears to have a lively apprehension of the opposition of the gospel to all the native tendencies of man's fleshly nature, fears proclaiming the doctrine of universal salvation to the world, I would ask on what ground the Almighty is justified in revealing his glorious purpose at all? If the wicked man who glories in his shame, can derive any encouragement to live in iniquity from the knowledge of the fact that all are saved and shall be hereafter eternally happy, may not the very elect find out, likewise, that this is its tendency, and be, themselves, beguiled into sin? For the gospel, I take it, in its relation to human character, and conduct, is the same to all; and wherever received its appropriate effect (the effect proper to its nature) must discover itself. The grace of God can only be made the minister of sin by those who PERVERT it; and if men will pervert the gospel (as they did in Paul's time) the fault lies at their own door.

And what, poor sunken sensualist, does it say to thee? That thou shalt be happy? that thy empty coffers shall be replenished? that thy blunted powers shall be sharpened so that thou mayest use them with a keener relish in pursuit of thy fancied good? that thy clouded intellect shall be cleared in order that thy perceptions of those abominable objects of thy sinful indulgence shall be more vivid? that thy broken constitution shall be reorganized, and indued with the vigour and freshness of youth? Thinkest thou that this is the gospel? that this is the universal salvation for which we plead? Poor wretch! Thou hast already eaten of the fruit of thine own ways! thou dost already turn from the bitter cup thou hast mingled for thyself! and the gospel with its universal salvation has nothing for thee wherewith thou mayest indulge for one moment in (what thou art now proving are thy *bitter*) pleasures. It promises thee nothing but the destruction of all that is filthy and impure. Know, that salvation is salvation from *sin;* and thou wilt only be happy as thou dost find that thou art crucified unto the world and the world to thee.

And thus would I speak of the doctrine of God's grace to the guilty, with pity for my fellow sinner, and yet with confidence in the certainty and universality of salvation. Salvation is nothing more nor less than the utter destruction of human nature, and the investiture of every being who has borne it with the divine nature. The one is to be superseded by the other: mortality is swallowed up of life.

D. T. in his review of Newman, &c, has most forcibly dwelt upon the diametrical opposition of that which is spiritual to that which is natural or carnal; and, as affecting universal man, he will not deny that the doctrine of universal salvation is the most transcendent—the climax of all spiritual truth. I will submit to his consideration, and that of your readers, a few extracts from a work which I doubt not is justly esteemed by your readers generally, and whose authority, as accordant with Scripture, will be admitted as decisive.

"The glad tidings of a salvation which is free, which is present, and which is ours, must be presented under every aspect, and man must have every opportunity of opposing it." Thom's *Three Grand Exhibitions of Man's enmity to God. p.* 190.

"That test was to proclaim and make known, as a matter of fact, that righteousness and life everlasting are, in Christ Jesus as second Adam, man's portion—every man's portion." *Ibid*, p. 192.

"One thing, Papists and Protestants, Churchmen and dissenters, [I do not know whether D. T. be enlisted under the banner of any of these parties], all cordially agree in: they all hate, and authoritatively stigmatize as false that present salvation of the whole human race in Christ, the second Adam, which is the grand divinely revealed fact, 1 Cor. xv. 22, and which constitutes the gospel. Luke ii. 13, 14." *Ibid*, p. 255.

"Let every man, to whom the interests of morals and the good of society are dear, with-

out distinction of sect or party, lift up his voice, and if necessary exert his arm likewise, in opposition to such a daring outrage on the character of God." *Ibid*, p. 221.

"But the gospel! The declaration that God, in Christ, loves all mankind freely, certainly, and for ever! The proclaimed fact that eternal life is God's gift, and the creature's present, eternal, and indefeasible enjoyment! Towards this let no toleration be shewn; to this let no quarter be given. Let it be run down; let it be obliterated from the earth by the common consent of men of all sects and parties," &c. *Ibid*, p. 225. Thus does this eloquent writer put words into the mouths of "Jews and Gentiles, Roman Catholics and Protestants, Socinians and Calvinists, clergy and laity, the *profligate* and the serious." See p. 224. I am unwilling to think that D. T. would adopt such a sentiment himself.

The writer of the work we have quoted evidently makes the proclamation of UNIVERSAL SALVATION TO THE UNREGENERATE the *sine qua non* of the third grand exhibition of man's enmity to God; and I think he is right.

I am, Sir,
Yours respectfully,
JAMES JOHNSON.

Fulham,
Jan. 21st, 1851.

REVIEW.

"*Election no excuse for Man's Sin, but rather a motive to Holiness.* By The REV. NINIAN BANNATYNE, A.M. Free Minister of Cumnock." Reviewed by JAMES NICOL, Cumnock. 1844.

IT was a well-known axiom of antiquity, and has been acquiesced in by the moderns, that *poeta nascitur, non fit.* That is, unless a man be endowed by nature with the poetic temperament, and be actuated by overpowering poetic aspirations, it is in vain for others to try to raise him to the rank of one of the muses' favourites, by conferring on him any kind or amount of education; and equally in vain for himself to hope to succeed, by the longest and closest application to the practice of the rhyming art. Every true poet must be able, it may be with some modification, to adopt the language of Pope, and say—

"I lisped in numbers, for the numbers came."

The principle of innate capacity and propensity, to which we have just been adverting, is applicable to more things than poetry. Peculiar natural aptitudes, we have reason to think, characterise all human beings. Some possess an instinctive courage which qualifies, and, circumstances favouring, prompts and disposes them to brave the perils of land or sea. Some appear to be born with a mechanical turn of mind, which almost necessarily shapes out their future sphere of action; and which, in its higher forms of constructiveness and comprehensiveness of intellect, assisted by education, produces our military and civil engineers—our Vaubans, our Smeatons, our Brindleys, and our Stephensons. In others, again, there is a naturally refined power of analysis, and a closeness and accuracy of observation, which in Academic groves, surrounded by all the means and appliances of learning, and backed by industry, lay the foundation of the ripe and universal scholar. Profound metaphysical and logical powers, other things conspiring and co-operating, produce from time to time, an Aristotle, a Leibnitz, and a Locke. And so of other natural tendencies. Not that all men have the means and opportunity of following out the native bent of their minds. Alas! this is, in but too many instances, counteracted and frustrated. Mistakes committed by parents and guardians, misapprehension of one's own capabilities, and the chilling influence of penury, are constantly the means of persons being placed in circumstances completely antagonistic to those in which by nature they are fitted to excel. All that we mean to contend for is, that in each man there is some peculiar faculty or capacity, by which he stands distinguished from his fellows; and that it is on the due and industrious cultivation of this, his best prospects of success in life depend. Nay, farther, that sometimes—might we not be justified in saying, *often?*—even in spite of circumstances tending to repress and prevent its manifestation and growth, so strong and over-mastering is the peculiar mental characteristic of the individual, as to enable it to burst through every restraint, assume its proper place, bring forth its richest fruits, and draw towards it the gaze and admiration of mankind.

We have been led into the preceding train of thought and observation—not, certainly, very novel—by a consideration of the case and experience of our dear, worthy, Christian friend, James Nicol.

James was born a critic. He has the foundations of this distinctive rank

and character laid deep in his mental constitution; and its elements are so thoroughly interwoven with the very warp and staple of his faculties, that we doubt if, under any circumstances, he could have altogether suppressed their manifestation. He might, to be sure, have been nothing more than the village oracle. He might have lived and died content with being the shrewd and racy "Town Clerk of Ephesus," of the "*Glasgow Reformers' Gazette.*" Or, in the hands of a few private friends, his masterly lucubrations might have remained unheeded: read, perhaps, at first, with avidity, and then, like the productions of many other able men, consigned to oblivion. But James Nicol would have been essentially a critic, notwithstanding. And from his writings, rude and crude as they are—disfigured but too frequently as they are by marks of hurry, and exhibitions of bad taste—individuals of superior discernment, attracted by the fresh, just, pithy, original and profound observations in which they abound, and able to separate the gold from the ore, might have enriched their own minds, and might it is too probable, without due acknowledgment of obligations, have contributed valuable additions to that stock of ideas and sentiments, which constitute the common literary property of mankind.

To our friend, Mr. Nicol, it is due to state, that he has enjoyed few or none of the advantages of education, in that sense in which the word is conventionally understood. Refinement and refined society he has, nearly all his life long, been estranged from. The fields of elegant literature he has had little time, and still less inclination to cultivate. His knowledge he has acquired, and his energies he has put forth, in a great measure without any definite plan or purpose. Such disadvantages, however, serve but to render his native superiority the more conspicuous. God has endowed him with faculties of a peculiar kind which, in the degree to which they meet in him, are rarely to be encountered even in literary and polished circles. Were it allowable to do so, he might with truth boast of being animated by more than "ae spark o' nature's fire." Keen, discriminating, sagacious, he sees in a moment into the very pith and marrow of any case that may be submitted to him. And as there is directness in his discernment of its merits, so is there directness also in his mode of dealing with its difficulties. Candid and straightforward in the extreme, he disdains having recourse to those round-about and tortuous expedients which worldly policy dictates. He meets his adversary, face to face. Should the cause withstood by him be weak, its hollowness in an instant he exposes. Its arguments, by a few plain, well chosen and unanswerable, facts, he confutes. Let even a web of special pleading and sophistry be woven for its defence, after having analysed its texture, and disentangled its intricacies, he finishes by tearing it to tatters. Should wickedness, however, be superadded to weakness, woe betide him who ventures to step forth as the champion of such a cause. On him is brought to bear the whole weight of our friend's moral disgust and indignation; the lightning of heaven's denunciations against evil is made to flash terrors into his guilty soul. Unsparing ridicule, stinging sarcasms, and withering invectives he is prepared to employ in every case, where circumstances seem to call for them. Not that roughness and severity are invariable characteristics of Mr. Nicol's style. To play the critic is his delight. And it is pleasing, as well as instructive to observe the calmness, gentleness, and dignity —the perfect ease and power, without uttering a single harsh expression—with which he can succeed, when he chooses, in damaging and destroying an adverse cause. The great defect of our author is that, fertile in resources to excess, he has never yet thoroughly learned the art of grubbing up weeds, and pruning excrescenses; that riding the highly mettled charger of his own buoyant and exhaustless activity, he seems scarcely ever able to know when to rein in. His, indeed, is one of the richest and most exuberant minds of the critical genus, which it has ever been our lot to meet with. To James Nicol cannot by any one who is acquainted with him or his writings, be denied the possession of genius.

Respected, however, as Mr. Nicol is by us on the score of mental and moral

superiority, and abounding in proofs of this as does the little tract now lying before us, we should not on this ground alone have deemed ourselves justified in giving to him and his production a place in our pages. His clear-headedness, innate vigour of soul, restless activity, shrewdness, sagacity, critical acumen, and comprehensiveness of vision, might have been observed and admired by us, without drawing from us any public notice of their existence. To the hero-worshippers—the adorers of mere intellect—we should, under ordinary circumstances, have left his high qualities to be found out and appreciated. But James Nicol, besides being a man of sense and penetration, happens also to be a christian. To him, it has *fallen by lot*, (2 Peter i. 1), and yet according to the divine purpose and sovereignty, (Rom. viii. 29, 30), to know *the truth as it is in Jesus*. Therefore, it is, that we not only love him, but publicly speak of him.

Long acquaintance with the author of the "Review of Bannatyne's Sermon" personally, by correspondence, and through the medium of manuscripts on the subject of religion submitted to our perusal, enables us to say, that his knowledge and attainments in theology, using that term in its best sense as signifying *the character of God revealed in the scriptures*, are such as to indicate that of the teachings of God's Holy Spirit, he has been in no small or stinted degree a partaker. A brief abstract of his religious history may not be unacceptable or uninteresting to our readers.

Reared early in life, among what are denominated popularly in Scotland the Cameronians, McMillanites, or *True Blues*,* he adopted their views, and imbibed their prejudices. But he inherited also their honesty and independence of character. With them, he studied the scriptures in the light of the "Westminster confession of faith," and "Catechisms larger and shorter;" and with them, he determined resolutely, through *good report* and through *bad report*, to adhere to covenant obligations which he regarded as binding on the people of these realms. Such was the opening which, under God, and in direct contradiction to its own restrictive tendencies, led afterwards to his emancipation from sectarian thraldom. Having, while still young, been confined to bed for several years by a disease of the hip-joint, our reviewer availed himself of the leisure thus painfully afforded him, to indulge much in reading. The habits and tastes then acquired have never, since his recovery, forsaken him. Reading has for nearly half a century constituted his chief recreation. Not that there has been much variety in his topics. Theology has always been his favourite branch of study. Especially, that portion of it which enters into the controversies that, in the course of last century, agitated the Scottish Church and nation. He has made himself intimately acquainted with the discussions, which were occasioned by Mr. Boston's† republication of the "Marrow of Modern Divinity;" (1717—1730); with Mr. Glas' expulsion, and his works; (1728 &c); with the causes which led to the secession of the Messrs. Erskine Wilson, Fisher, and Moncrieff, in 1732; and, above all, with the writings of the Rev. James Hervey, particularly his "Dialogues of Theron and Aspasio," —the awful castigation given to these, and to the published sentiments of the popular preachers in general, by Sandeman, in his acute, clever, and sarcastic "Letters,"—and Cudworth's posthumous defence of the views of the deceased Rector of Weston-Favell. (1755—1760.) Various other works illustrative of this, and of other controversies of the period, were perused by Mr. Nicol in

* The strictest by far of our Scottish Presbyterian sects, which adheres with inviolable constancy and fidelity to the "National Covenant," 1581, and the "Solemn League and Covenant," 1643, and which, considering the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, to be bound by covenants to God, in the same way as the children of Israel of old were, has all along refused to acquiesce in the Revolution Settlement of Presbyterianism, in 1690, as Erastian. Their own appellation is, "The Reformed Presbyterian Church." See them, and their notions, travestied in Sir Walter Scott's "Waverly," when speaking of "the gifted Gilfillan," and his followers. The great poet and novelist, whose delight it was to revel in the fictions of chivalry and romance, had no sympathy with the noble, manly, straighforward, and persevering, although, it must be admitted, narrow-minded, impracticable, and somewhat unscriptural Covenanters.

† Author of the celebrated "Fourfold State." Likewise of "Memoirs," "The Crook in the Lot," &c.

succession. He read Archibald M'Lean's shrewd and suggestive treatises. He made himself acquainted with the differences subsisting between the sect of Baptists which owed its origin to that clear-headed man, and the Sandemanians. And, having examined into the doctrines and discipline of the Scotch Independent Churches, in connexion with the late Mr. Dale, of Glasgow, he finally joined them.* From twenty to thirty years he continued a member of their body, living under the influence of a species of modified Sandemanianism. At last the works of John Barclay, of Edinburgh, were put into his hands. Through their instrumentality, he was enabled to see the *more excellent way* which the scriptures themselves teach and develop, in regard to the sinner's hope towards God. Other religious systems, even the best with which he had been previously acquainted, he now discovered had been inculcating, in one way or another, a conditional scheme of salvation—that is, a salvation dependent, in whole or in part, on something to be accomplished by the creature himself. The gospel, he was now enabled to perceive, might be as completely nullified by *works of faith, labours of love, and patience of hope* being made evidences to ourselves of personal state, and thereby substituted for the perfect work of Jesus Christ—the sole foundation of hope towards God—as by all those appropriating acts of faith, so much insisted on by the more serious portion of the popular clergy, which he had long before regarded with abhorrence. Barclay, trampling underfoot all creature righteousness real or fancied, and turning his back on all pretences to superiority on the part of one creature over another, directed him at once and exclusively to Christ's salvation as perfect—to God as appropriating us to himself by the manifestation to our consciences of this truth—to eternal life as not offered to us, but unconditionally bestowed upon us, solely through the death and resurrection of God's well-beloved Son—and to our interest in heavenly blessings as not resulting from our belief, but as having existed anterior to, and being productive of our belief. Salvation certain, because secured to us in Christ Jesus, was, this man of God shewed, the doctrine of scripture.† The fulfilment of every condition of life everlasting by the Redeemer himself—the acceptance of sinful man as righteous in the beloved—were he shewed, not problems which human beings themselves were called on to resolve, not hypotheses which by some *hocus pocus* of their own they were to convert into truths, but facts actually existing, and to every child of God divinely revealed. To the scriptures alone he pointed as proclaiming these and kindred topics. In the blaze of light poured by the written word of God into the mind of every believer, are divine truths alone capable of being apprehended, and are they actually apprehended. Ascribing to revelation alone all our divine knowledge, Barclay shewed that the same scriptures which bring against us a charge of guilt as one with Adam, the transgressor, discharge us from guilt as one with Jesus Christ, the righteous; that the same scriptures which make us acquainted with death as the wages of Adam's one sin, also make us acquainted with eternal life, as the gift of God to us, through the one righteousness of Jesus Christ our Lord. (Rom. v. 12—21.) Sweetly and powerfully did these scriptural views fall upon the mind of Nicol. Prepared in some respects already for their reception in consequence of previous spiritual illumination, it was God's good pleasure to carry them home to his conscience by means of the heavenly light and evidence which from themselves beamed forth. A certain salvation, established in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ alone, by whose destruction of sin and death every condition of the enjoyment of heavenly blessings by us had been fulfilled and exhausted, and by whom as reigning the heavenly blessings themselves are freely bestowed, henceforth became our author's glory. From this, his transition, after a while, to a view of Christ as spiritual Adam, and as thereby the saviour of the world (1 Cor. xv. 22), new-

* "Inghamite" is the term applied to these Churches in England.

† The whole constituting, although unconsciously on Mr. Barclay's part, an anticipation of one of the phases of the doctrine of "Divine Inversion."

creating the unregenerate, through having previously new-created *the bride, the Lamb's wife,* (1 Cor. xv. 22—28; 1 Tim. iv. 10; Rev. xxi. 1—5, with Gen. ii. 21—24, iii. 20, iv. 1, 2, v. 3; and Gal. iv. 4), was easy, and in a divine sense, natural.

Thus, not by human learning, and not by laborious trifling in the study of what are denominated the evidences of Christianity, (one of those delusions by which Satan but too frequently succeeds in drawing aside the eyes and attention of men from Christianity itself, and in perpetuating his sway over them, 2 Cor. iv. 4), was Mr. Nicol brought directly into contact with the scriptures, and was his mind pointed to their essential doctrine, the salvation of Jesus Christ. Not that the truth in its fulness burst upon him all at once. On the contrary, he was left for years amidst much darkness—was made to experience the impossibility of mere man either acquiring or communicating the knowledge of divine truth—and was thus at last brought personally and practically to comprehend what is implied in the declaration, *they shall all be taught of God.* (John vi. 45.) To him, it pleased God in due time to reveal the Saviour. Not that Saviour, whose work is dependent on ours—not that Saviour, who will bring us to glory, if we will but permit him—as fleshly-minded religionists suppose. But that Saviour who hath saved us with an everlasting salvation—who does not find, but makes us willing in the day of his power—and who in his gospel, revealing to us what he himself is, and the righteousness and life which in him we possess, is thereby at once and for ever superseding all self-righteous notions and actings of ours:—cleansing our consciences from guilt by the sprinkling on them of his own precious blood, and by the power of his resurrection, filling us with joy as well as peace in believing.

How sweet, how instructive, how edifying an experience like that of James Nicol. It exemplifies in the history of a single individual the essential nature and progress of spiritual light. Beginning with certain elementary convictions of heavenly truth, introduced into the mind by God himself, through the instrumentality of his word, it is carried on by more enlarged communications, on God's part, of the understanding and belief of the same. (Eph. i. 18—20, iii. 14—18; Coloss. i. 9, iii. 16.) Sometimes human writings or controversies on religious subjects, and sometimes the scriptures themselves, constitute the exciting cause of attention being first directed towards certain divine truths; but in every case where spiritual illumination either originally, or in any of its more advanced stages follows, the effect is due solely to God himself having condescended, by means of his written word, to bear testimony to the conscience of the individual. (1 John v. 1, 9—11.) Revelation, or the substantial wisdom of God, is always wherever divine truth is seen to be what it is by shining into the mind with its own heavenly lustre, superseding and destroying, so far as it extends, the reason or shadowy wisdom of man. (1 Cor. ii. 9—16.) With no other species of knowledge or light, intellectual, moral or religious, can *the light of the knowledge of God, as it shines into the heart, in the face of Jesus Christ,* be confounded.* While confirming those views of God's character as the Creator of the universe, and Punisher of the guilty, which even fleshly mind can apprehend, and by which men totally ignorant of the gospel are often powerfully influenced, spiritual light consists in the opening of the eyes of our understanding to see God as having new created us in his own Son, through whose blood we have the free forgiveness of sins, and through whose resurrection we are made partakers of glory, honour, and immortality. And so far from spiritual light being indebted to the continuance of nature's darkness, for any portion of its brilliancy and splendour, it is as the antagonist and destroyer of darkness, that at every step of its progress it becomes visible by shining into the mind. *God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.* (1 John i. 5.) Against darkness, therefore, of every kind and in all degrees, divine light wages eternal war; over darkness, until darkness in the fulness

* 2 Cor. iv. 6.

of heavenly manifestation be finally swallowed up, it is continually achieving its triumphs. But it is doing more. Divine light cannot co-exist with light of any inferior description. It supersedes nature's light, no less than nature's darkness. It supersedes the light which feebly dawned forth from Moses' dispensation, no less than the dark clouds of shadowy ritual observances, and the thick gloom of legal threatenings which brooded over it. (2 Cor. iii. 7—11.) Light shining into the mind, through faith in the scriptures understood, by means of the teaching of their divine author, is thus not only manifestative as all light is (Eph. v. 13) but surpassingly and supereminently so. Compare Acts ix. 3, and xxvi. 13, with I Cor. ii. *throughout*, 2 Cor. iii. 12—18, iv. 1—6, 1 John i. 5, v. 1—11, &c. It is of the nature of self-evidence. And, to the degree to which it enters into the mind, it is such self-evidence as leaves not the possibility of a mistake. Making inroads continually upon the realms of darkness, by the increased swallowing up of darkness in light, it bears testimony, by this very fact, to its divine origin. Fleshly mind, it may be, occasionally mistakes its own erroneous assumptions and reasonings for heavenly light; but the light which shines from God himself, through the scriptures, being true and heavenly, neither deceives nor allows the possibility of deception. By this light of God's word was James Nicol led on. And in his privilege it has been given to others to share. The divine perfections displayed in Jesus Christ, as these are recorded in the scriptures, have been revealed to them; and in the light of the perfections thus made known, have they been enabled to see their own personal interest in them. And truth after truth, still farther illustrative of these perfections and of their interest in them, having been from the same scriptures, by the spirit of truth, made to enter into and take possession of their minds, their path, like that of the Just One, their head, resembles the *morning light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day.* As with divine light, there is combined divine love, so by increasing love is increasing light accompanied. One necessary effect of which is the painfully humiliating effect upon the mind of all divine illumination. When light from above first enters into the understanding, it is as destructive in some measure of previous darkness; and as this heavenly light augments, the darkness natural to man is more and more destroyed. But this very destructive process tends to bring under our notice the fact, that naturally our minds are the abodes of darkness only; and that as the destruction of darkness is entirely dependent on the progress and triumph of light, so, while light is imperfectly developed, there must remain in the mind vast regions of ignorance as to heavenly and divine truth, which God alone, by the light of his word, and the power of his spirit can destroy. While raised and enabled to triumph in God, by the manifestation to him of the truth as it is in Jesus, the believer is thus, by the very same process cast down and humbled in self. Satisfaction, however, comes to him from the revealed fact, that as his Adamic nature is one of the principal provinces of the realm of darkness, so in the complete and final destruction which awaits that present mighty monarchy, from him who is *The Light*, it is inevitably involved: he as *delivered from the power of darkness, by being brought into the kingdom of God's dear Son* (Colos. i. 13), being enabled to rejoice in that destruction of creature self, through his new and divine creation in Jesus Christ, which otherwise would have been to him an occasion of dismay. (Gal. ii. 20.)

Exactly and thoroughly contrasted with all this, are reason's suggestions and views in the matter of religion, and is that species of progress in religious conviction and illumination, of which rationalists of all descriptions make their boast. To them, not scripture, or the revealed and recorded wisdom of God, but those investigations and conclusions of which the wisdom of man is capable, are everything. The foundation of this system has in every age been laid in the rejection and denial of what God hath said concerning himself as the creator and preserver of all things, and the punisher of iniquity; or concerning his eternal power and godhead, as evinced in the things that are made,

and in his dealings with guilty man. For his own divine account of these matters, some one figment or other of the human mind is substituted. That is, man ventures to give the lie to the God of truth. At this point commences, and henceforward proceeds, reason's progress in religion. *Because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations,* (*reasonings*) *and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.* (Rom. i. 21, 22.) And as the result, *they changed the glory of the uncorruptible God, into an image made like to corruptible man,* (ibid. 23); or, as it is afterwards expressed, *they changed the truth of God into a lie.* (Ibid. 25.) Thus Cain, and subsequently the Gentile descendants of Noah acted—thus from the very commencement of their history the Jews acted—and thus since the coming of our Lord apostate churches and individuals have acted. The principle common to all of them has been, that to the suggestions of the wisdom of man, are always to be postponed declarations emanating from the wisdom of God. Reason's rushlight faintly glimmering in the cavern of their own dark and darkening understanding, alone commands their confidence. The night of the mind they deliberately prefer to its day;* and the twinkling of the luminaries of human intellect, to the glorious beams of that sun of righteousness which, after the prelude of a long and gradually brightening dawn, hath at last arisen, with healing under its wings. (Mal. iv. 2.) Judicially are all such parties given up to themselves, and to believe their own lie. (2 Thes. ii. 11. Also Rom. i. 25 *downwards.*) Turning their backs on revelation, and glorying in the fancied discoveries of reason, they become the willing dupes of their own delusions. Darkened thereby as to their understandings, reason is the only light which they have to guide and direct them; and as, pursuing the course upon which they have entered, the darkness of their minds necessarily increases, so does the light of reason appear proportionally to increase likewise. That is, reason's light acquires a growing power and intensity, actually from the growth of mental darkness. The thick darkness as to divine and spiritual matters in which the votaries of reason find themselves more and more enveloped, or the constantly augmenting gloom of unbelief, and not, properly speaking, any actual and positive advance in reason itself, is what imparts to it the ominous lustre and brilliancy, by which in such a state of things it is characterised. It is, like the lurid flames which welcomed Milton's fallen spirits on their descent into Pandemonium, not light, but "darkness visible." Strange, however, and most melancholy the powerfully fascinating influence which reason, in the absence and rejection of revelation, exercises over the human mind.† Its manifestations are hailed as so many divine oracles. Its supposed exposure of scriptural fallacies, combined with its substitution of human virtue for divine righteousness, and of the native energies of man's soul, for that strength which *the truth as it is in Jesus* alone can impart, inspire the feelings and language of exultation and triumph. Jesus, God's eternal son, degraded to the rank of a mere creatuae—sin done away with, not through atoning sacrifice, but by a direct act of mercy—and man prepared for glory, not through his oneness with Christ in his divine righteousness and life, but through his own proud self-righteous copying of Christ's example, constitute the religious aliment by which the most moderate rejectors of revealed truth, and most moderate devotees of reason, are nourished and supported. But, alas! in many cases, the darkening of the human mind, evinced by the existence and prevalence of such sentiments, does not stop here. While some, like Bunyan's Pilgrim, led astray by the advice of Mr.

---

* *Ye are all,* says the apostle, *the children of the light, and the children of the day; we are not of the night, nor of darkness.* 1 Thes. v. 5. Similar language occurs, Eph. v. 8. See the following context of this last-named passage, as well as Rom. xiii. 11—14. Nothing can be more obvious from such texts, taken along with 1 John i. 5, &c. than that where the knowledge of God, imparted by divine teaching, through the scriptures is, there is day; and where such knowledge is not, there is night.

† See Gal. iii. 1.

Worldly Wiseman, may be alarmed by the nature, and threatening aspect of the light to whose guidance they have hitherto entrusted themselves, and may thereby be deterred from proceeding farther; and while others may come to a stand-still, actuated by a vain hope of conforming, by subjecting the inspired language of scripture to the dictates of human reason; bolder, and more wicked spirits without hesitation pursue their mad career and prepare themselves for every extremity. The very danger to which they are exposing themselves, seems to quicken and stimulate them in their impious progress. Light, such as it is, still beams from the altar of their idol. Why should they not follow it? It may be, that, at every step they take, their difficulties are multiplied, and darkness they find to be fast thickening around them: but why not continue to trust to a guidance which has already made them independent of revelation, imparted to them a sense of liberty self-sufficiency and self-triumph, and enabled them in all the dignity of manhood to trample underfoot popular delusions? And, accordingly, still confiding in reason, they do advance. Under its animating, although baleful guidance, revelation ceases at last to be even a name—their own self-worship becomes complete—in the consciousness of personal virtue, the sense of guilt expires—future life and happiness constitute a boon, to which they declare themselves indifferent—and God himself, as a being to a level with whom they have elevated themselves, is in his promises, no less than his threatenings, openly set at defiance. Amidst this gross darkness—this complete night of the mind—with reason beaming forth fitfully and ominously, and fascinating its votaries to the last, (unless sovereign grace prevent), closes the scene.—Reader! are you as taught of God through his word, and thereby possessed of a certain measure of spiritual discrimination, (Heb. iv. 12) able to distinguish between these two kinds of progress, the progress of light, and the progress of darkness—the progress of Revelation and the progress of reason? Are you able to see, that they are thoroughly and necessarily opposed, the one to the other?

After all that has been said respecting our author, our office as critics in his case is yet to begin.

The review of Mr. Bannatyne's sermon, now lying before us, is clever, pungent, and on the whole most scriptural. Critical acumen, it is evident, is our author's *forte*. And well prepared to detect error, and shew up anti-evangelical statements in the light of divine truth, does he approve himself to be. Poor Bannatyne is but a child in his hands. His shallowness and sophistry, and the inconsistency of his leading positions with the very first elements of Christian theology, are rendered visible in a moment. They are laid bare, indeed, by the hand of a master in Israel. No thanks, however, to our respected friend for this. Taught by the scriptures, and enabled thereby to bring his naturally acute intellect to bear on the subject, the paltry and flimsy nature of Mr. B.'s composition, it cost him scarcely an effort to expose. An election to heavenly blessings which is dependent on creature doings and feelings, and which thus stands irreconcileably opposed to that sovereign and eternal election to salvation by God himself, which is through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth, it required not the vigorous arm of James Nicol to dash to pieces.

Notwithstanding all this, we are bound in truth and fairness to say, that Mr. Nicol's review of Bannatyne, is far from being one of his happiest efforts. Our friend is capable of better things, and has actually achieved better things. Not a few productions of his, vastly superior to the present, have fallen under our own notice. Somehow or other, we cherish a strong suspicion that, as having served its purpose, he himself would not be particularly chagrined, should the "Review" pass into oblivion. Besides grammatical slips, transitions the exact connection of which with what goes before is not always immediately obvious, frequent exhibitions of coarseness, and a bitterness of spirit, the origin of which none of us who have any acquaintance with the truth, and consequently with our own hearts, can have any occasion to guess at—we

say, besides these, the review is not altogether free from crotchets of the author himself, and passages to reconcile which with scripture requires sometimes explanation, and sometimes even modification. His tract, in a word, affords evidence, that although privileged to possess a large measure of spiritual illumination, he nevertheless, like all the other members of the church of God while in flesh, *knows but in part.* Every deduction made, however, the Review is an extraordinary performance. In it, we are at once and constantly brought into contact with the word of God; and are made to feel how powerful it is, even in spite of the weakness of the instrumentality by which it may be wielded, to the casting down of man's vain imaginations and the levelling and demolishing of Satan's strongholds. This is one of the very few human productions on the subject of religion, in which the universality of God's love to man through Christ Jesus is maintained in strict consistency with the sovereignty of grace, as displayed in the election and elevation to *the kingdom* of the true, heavenly and spiritual church.

Sometimes when reflecting on what looks like a waste of talents and energy, in the fact of the passage through life, unnoticed and unknown, and destitute of any commanding attitude, of such men as James Nicol, we have felt, in spite of ourselves, the intrusion into our minds of that mawkish and puling sentimentality so pathetically embodied by Gray in the well-known lines—

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene," &c.

But speedily have we been enabled, as believers in the revealed character of Jehovah, to rebuke and put away from us the impious, no less than unmanly thought. God, we are satisfied, never created any being, much less any human being, in vain. Each is answering some wise and holy end—each is fulfilling exactly, and to the uttermost, the purposes for which he was summoned into existence. James Nicol, as a resident in the obscure village of Cumnock, is just where he should be. Grant we may, speaking after the fashion of men, that differently educated, and differently situated, he might have sustained a loftier position, and filled, what in our apprehension, would have been a more befitting part. But how know we that such a position, and such a part, would have been in reality more important? How know we, that, differently circumstanced, his career would have been more conducive than it has been, to the accomplishment of the highest and most glorious purposes? Nay, what if God, by means of the mass of natural and acquired talents which is allowed continually to run to waste, may not be pouring contempt on that which holds so distinguished a place in man's estimation, and is in so many respects the object of his idolatry?* All natural, as well as spiritual gifts, are of His bestowal; and, possessed as he is of Almighty power, there can never be awanting for his service, at any time, any description or amount of human superiority. But the world is subservient to the church, and the things of time to the things of eternity. Human gifts, like all other human things, *perish in the using.* Under such circumstances, what more emphatic method of declaring practically the comparative worthlessness of mere human powers and attainments can our heavenly Father be conceived to adopt, than that of shewing them, not confined to a few, but existing in a state of lavish and apparently even indiscriminate profusion?

Were it not that there are well understood editorial secrets, and that consequently a sense of propriety seals our lips, we could with pleasure have pointed to the many valuable contributions, with which the industry, activity, and Christian knowledge of Mr. Nicol have, under an assumed signature, enriched and animated our pages. Much, however, do we question, if even the best of these—and all of them are truly excellent—surpass in critical accuracy, comprehensiveness of thought, and masculine energy of language, several which we have read, and which still remain in manuscript.

D. T.

---

* 1 Cor. i. 25—29.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

MARCH, 1851.

THE GREAT OBJECTION TO UNIVERSALISM AND ITS ANSWER.

The principal objection in the minds of professing Christians to the doctrine of the ultimate and certain salvation of all men, is its apprehended licentious tendency. If this doctrine be true, it is said, men may do as they please; whether they restrain their selfish inclinations and interest themselves in the welfare of their fellow creatures, or whether they are utterly regardless of the good of others and seek their own gratification by any means by which it may be attained, it will ultimately come to the same result,—happiness will be their destiny in eternity. It is not to be supposed that God does anything in vain, and that therefore he can have made a revelation of his procedure and purposes to man which can serve no good object. But this doctrine is useless; for if it be true, the result would have been the same whether the knowledge of it now had been communicated to man or not; nay, it is worse than useless, for it encourages men to throw off the restraints which even their own erroneous opinions might have imposed upon them, and thus has a tendency to produce great evil and misery. It is therefore utterly incredible that a being of supreme benevolence should be the author of a doctrine attended with such consequences; even if his purposes had been such as the doctrine indicates, he would at least have refrained from communicating the knowledge of them to creatures so constituted as are the human race.

This is an objection, it will be observed, derived entirely from the supposed tendency of the doctrine, altogether irrespective of the question, whether or not such a doctrine is actually taught in the Scriptures as a matter of fact. And although the objectors would not avowedly rest their opposition to Universalism on such grounds, there can be no doubt that it is at the bottom of it, and that it operates not only in prompting them to that opposition, but also in preventing them from giving their due weight to those statements of Scripture in which the doctrine is announced, making them shrink from a candid investigation of the subject, and disposing them rather to put it aside as a thing which they privately wish, hope, or think may probably be true, but which it is advisable to say or even to think nothing about.

The objection has been answered repeatedly,—it may have been, fully and sufficiently, though we have not met with such an answer as from its importance we think it deserves; but often also, we are of

opinion, rather petulantly, carelessly, and insufficiently. We consider that it deserves a fair, full, and sufficient answer; and, in the absence of any other, we shall endeavour to the best of our ability, to give it such an answer.

We say that we think the objection deserves a full and careful consideration, because it is one which has great, nay the greatest weight, with even the fairest and most conscientious opponents of our cause; and those who support that cause in the spirit of Him who was long suffering to his enemies and never weary in well-doing, ought not to spare pains in endeavouring to remove difficulties from the minds of others, upon points on which they themselves have none. The objection indeed is not one which bears exclusively against Universalism; but may be, and is brought against the gospel itself, even when understood as declaring only a partial salvation; namely, that true, and only true glad tidings, which tells of God's unconditional love to man in sending his Son into the world to save sinners;—to save them entirely, not to help to save, or put them in the way of saving themselves. But it bears still more strongly when that love is held to include as its object the whole human race.

In considering the objection, we shall take for granted that we have stated our case in proof of the truth of the doctrine of the salvation of all men as a matter of Scriptural declaration, and at least silenced, if not convinced our opponents. We shall also take for granted that they acknowledge, verbally at least, the unadulterated gospel,—that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; and hold that salvation is entirely of God's free grace or undeserved mercy,—that eternal life is the *gift* of God. When they tell us then that our doctrine destroys all motives to well-doing, we ask them what are the motives and sanctions to well doing which Christianity supplies. We have endeavoured to shew what these are in some articles lately published in this magazine ("True Christianity a Practical Religion,") and would just briefly state them to be—love for him who first loved us,—the love of God shed abroad in our hearts, devotedness to him who hath bought us with a price. Our opponents, we doubt not, will acknowledge these as the highest motives by which believers can be influenced. But their objection, at least if urged with reference to believers of the gospel, is inconsistent with this admission, for it is equivalent to saying that these motives and sanctions are quite insufficient to induce to well-doing or to deter from evil, (indeed there is nothing *deterring* in them,) and that the only thing really efficient is the fear of incurring everlasting, never-ending misery. Perhaps they may tell us that with all who really believe and are assured of their own salvation they will be sufficient; but that there are many who are weak in faith, not quite certain that they are believers, or not quite assured of their own salvation, and with whom accordingly such motives and sanctions cannot be sufficiently powerful. To this we can only say, that such men cannot understand the gospel; with them the glad news is not that Christ died for *sinners*, but that Christ died for believers; or rather practically for such as can persuade or assure themselves that they are believers. Such we cannot recognize as believers of the apostolic testimony; but

whether their uncertainty respecting their faith and hope be great or little, we can only class them amongst unbelievers;—it may be, very religious or very devout unbelievers. It is enough, in the first place, that we reply to those who profess to see the glad tidings proclaimed by the apostles as undoubtedly true, (and, as inseparable from that, themselves assuredly saved), that if the love of God be sufficient to constrain to well-doing, their objection so far is inconclusive; as with them, on their own profession, there is no room for the fear of hell and no necessity for it.

But there may be some, who, professing to believe the gospel, have no doubt of their own salvation, and who may with truth urge the objection, and from experience both see and feel its weight. They may be assured that they shall be saved, and therefore feel neither necessity nor inclination for doing anything than indulge their own selfish propensities, as whatever their conduct may be, it will make no difference in the end. They cannot deny that they are commanded to abstain from evil, but the command is accompanied with no penalty, or with no sufficient one, therefore why should they attend to it? They cannot but acknowledge that they are exhorted to walk worthy of the calling by which they are called, but as they gain nothing by doing so, it appears to them quite unnecessary. True, they are exhorted to do so from love to Him who first loved them, but love which costs anything is to them too expensive; it may be well enough to talk about, but they cannot afford to give it. They feel no such love, though it may be, they are not insensible to the feeling in regard to other things. And why is all this? Simply, because such men know not the gospel. Professing to believe it, they totally misunderstand it; their gospel is, that Christ died to save them, they being special favourites of heaven; or, rather, that it was the will of God to save them, and therefore it behoved the Son of God to come into the world to do it. But this was not because "God so loved the world," but simply from an arbitrary determination to display his sovereignty; it indicated. therefore, no love to them, and calls for none in return. These men know not what salvation is:—slaves to the law of their own nature, they seek only to be undisturbed by any other law which might be opposed to its dictates, and know nothing of a desire to be delivered from its selfish tendencies; slaves to sin they desire only to remain quiet, in ignorance of any law which brings the knowledge of sin, and have no wish to be animated only by that love which raises them above sin; slaves to death, they flatter themselves that they have life while it is only the bliss of ignorance, and they are strangers to that life which consist in the favour of God, and the knowledge of his character as revealed in Jesus Christ. Men holding such sentiments will, no doubt, act as they like, unrestrained or unconstrained by any other than worldly principles, animated by nothing higher than selfish motives; but they afford no illustration of the force of the objection to Universalism which is under consideration, as their plea would be the same whether they were Universalists or Partialists, and the objection equally applicable in both cases.

It may be said however that it is not in reference to such individuals as either of the preceding classes that the objection has most importance,

but in respect to a much larger class who have no such certainty of belief, or such confidence in their destiny; in reference to those who either are avowed unbelievers or are doubtful of the truth of the gospel, —either almost persuaded that it is true, or at least somewhat suspicious that it may be so. We shall, therefore, now direct our attention to the objection as it concerns such individuals.

We have already stated that all such we must consider as unbelievers; it may not be disbelievers, or men who positively discredit the apostolic testimony respecting the work of Jesus Christ, but at least men who are not certainly convinced of its truth. Only those who have such a conviction we can recognize as believers of the gospel,—as really Christians. But the vast majority of professing Christians we readily admit will not come under this description: they either understand more or less clearly the glad tidings of the apostles, and think them more or less probably true, or they put faith in something which is a misconception and perversion of the gospel of the grace of God. It is upon such as these, in all their varieties, that the doctrine of the ultimate salvation of all men is charged with producing bad effects; and it is our business now to inquire how much truth is in the charge, and how it is to be answered.

Those who consider Christianity as an imposture or a fable can only look upon the doctrine as a speculation, which they will regard with more or less favour according as it coincides or not with their own opinions or guesses. Such, however, in nominally Christian countries, are but few in number; there are many more who are more or less doubtful of the truth of Revelation, and not without more or less suspicion that there may be more truth in it than they are willing to admit. Such a doctrine, as it is supposed to promise them impunity from punishment, it is apprehended will be looked upon by them with favour and be productive of bad effects. And the same may be said of all who are in any degree doubtful of the truth of Revelation, even though their doubts may be unconfessed, and their profession that of believers.

Then there are the very numerous class who hold a perverted gospel —tidings that a Christ came into the world to save some sinners, or to shew men how they may save themselves. Upon those of such who are satisfied that they shall be of the number of the saved, Universalism can have no influence; their motives will be the same whether it be true or not: on the much larger number of this class who are more or less doubtful of this, it is supposed that the doctrine will be productive of evil, by making them, in proportion to the credence they give it, careless as to the use of the "means of grace;" as, if this doctrine be true, any labour or self denial on their part, any exertion of their talents, or any circumspection in their walk, will be thrown away. It is a balance of probabilites, and their wishes are in favour of the doctrine which is supposed to be most agreeable to them.

Upon the minds of all such men the rival doctrines can only appear as invested with a greater or less degree of probability. On the one hand it is more or less probable that some who attain to a certain standard of works, or of faith as evidenced by works, shall be saved and all others condemned to everlasting misery; on the other hand,

it is more or less probable that all shall be finally happy. The former of these is held by our opponents to be the doctrine the most conducive to the welfare of mankind as it imposes a useful restraint on their evil inclinations; the latter to be a dangerous one as it relieves them from that restraint. Such influences can only be exerted on the minds of any, on the supposition that their belief in the doctrine, though it may be only that of probability, is at least so strong as to influence their actions. This accordingly we shall presume to be the case.

It will be well to advert, in the first place, to the consideration of what constitutes the principal restraining and controlling influence on the great mass of mankind. This is public opinion; the voice of society at large, or of the particular section with which individuals may be more closely connected. Not that we would deny the influence of religious opinion; on the contrary, we believe it to be very great and extensive; but on the majority it operates only as it is enforced and supported by public opinion; or, more correctly, by those who lead and direct public opinion.

Such men, then, it is contended, if they incline to believe that universal salvation is true, will be released from useful and beneficial restraint in proportion to the strength of their faith. We admit this to be true, but contend that they will also be so far influenced by gratitude; and, in proportion as their faith in the doctrine is imperfect, they will be kept in check by the fear that it may not be true after all. On the other hand it is maintained that those who have the fear of hell before their eyes are under a powerful restraining influence, while the hope of heaven presents to them a stimulus to well doing, an influence constraining to good; in other words, the hope of reward and fear of punishment are the most powerful influences on mankind for good, the absence of them tends only to evil.

Now it is to be remarked that reward and punishment are purely and only selfish motives; men actuated by such motives alone are influenced only by the personal advantages to be derived from conducting themselves in the way indicated; deprived of these they would act no better than others who have no such motives,—who expect happiness without deserving it, or commit evil with the hope of impunity. The former would not do well if they were not to be gainers by it, they would do ill if they durst. They do well not from love to God, but from love to themselves; they avoid evil not from fear of God,—reverence to his pure and holy character, but from fear of hell. Those on the other hand who believe that they and all shall be finally blessed, whatever selfish motives they may have in common with others, have not the hope of heaven for one to induce them to good, or the fear of hell to deter them from evil. So far then as the character of the motives are concerned those of the Partialist are low and selfish; those of the Universalist, so far as he is actuated by the principles which the positive belief of the doctrine produces, are high and generous.

Then again, Partialists in examining their own hopes of happiness, are under the perpetual temptation to look with complacency upon their own actions,—to deceive themselves as to their value and importance,—to be puffed up with pride at their own attainments. Represent

it as they may, whether they look to their good works as evidence of the sincerity of their faith, or examine the state of their affections to ascertain whether they have taken hold of Christ, one thing they look for, and that is something in or about themselves, whether they attribute it to God's grace or not, to distinguish them from their fellow-sinners. They cannot, therefore, "examine themselves," they dare not do so candidly, they cannot run the risk of discovering that they are in imminent peril of "never ending ages of unutterable woe." The effect therefore of the doctrine is to produce spiritual pride and pharisaical self complacency: from these, so far as the prospect of eternal happiness or misery is influential in producing them, the Universalist, in proportion to his faith in his principles, is free.

Or, if some more candid or less self-deluded than others, do undertake this self examination, and discover themselves to be in imminent danger of eternal misery, if not even certain of it, what are the effects? Despondency, desperation, recklessness. Without God and without hope in the world, they say, Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die. Escape appears to them hopeless; why then concern themselves about the future? let them make the most of the present. Even in human affairs, the effect of punishment disproportionate to the offence has been to produce desperation; and what can be so disproportionate as eternal misery for human crimes? From these effects also the Universalist is free. He has no cause for such despair; he has not this inducement to recklessness. D. W.

(To be continued.)

PORT NATAL.

A SECOND LETTER FROM MR. JAMES RIDDALL WOOD.

D'Urban, Port Natal,
South Africa, 30th Sept., 1850.

My Dear Sir,

I seize the opportunity of a conveyance to the Cape to renew my correspondence with you, which has been neglected for some time past, owing to the struggles I have had to engage in since my arrival. I am thankful to say, that, with the exception of an attack of dysentery on my arrival, I never enjoyed better health in my life. I walked up to Pietermaritzburg, a distance of sixty miles, in two days, and back in the same time; and never did I pass through a more beautiful country in my life. Of course it is very much in a state of nature, but the luxuriance of vegetation exceeds my powers of description. It abounds in bucks, as the roe-buck, the springbok, and several other sorts; elephants are also numerous, and on the lakes the sea-cow. Cotton and indigo are indigenous, and in some places the sugar cane:—then you sometimes come upon a settler's location like an oasis in this beautiful wild, (not desert), where the pine-apple and the lemon and orange and banana, and other tropical productions are to be met with, beside the turnip, and cabbage, and potato of old England. As you pass along through the bush and over the table lands, the air is redolent of sweet scents from a thousand flowers; and the hum and chirp of a thousand insects mingle into one delightful harmony—so that it has the most exhilarating influence on the animal spirits, there is everything around inviting you to settle, and cultivate so grateful a soil. There are, however, draw-

backs: the soil is as productive of weeds as of useful plants; there are insects, against whose depredations you will have to protect yourself by watchfulness and care; you must labour hard to clear the ground, and to keep it clear of weeds; you must erect good fences to protect your crops from deer and strong cattle; kraals to shut out the hyena and the tiger-cat from your herds; but then these are the conditions upon which the earth is given to man—"in the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread," &c. It is well to know, however, that these animals never venture to attack man, unless first provoked: they instinctively fly even from the naked Kafir.

When I last wrote, I was, with the assistance of Mrs. Wood, keeping school and getting occasional jobs from the only notary in the place. I have, however, made some progress since that time, having entered into an engagement to become the manager for Mr. Feilden, son of the late Sir John Fielden, of Blackburn; and as his estate is only three miles off, I shall continue to reside here. Mrs. Wood continues the day-school, and I the evening school, and in addition to this, I report for the "D'Urban" newspaper, and am now about to publish an almanack for 1851, a copy of which, when out, I will send you. We have had large numbers of emigrants arrived of late, and all either go on the land, or get into employ, except three who had formed drinking habits—who hang about the canteens as long as their money lasts. There is room for tens of thousands more, and the capabilities of the land are unsurpassed. Then the climate is delightful. During the last four months it has been winter, but more like an English May or June, and the air balmy and pure—so pure that at night you may distinctly perceive the relative distance of the stars from this planet—the nearest ones appear so—others appear more deeply embedded in the rich etherial blue, while others again appear immeasurably deeper still. This I never observed in England: all there appear the same distance, differing only in size.

As a cotton growing country, I do not think it will produce anything very considerable for some time, as the capital is wanting, and the supply of labour at the season for picking very uncertain, that being the time they generally spend at their respective kraals getting in their *mealies*. if any of your friends contemplate coming out, I would advise them to bring nothing but money. The market is glutted with English manufactures of all kinds, and prices of all things have been very much reduced in consequence: whereas money is so scarce, that parties are paying 4 per cent. per month, and giving security into the bargain; and yet I know many instances in which it pays the borrower well even at that exorbitant rate. So much for the things of this world.

As regards the things pertaining to a better life, I find myself very much alone—among parties who are notoriously making a gain of godliness, or who are going about to establish "their own righteousness, not submitting themselves to the righteousness of God." By the last vessel we had a Mr. Campbell, (I beg his pardon, Rev. I should have said), who is come out to establish a church in the interests of the Free Church of Scotland. He is preaching to-night I hear at the Wesleyan chapel: he preached there on Sunday, and, of course, was very urgent upon his hearers to become their own Saviours. I have met with two Johnsonians from Liverpool; one, a Mr. Holmes, who was shipwrecked in the Minerva, and who has a wife still in Liverpool. He has been obliged, in consequence of his loss, to take the situation of teacher in the family of a wealthy Dutch Boer. I was much pleased with him—his knowledge of the scriptures was extensive. He was formerly in the employ of the late Rev. W. Jones, author of a History of the Waldenses. He mixed with the Wesleyans, as he "felt it his duty" to do; I cannot but feel it my duty to stand alone, though by so doing I incur the general disapprobation, and am thought to be exceedingly illiberal in consequence. This is however of little consequence, since I know it cannot be otherwise, than that minds imbued with fleshly views of religion should be hostile to those which are spiritual and divine. I am going through your "Divine Inversion" with greater care and

attention than ever I have yet been able to bestow, and find it to be indeed suggestive of an almost infinite series of resemblances and oppositions to be met with in the word of God. The bearer of this is Mr. Horwen, who was likewise wrecked in the Minerva, and who is a Johnsonian; but from not having seen him more than once or twice on business, I have had no conversation with him on religious topics. He is returning home I fear with prospects blighted in consequence of the wreck; although had the property been landed safe, I think it would only have helped to increase the glut in the market.

Mrs. Wood and my family are in the enjoyment of excellent health and spirits, and all like the colony much.

* * * * * * *

When you have a leisure hour I should be delighted to hear from you. My address is, "James Riddall Wood, D'Urban, Port Natal, South Africa." With my kindest regards to Mrs. Thom and family, and to all friends meeting in Bold Street, I remain, dear Sir,

Yours very truly,

Dr. Thom. JAMES RIDDALL WOOD.

THE CHRISTIAN TREASURY AND THE DYING UNIVERSALIST.

How should Universalism be opposed? is a question which some of our contemporaries are answering by the tactics they employ to prejudice their readers against it. And what are their weapons? We have already given a specimen from the *Christian Witness;* and, in the *Christian Treasury* for February, we have another unmistakeable sample.

These two *Christians* are worthy of each other! They are not fools. They well know that an ounce of prejudice is more available than a pound of argument; and that "a telling anecdote" will go a great deal further than a scripture statement, or any amount of Christian logic. We are unwilling, however, to believe that their readers are so easily satisfied: we cherish the conviction that many of them are capable of distinguishing between the true and the false in what they say respecting Universalism; indeed, it appears to us that their intelligence and Christianity *must* be insulted by such abominable and barefaced misrepresentation of "*our most holy faith.*"

"*The Harvest Past, or the Dying Universalist,* by J. S. SPENCER, D.D.," is the title of the paper to which we allude. As usual, we have no name and no place: but we are favoured with the very satisfactory information that the event, which the writer narrates, took place "more than 16 years ago." After so far satisfying us as to the time, Dr. Spencer expresses his reluctance to commit to paper that which is so appalling, and the thought of which fills him with horror; but he will yield to the solicitations of his friends.

He states that he was hastily summoned to the bedside of a sick man, about 26 years of age. And this is the character he gives him:—"*He was an industrious man; prosperous in his business; and, as a man of the world, bore a good character.*" This is not very discreditable: we wish nothing worse could ever be said of a professing Christian! We have more than once been told by men of business that they would rather have transactions with "men of the world," than with those who make a profession of religion. Alas! that Christ should be so wounded in the house of his friends!

"His father was a Universalist, and the son had imbibed his principles." The writer, however, does not attribute the son's industry, or prosperity, or his good character to his Universalism. Oh! no: his object is to show that Universalism is the parent of the worst of crimes and greatest woes. The clergyman found the young man in intense suffering, and in a state of despair. In vain did he attempt to administer consolation by setting before him the mercy and grace of God; and, after some conversation, the young man "vociferates," "'Mercy! mercy! that is what makes my situation so dreadful! I have despised mercy! I have scoffed at God! I have refused Christ! If God was only *just* I could bear it. But now the thought of his abused mercy is worst of all! there is *no mercy* for me any longer! For years I have refused Christ! My day has gone by! I am lost! I am lost.'"

The Universalist despise mercy? Scoff at God? Refuse Christ? Could bear God if he were *only* just? Abuse mercy? and die in despair? The picture has not even the slightest claim to being a bad caricature of a Universalist. We do not deny that such words were uttered; and it is quite unnecessary to show that a Universalist could not utter them: but we know that there is a religious (?) teaching which is calculated to produce something very much like them.

But here is more to add to the account. The young man goes on, "The eleventh hour is past! This is the twelth hour. God's time of vengeance has come! . . . . I have loved the world only," &c. His father comes into the room, and, "in a tone of hatred and anger," the son upbraids him with, "You have been my worst enemy! You have ruined me. You led me to disobey God, and neglect the bible! You led me into sin when I was only a little boy," &c.

We cannot quote more; the father appears to be everything that is bad, and the son shortly dies in despair.

The impression conveyed by the whole narrative is that Universalism is the enemy of both God and man: opposed to religion, to morals, and to happiness; and terminating in ruin and despair.

Dr. Spencer (whoever he may be) must be either profoundly ignorant, or—— we forbear to characterize the man. We presume that the Editor of the *Christian Treasury* has a mortal hatred of Universalism; for this is not the first "anecdote" he has published with a view of throwing discredit upon us. Upon *us?* nay, upon Him who bore our griefs, and carried our sorrows; upon Him who bore the iniquities of us *all;* upon Him, who will see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied; upon Him who was called "a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners;" upon Him, whom the *pious* of his day on earth deprecated because "*he receiveth sinners.*" Well! we can afford to bear the reproach of *Christian Witnesses* and *Christian Treasuries,* and *Christian Times** too, for our master; since we have his company and the animating words he uttered for our consolation, "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake." Let us live up to our privileges, and illustrate our principles in

* A weekly newspaper, bearing this title, in animadverting on a recent sermon by a clergyman at Oxford, after condemning many of his statements, discovers the climax of his error to consist in his exposing himself to the charge of Universalism, inasmuch as "there was no discrimination," &c.!

our lives, not forgetting to pray "that all who profess and call themselves *Christians* may be led into the way of TRUTH;" and we need not fear but that we shall put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.

Z.

IMPORTANT CONCESSIONS OF PROFESSOR STUART.

PROFESSOR MOSES STUART has long been one of the most influential writers in the orthodox ranks. With the Presbyterians his name is a tower of great strength, and a defence against all religious heresies. What then will be thought of the following article from his pen, published in the Biblical Repository?

"There are minds of a very serious cast, and prone to reasoning and inquiry, that have in some way come into such a state, that doubt on the subject of ENDLESS punishment cannot without the greatest difficulty, be removed from them.

"They commence their doubts, it is probable, with some *a priori* reasoning on this subject.—'God is good. His tender mercy is over all the work of his hands. He has no pleasure in the death of the sinner. He has *power* to prevent it. He knew, before he created man, and made him a free agent, that he would sin. In certain prospect of his endless misery, therefore, his benevolence would have prevented the bringing of him into existence. No father can bear to see his own children miserable without end, not even when they have been ungrateful and rebellious; and God, our Heavenly Father, loves us better than any earthly parent does or can love his children.

"'Besides, our sins are temporary and finite; for they are committed by temporary and finite beings, and in a world filled with enticements both from without and from within. It is perfectly easy for Omnipotence to limit, yea, to prevent, any mischief which sin can do; so that the endless punishment of the wicked is unnecessary, in order to maintain the divine government, and keep it upon a solid basis. Above all, a punishment *without end*, for the sins of a few days or hours, is a portion of misery incompatible with justice as well as mercy. And how can this be any longer necessary, when Christ has made atonement for sin, and brought in everlasting redemption from its penalty?'

"The social sympathies, too, of some men, are often deeply concerned with the formation of their religious opinions. They have lost a near and dear friend and relative by death; one who never made any profession of religion, or gave good reason to suppose that his mind was particularly occupied with it. What shall they think of his case? Can they believe that one so dear to them has become eternally wretched,—an outcast for ever from God? Can they endure the thought that they are never to see or associate with him any more? *Can heaven itself be a place of happiness for them, while they are conscious that a husband or a wife, a son or a daughter, a brother or a sister, is plunged into a lake of fire from which there is no escape?* 'It is impossible,' they aver, 'to overcome such sympathies as these. It would be unnatural and even *monstrous* to suppress them.' They are, therefore, as they view the case, *constrained* to doubt whether the miseries of the future world can be endless.

"If there are any whose breasts are strangers to such difficulties as these, they are to be congratulated on having made attainments almost beyond the reach of humanity in the present world; or else to be pitied for ignorance, or want of a sympathy which seems to be among the first elements of our social nature. With the great mass of thinking Christians, I am sure such thoughts as these must, unhappily for them, be *acquaintances too familiar*. That they *agitate our breasts as storms do the mighty deep*, will be testified by every man of a tender heart, and who has a deep concern in the present and future welfare of those whom he loves.

"It would seem to be from such considerations, and the like to these, that a belief in the future repentance and recovery of sinners has become so wide-spread in Germany, pervading even the ranks of those who are regarded as serious and evangelical men in respect to most or all of what is called Orthodox doctrine, saving the point before us. Such was the case, also, with some of the ancient fathers;* and such is, doubtless, the case with not a few of our day."

It really seems to us that the man who wrote that article must be leavened, to some extent, with the spirit and principles of Universalism.—Is it too much to suppose that he has strong doubts of the eternity of hell torments?

Star in the West.

PRIESTCRAFT.—Priests above all people are naturally inclined to sectarianism; they are accustomed to regard the Church as of higher importance than the Bible; according to them, Religion is not the work of God alone but of God and man together. Hence it is that the Priesthood, in every Christian sect, is that which divides, opposes, denounces, and excommunicates. It is through the Priesthood that we have schisms, and we shall continue to have them so long as in the Church of Christ the believer is not placed before the minister, the spirit before the form, grace and faith before outward rites and observances. *Achilli's Dealings with the Inquisition.*

KINDNESS THE BEST PUNISHMENT.

A QUAKER, of most exemplary character, was disturbed one night by footsteps under his dwelling, and arose from his bed, and cautiously opened a back door to reconnoitre. Close by was an out-house and under it a cellar, near a window of which was a man busily engaged in receiving the contents of his pork barrel from another within the cellar. The old man approached and the outside man fled. He stepped up to the window and received the pieces of pork from the thief within, who after a little while, asked his supposed accomplice, in a whisper, 'shall we take it all?' The owner of the pork said softly, 'yes, take it all,' and the thief industriously handed up the balance through the window, then came himself. Imagine his consternation when, instead of meeting his companion in crime, he was confronted by the Quaker. Both were astonished, for the thief proved to be a near neighbour, of whom none would have suspected such conduct. He pleaded for mercy, begged the owner

*"However it may be explained, it is a striking fact, that neither the Apostles' Creed nor the Nicene, nor yet the Thirty-nine Articles of the Episcopal Church express any belief in future misery, although they distinctly express a belief in future happiness. The Apostles' Creed closes thus:—'I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy Catholic Church; the Communion of Saints; the Forgiveness of sins; the Resurrection of the body; and the Life everlasting. Amen.'"

not to expose him, spoke of the necessities of poverty, and promised faithfully never to steal again.

'If thou hadst asked me for meat,' said the old man, 'it would have been given thee. I pity thy poverty and weakness, and esteem thy family; thou art forgiven.'

The thief was greatly rejoiced, and was about to depart.—'Take the pork neighbour.'

'No, no,' said the thief, 'I don't want the pork.'

'Thy necessity was so great that it led thee to steal. One half the pork thou must take with thee.'

The thief insisted he could never eat a morsel of it. The thoughts of the crime would make it choke him. He begged the privilege of letting it alone. But the old man was incorrigible, and furnishing the thief with a bag, had half the pork put therein, and laying it upon his back, sent him home with it.

He met his neighbour daily for many years afterwards, and their families visited together, but the matter was kept a secret; and though in after time the circumstance was mentioned the name of the delinquent was never known. The punishment was severe and effectual. It was probably his first, it was certainly his last, attempt to steal. *Young People's Mirror.*

—o—

ANOTHER AWFUL SUICIDE.

We have often said that the doctrine of endless misery is one of the most fearful scourges under which society now suffers. A history of that doctrine for hundreds of years past, would disclose scenes of persecution, sorrow, despair and suicide, at which the stoutest heart would quail. Who will write a faithful history? Who will show where the doctrine originated? how it crept into the Church? when it came to be considered essential to the orthodox faith? how it has gone side by side with persecution? how it has filled men with wrath and bitterness against their foes? how it has oppressed the tender, pious heart, driving men and women to despair, insanity and death?

The following is only one among a thousand similar statements of facts which it makes the blood run cold to recite.

Br. Whittemore,—I hereby announce to you the intelligence of a most *heart-rending* suicide, which occurred in this place on Monday last. The circumstances attending it are as follows, and were communicated to me by the coroner who held the inquest.

The unfortunate subject of this notice, whose name was Julia A. Chapin, of New Marlborough, attended a protracted meeting which has been in progress for a number of weeks in the vicinity where she lived. It was carried on principally by the Methodists. She was (to use their own expression,) hopefully converted, and in this situation she remained until about two or three weeks ago, when she listened to a sermon from Matt. xx. 16: 'So the last shall be first, and the first last; for many be called but few are chosen.' From this time the conviction seemed to fasten itself upon her mind that she was not among the chosen, and consequently there was no salvation for her. In vain did her friends endeavour to dispel the delusion. She grew melancholy, continually insisting that she must go to hell; in which situation she continued until the morning of Monday last when she rose from the breakfast table, took a razor which she concealed about her person, put on her bonnet, went out un-

observed, and was found in about ten minutes after, perfectly lifeless, having cut her throat in such a manner, as to cause her death apparently without a struggle. Respectfully yours, C. D. Palmer.

New Marlboro', Mass., Nov. 24, 1849. *Boston Trumpet.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

SHOULD THE DOCTRINE OF UNIVERSAL SALVATION BE PROCLAIMED TO THE WORLD?

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Dear Sir,

In the Universalist for February last (No. xiv) there is a letter from Anetazo upon the question whether the doctrine of Universal Salvation should be proclaimed to the world, in which he takes for his subject of comment, some remarks made in a private letter to him by the writer of this. The same reasons that induced him to give publicity to his comments in your Magazine have actuated the writer in requesting that you will give insertion to this reply. Trusting that you will do so, to avoid unnecessarily occupying your space, he will proceed at once without any preliminary remarks to the consideration of the subject.

"Anetazo" asks in the first place whether "the gospel of the grace of God can be proclaimed in its integrity without proclaiming the Universal love of God?" This he answers with a hypothetical *No*, and then draws the conclusion that the first proclamation of the gospel to any man or to all men who ever heard it, *must* have been a proclamation of the Universal love of God to the Unregenerate, and appeals for proof of this to the scriptures. We reply that the gospel of the grace of God is not properly the announcement of the *love* of God at all, and that Anetazo at the outset confounds two things quite distinct, namely the love of God and the grace or mercy of God; the love of God being his goodness or beneficence in bestowing blessings on his creatures either as innocent or without any reference to guilt, his grace or mercy being his goodness in shewing kindness to *guilty* creatures, those who were deserving only of wrath—the objects of righteous judgment. He at once shows this by citing as his first instance God's bestowing blessings at the creation on innocent man and animals, an exhibition of God's love certainly, but not of his grace or mercy. He then cites "as the next proclamation of the universal love of God" the sentence on the serpent, the prophecy of the enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent and of its results. "This" says he "was a proclamation of the gospel —of God's universal love." It was we reply, the first announcement of the gospel or tidings of the grace or mercy of God, of his love to man guilty or deserving only of justice. That it was a proclamation of God's universal love to the world, so understood by Eve, is a pure assumption, and her observation on the birth of her first born,* suggested as a proof of this, only shows how egregiously wrong she was in any supposition respecting it she may have formed. There is no evidence how the prophecy was understood by our first parents; in all probability they understood no more than that it was a promise of future victory over the tempter, but how or to what extent, they could probably form no definite idea.

Anetazo next proceeds to quote several other instances in which the gospel was announced to Abraham, Nicodemus, Jews and Gentiles, in order to prove that the universal love of God was proclaimed to unregenerate men. Now nothing could be further from our thoughts than to question the propriety of proclaiming *the gospel* to men who do not believe it; indeed it is only to such that it can with propriety be proclaimed. To those who believe it we cannot proclaim it, as that would virtually be to assume that they do not believe it. We may speak of it and comfort one another with the knowledge of it, but it would be a contradiction

*As given by Anetazo—"I have gotten a man, the Jehovah."

to proclaim peace as glad tidings to those who have already heard the proclamation and found peace in believing it. We have already shewn that to identify the glad tidings of the mercy of God with the proclamation of the universal love of God to men is to confound two things totally different, but as our object is not to gain a victory in argument but to educe and vindicate truth, we shall suppose that Anetazo may still contend, or perhaps may have meant from the first, that the gospel cannot be proclaimed in its integrity without proclaiming the mercy of God as effective towards the whole human race. He does not say so directly but his whole argument is founded on the assumption of this. It would have been more to the purpose had he proved *this* instead of adducing evidence that the gospel was proclaimed to the unregenerate, a point which we never dreamt of questioning.

After the case of Eve in support of his Universalism Anetazo quotes that of Abraham, referring to God's promise contained in the words "in thy seed (which is Christ) shall all families of the earth be blessed," stating that Abraham believed that what God had promised he was able also to perform, that he saw the day of Jesus when he would be set forth a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, &c. Who told Anetazo this? How does he know that Abraham saw this? There is not the slightest Scriptural evidence that he saw any such thing, but much to indicate that it was highly improbable that he did. There is no probability that he had any distinct idea as to how all families of the earth should be blessed in him; he could however without difficulty understand that he should be the father of many nations and that his seed should be as the stars of heaven in number; and nothwithstanding the improbability of this, being without heirs at the advanced period of his own and Sarah's life, he believed God, being fully persuaded that what he had promised he was able to perform. (See Rom. iv. 16—22.)

When Anetazo speaks of the gospel being proclaimed to Jews and Gentiles does he mean to say that it was stated in such a way that they *understood* the preachers to mean that the whole human race should be saved? When he declares his Universalism to his neighbours they have no difficulty in understanding him and many of them are probably shocked at such a doctrine and reject it. But was this the case in New Testament times? It is very clear that it was not. Jesus it is true spoke of having been sent to save the world, but it is equally plain that those who heard him, Nicodemus as well as others, did not understand what he meant by it, for until after his resurrection not even his own disciples understood what the salvation was, and afterwards not even they understood that it was to be proclaimed to the Gentiles. And how much greater must have been the ignorance of the Old Testament saints during the times that the knowledge of Christ was a mystery hid from ages and generations, and which in the express words of the apostle (Ephes. iii. 5), "in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit." That very Peter whom Anetazo refers to as proclaiming the restitution of all things was, after this, prepared by an express communication from Heaven before he preached the gospel to the Gentiles, much to the surprise and discontent of the Jewish believers. (Acts x, xi). In referring to Paul's preaching (Acts xiii. 38) Anetazo says that the Jews understood it as a universal proclamation; probably they did, but he ought to recollect that a universal proclamation of God's love is not identical with a proclamation of God's universal or unlimited love. The Jews were offended that *any* Gentiles should be saved, and required no Universalism to offend them: probably they would not have been offended with the doctrine of the salvation of all Jews.

Perhaps Anetazo may contend that the gospel really means the salvation of all men, however men may misunderstand it. This we do not dispute. But as in Apostolic times all did not so understand it, it indeed being generally proclaimed by the apostles as limited to those who believed it, it is clear, either that the apostles did not proclaim it in its integrity, or that it may

be proclaimed in its integrity without necessarily suggesting the salvation of the whole human race. We should like to know which alternative Anetazo chooses.

Anetazo says, that to be consistent, the writer, and those who entertain similar sentiments ought also to object to the putting into the hands of the unregenerate who can read, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and farther that a few Universalists seem to be afraid of shewing to the uncircumcised of heart and ears, the gold, silver, and precious stones of the heavenly Jerusalem, &c. lest these Babylonians should abuse the Holy things, &c. Let us be clearly understood;—the statement quoted by Anetazo respecting the propriety of proclaiming the doctrine of the salvation of all men was as follows—"Not that I would conceal it, or make any mystery of it; but I would not make it a prominent doctrine to press on the attention of the world." We contend for proclaiming the apostolic gospel, the glad tidings of God's mercy to sinners—salvation God's gift to the guilty. We should therefore have no hesitation and feel no inconsistency in placing the scriptures in the hands of unbelieving men, being convinced that this gospel has its due prominence there. And with respect to the precious stones of the heavenly Jerusalem we would remember the words of our divine Master, not to give our holy things to the dogs, nor cast our pearls before swine, and therefore we should not parade before unregenerate men the universal love of God. Again we ask Anetazo to give us one passage of scripture which shews that this was done by the commissioned preachers of the gospel. But we should do as they did, or as they give us warrant to do. Now that all authority to denounce condemnation has passed away, we should declare the mercy of God to sinners, forgiveness of sins to the guilty, life to the perishing through Jesus the Messiah, openly, "without guard or shadow," or any kind of reserve, and until they see this salvation extended to themselves *sinners*, we should care very little to tell them of God's love to all.

Anetazo has confounded the *love* of God with the *mercy* of God,—the proclamation of God's *universal love* with the *universal proclamation* of God's love, and the writer's objection to make *universalism* a prominent doctrine for proclaiming to the world with an objection to preach the *gospel* to unbelieving men. He says that it is possible he may have gone to an extreme: we think that he has, and that his zeal for Universalism has led him to lose sight of the most elementary and fundamental principles of Christianity.

There is yet one passage in Anetazo's communication which we have omitted to notice, in which he speaks of the difference between the expressions, "God loves and forgives sinners" and "God loves and forgives all;" and there are also one or two objections, which the writer anticipates may occur to the reader, to the views he contends for. These he is desirous of examining before concluding his communication; but as he fears trespassing to too great an extent at one time on your space, he will include them in another letter, which he will be glad if you can insert in the next number of your magazine. Meantime he subscribes himself,

Yours very sincerely,

Feb. 10, 1851. EKDIKALETHES.

REVIEWS.

The Infidel: a poem written in defence of revealed religion. By EDWARD COCK, of Stonehouse, Plymouth.—London: Palmer & Son, Paternoster Row. 1844.

"MEDIOCRIBUS esse poetis, non Dii, non homines, non concessere columnæ." Thus wrote Horace nearly two thousand years since, recording the experience of past, and anticipating the verdict of future generations.

Far be it from us either to say, or insinuate, that Mr. Cock is an indifferent poet. On the contrary a careful perusal of the work now lying on our table

has satisfied us, and a similar perusal must we should think satisfy others, that as a man of imagination, vigorous and cultivated intellect, and genius, the writer of "The Infidel" takes high rank, and occupies a commanding position. Men of no small name in the literary world might well be proud to have produced such a poem. As to our poor selves, who are obliged to be content with trudging on leisurely along the pathway of plain prose, we should have given a vast deal to be able to write any thing, a twentieth part as good. But, alas! "The Infidel" is after all a failure. It comes short of absolute perfection. And, therefore, in the Horatian sense of the term, and tried by the poetical standard which, in the stern severity of its enactments, differs materially from those gentler laws to which prose compositions are subjected, it bears on it the stamp of mediocrity. Having been read and admired, it is liable to be flung aside and forgotten.

This is a result which, we confess, we deeply deplore. Honesty, whether associated with talents or not, is the object of our unqualified respect. A desire to draw attention to the Holy Scriptures, and to check that growing spirit of refined and literary scepticism, by which the past and present centuries have been so pre-eminently distinguished, is most laudable, and must enlist in its behalf the sympathies of all to whom the truth as it is in Jesus is dear. Above all, when the party presenting himself to the public in the capacity of an author, is endeavouring to clear away from the face of God's word doctrines of doubtful import, if not even human invention, by which hitherto its beauty has been marred, its glory obscured, and its progress impeded, is it possible to check the eager and ardent wish, that one wielding spiritual weapons, and so engaged, may have *God speed?* In these very predicaments stands our respected friend Mr. Cock. He is an honest man,—a sincere believer in revealed truth, and therefore an opponent of infidelity in all its varied forms,—and being a Universalist is solicitous that the Manichean doctrines of infinite sin, and infinite torments, may sink into those shades of eternal night, from which by the folly, misapprehensions, and perversity of human beings, they have temporarily emerged. He writes, in order that God may be glorified, and sinful man benefited by being awakened to a sense of the love borne by God to the world, in Christ Jesus. Can such objects fail to interest us? Can we help admiring the talents with which, in the case of Mr. Cock, they are prosecuted? And, if unsuccessful in their accomplishment, is there one of us indisposed to sympathize with the author in those feelings which, as disappointed in his benevolent and Christian wishes, he must have experienced?

Many causes might be assigned for Mr. Cock's failure. None of them lie very deep. Two, we may mention. Ungracious is the task which we have undertaken. But in a spirit of affection to our brother, as well as with due regard to our readers, we shall try to go through with it.

The first cause of our author's want of success to which we advert, is that his work has evidently not been subjected to that process of careful and patient elaboration, without which no poetry, however excellent in other respects, can abide the test of ages. *Prematur in nonum annum*, was the maxim of ancient wisdom and experience. And Pope, as is well-known, has, in one of his Epistles embodied a lesson to the same effect.* By the way, the name of Pope reminds us that, in this respect, he himself practised what he preached. His productions which he was seldom if ever in a hurry to publish, he kept always lying past him: frequently revising them; constantly re-touching them; substituting one phrase for another, as taste or caprice dictated; sometimes altering the alteration itself, and replacing it by a reading that pleased him better; and sometimes, even, reverting to what he had originally put down. Not unfrequently did he erase a great deal of what he had composed, as either enfeebling the sense, or detracting from his general design. Some of his manuscripts,

* And drop at last, but in unwilling ears,
This saving counsel, "keep your piece nine years."
PROLOGUE TO THE SATIRES.

especially those of his translation of the Iliad and Odyssey, are, from the number and minuteness of his corrections, in some places scarcely legible. Few, if any, of the words originally written, in certain cases remain. We wish that our dear friend, Cock, had but a little better understood the value of the *litura.** *Sæpe vertere stylum* is a precept, with which no poet,—no author, we might say, who is desirous that his works shall be generally read and shall survive him, whatever his affection for his mental progeny may be, will neglect to comply.†

The second cause of Mr. Cock's failure is his choice of subject. If success in the realms of poetry generally be a matter of the utmost difficulty and of rare attainment, success in poetry of the didactic kind is about the most difficult, and the rarest to be attained, of all. The superlative degree we might justly have employed without any qualification whatever, were it not that *the Epic* must be excepted. Success in it is proverbially next to impossible. The fact of every specimen of Epic poetry, except the Iliad and Odyssey of Homer, the Æneid of Virgil, the Paradise Lost of Milton, and the Inferno Purgatorio, and Cielo of Dante,—may we add, the Lusiad of Camoens? certainly not the Pharsalia of Lucan, the Henriade of Voltaire, or the Messiah of Klopstock,—having either passed into utter oblivion, or enjoying only a local and limited notoriety, surely should be the means of deterring all, except the bold and presumptuous, from making any future attempts in this department of the Muse. Unless, haply, some sublime genius, destined to eclipse all his predecessors, should in the course of God's providence in after times arise. Excepting the Epic, however, the Didactic, it strikes us, is the most unpromising field in the whole range of the poetic art, to the cultivation of which any unhappy wight can betake himself. How monotonous and heavy, how absolutely prosaic, is the writer in this line almost necessarily felt to be! If "the good Homer sometimes nods," who has not been conscious occasionally of an inclination to slumber over even the *Ars poetica* itself? And had not the splendour of Pope's genius and the versatility as well as rich exuberance of his talents, been evinced otherwise,‡ would the "Essay on Man," or the "Essay on Criticism," great as their beauties confessedly are, have in any way contributed to his being placed as by the almost unanimous suffrages of contemporaries and posterity he has been, so near the head of England's greatest poets? It is a ticklish thing to adventure one's whole stock of literary reputation, in the cumbrous craft of a didactic poem. Dutch-built, and heavy laden, its weight has been sufficient to sink some of the greatest masters in the art—some of those who have been the most potent in the use of the Muse's enchanting spell.—Who, then, can be surprised to find that Mr. Cock, with talents and attainments of a high order, should form no exception to the general rule? He is able, he is eloquent, he is from time to time powerfully impressive. If apparently paralysed sometimes by the nature of his subject, it is but the more to evince the greatness of those powers, by which he is enabled to bear up under, and even to throw off the load by which he is pressed down. But in spite of all such efforts, we feel ourselves irresistibly impelled to wish, that to some other of the coy sisterhood,—some other of the "sacred nine"—than her to whom he has addressed himself, he could have been led to devote his attentions. And this the more that, to the almost insuperable difficulties inherent in didactic poetry itself, he has chosen

---

* Ev'n copious Dryden wanted, or forgot,
The last and greatest art, the art to blot.—POPE.

† The practice of frequent and trenchant correction has not been confined to poets. J. J. Rousseau's manuscripts shew the extreme fastidiousness of his taste; and seem to indicate that to retouching, retrenching, and the unhesitating substitution of one phrase for another—in a word, to the incessant "use of the file"—as much almost as to natural genius, he owes many of the graces of his exquisite prose style. It is a well-known fact, that Mr. Roscoe, of Liverpool, the celebrated author of the Lives of "Lorenzo de' Medici," and "Leo the Tenth," was in the habit of sadly annoying M'Creery, his printer, by the frequency and minuteness of his alterations. For the sake of a phrase, or passage, which on reflection struck him as inaccurate, or inelegantly expressed, he has gone to the expense of cancelling a whole sheet.

‡ As in his "Dunciad," "Messiah," "Rape of the Lock," "Abelard and Eloisa," &c.

to add another, arising out of the particular topic, of which he treats. We are sure that intentionally Mr. Cock is no servile imitator. His intellect is of itself too strong and too richly stored, and his feelings are too independent, to permit anything of the sort. And yet besides that feeling of monotony which, in the perusal of his poem, one cannot entirely shake off, one finds certain recollections constantly obtruding themselves on the mind. Is it possible to dissociate the Lemander of "The Infidel," and Alfred's able and happy expostulations with him, from the Lorenzo, and the remonstrances of the "Night Thoughts?"

In stating the two facts which we have done—and more of a similar kind, were it necessary, might be adduced—we have assigned reasons sufficient to account to others, for our worthy and respected friend's want of success. But we confess that insisting on these, we have not satisfied ourselves. We consider Mr. Cock to have failed, on a principle which is not precisely of a literary nature. Readers may if they please view our objection in the light of a prejudice, or crotchet of our own; but we must nevertheless be permitted to mention it.

We dislike Christianity being treated of in the poetic form altogether. Inspired poetry constitutes one of the most glowing and glorious portions of the Old Testament Scriptures; but poetry, on the subject of religion, from uninspired pens, is almost always, if not always felt by us to be out of place and keeping. Sometimes, even, it is positively nauseating. This is particularly remarkable in the case of the loftier pretensions of the muse. They almost necessarily involve language and ideas, certainly not *according to godliness.* A writer of religious poetry, be it Epic, Didactic, or Dramatic is in his style, descriptions, and allusions, more or less heathenish. He *speaks* more than *half in the speech of Ashdod.* Nehem: xiii. 24. Milton himself is no exception to this. His God the Father, and his Christ, have always, in their addresses, excited in us the offensive feeling of *Dramatis personæ*, introduced on the boards of a theatre;* besides also stirring up disagreeable recollections of their prototypes, the gods and goddesses, and reminding us of the other supernatural machinery of the Iliad and Æneid. We dislike invocations of the Holy Ghost in a work written for a display of the author's artistic skill, as we do invocations of the Muse. The former is, in every mind imbued with the slightest tincture of classic lore, invariably associated with the latter; and to find the Divine Being invited to play the part which was formerly assigned to an idol of the human imagination, is of necessity to a Christian thoroughly disgusting. And yet if religious poems are to be written,and religious subjects treated of, according to the strict rules of art, how are such things to be avoided? Cowper, it must to his honour he admitted, is, on the whole, in his own poetry, free from the fault complained of. Our author, too, evidently felt that heathenish allusions were inconsistent with his main design, and accordingly has been sparing in his use of them. But they decidedly, it may be slightly, tinge his poem, notwithstanding. If epic or didactic poetry, on the subject of religion, must be written—why should it?—would that some man might arise, gifted with John Barclay's knowledge of the gospel and fervent love to God's revealed character but with more than Barclay's genius, and free from that coarseness, want of taste, and intense vulgarity by which his versification is disfigured, from whom some production worthy of his theme, and, if an Englishman, worthy of his country might emanate.†

---

* We may tolerate, nay, even admire and applaud, in the Tragedies of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, what in the works of a professor of Christianity is absolutely intolerable. How melancholy to think, that the truly sensible injunction of a heathen, *Nec Deus intersit*, &c., should have been so perpetually neglected, if not even trampled under foot, by the nominal advocates of a purer creed!

† The spirited and not unfrequently spiritual effusions of Watts, the exquisite taste and nameless graces of James Montgomery, and the rich radiance of evangelical truth which beams forth from the pages of Cowper, are not without their charms for us. Nay, when enraptured by their glowing phraseology, we have been tempted sometimes even to overlook, if not forgive, the sad and serious blundering as to the simplicity of the gospel which, in the works of these deservedly eminent men, is constantly obtruding itself on our notice. Their manner almost

Persons who have gone with us thus far, may be apt to think that, notwithstanding our disclaimer at the outset of he article, we rate Mr. Cock's poem low. Such persons would do us, as well as him, a positive injustice.

"The Infidel" is a poem of very rare and superior, although somewhat irregular merit. Its versification, which is that of the Iambic ten-syllable line, is singularly harmonious: beautiful descriptions abound in it; and, in the author's appeals to the heart and conscience, he is often remarkably felicitious and impressive. He has, besides, the happy knack of from time to time condensing in a line or two, the most valuable axioms in morals, metaphysics, and theology. He does not in this imitate Young. Against being supposed to lay such a charge, we have already guarded ourselves. We, however, in reading Mr Cock's poem, cannot help being struck with a most marked resemblance, in the respect alluded to, between it and the "Night Thoughts." Not merely are the authors of both productions the combatants of infidelity and scepticism in their various shapes and disguises, and thus at one as to their subject, but both understand well the value of point and antithesis. In Young, fondness for these is, perhaps, not unfrequently carried to excess. Our author is more sparing, and therefore, in our apprehension, more judicious in the indulgence of his taste for them. His antitheses are often most admirable; and the aphoristic form in which they are presented, very striking. Both authors have striven to track the monster, infidelity, to his most secret lairs and lurking places; both authors have assailed him in his stronghold. His destruction they have aimed at, by having recourse to every species of weapons. Wit—argument—ridicule—indignant remonstrance—scripture. The one has employed blank verse as the medium of his onslaught—the other, rhyme. If Young must be admitted to have carried off the palm of superiority, in this species of rivalry—supposing rivalry to be a fitting term to be applied to the distinct and independent efforts of men, who were not contemporaries, in the same intellectual arena—let it be remembered, that he enjoyed many advantages over our author. He was first in the field; his education was of a first-rate order; his was that academic and rural leisure, after which the sons of genius have so often sighed, and sighed in vain: he took time to elaborate his compositions: he published them piecemeal, thus trying the public pulse, and benefiting by public criticism: and, so far as objections to revealed religion had been started in his day, he may be said, in his statements of them and replies to them, to have exhausted the subject. Mr Cock, whose situation and circumstances have been, in almost all respects, the opposite of those of Young, has had, we suspect, to conflict with difficulties in the preparation and publication of his work, to which his predecessor was an utter stranger. Should not this, in the awarding of praise or blame by the critic, be considered? Young in the statement and enforcement of gospel truths, is sometimes—we regret that we cannot say often—most happy. Witness, some of those magnificent passages—those glorious outbursts of eloquence and genuine feeling—by which, especially, the fourth book of the *Night Thoughts* is characterised. Although not always able to agree with our friend, Mr Cock, in the religious views which he expresses—indeed, obliged now and then to condemn phraseology which, however popular and conventional, is not according to the revealed mind of God—we cannot but deem him, on the whole, a much more scriptural and spiritual writer than Young. Some little progress in the knowledge of Him

---

apologizes for defects of matter. Widely different is the case with John Barclay. It is his matter which atones for his manner. In spite of all the verbal drawbacks and imperfections—so great as frequently to inspire a feeling of uneasiness almost amounting to disgust—which detract from the value of his poetry, (not without indications of genius,) such are its scriptural richness and depth—so truly heavenly and divine is its subject-matter—that from time to time we delight ourselves, nay, absolutely revel, in the perusal and enjoyment of it. Nothing mawkish, certainly, and but little that in a spiritual point of view is objectionable, does it exhibit.—Without exactly concurring in all that our dear friend George Gilfillan has said on the subject of religious poetry, and objecting to it on grounds far different from those to which he has so ably adverted, the feelings which he describes as having been experienced by him in reference to this species of composition, have often to the fullest extent been our own.

whom to know is life eternal, we are convinced Mr Cock has made, since he composed his poem.

Bishop Watson in his "Apology for Christianity," and his "Apology for the Bible—the word *apology*, in both cases, being employed in its classical sense, and having a reference to the titles of works of Plato, Justin Martyr, and others—has endeavoured to bring down to popular apprehension, particularly in that production of his which we have named last, the facts and arguments by which objections to revealed religion are met and obviated, and frequently even turned against those who have had recourse to them. "The Infidel" of Mr Cock is an attempt of a similiar kind in rhyme. Its praiseworthy aim is to popularize, and render impressive, the main arguments by which scepticism is refuted, and the truths of scripture are established. Whether successful or not, his purpose he has ably and honestly executed. The claims of "Nature" to take the place of God, our author eloquently and powerfully exposes. The tendency of youthful passions indulged in, to debase and brutalize the mind, and of scientific enquiries prosecuted in a spirit of self-conceit, to darken the perceptions of right and wrong, and to harden man against religious truth, is urged with an energy, and occasionally with a captivating sweetness of phraseology, by which, almost insensibly, we are carried, or rather hurried along. And objections to revealed religion, founded on its difficulties, are retorted on the objector by allusions to the insurmountable difficulties presented by nature and facts themselves, with overwhelming conclusiveness. The logical sequence of the topics treated of is most admirable. While the rich, but subdued imagination, in which the language and sentiments are steeped, and the sweet aroma of genuine poetic feeling which they diffuse all around, are to the mind of every competently instructed reader most refreshing. Could we get over our fundamental objection to any work on the subject of what are denominated "the evidences of Christianity," being employed as a means of *making men Christians*, the poem now before us would be still more gratifying and satisfactory to us, than it is. Convinced, however, are we—and to our conviction we have more than once given public expression*--that arguments similar to those employed by our author, and prosecuted as by him they have been, although not without their use, can only at the utmost have a *negative* influence on the human mind.† They may repel and refute objections to revelation; they may tend, even, to expose the hollowness and worthlessness of unbelief; but divine light they never can, of themselves, introduce into the heart and conscience. To do this *positively*—to make the light of the divine glory, in the face of Christ, to shine into the understanding—is God's sole and inalienable prerogative, which he is pleased to exercise, through the teachings, not of human reason, but of his own most blessed Word and Spirit. Nevertheless, if infidelity is to be refuted, (to do so being the only object aimed at,) and if powerful appeals to human reason, and human feelings, have any weight, and any influence in conducing to such an issue, then, a work written with such ability as is displayed in the poem of Mr. Cock, cannot be too highly praised, and too highly commended.

Having said thus much regarding our author, and in praise of his work—and much more, had time and space permitted, might have been said—it only remains for us to wind up this brief and hasty notice, by a few quotations. These may be taken almost at random.

The poem thus begins:—

> Time was when Prudence stood inspired with zeal,
> And even Logic learnt the power to feel—
> When youthful Ardour poured the glowing line,
> A free libation to the Sacred Nine:

---

* As in the first volume of "The Assurance of Faith, or Calvinism identified with Universalism," 1833, and the preface to Barclay's "Without Faith without God," edition 1836.

† Unless God, in his infinite sovereignty, and according to his eternal purpose, be pleased himself to interpose—superseding human reasonings by divine illumination. This, however, it is to be remembered, is, in most instances, not the rule, but the exception. Matt. vii. 13, 14.

Then rose the visions beautiful in song !
Then dwelt the living rapture on the tongue !
Then on the ear broke the soft chaunt of Fame,
And laboured all the breast to gain a name !
Luxuriant moments to the early Muse !
Oh ! that for aye she would these fires infuse !
How fresh remembrance then of pictures past,
Which may o'er future years rich influence cast.
Full many a vernal morn has op'd since then,
And vernal eve has closed each bud again : &c.

At the third page, we meet with the following :—

Faint Autumn sat one eve, in bright array,
Upon the silken lap of fading day.
The golden sward drew forth each loveliest Muse,
That dipt her pinions in ten thousand hues.
Alfred o'er many a mount had tireless trod,
And drunk from many a vale the wines of God ;
Kissed from fair Flora's lip the luscious dew,
As down the deep Sol's burning chariot flew.
Wrapt in its sweetness, bent each pensive flower,
In modest homage to the Ruling Power :
The blackbird's song had fled the gloomy grove,
And left it to the whisperings of love :
The broods of heaven were slumbering : the lamb
Had found the fleecy shelter of the dam :

* * * * *

Then stealing up the eastern skies, the car
Of cool Diana spread her glory far;
Kindly, lay scattered o'er the lake below,
Her evening off'ring, like pure flakes of snow.
Heaven's holy breathings melted down the soul,
And flung a luscious concord o'er the whole.

Again :

Seest thou Lemander ! distant lightnings play,
The flashing mimics of the Moon's bright ray ?
How arrogant yon momentary gleam,
To Luna's gentler, all pervading stream !
So, whilst o'er Nature's unsurveyed profound
Truth, all effulgent, sheds her light around,
Quick dart athwart the Sceptic's partial eye,
Th'electric currents of a darker sky ;
A fancy he believes, but doubts the Sun ;
Proves *three* are *three*, but never *three times*, *one ;*
To strike unsav'ry truth will canvass hell,
Yea ! *prove* himself to be impossible.
With atheistic taper to his eyes,
The fatal glare extinguishes the skies.
Caught by the sparkle of some dazzling things,
He passes by the source whence Beauty springs,
Reasons till Reason insult oft obtains,
And quits the inglorious rule of impious brains.
Thou Hercules ! unbind thy mental thongs,
And give the winds thy voluntary wrongs !
Thou tall Colossus ! stoop from climes of air ;
For Reason's viands are *substantial* fare !
Take now thy tube !—what particles of light,
A million in each moment—cross the sight !
Go, analyze the ambient atmosphere !—
What living myriads in each inch appear !
These functions have appropriate—these live
Upon the pensions which their instincts give ;
Yea ! bask in joys luxuriantly bright,
Which Nature generates by heat and light.
Whose hand, thus open, yields them every good—
Existence, life, enjoyment, rest, and food ?

* * * * *

What is thy boast, then ? Say, where hast thou been ?
What found or done, or heard, or felt, or seen ?

This little range of sky is to the whole
Less than the first idea to the soul.
A ray upon the heavens—a tiny gem,
Scarce glittering on the Eternal's diadem.
With all this vast of Being spread to thee,
What MIGHT unseen sustains immensity ? pp. 18—20.

Let one more quotation suffice:—

Light breaks from Heaven upon the rising morn,
Empyrean hues the mountain tops adorn;
The modest Moon puts on her veil, to see
Her Lord, bright riding forth in majesty.
The *star* is in the east: the *babe* appears—
The dawning prelude of refulgent years:
The shepherds lift their voice; the valleys ring
With Hallelujahs.—See Earth's rightful King!
The prince of darkness from his Cavern screams,
For Knowledge wields her mightiest boast—her beams:
The holy Sabbath of a thousand years,
The great Millennium, appears—appears!
Then shall Messiah reign o'er all his foes,
In the soft splendour of supreme repose;
The Jew beneath his cross, in tears shall bow;
The Greek bring forth his offering and his vow;
The captive leap from chains of wrong and gore:
The Soldier spill his brother's blood no more;
Devotion with her sister—Happiness,
Shall every nation, every bosom, bless;
Want shall at Bounty's smile shrink far away,
And doubt quick vanish 'neath the gaze of day.*—pp. 96, 97.

D. T.

Remarks on the study of languages, with hints on comparative translation and philological construing. Reprinted, with additions, from "the classical Museum."—By JOHN PRICE, M.A, formerly Scholar of St. John's Cambridge, a Master of Shrewsbury School, and of the Bristol College.—London; Whittaker & Co. and Taylor & Walton. 1850.

Our personal respect and affection for Mr. Price, author of the clever *brochure* bearing the above title, would of themselves have enforced a notice of any thing emanating from his pen.

Able, learned, industrious, persevering, conscientious—a lover of the Lord Jesus Christ, and a patient sufferer for his sake—Mr. Price has many claims on the sympathies of those who, in the Son of God crucified and glorified, find all their salvation and all their desire. His claims on ours, we feel and recognize. He may not, to be sure, see and worship with us. Towards the doctrine of Universal Salvation, as never having had his attention particularly fastened on it, he may look with a somewhat dubious eye. But let him be a member of the "Plymouth Brethren," or of whatever sect he please, upon his conscience the truth of God appears to have taken hold, and in his heart the spirit of heavenly love appears to be operating. Hence we love him, and cannot help loving him, *for the truth's sake that dwelleth in him, and shall be with him for ever.* 2 John, 2.

Mr. Price, however, viewed as a literary man, requires not the aid of our sympathy. His high and acknowledged scholarship places him in a position to command, not implore, the notice of critics. And in the pamphlet now before us, we have a work, in which varied talents, and varied learning, combined with great usefulness, are too conspicuous, to justify any, who take an interest in the culture and expansion of the youthful mind, to overlook it.

---

* Mr. Cock, who is a native of Mevagissy, Cornwall, has for many years had his residence in Stonehouse, one of the suburbs of Plymouth. Few have been our opportunities of enjoying personal converse with this poet and Christian: few, however, as they have been, they have left upon our mind the impression of his being a keen, observing, intelligent and imaginative—a large-minded and warm-hearted man. Well may the Christian Universalists of Plymouth, Stonehouse, and Devonport, be proud to have such a man residing among them.

The grand object of our author is to bring under public notice the system of comparative translation of the Greek and Latin classics which was so happily begun and prosecuted at Shrewsbury School, by the late celebrated Dr. Butler, long the head master of that Seminary, and for a short time Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry. Rather, that system, as modified and improved by Mr. Price himself, and adapted by him to instruction in the modern, no less than the antient tongues.

Its value is attested by the unprecedented success of Dr. Butler's pupils, in carrying off honours at Oxford and Cambridge; as well as by the very great success of Mr. Price himself.

The system of comparative translation has for its aim, not to *cram*, but to *inspire thought*. Translation is, with our author, made the medium of stimulating and exercising the logical, critical, and inventive faculties. No one, it strikes us, can be brought thoroughly under the influence of this system—unless, indeed, he be an incorrigible dunce—without having imparted to him the elements of sound scholarship, and without having his intellect at once enlightened and enlarged. We should add, strengthened also.

Simple, but not on that account the less effective, is the plan pursued.—Paper is prepared. A good, plain, idiomatic translation into English, (or the vernacular or foreign tongue, as the case may be,) of some passage in a dead or living language, is required. Sufficient space is left between the lines. Above each line, in blue ink is written, say in English, what is *literally* expressed in the foreign tongue, wherever variations between the two languages occur. To indicate the extent of variation, underlining of the English translation is had recourse to. Loops made above, point to words existing in the original, which, from difference of idiom, difference of arrangement of words or other causes, are in the rendering omitted. Every sort of opportunity and encouragement is given to the pupil, to be as minute in his observations and criticisms, on diversities of thought and idiomatic peculiarities, as possible.—Red ink is employed in correcting the exercises by the master. To him, no less than to the pupil, the following out of such a system must be at once instructive and suggestive.

Briefly and faintly have we sketched the outline of Mr. Price's plan. His work itself must be read, and pondered on, in order to its being perfectly understood and appreciated. Impatient and superficial readers will perhaps content themselves with looking at the "Hints," pp, 9 and 10, and the examples of the working of the system which are given in the Appendix.

To parents who purpose imparting to their children a classical and liberal education—to gentlemen and ladies engaged in teaching—and to senior pupils, we say unhesitatingly, get, read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest, the contents of this short, but masterly and valuable treatise. D. T.

The One Faith of the Gospel. By Robert G. Hunt. 3rd Edition, 1849.

The author of this little tract evidently loves the Lord Jesus Christ, wishes to see the gospel proclaimed in its purity and simplicity by religious teachers, and deems it incumbent on him to point out some of the but too common misapprehensions and misrepresentations by which divine truth is corrupted.

One leading idea, the unconditionality of life everlasting, pervades his work.

We could have wished that, in other productions of his, he had not exhibited such bitterness of spirit, as he has done, against what he does not understand, namely, the scriptural doctrine of God's universal love; and that he had been preserved from taking up certain crotchets, respecting the human nature of our blessed Lord. Ignorant of what is implied in the Son of God being spiritual Adam as well as spiritual Abraham, his views of the deliverance wrought out by him as *The Saviour of the world*, 1 John iv. 14, although in many respects exceedingly correct, are yet necessarily one-sided and partial. Ignorant of what is implied in our Lord having been conceived and born of a

woman—in his having become *bone of our bone*, and *flesh of our flesh*—and overlooking the fact, that, while as having had God for his Father, the seed, principle, or personality of his existence was divine, yet, as having had woman for his mother, his form, fashion, or nature was human (Phil. ii. 5—11, with Rom. viii. 3), he has fallen into some strange vagaries, and adopted some strange modes of expression. Because a *body was prepared for* our Lord, he has not observed, that it was prepared in the womb of a human female; and because our Lord's humanity was only on the side of his mother, he has jumped to the conclusion, that, therefore, he had human nature in no respect whatever. We acquit him most cheerfully of wishing to promote the sentiments of the Docetæ.* His wish is, we have every reason to believe, to maintain the purity from sin of our blessed Redeemer. This is laudable. But every scriptural truth should be maintained in a scriptural way. Jesus' purity was ensured, by his seed, or principle of existence, being divine. He was *the Lord from Heaven.* (1 Cor. xv. 47.) His connection with us,—the ground of all our hope towards God—was ensured, by the nature which he took hold of, and, in taking hold of, purified, being human. God, in him, as his only begotten Son, brought *the clean thing, out of the unclean.*

Notwithstanding however, Mr. Hunt's serious blunders, and some unadvised and bitter expressions which, in support of what he deems to be right, he has in other productions of his made use of, we admire him for his honesty of purpose, and love him for the truth's sake, in so far as that truth dwells in him. We especially like the tract now before us, on account of the truly scriptural principle which it is his object to commend to notice, and of the manly, straightforward, and uncompromising manner, in which he contends for it. All conditions of salvation he sees clearly to have been fulfilled and exhausted by the Son of God himself. Salvation, in consequence, he sees with equal clearness, comes unconditionally, that is, freely or as a mere gift, to its guilty and dying recipients. In Christ's divine righteousness,—and in it only, but certainly,—does every believer of the gospel know himself to stand accepted before God. To the finished work of the blessed and adorable Creator, no act of the creature, be it great or small, be it more refined, or less refined, be it bodily or mental, be it faith viewed as an act of ours, or supposed good works, can, he knows well, by any possibility be added. While false gospels proclaim some condition or conditions as yet remaining to be fulfilled by the sinner, before he can participate in the benefits flowing from Christ's death and resurrection, the true gospel is simply the manifestation to us, by God himself, and on his own infallible testimony alone, that in Christ, as a matter of fact without any act of ours whatever, we have salvation with eternal glory. The glad tidings are, when the ear to hear is vouchsafed to us, that in Christ's precious blood our sins have been washed away; and that in him we are, even now, partakers of life everlasting. Glad tidings, indeed—glad tidings of great joy—to us the guilty children of men. While false faiths respect a false gospel, in which man's hopes of divine favour are made to rest on his becoming either in whole, or in part, his own Saviour—the "one faith of the gospel," contended for by Mr. Hunt, and by all to whom simple divine truth is dear, is faith in the divine and therefore infallible testimony concerning God's Son, dying and rising again, as revealing him who, independently of all acts and merits of ours, is our sole, present, certain and everlasting Saviour.

Thus as not in a spirit of fault finding, but approvingly, we began this notice, it must be obvious to Mr. Hunt that, in spite of what we deem grievous errors of his, we are determined, God enabling us, to assist and co-operate with him in the maintenance of what we consider to lie at the very bottom of real and vital godliness. D. T.

---

* May we respectfully recommend to Mr. Hunt's serious and prayerful consideration 1 John iv. 2, 3? *The flesh*, observe. Not flesh of *beasts*, or of *some being who is not connected with Adam's race.—Flesh of man*, unquestionably.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

APRIL, 1851.

THE GREAT OBJECTION TO UNIVERSALISM AND ITS ANSWER.

Concluded from Page 46.

It may, however, be contended, that admitting the truth of all we have said, we have hitherto evaded, not answered the objection. For whether we recognize the great mass of professing Christians as believers or not, it matters not in respect to the point under discussion; for even though they may hold a perverted gospel, even though professing to be under grace they are really under law, still this is better than the state into which the propagation of Universalist doctrines would bring them; for that these, as a general result, would only relieve them from wholesome restraint and deprive them of a beneficial stimulus, without substituting anything really efficacious in their place: moreover, that the hope of Heaven and fear of Hell, though motives addressed to their selfish propensities, are not motives unworthy to influence them; that the hope of Heaven to be gained is something more exalted than worldly reputation, and the dread of Hell something less degrading than the fear of man, which would, in such circumstances as we have alluded to, be in effect with the great mass the only practically influential principles remaining, except the promptings of their own nature. We have therefore now to meet the objection in this form.

In addressing ourselves to answer the objection, we shall in the first place present it in the briefest and most explicit terms, so as to get at the point on which the force of the argument rests. And this is, that nothing less than the hope of Heaven, or of a greater degree of happiness than this world affords, can constitute a sufficient inducement to men to relinquish any present attainable gratification; and still more, that nothing short of the fear of Hell, or of hopeless never-ending misery, can supply a sufficiently powerful restraint, to deter men from indulging in any present selfish desire. These positions we dispute, and shall endeavour to shew that they are untenable.

Men talk tritely of the vanity of human wishes and the unsatisfactory nature of the sources of happiness in this world. Yet few men appear to have an abiding sense of this,—a practical belief in it; for the great majority by their actions attest, that either the pleasures which this world affords, or the hopes which these excite and the exertions they stimulate, are the great end and object of their existence. The objects are worldly, and the means by which they are attained are regulated

by worldly laws, the law of the land and public opinion. For such objects they will restrain their desires after present gratifications of inferior importance, and have no need for the hope of Heaven to induce them to do so. Indeed, they do not seek Heaven; practically they care not for it. In the view of leaving this world it may be, they speak of Heaven and hope to go there; but this hope is little better than the hope that they will not go to Hell. Such appears to be the case with the vast majority; and for those few who have higher aspirations, Heaven as a certainty to be bestowed upon them is better than Heaven as a contingency which may be attained by them; such men need not such hopes to induce them to restrain their inferior propensities, they are capable of doing so without such inducements; and if they are not entirely satisfied with eternal life as God's free and undeserved gift to them, they may, and indeed do, see grades and distinctions in Heaven, prizes for which it is an honourable ambition to strive; and find in the thrones and principalities of a future state of existence higher objects of ambition than the passing and uncertain glories of this world. The hope of future happiness, therefore, as a motive, may be as strong in the minds of the Universalist as of the Partialist with all who are capable of being influenced by such motives, even taking it in the point of view for which it is contended by our opponents, as something to be gained by man's own conduct or exertions.

But, indeed, it is only upon a comparatively small number of the human race that such motives exert any practical influence. By far the larger proportion are influenced chiefly by the fear of future punishment, and it is contended by our opponents, that in order that this may be really efficacious as a restraint, it is essential that it should be endless; for if there be hope of ultimate relief from it, men will sieze upon this hope and overlook temporary sufferings altogether. This, the stronghold of our opponents, we shall now examine and controvert.

The efficacy of punishment depends upon two points,—its justice and its certainty. The dictate of strict justice is, that punishment should be in proportion to guilt; and as guilt varies according to circumstances, retribution must vary also. If therefore any amount of guilt be worthy of eternal misery, the least amount of guilt must also be worthy of it, otherwise there could be no proportion between them. This, in fact, is maintained by the opponents of universal salvation; punishment is held to be eternal in duration, though limited and varied in degree.

That punishment may be in accordance with justice it is necessary that the criminal should be capable of forming some conception of the nature of the alternative with which he is threatened. To inflict a punishment upon a child with which he had been threatened, but the nature of which he could form no conception of, would be to act with cruelty. So, man is but a child in relation to the comprehension of eternity, and the threat of eternal misery is nothing more than that of indefinite misery. This is felt by the advocates of the cause; they are obliged to admit that men cannot realize the nature and extent of the punishment, and the more zealous amongst them endeavour to assist them in its realization by eloquent descriptions of its horrors. They cannot extend the eternity, they can only multiply its sufferings.

Further for the due administration of justice it is necessary that the subject of it, at least when not placed in circumstances calculated to bias his judgment, should acknowledge the justice of the retribution threatened. Adam was threatened, in the event of disobedience, with the loss of the blessings he enjoyed; he saw what these were, and he could not murmur, if, of his own will, he chose to give them up. Every man will acknowledge the justice of the sentence that he will be rewarded according to his works; but no man can be satisfied with the threat of never-ending misery in another state of existence for the smallest crime he may be guilty of. Under the influence of a system he may profess to be satisfied, but in reality he cannot approve of it, he can only acquiesce: conscious of his own frailty he cannot admit the justice of putting his strength upon a trial attended with so awful an alternative: if placed in such a situation he may submit to it but cannot approve of it.

Such considerations affecting the justice of eternal misery also affect its certainty. The introduction of the idea of eternal duration as an element in the punishment of all crimes whether great or small, by weakening our impressions respecting proportion in punishment, also impairs our feelings respecting its certainty. Our inability to form a definite conception of the nature of eternal misery or of its extent, has also a similar effect in weakening our belief of its certainty; and above all, our incapability of admitting its justice or giving it our approval, and, when we try to contemplate it, the greatness of its horrors and the excessiveness of its cruelty, strike us as so inconsistent with the character of God as displayed and declared in the very Scriptures from which it is professed to be taken, that we cannot but be influenced in a similar way and to a still greater degree. Such considerations, the effect of which is avowed by Universalists, though they may not be expressed have also their effect upon Partialists; if these do not avow their doubt or unbelief in eternal misery in words, the great majority of them manifest it in their actions: in truth they have no positive belief in it themselves, but they do not think that it would be wise or prudent to say so for the sake of others. Let us examine into the causes for the supposed necessity for such prudence.

Man is in a great degree the creature of habit. When he is accustomed to stimulants in the ordinary course of his life, still stronger ones are necessary in extraordinary cases; when accustomed to none, small stimulants are equally efficient. Habit engenders carelessness and recklessness; in countries where there is great tenderness for human life the guilt of taking it away is great and restraining influences are powerful; where on the contrary there is carelessness of life, the restraining influences are comparatively inefficient. Punishments for crime may be and often are excessive, and fail in repressing it; men accustomed to great punishments for small crimes lose the sense of their terror for greater ones, and become reckless in the commission of those to which they are exposed; the watchfulness to preserve themselves from them is more irksome than the fear of the punishment. Even many of the punishments inflicted by society, which in some cases are excessive in their severity as in others they are defective, though they may operate powerfully in repressing criminality in some, perhaps

create as much evil by the recklessness and despair which they produce in others, when they are disproportionate to the offence or partial in their operation.

The same influences operate in reference to the divine government. Men accustomed to be constantly urged by the fear of Hell-fire lose their susceptibility of being influenced by less powerful restraints; they become habituated to a high standard of deterring influences, and less powerful ones would have comparatively little efficacy. Such a system may produce a severe and rigid morality, but it is one of a morose and gloomy character, destitute or deficient in the kindlier attributes by which society is made happy: it is also apt to be of only temporary duration; or, if more permanent, it depends upon the character of the people, who would have been equally well conducted though their standard of restraint had been less intense. The preachers of such systems first create a high standard of restraint, and then contend for the necessity of that of which they have created the existence and the need.

These statements are illustrated by the consideration of the influences which operate on the different grades of society. Amongst the educated and refined the punishments and restraints are of a more refined and less violent character than amongst the uneducated and vulgar, yet they are equally effectual; a look or a word in the one are as effectual as an invective or a blow in the other. But, in truth, in estimating the influence of such doctrines upon society, we must revert to what we formerly said, namely, that such restraining influences act to a great extent only indirectly on the mass, the great majority of mankind being operated on by them only so far as they are enforced by public opinion, that is, by those who lead and direct public opinion. But such men are eminently those who would question the justice and feel the uncertainty of the truth of the doctrine of eternal misery: practically, few of them can have any real faith in it, but they think that it would be unsafe to tell the people so. Yet such men might equally well enforce warnings of punishment in indefinite terms. That every man shall be rewarded according to his works is a statement in the plain language of Scripture, the justice of which no one can question, and the certainty of which is open to none of those sources of doubt to which the doctrine of eternal misery is liable. So far from that it is consistent with every thing the Scriptures teach us respecting the character of God, and it alone has such consistency. It is the expression of perfect justice, of justice which is not incompatible with mercy,—that gracious attribute of the Almighty which is not opposed to justice but above it.

But indeed the advocates of the doctrine do not seek so much to impress sentiments of justice as feelings of terror. This is much easier to do, and possesses many advantages to recommend it to those who seek to exercise an influence over their fellow men, and who are at the same time not very scrupulous as to the way in which such influence is to be obtained, it may be, because they consider that it is to be exercised for the general welfare. Accordingly the doctrine of eternal misery has always been a favourite one of human priestcraft. For it was easier, as well as more desirable to a priesthood ambitious of power and worldly aggrandisement, to make the people the abject slaves of fear,

than to treat them as rational beings capable of understanding what justice was, of acknowledging its dictates, and acting upon them. It was more favourable for their designs, as the one course was adapted to impress feelings of blind subjection to their authority, the other was calculated to suggest submission to truth alone, and regard for the teacher only so far as he commended himself to approbation by the truth he taught. And even after the great right of private judgment had been asserted, still, so slow are men to free themselves from error, so prone are they to seek to exercise their own authority rather than to maintain the intrinsic authority of the doctrines they teach, that the religious teachers clung to this doctrine, and still maintain it as one of the most essential points of their system, even branding as sceptics or infidels those who disbelieve and deny it. Yet these men profess to be preachers of the glad tidings that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners! Professedly delivering a message of mercy to guilty men from a being who is Love itself, they yet tell us that it would be useless, nay worse than useless unless it were enforced by the threatened alternative of the curse of the never-ending wrath of the Almighty.

We have thus given our reasons for disbelieving and denying the statement that nothing short of the fear of hopeless, never-ending misery can supply a sufficiently powerful restraint to deter men from indulging in present selfish gratifications. Human restraints exercise a powerful, and so far as they operate directly, almost an exclusive influence on the majority of mankind; religious restraints only an indirect influence, so far as they are enforced by others: and on the comparatively small number upon whom they exercise a direct influence, there is no reason to believe that they would operate less efficaciously, if they stood upon the ground of justice alone, shorn of terrors calculated only to inspire a slavish fear, incompatible with a true view of the character of Him who has declared himself to be "Our Father in Heaven." And men inspired with such sentiments as these, looking upon punishment only as the chastisement of the Lord who loves them, could teach and enforce his precepts to their fellow men with a freedom with which no man who has the love of God shed abroad in his heart can denounce everlasting misery on his fellow sinners, commending their doctrine to their consciences with a power that would compensate for the absence of principles inspiring only a slavish and degrading subjection.

We have now answered the objection so far as we can answer it in this way, yet we are well aware that such an answer may fail to produce conviction in the minds of objectors. But there is another and a better way of proving the falsehood of the objection, not however to be expressed by argument. It is one which all believers in the doctrine of God's purpose to save the world are, or ought to be, interested to give; the answer which consists in a practical exemplification of the groundlessness of the objection in their own cases. Such an answer is greatly better than a verbal one, as it is open to the apprehension of all, and carries with it a force which no argument can possess. In itself it carries conviction, while without it the most logical arguments will fail to produce an impression. It consists in reverence for, pleasure in, and attention to the divine precepts given for the guidance of the believer. It is not to be confounded with obedience to the laws of the land or

observance of the requirements of Society. It comprehends all that is good in these but it embraces much more. It follows no human laws, it leads and controls them. Never ought it to be forgotten that the Christian has a high calling,—that disciples of Christ, in the words of their Master, are the salt of the earth, the light of the world; that they are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, to shew forth the praises of Him who hath called them out of darkness into his marvellous light. Worldly respectability however great is not practical Christianity, and it requires no very keen discernment to distinguish between the two: the comparatively ignorant will without much difficulty discriminate between the man who regulates his conduct by the requirements of Society and him who does so upon the principles of the Word of God; even if they cannot point out the difference, or even if they fail to distinguish between them, they can scarcely avoid feeling the difference and receiving a different impression; or if the two things are confounded in ordinary circumstances, occasions now and then arise which unmistakably indicate the distinction between them.

This is the true and only efficient way to answer such objections, the way pointed out in the Word of God,—"For so is the will of God, that by well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." The objection we have been combatting, we have already observed, may be and actually has been brought against the gospel itself irrespective of the universality of its application, and we think that it is most desirable to meet it upon that ground. The gospel is the proclamation of God's unconditional love to the guilty,—of his purpose to bestow eternal life on those who are dead in trespasses and sins. If we cannot agree with objectors on this point we see no necessity or propriety in going into the subject of Universal Salvation with them. For our part we do not care to make Universalism a prominent topic with the world; as we believe it to be true we are never ashamed to avow our belief in the doctrine, ever ready to defend it, and even on suitable occasions to advocate it. Yet we consider it a doctrine intended, not to be paraded before the world, but for the joy and consolation of believers. To men who are jealous of each other's motives, fearful of the effects of the lack of their own particular conditions and restraints, whether these be a priest-guarded pale, or external rites, or internal acts or feelings, to all such let us declare God's mercy to sinners, salvation his gift to the guilty and lost, free and unconditional. Such was the apostolic practice; to their fellow countrymen who had rejected and crucified Jesus, they proclaimed forgiveness of sins through him as their long expected Messiah; to the Gentiles they spake of a judgment to come, of the resurrection from the dead and salvation through Christ; to such they declared things which interested them personally, and it was only when they could address them as beloved of God, called to be saints, faithful in Christ Jesus, that they spake to them of grace abounding more than sin had abounded, of all living in Christ as all had died in Adam, of God's purpose to gather together in one all things in Christ Jesus.

There are many kinds of Universalists,—men professing to believe the doctrine on different grounds. Some altogether reject the atoning

sacrifice of Jesus and look to human sufferings as the means by which men are to be driven from vice and misery, to human aspirations, as the way in which they are to be led to virtue and happiness. They would bring purity out of corruption, life out of death. Others again persuade themselves into a belief of the doctrine from a fear of punishment; they see it not as the purpose of a being of infinite love, but as the proceeding of one of imperfect justice. Various may be the principles on which the doctrine is held, much more attractive to popular feelings or much more congenial to the tastes and philosophy of the learned, yet with none have we any sympathy except based on the one foundation of Jesus Christ, his death as the one sacrifice by which he put away sin, his resurrection from the dead and ascension to God's right hand as the victory by which he hath brought life and immortality to light. When men therefore bring the charge of a licentious tendency against Universalism, we should first prefer asking them on what their own hopes of eternal life, if they have such, are founded; we should tell them to lay this doctrine aside, and say whether they find themselves accepted in Christ Jesus, sinners saved by grace alone, as certainly living in Christ as they are dying in Adam;—whether they have peace of conscience flowing from the knowledge of the fact that for Christ's sake God is at peace with the guilty;—whether they are rejoicing in an assured hope of eternal life arising from the belief that they are partakers with Christ in his victory over death. If they cannot answer these questions in the affirmative it matters little to us whether they object to the tendency of Universalism or not, as they will be equally dissatisfied with the profession of those who hold such sentiments irrespective of the extent of their application. And whether our reasoning against their apprehensions regarding the tendency of Universalism be to them satisfactory or not will matter but little; our controversy with them will be one touching the character of God as revealed in the glad tidings of mercy through Jesus Christ, a subject to which all other matters of Scriptural teaching ought by the believer to be made subordinate.

D. W.

JOHN THOM.

BY HIS SON, DAVID THOM, D.D. PH.D

John Thom, son of David Thom and Christian Stewart, was born at Glasgow, in what is now called Queen Street, Dec. 5, 1763.—He was the only survivor of five children.

Concerning his early years little need be said. That he was the object of the tender care, and affectionate solicitude of his parents, may readily be believed. Moving as they did in a somewhat narrow sphere of life, and with circumstances the reverse of affluent, John Thom's education, although good, was far from realizing either their wishes, or his own. Besides receiving instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic, he learned at the Grammar School, the elements of the Latin tongue. When between thirteen and fourteen years of age, having matriculated, he was during the Session* 1776—7,

---

* *Semestre*, on the Continent.

a student in the Humanity class of the University of Glasgow, then under the charge of Professor Richardson, author of "Poems," two volumes on "Russia" (1768—70,) an "Essay on certain characters of Shakspeare's Plays," &c.* Circumstances soon enforced a termination of John Thom's literary career. In 1777, he was apprenticed to Mr. Joseph Lockhart, hardware merchant in Glasgow; on whose sudden and lamented death, in 1778, his indentures were transferred to that gentleman's brother, Mr James Lockhart.† At a subsequent period of my father's life, I perceive from copious notes in his handwriting, that he attended the private classes taught in the University, by Professors John Anderson, and James Mylne: the former, who was grandson of the able defender of Presbyterianism against Rhynd, distinguished as the inventor of the carronade, and as the founder of the educational establishment, long known in Glasgow by the name of the Andersonian Institution, (1797,) and now by that of the Andersonian University;‡ the latter, although from indolence, diffidence, and shyness of temperament, scarcely know as an author, yet confessedly one of the acutest metaphysicians of his day.§ In the class of the former Mr. Thom was initiated in the elements of Natural Philosophy; and in that of the latter, he listened to clear, elegant, and interesting prelections on the subject of Political Economy. The French language, my father studied likewise; and mastered it so far as to be able to read in it, with ease and pleasure, many valuable compositions in literature and science.

The only other thing, connected with the early portion of my father's career, which I deem worth mentioning is, that when very young he spent two years with his mother's relatives, on the banks of Loch Veoil, amidst "the braes of Balquidder," and on the banks of Loch Earn, at Ardvorlich. To this circumstance, he was indebted for a slight acquaintance with the Gaelic tongue, which in after life he never thoroughly forgot.

Few and comparatively unimportant were the incidents of Mr. Thom's mature age, secularly considered; but perhaps a clear and circumstantial, although succinct account of them, and a general glance at his principles and conduct, may form a not unsuitable introduction to the statement of his religious views and character.

Mr. Thom's apprenticeship having ended in 1782, and his clerkship, in 1787, he in the course of the latter year entered into business as a manufacturer, in company with two gentlemen, afterwards his brothers-in-law, Messrs. William and John Falconer: the firm assumed having been John Falconer and Co. The same parties added to their former, the hardware business, in 1792: adopting, however, Thom and Falconers as their firm, in this particular department. Mr. John Falconer having retired from both firms, and embarked in the Hamburgh trade, in 1797, the manufacturing and hardware concerns were thenceforward carried on respectively in the names of William Falconer and Co, and Thom and Falconer. This state of things was terminated by Mr. William Falconer's withdrawal from business altogether, on account of long protracted and severe illness, 1806. And from that time, until his death in 1814, Mr. Thom was engaged in business, on his own account alone.

My father's removals from home, especially in the latter part of his life, were

* Singularly enough, thirty years afterwards, Mr. Thom's eldest son, the writer of this memoir, was enrolled as a student under the same Professor, Sessions 1806, 7, and 1807, 8. Well can I remember the fact of his having taught both father and son, having been once very kindly and happily alluded to by the learned gentleman, at my father's dinner table.

† This gentleman amassed considerable wealth: he was father-in-law of Dr. James Jaffray, who, during the long period of 57 years, occupied the Chair of Anatomy in the University of Glasgow.

‡ The celebrated Dr. Birkbeck, with whom the idea of Mechanics' Institutions is generally understood to have originated, was Professor of Natural Philosophy in the Andersonian Institution, Glasgow, from 1798 till 1800. Was it his observation of the practical working and utility of the latter, that suggested the establishment of the former?

§ Many English gentlemen, principally connected with dissenting bodies, some of whom were my classfellows, will, I am confident, bear me out in this assertion. Mr. Jevons, in the dedication to the Professor, which he has prefixed to his philosophical work, has spoken of him in terms of the highest eulogy. Let it be observed that my own commendation is expressly limited to Mr. Mylne's metaphysical acumen, and literary merits.

not frequent, and seldom to any great distance. In 1787, for the recovery of his health which had been seriously impaired by attention to business, he made a voyage from the Clyde to Dublin, and back again.* Annual visits, for the sale and purchase of goods, he was in the habit of paying to Sheffield and Birmingham, between the years 1790 and 1802. He was also obliged, about the same period, to undertake journies, in the prosecution of trade, to various districts of Scotland. Interesting accounts of his travels in both England and Scotland and of the eminent men with whom, from time to time, he was brought into contact,† I have often heard from his lips.‡

Mr. Thom was married to Miss Jean Falconer, eldest daughter of Mr. William Falconer, a highly and deservedly respected citizen of Glasgow, and sister of his partners in business, on the 28th. day of April, 1794. By their union, which was a very happy one, Mr. and Mrs. Thom became the parents of nine children.§ Respecting his excellent, Christian, and much endeared mother, who was born at Glasgow, January 22nd. 1768, and finished her course at Liverpool, Dec. 6th, 1847, his feelings are still too keenly sensitive, to permit the writer to say a word more.

The city of Glasgow, rapidly advancing in population and wealth, remained without any efficient and satisfactory system of Police, till the year 1800. The old "Watch and Ward" practice, as long felt to be extremely burdensome, had a short time previously been discontinued; but the plan which at first was adopted turned out to be a complete failure, having become an object of dislike, as well as a laughing-stock, to the inhabitants. Something required to be done, to meet the exigencies of the case. But as the Corporation of Glasgow, like other Scotch town Councils at that period, was a self-elected body, a strong disinclination was felt to entrust its members with the power of imposing assessments on their fellow citizens, even for objects admitted by all to be desirable and expedient. This operated long as a bar in the way of needful improvement. At last, a compromise was effected. With common consent, an act of Parliament was passed in 1800, by which Glasgow was divided into 24 wards, or districts for police purposes; and to each of these divisions was assigned an unsalaried commissioner, or representative, himself paying at least £30 of rent annually, and elected by householders whose rent was £10 a year, and upwards. These twenty-four Commissioners of Police, together with the Lord Provost, for the time being, and seven other members of the Town Council, were constituted a board, or court, for assessing the inhabitants, for lighting the streets, for the appointment of constables and watchmen, for extinguishing fires and for other objects recommended by considerations of public safety, comfort, and utility. Mr. Thom was chosen Commissioner for the 17th. Ward, in 1802.

* About the time referred to in the text, Mr. Thom, influenced particularly by the impaired state of his health, cherished intentions of going out to Jamaica, and had actually made preparations for the voyage, when business proposals and arrangements interposed to prevent the fulfilment of his design. I have heard him say that, out of 21 young men, several of whom were known to him, who then went to the island, (Jamaica,) and whom he was to have accompanied, after the lapse of two years, only one, or at the utmost two were in existence.

† Of these, only James Montgomery, of Sheffield,—*poetarum nostrorum haud minimus certe*—still survives.

‡ Mr. Thom, while much attached to his native country, was also extremely fond of the English nation and character. His own affectionate and generous dispositions, always on the lookout for something congenial, had prepared him to sympathize with Englishmen. He liked their frankness, their straightforward mode of transacting business, and the apparent fervour and earnestness of their devotion. Many interesting anecdotes, illustrative of this latter quality, he has given me. While on his journies, he made a point to hear, not only popular clergymen of the Established Church, but theleading Methodist, Independent, and Baptist preachers of the day. Samuel Pearce, of Birmingham, he took a lively interest in, and his untimely fate, he deeply deplored. His associations were chiefly with the superior, and more religious class of his English customers. Between him and them, a strong mutual liking subsisted.

§ David—William, who died a medical student, March, 1813—Jane Campbell, whe fell a victim to consumption, May 23, 1822—John, a resident in the Island of Jamaica, for upwards of 33 years, and still alive—Margaret Corss, married to Mr. George Charles—Christina Stewart, who died in infancy, 1805—James, whose brief but interesting career, terminated at Kingston, Jamaica, May 21, 1824—Robert, the eminent Chinese scholar who, after having rendered very considerable services to his country during our recent hostilities with the "Celestial Empire," was appointed Consul at Ningpo, March, 1844, and died there Sept. 14, 1846—and Janet Falconer, *(eheu! quam deploranda, deploratque,)* who expired at Rothesay, Isle of Bute, Sept. 15, 1828.

To him it was most gratifying to find himself associated, at the police board, with several of the wisest, and most esteemed of his fellow citizens.* It was, indeed, then a high honour, to hold the situation which he did. My father's activity, general intelligence, prudence, business habits, and integrity, soon raised him to a leading position at the board. He was for many years, Convener or Chairman of one of its most important and influential Committees. The entire confidence of the electors of his ward, as well as of the public in general, he possessed. This was evinced, by his having been several times re-elected as Commissioner. And to the close of his life, he might have continued to fill this office, had not increasing bad health necessitated a change of residence, and thereby disqualified him. He retired amidst the deep regret of his constituents.

Standing high as a man of integrity and honourable feeling, as well as a man of sense, several societies were glad to avail themselves of his services, as one as their office-bearers; and many were the private trusts, from abroad, as well as at home, devolved, I might almost say, pressed on him.† How well—how conscientiously and humanely—he discharged these, survivors can tell.

Towards the end of February, 1812, in the midst of Mr. Thom's active and useful career, disease attacked him unexpectedly, and while apparently in the enjoyment of the best health. Strangulated hernia, which rendered necessary the performance of an operation, and which was followed by a paralytic seizure, prostrated his powers, and impaired his usefulness. He languished in a state of distressing debility, sinking more and more, until the morning of Monday, the 17th. day of October, 1814, when apoplexy suddenly, but gently, stept in to grant him a release from his sufferings. At the period of his decease, he had not quite completed his fifty-first year. His removal was much and generally lamented. With regret, but "in the sure and certain hope of a joyful resurrection," his relations, and a large number of attached fellow citizens, deposited his remains in the crypt of the Cathedral of Glasgow,‡ in a burial-place purchased by him from the heritors of the Barony Parish—situated immediately to the north of the recumbent statue of St. Kentigern, and almost close to the grave of the celebrated and ill-fated, Edward Irving.

Some general remarks, concerning the character of my father, seem appropriately to come in here.

Politically considered, Mr. Thom was, what in days that are long bygone was denominated a democrat. And owing to the firmness and decision with which he avowed his sentiments, and the upright consistency with which he acted on them, he at first laboured under the suspicions, and was for a time exposed to all the persecutions, petty and otherwise, which persons holding liberal opinions were, sixty years ago, obliged to make up their minds to. He was one of those, who, in 1792, had the courage to attend the meeting of Glasgow Reformers, presided over by Mr. Lambton, to which allusion was made by the late Earl of Durham, son of that gentleman, at the banquet given to him, by his friends and admirers, in 1834.—Ill, however, should we discharge our duty to our parent, and unjustly should we deal with his memory, if we left it to be supposed, that he was distinguished by any of the qualities of the demagogue—that decision in politics was united in him to a violent and turbulent temper, or rendered him rash and precipitate in his procedure. Well did his contemporaries know the contrary. Nothing in Cicero and Sallust's descriptions of a Cataline could apply to him. With a firmness of

* Among these may be mentioned, that honest man and sterling patriot, Alexander Oswald, Esq., of Shieldhall, father of James Oswald, Esq, of Auchincruive, long M. P. for the City of Glasgow.—Mr. Oswald was a near relation of the celebrated author of the Essay on "Common Sense."

† Besides my own personal recollections on the subject, I am borne out by the number of powers of attorney, and other documents connected with the affairs of friends which, subsequently to my father's death, I found among his papers.

‡ This was for a long term of years, the Church of the Barony Parish of Glasgow; and, as the 'Laigh Barony Kirk," is most powerfully and graphically described by Sir Walter Scott, in his ascinating novel of "Rob Roy."

character which no opposition and no sufferings could shake,—with undaunted courage, and with an uprightness which never permitted him to have recourse to tortuous and time-serving expedients,—he combined a gentleness of spirit, and a moderation of conduct, which at any time, and especially at such a time are rare, consequently remarkable, and above all decidedly praiseworthy. Every thing at the æra of which we are speaking, 1792, 3, was in extremes. Mutual exasperation of political parties was one of its most painful characteristics. Aristocrats positively hated democrats; and by democrats was this feeling of hatred retorted with interest. Scarcely did any man seem capable of making allowances for the education, prejudices, and circumstances of his neighbour. The French Revolution, that political and social volcano, had stirred up from the bottom, and brought to the surface, the very worst passions—the diabolical instincts of human nature. A desire to have recourse to violence, in putting down their political opponents, was common to both parties. John Thom's conduct was all the while calm, mild, and conciliatory.* With men of violence he refused *to cast in his lot.* The Meeting of the British Convention at Edinburgh, in 1793, 4, he declined having anything to do with; and its wild and chimerical, because impracticable, (although, perhaps, honestly meant) schemes, he utterly discountenanced and repudiated. Nothing but calm, earnest, forcible remonstrances with the Government of the day, met his ideas of what was then incumbent on reformers. The public, he contended, should be enlightened—honestly zealously, and perseveringly, but prudently enlightened—as to the defects in the constitution of the country, made then but too apparent in its practical workings—as to the remedies required for these—and as to the proper means of applying them. But nothing more. Every thing, in his opinion, should be left to time, and to the progress of the human mind. With an educated people, with a free press, with the right of petition and remonstrance, and with our valuable institutions defective although in many respects they might be, he did not despair of ultimate success. The greatest integrity, however, could not at first shield Mr. Thom from the reproaches of his own party. His moderation, they could neither understand, nor appreciate. It was enough with many democrats—some of them truly honest men—to condemn my father, that although content to suffer for the avowal of his opinions, he was not prepared to employ violence in their support. Hence, what in him sprang from moderation—from Christian principle—and from a calmer and more profound view of human nature, and the exigencies of human society, than was at that period taken by most of his contemporaries, was by many, professing sentiments similar to his own, set down to the score of cowardice. Probably, some who did not know him, might even suspect him of time-serving. To all such charges, and to every surmise of his having been actuated by unworthy motives, a life of firm and undeviating, although moderate assertion of liberal sentiments—an open avowal from which, although at the expense of much personal feeling, and the incurring of considerable losses, he never shrank—and a confidence, like that of his friend, Thomas Muir,† and expressed with equal decision, that "the good cause of

* The following little anecdote, once related to me by him, may serve to illustrate and confirm this.—"Owing to the exasperated state of parties, my friends and myself had been compelled to retire from the Exchange Reading Room, on account of our political sentiments." (1793.) "We immediately summoned, and held a meeting, for the purpose of getting up another institution of a kindred nature. At that meeting it was proposed, as one of our fundamental laws, that 'no aristocrat should be eligible as a member, or become entitled to any of the privileges and advantages of our association.' To this proposal, I at once, and unhesitatingly demurred. I said, that 'it struck me as not only savouring of revenge, but as inconsistent with our own professed principles. We had been made the victims of harsh and illiberal treatment. Let us not stultify ourselves, and justify what our political adversaries had done to us, by pursuing a similar course towards them.'—My opposition was in vain. The motion was carried against me. Thenceforward, I saw that I had lost the confidence of the leaders of the party; and they, certainly, did not possess mine. However, as I approved of their objects generally, and as I believed them, in spite of their hot-headedness and violence, to be worthy and honest men, I did not withdraw; but continued for many years to frequent the room, and pay my annual subscription."

† None could admire Mr. Muir's integrity, or respect the motives of his conduct, more highly than did my father. Nay, I have heard him admit, that in the estimate which he had formed of

reform would ultimately prevail"—afforded the best reply. Mr. Thom was not a man of violence, but he had emphatically the spirit of a martyr. He could, when necessary, openly and unhesitatingly avow what he thought; and he could patiently take the consequences.* His character, as a politician, I can from recollections of my own illustrate. When telling him some of the day-dreams which a perusal of the classics, and of such books as the late Sir James Macintosh's *Vindiciæ Gallicæ*, had inspired me with, he has said to me:—"Violence in politics is most distasteful to me. Even anxious as I am, to see the cause of liberty and good government prevail, I would not do, I would not sanction others in doing, the slightest injury to one of my fellow men, in order to promote it. Leave matters to time, David. If violence be resorted to, with a view to advance even the cause of truth—the cause of what is right and desirable—not more inconsistent is such procedure with Christianity, than is it calculated to defeat its own professed object. All premature reforms are apt to be short-lived. Let public opinion precede legislative enactments, and the law thus merely give form and authority to what is already the matured conviction of the people, and we get on. Acting otherwise, rash innovations are but too likely to be followed by retrogression; nay, may lead even to the resuscitation of despotic powers which, as having long lain in abeyance, might appear to have altogether passed away."—How much do I owe to my dear father's advice and suggestions in such matters!—Such sentiments as those which I have quoted, may not now be uncommon; but looking back fifty or sixty years, by how very few of the parties who were then engaged in the great political struggle, were they even conceived of, much less held and maintained. —My father loved our British institutions, with all their defects. Their amelioration, not their destruction, was one of the wishes nearest and dearest to his heart. The tom-foolery of French Republican names and practices, his strong, shrewd, common sense, always kept him aloof from. War, he abhorred; and, therefore, although patriotically desirous to see the French driven back from our shores,—not insensible to the glory which our naval victories, and the triumphs of our arms by land, had been the means of achieving;—and grateful to both services, for these exertions of theirs by which, under God, our privileges civil and religious had been secured to us, he never could be prevailed on to take up arms. He conceived that the profession of a soldier, however

---

Mr. Muir's abilities, while at College, he believed himself to have been mistaken. He was satisfied that he had underrated them. After coming to the bar, that gentleman, in Dr. M'Gill, of Ayr's trial, (see the Doctor's able and learned, but not less heavy than Socinian work, on the Sonship of Jesus Christ, 1786, and Burns' Poems,) before the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, and in the case of two soldiers brought to the bar of the Justiciary Court at Glasgow, had displayed an eloquence, and general forensic talents, for the possession of which, no one previously had given him the slightest credit. But, notwithstanding, Mr. Muir, in my father's opinion, was too much of an enthusiast. He was apt to overlook difficulties and obstacles which cooler judgments perceived; and to rush to conclusions which, could they have been realized, would have endangered the peace of Society. My father, with many others, considering that Mr. Muir had, by several rash and injudicious steps, not only produced results disastrous to himself, but detrimental to the interests which he was sincerely desirous to promote, deprecated the popular cause being entrusted to his leadership.—None could more decidedly and feelingly condemn, the harsh and brutal usage which, after his trial and conviction for sedition, (1793,) that gentleman met with, than did my honoured parent.

* Mr. Thom was the near relative of one who has acquired the rank and character of a martyr, in the estimation of many of the Scottish people. I allude to Robert Thom, a good man who was shot at Polmadie, near Glasgow, May 11th, 1685, for adhering to the "Cause of Covenanted Reformation," and refusing to pray for King James VII; and whose remains, with those of Thomas Cook, and John Uric, barbarously murdered on the same occasion, were deposited under "the martyrs' stone" in Cathcart Church Yard. The details of the case, which are briefly adverted to in "The Cloud of Witnesses," will be found set down at full length, in Wodrow's "History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland," during the persecuting reigns of Charles II. and James II., Vol. IV. pp. 250, 251, of Burns' edition, Glasgow, 1828 See also p. 17, of the same volume. Although admiring his relation's honesty, respecting the firmness and conscientiousness with which he maintained his principles, and condemning the atrocities of the Stuart administration, my father with equal decision, condemned that principle of armed resistance to "the powers that be," and disposition to take the sword for the promotion of what was deemed to be truth, of which the Robert Thom of that period, in common with his party, was a supporter — By the by, one of my mother's ancestors, Mr. William Falconer, of Hamilton, although not raised to the dignity of a *martyr*, ranks among the *confessors* of the period in question. Wodrow, Burn's edition, vol. iii. p. 217, and vol. iv. p. 490.

useful and honourable, and however necessary, secularly considered, in the present state of Society, was inconsistent with the genius of Christianity. Matt. xxvi. 51—53, John xviii. 36.*—The rights, privileges and claims of others, whatever might be their opposition to himself in civil or religious matters, John Thom always had a most tender and sacred regard for. In all social changes—even in the removal of proved and acknowledged abuses—he insisted that justice should be done to every one—that vested rights should be respected—and that public improvements should be postponed, rather than carried by acts which might have even the semblance of violence and oppression. "No man, be he great or small—be he aristocrat or democrat—should, even for purposes of manifest utility, be deprived of his property, without adequate compensation." C. J. Fox's well-known idea, as to the identity of the principles of public and private morals, was his. My father's mode of thinking as to topics of great and stirring interest may be best exemplified, by quoting his language in reference to slavery and the slave trade: "Do justice to the slave, certainly. Let the accursed traffic in human flesh and bones, be at once abolished; and let slavery—man's claim to hold in perpetual bondage, and to treat as if he were a portion of his goods and chattels, his fellow man—with all its attendant abominations, as unjust, as nefarious, as brutalizing, as absolutely inconsistent with Christianity, be banished completely and for ever from the face of the earth. But see that, in doing justice to the slave, you do justice also to the slave owner. Make not men, whom you have encouraged, nay urged to invest their capital in this loathesome species of property, and to whom you have guaranteed its possession, the sport of your caprice, and the victims of your fit of tardy national repentance. Put down the slave trade. Liberate the slave. But in doing so, take for the model of your procedure, the conduct of King David, in the matter of the threshing floor, cattle, and implements, of Araunah, the Jebusite."† To us now, there is no novelty in such language and such opinions. Our parliamentary compensation of £20,000,000 sterling to the British planter, when emancipation was conceded to the slave,—an act which constitutes not the least of England's glories—stamps my honoured relation's views as having been, in 1836, those of the nation to which he belonged. But be it remembered, that the sentiments just quoted, were cherished by him as far back as 1790. At that period, he had but few, comparatively speaking, who were like-minded and sympathized with him. Scarcely was anything then to be heard but, on the one hand, a demand for the immediate and unconditional abolition of the slave trade, let the consequences be what they might; and, on the other, the dogged and sullen utterance of a determination uncompromisingly to maintain it, by parties who deemed its perpetuation essential, not merely to the well-being, but to the very existence of our West-Indian Colonies. Interesting, surely, is it to think, that at this long by-past period of extremes, when men were positively deaf to the strongest arguments proceeding from the side that

* There were several points in regard to which my father, to a certain extent, agreed with the Quakers. Particularly, he looked on war, and on warlike operations as, under all circumstances, unchristian. Not, however, that he denied the use or necessity of military power. Christian principles, he always contended, must not be confounded with those of the present world. John xviii. 36. "In the case of the resistance of the American Colonies, now the United States, to Great Britain, I distinguish between the justice of their cause, and the means by which they carried it; and between what human and patriotic principles, on the one hand, and Christian principles, on the other, dictated. In taking up arms, and achieving their independence by main force, they acted rightly as human beings; but on the maxims enunciated by the Son of God, Matt. v. 38—48, and according to the law of love, Rom. xiii. 10, they never can be justified." Thus, in one particular instance, he anticipated that doctrine of the essential antagonism subsisting between human and divine principles, to which, when observed by myself, I have ventured to give the name of "Divine Inversion." Would my father, holding the sentiments which he did, if he had lived, have become a member of a "Peace Society?" I am dubious. The success of such societies, if feasible, I am certain he would have prayed for. But with human nature, constituted as it is, staring him in the face, Titus iii 3, James iv. 1, and the impossibility of human nature ever, while it lasts, casting off its essential properties, laid down as an axion of God's word, Jer. xiii 23, Matt. xii. 25—29, must he not have regarded the anticipations of human benevolence, in reference to the cessation of "wars and fightings among men," as, at the best, but a dream?

† 2 Sam. xxiv. 18—25.

was opposed to them, and when enthusiasm or self-interest ruled public opinion, there were a few who could look calmly and impartially at both sides of a much-vexed question—could reconcile the most intense hatred of slavery, with an equally intense hatred of whatever was at variance with the plainest dictates of common justice, and common honesty—and could thus pave the way for those matured convictions of their countrymen, which were destined to be embodied in an act of the legislature, at a future day.*—Pursuing such a course, holding such sentiments, and influenced by motives at once just, wise and honourable, it will not surprise my readers to be told that, while Mr. Thom was the friend and associate of determined but moderate and patriotic reformers, with many gentlemen of opposite political sentiments, he was on terms of the greatest intimacy. After the first explosion of party feeling—after the first access of the revolutionary fever—was over, even conservatives felt constrained to admire a man, in whom the greatest firmness and resolution were found united to an equal degree of caution; and whose ardent love of reform had not blinded him to the fundamental excellence of those institutions which he wished to see ameliorated. Such parties might still continue to dislike Mr. Thom's sentiments, as a whole; but they could not help observing, that in him they were perfectly compatible with his being a good man, and a good citizen. The number of leading men, on both sides of politics, who lamented his death, and testified their respect by attending his funeral, speaks volumes as to his character.

In a literay point of view, I experience some difficulty in speaking of my father. Although a great reader, and stored as to his mind with much varied and useful information, the original defects of his education clung to him to the last. The incessant demands of business too on his time and attention, and the many public duties which he had to discharge, active as he was, sadly interfered with that cultivation of his mind, and that gratification of his literary tastes of which he was so desirous. I learned from him, that between 1787 and 1792, or thereabouts, he was in the habit of contributing scraps of poetry, (*jeux d'esprit,*) as well as letters, and short essays to the Glasgow newspapers. A number of old Glasgow journals, belonging to the period in question, I have had in my possession; but in consequence of any productions of my father's which they might contain, not having been marked, I long since abandoned all attempts at identifying them. Several manuscripts of his, I have. They consist of poems, political diatribes, and essays and letters on the subject of religion. None of them are in such a state exactly, as to justify me in publishing them without revision; indeed, without their having been subjected to much correction, and, in some instances, to curtailment. Should the respected

* The immediate emancipation of the grown-up negro, inured to slavery, except under very peculiar circumstances, my father regarded as a positive evil. With the education of a slave, he was satisfied, came the low and debased feelings and inclinations of a slave,—came, likewise. an almost necessary sense of dependence. So much so, that nominally to emancipate such parties was, in his apprehension, a burlesque on liberty, no less than an act of wanton cruelty to those to whom the boon was vouchsafed. The ivy requires support; and how is it to stand, when the sturdy oak on which it formerly leaned, and around which it had entwined itself, is at once and rudely withdrawn? Ardently, therefore, did he desire to see steps taken, as soon as possible, to prepare the slave for freedom. The exertions of the Moravians, and other missionaries, in this respect, he highly prized. The conduct of the legislature of the State of New York, in rendering free all negroes, and coloured persons, born within their territory, after the passing of their act, leaving it to proprietors of grown-up negroes, if they saw meet, to manumit them, and to all such negroes the power of purchasing their own freedom, he looked on as, all circumstances considered, a proper and judicious measure. Had he lived, it strikes me, that of the *principle* of apprenticeship, as applicable to many of our colonies, he would have approved, however objectionable he may have deemed certain of its *provisions*. I am sure, that the conduct of the legislature of Antigua, in dispensing with the apprenticeship system altogether, and at once emancipating their coloured population, on the ground of its high moral, intellectual, and religious character, would have met with his unqualified approbation. It was solely the good of the negro himself, that, as respects this matter, he thought of.—Before my father's death, the process of preparation of the negro for manumission, by religious training and otherwise, had in several colonies begun; and after his death, it was carried on. Still, after all, it may be suspected, that there was, with regard to some of the West Indian Islands, an undue precipitancy in the final step. A little longer delay might, in some instances, have been advisable and advantageous. Emancipation was certainly an act of justice to the negro. Tardy it may be. But has he—especially if of mature age before the passing of the act,—been in all respects benefitted by the change? I fear not.

Editor of the "Universalist" consider any thing from my father's pen, as worthy of insertion, I may at some future period solicit a place for one or two of them in his pages. Their literary characteristics may be briefly stated.—Imagination, to a certain degree, they all display. Sweetness, pathos, and occasionally a gleam of sublimity, strike me as distinguishing his poetical effusions. His prose writings are clear, manly, and judicious. Eloquent,—it may be sometimes a little diffuse: always, however, sensible, and to the point. They appear to me to be singularly nervous and spirited. They are not, I admit, very artistic in their structure; and they want that polish which practice and leisure, (alas! Mr. Thom had not much of that,) alone can impart. Yet their writer was far from being devoid of taste. Traces of it—untutored, to be sure—are unmistakably perceptible in all that he ever composed. His original classic education although limited, and his acquaintance with the elegancies of French diction, aided by native tact, sufficed to preserve him from coarseness and vulgarity of language.

Mr. Thom's personal appearance was most prepossessing. He was scrupulously clean and neat, without being finical in his attire. Somewhat short of stature—not quite five feet, six inches in height*—he was full, without being corpulent, and was endowed with an almost faultless symmetry of form. His face in early life, and up to the period of his last illness, could not but be considered handsome. The several features were good. There was complete harmony among them. And the *tout-ensemble* was most attractive and impressive. Not that there was anything feminine about his aspect. It denoted frankness, benevolence, manliness and intelligence. Peculiar modesty was expressed by it. The sweetness of his smile, I shall never forget. Occasionally, his countenance might have been regarded as that of a proud man. Seldom however. And never, except in self-defence. The forward and the assuming, he certainly, by his look, could keep at a distance. Affectionate as he was by nature, and unwilling to create uneasiness in the breast of any one, that man must have been but a poor physiognomist, who failed to discover in the mild and benevolent features of John Thom, indications of decided self-respect—a deep, although subdued sense of personal dignity. To his features, his character exactly corresponded. Affections the most powerful were inherent in his nature. His was a benevolence which never could be satisfied, except when he was engaged in doing good. The law of kindness dwelt in his heart, and the language of kindness flowed from his lips. But his kindness was not confined to feelings and words. It evinced itself in a humane consideration for the condition and wants of others; and in a tender desire as far as he could to remove, or at least alleviate their sufferings. He was, without any shew, and without the boastful spirit implied in the use of the language, the realization of Terence's *Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto.* Generosity in him went hand in hand with benevolence; although both were under the control, incessantly, of a strict and efficient sense of justice. Disinterestedness of motives, whether his aims were public or private, formed one of his most prominent characteristics. Indeed, he was, in his whole conduct, one of the most unselfish men, whom I have ever met with.† He was fair and candid in his judgments respecting human character, and human actions. In this respect he was no *Joseph Surface:* for he no less abhorred, and guarded against scandal and detraction on his own part, than he was careful to put down every exhibition of it on the part of others.‡ Need I add, that he was singularly free from petty and spiteful feelings? Although the opposite of servile or cringing, he was preeminently courteous:§ courteous

* He, in point of height and make, took after his mother. His father was a tall man, six feet high, I am told; and all bearing his name whom I have seen, with scarcely an exception, have been tall likewise.

† In this, as well as in many other respects, his son Robert, the late Consul at Ningpo, strikingly resembled him.

‡ One most remarkable instance of this, I could give; but I suppress it, as it might appear to involve self-commendation.

§ 1 Peter iii. 8.

to the beggar, no less than to his superiors and equals.* Most forgiving was he in his temper. I have never known one who was more disposed and prepared to act almost literally on our Saviour's precept, as to the pardoning of offences, even *to seventy times seven.* Nor was this the result of apathy. So far was he from being insensible to insults and injuries, that few men were naturally more alive to them, or felt them more keenly. Had not higher principles interfered and imposed a habitual restraint on his angry passions, I question much when I consider the ill usage, and monstrous ingratitude to which he was but too frequently subjected, if even the almost boundless benevolence of his nature could, in many cases, have sufficed to curb his resentment.† But the heavenly mind of Christ was in him very powerful. Acquainted with self in the light of the glorious gospel, humbled under a sense of his own shortcomings and infirmities, and constantly recognising salvation as wholly of grace through the abounding righteousness of Jesus Christ, he could forgive the trespasses of others, for the sake of that Saviour who had freely forgiven him. Was not this magnanimity, in the true and Christian sense of the term?‡ He was a man of truth. The frankness that beamed from his countenance, was the exact index of the openness of his heart. Integrity and punctuality he displayed in all his commercial transactions. Small, comparatively, as was his capital, his mercantile credit always stood high; and never higher than at the time of his decease. Honourable feelings distinguished him. He loathed and kept aloof from all that was mean and tricky. You felt almost instinctively, when brought into contact with him, that he was a man in whom you could confide.§ High moral courage was in him blended with extreme caution. He had a nice and delicate sense of propriety. And, as the necessary consequence, he was modest and pure in his whole deportment. Unbecoming and offensive expressions as well as actions, he was peculiarly on his guard against. Self-diffident and self-disparaging he was. Not obtrusively and hypocritically so; but in his inmost heart‖ Indeed, the sense of self-depreciation he carried perhaps to excess. It was considered by some of his best friends, that through the timidity which was the offspring of his self-distrust, he lost opportunities of bettering his temporal circumstances which men of vastly inferior talents, but of far more sanguine temperament, and endowed with

---

* 1 Peter, ii. 17.

† Sometimes, but very rarely, I have remarked a fire in his eye, and a flash of indignation gleaming from his countenance, particularly on the sight or recital of any act of meanness or wickedness, so very marked, as has made me suspect that angry passions of considerable strength lay slumbering in his bosom. Since his death, and since the publication of Sir Walter Scott's enchanting tale, entitled "A Legend of Montrose," I have had my suspicions confirmed, by being made aware that he was descended, and not very remotely either, from the individual to whom that celebrated author has assigned the fictitious appellation of 'Allan MacAulay," and whose violence of temper is, to suit the purposes of the Novelist, grievously exaggerated. See Mr. Stewart, of Ardvorlie's, letter, prefixed to the later editions of the "Legend." Also, Bishop Wishent's "Memoirs," and Mark Napier's "Montrose." Inheriting Major Stewart's blood, it is but too probable, that Mr. Thom inherited also naturally some of his spirit. This, however, I can say with truth, that any unseemly ebullition of temper, on the part of my father, I never witnessed. If the lion was there, he was lulled to sleep. (*Assoupi*) My honoured parent seemed to me to have all his passions, especially the angry ones, ever under the most rigorous and efficient control.

‡ Have my readers ever seen Soame Jenyns' interesting treatise on the "Internal Evidences of Christianity?"

§ An English gentleman, not only of superior talents and occupying considerable rank in society, but standing high likewise on the ground of moral and religious qualities, who had had commercial dealings with my father for a long series of years, remarked when his grave was pointed out by a friend, "There lies one of the most honourably-minded men—perhaps, the most honourably-minded man—whom I ever knew."

‖ Here, again, his son, Robert, bore a very marked resemblance to him. Scarcely ever have I encountered such modesty—such self-diffidence—such self-disparaging tendencies, combined with such talents, as in the person of my brother. At a time when his services were rewarded with the approbation of his Sovereign and country, and when his progress in Chinese literature was extorting applause from the most distinguished Sinologues of England and the Continent, in his most secret and confidential letters to me, he was continually speaking with generous enthusiasm of parties whom he deemed his superiors in ability and attainments, was underrating himself as compared with them, and was of opinion that he had done next to nothing, in cases where parties competent to judge were satisfied that he had done a great deal.

a larger measure of self-conceit,* would with avidity have seized on. He timorously shrank back from embarking in new undertakings, even where the prospect of success appeared to others the most promising. All this was in his case the more remarkable, as his moral courage was undoubted—as his activity of mind was prodigious—and as his spirit of enterprise, when he did exert it, was great and almost uniformly successful. What damped his mercantile energies? Could it be conviction of the necessity uf learning a new business through losses, and, perhaps, even entire failure? Could it be the risk of sullying his fair fame, and bringing reproach on his Christian profession, by consequent inability to satisfy his creditors? Could it be, that he conceived himself unwarranted, as a follower of the Lamb, to step out of his own sphere, and outrun God in the course of his adorable providence? These queries, I am unable to satisfy. Suffice it to say, that he preferred continuing to prosecute a business which he knew, to engaging, with slender resources, in one that he knew not. And that in the estimation of many, thus acting, he stood in the way of his own interests: it having been next to impossible for him, with his superior abilities, in their opinion, not to have succeeded in becoming a richer man than he actually was.—There was no defect of firmness, on my father's part. Altogether, especially towards the close of his life, very cautious and deliberate before coming to a conclusion, when his resolution was once taken he adhered to it with a pertinacity, which sometimes might seem to approach to the confines of obstinacy. He had strong domestic affections, but most judicious was he in the display of them. He combined firmness, with the utmost kindness, in his treatment of his children. As to what he was in an intellectual point of view, after the facts already submitted to the reader, a very few words will be enough. He had strong common sense. He observed quickly and accurately; and was capable of sound, as well as profound reflection. His mind was a large and comprehensive one; he had great powers of generalization; and if in respect to dialectic skill and metaphysical acumen, he yielded the palm of superiority to many, his faculties of logic and analysis were far from being the least prominent of his intellectual characteristics. He was gifted with much natural eloquence. Mental as well as bodily activity has been more than once, in the previous part of this memoir, referred to, as having been possessed by him in a high degree. Amazing was his penetration into character, and correct his appreciation of the motives of those with whom he had to do. This feature of his mind was part and parcel of that astuteness and perspicacity—that shrewdness—of which, like his countrymen in general, he possessed no small share; although in him it lay embedded in such a mass of affection, and had drawn over it a veil of benevolent and generous feelings so dense, as almost to screen it from ordinary observation. A gentle but marked hint, on his part, was sometimes required to make individuals aware, that although great allowances were being made for them and no disposition was felt to do them any injury, their characters and designs were perfectly understood. It used to amuse and instruct me, in early life, to see the ease with which my father could lay bare the acutest sophistry, and strip hypocrisy of its disguises; and yet the kindliness of feeling with which, all the while, he did so. It was vice, not the vicious, whom he wanted me to hate. He never forgot, in his severest denunciations against evil, that he himself was a partaker of the same nature from which, that which he condemned had emanated. He had naturally an almost invincible propensity to humour, and a keen relish for displays of it on the part of others;† but as too frequently leading to the indulgence of malicious feelings,‡ and as in many

* May I not add, *with more worldly prudence?*

† His son, Robert, possessed this quality, in common with him, to a very high degree.

‡ With great kindliness, but in a manner not to be mistaken, my father once drew my attention to the character of a gentleman, highly estimable in many respects—esteemed by him and esteeming him in return—who was remarkable for his inability to suppress a jest, although its utterance might be at the expense of his best friend, and tend to wound his feelings, if not even to alienate his affections. Earnestly and impressively did my father urge on me to take warning

other respects at variance with the spirit and maxims of Christianity,* it was in him under strict, constant and effective restraint.† How incessantly watchful, indeed, was he to curb and keep within legitimate bounds, his own strong social dispositions! To genius he made no pretensions; but his possession of a fair share of it was obvious and acknowledged. Originally, as well as powerfully, could he think; but reckoning "an ounce of mother wit, worth a pound of clergy," he never would consent to forego the claims of sound judgment, for any mere theory however plausible and specious, even although that theory might happen to be his own. Consummate prudence he was endowed with; and well was it for him that this was the case, for it served as a check on a benevolence which otherwise might have been excessive. This leads me to observe that were I required to select and point out what was the predominant feature of Mr. Thom's mind, I should say unhesitatingly, *benevolence.* His faults—but who can bear to look at the dark side of a beloved and revered parent's character? If he had faults, they were such only as are common to men of a warm, energetic, and generous temperament. Vices he had none. None, even, of those foibles, failings, or frailties which on poetic authority, and according to poetic morality, are declared to "lean to virtue's side." I can say with truth that never, during the fifty-six years of my own sojourn upon earth, have I met with a human being more consistent—more humbled by the cross—and more lovely, than was he, whose character I am now attempting faintly to delineate. He lived and walked by faith. His purity, circumspection, and blamelessness—in a word, his holiness—of life and conversation, was the theme of universal remark and commendation. *Christianum virum facile dixeris; bonum libenter.*‡

(To be concluded in our next.)

---

by his example.—Who is not acquainted with the malicious and spiteful character ascribed to those imaginary beings called Fairies; and who has not read, or seen this character embodied in that glorious creation of the great master of the human heart, Shakspeare, his "Midsummer Night's Dream?" Independently, however, of all this, that man must be possessed of but slender knowledge of the world, and can have looked but superficially at human life, who has failed to observe, that the *esprit moqueur* is an *esprit malin*—that the unrestrained indulgence of fun and frolic is absolutely incompatible with the cultivation and display of benevolent feeling. What mischiefs have sprung from the possession of a talent for humour! Of ridicule I should say.

* Let not *foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient,* be once named amongst you, as becometh saints. Eph, v. 3, 4.

† Occasionally, his propensity to a quiet joke, when it involved nothing improper, was absolutely irrepressible.—Dining one day with a party, at the house of a much-respected and wealthy relation of opposite politics to his own, about forty or fifty years ago, when the war phrensy was at its height, a round of fighting men was proposed, by way of a toast, Admirals and Generals of high renown, and unquestionable gallantry, were given in succession. At last it came to my father's turn. Quietly, gravely, and with that dry humour for which the Scotch are so remarkable, he said, "Mendoza." (The name of a then notorious pugilist and prize-fighter.) The joke took, and was highly applauded by the company.

‡ Let it not be supposed, that in speaking with approbation of my father's character, it is my purpose indirectly to praise myself. Alas! the original and constituent elements of my own nature, I know to be in many respects inferior to what his were: and whatever, as a lover of the Lord Jesus, I may have aimed at, and in whatever ways I may appear to fellow believers to have succeeded, I am but too conscious that my life and conversation, viewed as a whole, will never for one moment bear to be brought into comparison with his. Looking at him, and remembering what he was, while I glorify God in him, I am humbled, not exalted. Could any other than myself have been found, qualified from knowledge to write a narrative of my excellent parent, and disposed from affection to do so, right glad should I have been to devolve the task, necessarily a delicate one, on him. This, however, could not he.—Differing as we do in other respects, in this my father and I agree. As a sinful and dying creature enlightened by faith, to the same grace of God, abounding through the divine righteousness of Jesus Christ unto eternal life, to which he looked, and in which he found sweet and abiding consolation, am I enabled to look likewise, and in it to experience that peace, and to cherish that joy, which the blood of Christ sprinkled on the conscience, and the power of his resurrection put forth in new-creating efficacy, alone can impart.

A STORY OF GRAGE.

CHAPTER III.

"Ah! my friend," said Mr. Weldon "as he entered George's chamber," I heard of the accident which had befallen you, and have come to spend five minutes with you, in the hope of relieving the monotony of your solitude. What does the doctor say?"

"Thanks for your benevolent intention, Mr. Weldon," replied George, "it is very kind of you; my patience will be put to the test, for the doctor says I must make up my mind to remain here for a few weeks."

"You will not be unsuccessful in the attempt to follow the doctor's directions, I am sure; for I have often remarked that you have a good share of energy and enduring resolution."

"Though an inconvenience, Mr. Weldon, how mitigated is my trial! I might have been called to suffer vastly more than I shall have to endure. And how thankful I am that I am under no necessity to resign my mind to the same inactivity as that to which my body is subjected by this event! I may read; and there is a book recently come out which I have made up my mind to peruse. Might I so far presume upon your kindness as to ask you to procure it for me?"

"I shall feel a pleasure in assisting you in this, or in any other way; what is the title and where shall I get it"

"The title of the book is 'The Trial of Spirits,' the author—James Relly, and it is to he had at Lewis's in Paternoster Row. I have his work on 'Union,' and purpose"—

"You surprise me," exclaimed Mr. Weldon, interrupting George, "you surely are not in earnest; you could not read such stuff as he prints—you are aware how strongly he is condemned by those who know more than you or I do about the man."

"It is because I do not know, that I wish to read and judge for myself," George calmly replied. "A man should not be condemned without a hearing, Mr. Weldon. Mr. Murray would not have favored a man whose sentiments were egregiously erroneous."

"I believe in my heart that Murray is a good man; but the best may err. And as to Relly—I would prefer leaving him in the hands of those who are mnch more capable of dealing with him than I am: but I will fulfil my promise, and you shall have the book in a day or two, when I will call upon you again."

George thanked his friend, and after a cordial farewell Mr. Weldon departed.

It was winter. A fall of snow, had been succeeded by a rapid thaw, which, again, was followed by a severe frost. On the day preceding that on which the above interview took place George was on his way to his employers, and in attempting to save a poor old woman from slipping down, he fell himself just as a cart was passing, the wheel of which went over his leg and fractured it. George was now much alone, and the time which might otherwise have hung heavily upon his hands, was fully occupied upon a subject in which he took a growing interest. *The Union, or a treatise concerning the affinity between Christ and the Church;* was a book he had picked up at a stall a few days before he met with the accident which confined him to his bed; and (the bible excepted) it had recently been almost his sole companion.

On his way home Mr. Weldon was met by an individual of some standing in the Whitfield Society; and being concerned lest George Richardson should imbibe the principles of Relly, and somewhat uneasy on account of the promise he had made respecting the book, he told Mr. Barlow (for that was his name), of his visit and his promise, at the same time suggesting that it would be well if he were to put him upon his sick visiting list, and see him accordingly. Mr.

Barlow, although a man of very strong nerve, was shocked at this disclosure, assured Mr. Weldon that he should make it is duty to pay him an early visit, and, after some serious remarks respecting the dangers to which the Christian was exposed, left Mr. Weldon at his door.

"A rather unpleasant business," said Mr. Weldon to his wife, after having related to her his visit to George Richardson, and his subsequent interview with Mr. Barlow; "I am not sorry that i met with the worthy gentleman, who seemed much pleased at my confiding so much to him, for I am relieved of the responsibility of it all; I should be sorry to see George spoiled by vain philosophy, but he could not be in better hands, and Mr. Barlow will be the means, I hope, of saving the bud before the blight of heresy quite destroys it."

Nearly a week elapsed before Mr. Barlow found himself at liberty, to call upon George Richardson, whose retirement was only once broken by a call from the poor old woman whom he had saved from falling; for the poor creature—concerned at the ill consequences of his kindness to her—had found him out with a view of ascertaining how he was.

George was expecting Mr. Weldon, and when he heard a knock at his door, instead of the name of his old master being annonnced, he was surprised to find that Mr. Barlow had called, a gentleman with whom he had never had two minutes conversation. He told the servant to ask him to walk up.

"Mr. Richardson," said Mr. Barlow, as he entered the room, "I have been anxious to see you about a most important subject, and I have taken the first opportunity of calling upon you for that purpose: but first tell me how you are, for I was sorry to hear of your accident."

"I am obliged to you, for calling, Sir," said George; "the confinement is tiresome, but I shall soon be about again, with the blessing of God, I trust: but what is this important matter which specially brings you here?"

"Since I saw Mr. Weldon, whom I happened to meet the day he called to see you "observed the worthy man, "I have had the most painful apprehension respecting your danger"—

"But, my dear Sir," George interrupted, "your alarm is quite needless, for see," and George began to exercise the fractured limb more than he had yet ventured to do, to convince Mr. Barlow that his apprehension was groundless.

The visitor returned George's smile with a deep sigh, and resumed—"You mistake me, Sir; the danger I allude to is not that of the body only, but the soul too, the never-dying soul; I tremble for you,—I tremble for myself when I see how many who promised fair, have forsaken the old paths. I understand you read Relly's books; and I deem it my bounden duty to put the unwary on their guard, lest they should be overcome by the enemy: depend upon it there is more of the enemy than the friend in Relly's doctrine."

This came rather abruptly upon George, and for a moment he felt perplexed as to the course he should pursue. He hesitated, and looked confused. The momentary pause was broken by Mr. Barlow, who more earnestly warned the invalid against false doctrine, and concluded by asking him whether he knew anything at all favorable of Relly.

"I know how seductive a thing is error, Sir," said George, who had now fairly recovered himself, "but of Mr. Relly I know nothing whatever. Report makes him a very black character, certainly; and if I were to pass judgment on him with no other evidence than that which this witness depones, there would be no difficulty in pronouncing a verdict. But you know, Sir, Report is rarely to be trusted: like a snow ball I saw some boys rolling along the ground yesterday, it gathers as it goes, and like the snow ball too—when subjected to the heat of inquiry, is found to be unsubstantial and melts away. In truth, Sir, I care little about what report says; and having through the recent proceedings in reference to Mr. Murray—upon whom I always looked as an eminently pious man—had my attention drawn to Relly, I have read his book on "*Union*" with great care, quite as much, perhaps more disposed to find flaws than Scripture truth, and the result is that I am inclined to

think that Report in this instance is not only guilty of falsehood, but calumny."

"Mr. Richardson," said Mr. Barlow, with the greatest seriousness, "if the devil could lay hold of pen and ink, I have no doubt he could write a beautiful book—for 'the devils also, believe, and tremble.' You are a young man, and it hardly becomes you to speak thus. You say you never saw Relly—I hope you never will; and, as one who knows something of the man and of his works, I caution you."

"I intend no disrespect to you, Sir; your experience, however, must confirm my opinion of mere report."

"There is quite enough in his 'Union' to shock an experienced Christian, Mr. Richardson, and though he makes a show of a stand against the licentious tendency of his doctrine, it is but a show after all. Depend upon it, the book is most mischievous in its tendency."

"That is what I have not yet discovered," George replied, and if the union of Christ with the people in the manner contended for by Mr. Relly be the doctrine of Scripture, the conclusion appears to be inevitable—although he does not insist particularly upon it in this work—that all must be saved."

"And where does Scripture mention such a union as he maintains?"

"If you please, Sir, we will refer to Heb. ii. which I happened to be reading when you came in. But I beg you will understand that I do not set myself up as a defender of either Relly or his doctrine: I would know the truth, and if perchance it should be found with Relly, with Relly I conceive it would be right to take my stand; if, on the contrary, the Bible should be found to echo the condemnation which report so loudly bestows upon him,—I trust I shall have grace to estimate him at what he is worth. From the 14th verse of this chapter, then," and he handed Mr. Barlow a well-thumbed bible, "it appears that it behoved Christ to become a partaker of flesh and blood in order to secure the salvation of the people."

"Just so," observed Mr. Barlow rather impatiently.

"As a partaker of a nature which was under the curse of the law," continued George, "it seems to have been naturally and legally essential that he should bear the curse. Now as all human beings alike bear the same nature, the Lord Jesus Christ must—by assuming our nature—sustain a similar relation to all. And agreeably with this we have in the 9th. verse, Jesus *suffering death*—his possession of the nature capable of suffering and dying being thereby implied—*that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.*"

"Fudge!—if you mean to argue from this that all men will be saved: *tasting death* for every man is one thing, and *saving* all is another. Now look at the next verse, and you will see what God's purpose is: He will bring *many sons unto glory;* God has *many* sons (blessed be His name!) but his having many sons plainly implies that all are not his sons."

"I do not see, Sir, that the word *many* necessarily implies a part only; and the use of the same word in other passages of Paul's epistles, suggests, I think, the idea of universality."

"Where pray?"

"In the 5th. chapter of the epistle to the Romans Paul states that 'through the offence of one many be dead;' now we are agreed that all are dead in Adam,—the many, therefore, in this passage must be all men."

"The Apostle is only considering the case of the church in this whole passage; the many, therefore, must be believers and no others."

"But if, Sir, 'the many' in the verse I have quoted implies that only those you believe to be spoken of under that term can be intended, you deny the consequences of Adam's fall as involving any except the church."

"I do not say that that may not be true of all in this instance, which is predicated of the many, but I maintain that the many here spoken of are the elect."

"You have admitted enough, I think, Sir, for my present purpose: for you allow that in this instance, the many of whom a certain condition is predicated

though only a portion of the human family, does not necessarily imply that the same may not be predicated of the whole.—Thus, then, the *many* sons whom Christ would bring to glory does not necessarily exclude any of the children of Adam, more than the many whom the apostle says are dead through the offence of one—though only a portion should be here intended (which I doubt to be the case) excludes from this condemnation any of his descendants."

"Well! you have more to say,—proceed."

"In the 8th. verse of this same chapter to the Hebrews, *all things* are said to be *put in subjection under his feet;* and this agrees with the universality expressed in the verses I have already quoted; and then, as Relly shows, the affinity—the identity of the nature and cause of Christ with that of all men, appears to be so clearly expressed in this chapter as well as many other portions of Scripture, that, to say the least, I know not how to gainsay the doctrine.

"'All things,' Mr. Richardson is not at all a specific term; I should be sorry to stake my salvation upon that, and I think you would too."

"Christ, and not any phrase whatever, is the ground of my hope of personal safety, sir, but what about those who have never heard of Him? If I found the Scriptures justify the delightful anticipation that all would be finally happy, I would gladly cherish it. The word *all* appears to be so definite in Is. xl. 5. 'the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and *all* flesh shall see it together' as to sanction the Universalist's view.

"The passage means, no doubt, that all flesh who would then be living should see the triumphs of Christ, that is, during the period of the millennium."

"Do you not think, Sir, that this falls short of the meaning of the text when you compare it with the next verse. Here it is said '*All flesh* is grass' —is not this true of all flesh in all ages?"

"And what if it is?"

"Why that as the verb in the phrase—'all flesh is grass' does not limit its application to those who were then living, so neither does the verb in the other confine the seeing of the glory of God to those who might happen to be living in some future age of the world: but that as *all flesh*, without exception, throughout all ages—is grass, so, all flesh—all who did, do, and shall yet live —should see the salvation of the Lord."

"And if it were so; the universal doctrine is not proved, for a man may see what he will never possess."

"Well, Sir, I don't know, but on examination, I think it will be found that to see salvation, means to possess and enjoy it."

"Human reason, Mr. Richardson," observed Mr. Barlow with considerable warmth, "never did and never will relish the truth of God. Take care, Sir, that you do not make yourself chargeable with the sin of idolatry, for you may be worshipping human reason and fancy that you are bowing to Revelation. Now what does all you have been saying amount to? You would persuade yourself that all will be saved, in the teeth of the whole tenor of Scripture, and in opposition to the judgment of the wise and good in all ages."

"Thank you, Sir, for your caution,—a very good one—but as an argument it cuts both ways. I do not wish to persuade myself of anything but the truth; and as to the whole tenor of Scripture—I suppose that, like the tenor of any other document—can be ascertained only be an examination of its separate parts; and if I were to attempt to incorporate in my creed all that the wise and good in all ages have maintained as bible truth, I should have as perfect a chaos as that described in Genesis.

"I admit that on points of less importance, Christendom has always been divided; but the remarkable unanimity which has always subsisted on this subject renders the individual who would question it presumptuous, if not wicked. Relly is as conceited as he can be, and from the way in which you speak, I fear you are a stranger to that humility which so well becomes a Christian, and which should be especially cherished by one who is confessedly in the dark.

"Not knowing Relly, Sir, I can say nothing respecting his character; and as to myself"—

Here Mr. Barlow interrupted with considerable impatience, "This will not do, Sir, if you don't know your position I know mine; I shall leave you for the present, and trust that calm reflection will convince you of your mistake. Remember, Mr. Richardson, how Murray has fallen. The church must and will do her duty, you cannot expect that they will alter their articles to meet the fancies of the unstable. If you should wish to see me again you will let me know;" and taking up his hat, he made a rapid retreat, heedless of remonstrance or attempt to get an explanation which George made during the hasty delivery of the last sentence; and he was left to calm reflection, which the overbearing manner, the ungenerous insinuations, the unmanly shirking of the question he had come to discuss, we need not inform the reader, were not exactly calculated to encourage.

George Richardson felt, and felt keenly, that he was wronged; the satisfaction of having the best of the argument did not immediately allay the agitation in which his combatant had left him. The consciousness of a pure motive, and a conviction of the propriety of his conduct, however, he retained; and while his suspicions as to the tenableness of certain opinions were increased, he was stimulated to greater diligence and earnestness in the investigation of the Holy Scriptures whose light alone he was resolved to follow, let the consequences be what they might.

A few days elapsed: but "The Trial of Spirits" did not come, and not wishing to have his solitude broken by a similar ordeal to that through which he had passed before Mr. Barlow, George did *not* send for that gentleman.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SHOULD THE DOOTRINE OF UNIVERSAL SALVATION BE PROCLAIMED TO THE WORLD?

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Dear Sir,—In the last number of the Universalist, page 53, the writer, in his reply to the comments of Anetazo, stated in conclusion that there were still a few other points connected with the subject under discussion which he was desirous of examining. These he now proposes to proceed with.

The only passage in Anetazo's letter not replied to is that paragraph in which he makes reference to the statement that the Apostles "proclaimed forgiveness of sins to *sinners*," and that "until a man sees God's love to *himself*, a sinner, I care very little about telling him of his love to all men." The paragraph commences "Is it possible that any man can see God's love to *himself*, *a sinner*, who does not see God's love to *all*? the possibility of this may be doubted." Then we presume, we must doubt whether there have ever been any Christians—any believers of the gospel except Universalists. For our part we do not doubt that there have been many, and that there are many even now. We are not conscious that our own belief of the gospel is altered since we came to see the truth of Universal Salvation except that it is clearer and more enlarged, but that only as a consequence of having carried out our former principles to what we consider their legitimate end

The paragraph then proceeds—"There is a great difference between the expression 'God loves and forgives *sinners*' and 'God loves and forgives *all*.' In the one case there is a possibility that God may love and forgive *sinners*, and yet neither love nor forgive *me;* while in the other, there is an assurance that *I* am loved and forgiven, because he loves and forgives *all*." We admit that there is a difference between statements that express God's forgiveness to sinners and his forgiveness to all. We have maintained that the Apostolic preaching expressed the former statement, and we have challenged Anetazo to produce one instance in which it *expressed* the latter to the unbelieving world. The Apostoles testified that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ or Messiah, the Saviour, and they accompanied their testimony as to the matter of fact with the declaration that he that believeth *shall* be saved, all that believe *are* justified from all things, *whosoever* believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. Thus Peter (Acts iii.) in speaking to the Jews and reminding them that they had denied the Holy One and killed the Prince of life, declared, "Unto you (even such sinners as you are) "first God

having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." And Paul (Acts xiii.) in like manner declared, "Be it known unto you therefore men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins:" every one believing this testimony must therefore believe that he assuredly shall be saved; if he do not, he must be looking for some especial revelation to that effect, or trusting to some other gospel,—that Christ came to save some particular class of sinners, and be waiting to discover whether he belongs to that class. Accordingly all partialist perverted gospels consist in conditionalizing and restricting this gospel:—he that believeth *may* be saved; all that believe and *persevere* are justified; whosoever believeth and in his acts or feelings, finds or gives *evidence of the sincerity of his faith* shall receive remission of sins; God sent Jesus to bless you in *giving every one of you an opportunity of turning himself* away from his iniquities; unto you is *offered* the forgiveness of sins. Not one of them gives the sinner when he first hears it, a warrant for believing that he assuredly shall be saved. But this is what the apostolic gospel does; it is a declaration of God's purpose to save men, entirely irrespective of anything in or about them to deserve or obtain that salvation

The other statement that God loves and forgives all men, was never made use of by the apostles in their preaching to the world. It is true that Jesus in speaking to Nicodemus (John iii. 16—19) states that God sent his Son that the world through him might be saved; but such expressions are often employed in a general sense without necessarily implying every individual in the world; besides in this instance the meaning is restricted,—"he that believeth not is condemned already." Moreover Nicodemus was a believer in Jesus (see verse 2,) though an ignorant one, as indeed all the disciples were, therefore his case is not at all to the point. The expression in Acts ii. 26, "in turning away every one of you from his iniquities" means simply "each of you," and has an individual rather than an universal reference; besides the expression is explanatory of the nature of the blessing rather than of its extent. The declaration of salvation proclaimed by the Apostles, was indefinite in its expression, not necessarily universal but certainly not partial: they did not say that God sent his Son to save all sinners, but still less did they say that it was to save some.

In comparing the two statements, Anetazo says, that in the expression "God loves and forgives all," "there is an assurance that I am loved and forgiven." No doubt there is. Anetazo evidently prefers this statement, contends for it, advocates it. He evidently considers it a great improvement on the apostolic testimony, as recorded in the various examples of their preaching. We do not; nay, as a way of declaring the gospel to the world, we disclaim and reject it as a presumptuous attempt to substitute the wisdom of man for that of God. In believing that statement, he is assured that he is loved and forgiven. Very likely. We can conceive that a man may think that as God forgives all men in the bulk, he, as one of the multitude, will come in for his share,—some immeasurably minute proportion of God's love; or that he, perhaps, a very little guilty, comes in along with the atrociously wicked for his comparatively small share of the forgiveness. And, of course, we can expect from such forgiveness such love in return: "To whom little is forgiven the same loveth little." But it is not so with the apostolic statement. By it all men are addressed as *sinners*, each one addressed as what he is—*a sinner*; one amongst sinners of the whole human race, one amongst those of his own age or country, one amongst those of the little assemblage who may be addressed, one to whom the proclamation is addressed though he stood alone in the world. It shows God's mercy to him irrespective of all others, as if he were of sinners the chief. And from those who see themselves the objects of such forgiveness we should look for such love in return: "To whom much is forgiven the same loveth much.

Anetazo says—"He who sees not that God loves and forgives all, may love God in a certain sense; but it cannot be with a *perfect* love; a love that casteth out fear which hath torment. *We love him because he first loved us.*" Yes, we reply, because he first loved *us*, not loved others or loved all; and our observation on the quotation would be, that he who does not see that God has forgiven him, can have no real love to God at all; he who does, will love him without fear as regards himself, though his love will be expanded and enlarged when he sees that forgiveness extending to all.

Perhaps it may be urged that as the apostolic office and commission have long since passed away, all that we can do is to take the record of their teaching as it has been left to the world and communicate what we have learned from it to others without reservation, and have no right to withhold or conceal any part of it from any supposed fear of the consequences. We neither withhold nor conceal, nor have we any wish to do so, nor are we afraid to tell any truth that the word of God communicates to us. But neither do we neglect the lesson which that word gives us, in the example of the Apostles, regarding the way in which these truths are to be taught and the persons to whom they are to be communicated. We see that to the world at large, whether Jew or Gentile, they proclaimed forgiveness of sins through the Son of God, salvation to

sinners by the death and resurrection of the the Anointed One. They vindicated the truth of this their message by appeals to principles which their hearers professed: in the case of the Gentiles bringing their testimony home to their consciences and to their own admitted maxims, in the case of the Jews "persuading them concerning Jesus both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets," reasoning with them out of the Scriptures. We find that this was all they did with such, this was their sole business with them, and it was only when they professed to believe this their testimony and acknowledged the Messiahsip and authority of Jesus of Nazareth, that they spoke to them of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, led them on to the knowledge of things to which the acknowledgment of the divine mission of Jesus was an essential introduction, instructed them as to the manner in which the promises of the gospel were to be fulfilled, exhorted them to go forward to perfection, to run with patience the race which was set before them, and comforted and gladdened them with the glorious prospect of a period when grace should abound more than sin had abounded, and the whole creation should be delivered out of the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

It may yet be objected that as we admit that the declaration of God's purpose to save sinners really means to save all, it is only as to the manner or way of declaring this purpose to the world that we dispute, and that this seems to be of little importance. If it mean this why not say so? We think on the contrary that the manner of declaring a truth is not of little importance. By the mere manner of doing it, a statement which in words asserts a fact may be transformed into an interrogation implying doubt or disbelief, or the language of grateful praise may be converted into the expression of bitter irony. The two statements we have been contrasting do not suggest the same feelings. But in the first place we would premise that the phrase, "God loves sinners," though often employed, and though inadvertently we have sometimes employed it ourselves, is not a scriptural one. We should rather say that the statement that "God loves and forgives all" does not convey the same meaning or suggest the same feelings, as that God is *merciful* to sinners or saves sinners. Indeed, by many zealous Universalists the word "forgives" might be omitted altogether, for the prominence which they give to the universality of God's love is apt to lead those they address to forget the necessity for forgiveness, and to suggest that he loves sinners, sins and all. Nothing in our view could be more diametrically opposed to the gospel of the grace of God. Such an interpretation may however be repelled, and it may be contended that the expression, *forgives*, necessarily shews that all are sinners and need forgiveness. The statement that "God loves and forgives all" suggests, we think, that as God loves all (just as they are) he is disposed to overlook their sins, and therefore finds a way to do so not incompatible with the holiness of his character. Men, with this gospel addressed to them, find themselves addressed as individuals of the whole human race, objects of God's love: it is simply as men they are addressed, and the characteristic of sinfulness is merely an incidental one. Very different are the thoughts suggested by the declaration of his *mercy* to sinners; men in this find themselves addressed as guilty; each individual as guilty whatever others may be. If they feel themselves guilty, the gospel confirms the feeling; if they have no such feelings, it tells them that they are guilty. It speaks of *mercy*, or of love to those who are deserving only of wrath,—the execution of righteous judgment. It displays the greatness of God's hatred to sin, and of his wrath against sinners, by revealing the way in which that judgment is to be executed, and the hatred and wrath swallowed up: it exhibits the greatness of God's *love* to man through the greatness of his *mercy* to sinners. In no other way can the love of God be seen by guilty man except through the knowledge of his grace or mercy in Jesus Christ.

That God loves me and loves you, loves some and loves all, and that his love will be effective in carrying out his purpose of salvation to me, to you, to some, and to all, are all statements which we believe and rejoice in; they all depend upon and flow from the gospel, but not one, nor all of them is the gospel itself. That good news is the declaration of his purpose of grace or mercy in saving sinners through the work of his own well-beloved Son. Gladly do we admit that the love of God is the highest aspect in which we can view his character, for God is love. It comprehends both justice and mercy; they are both alike modes of exhibiting his love. But it is only through his mercy that guilty creatures can see his love. "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." And when men pretend to see his love irrespective of his mercy, or to see his mercy through first seeing his love, we can only disavow all sympathy with such views and characterize them as unscriptural and human; or when others, under a profession of believing and declaring the gospel of the grace of God, so alter and express it as to substitute a declaration of love for one of mercy, or in any way by words or modes of expression suggest such ideas to the minds of those they address, we can only regard them as perverting the glad tidings of the grace of God. For our part, we trust that we shall ever be ready to vindicate the simplicity of the gospel of Christ, and with some of that jealousy avowed by the great apostle of the Gentiles, shall be prompt to expose and controvert every doctrine, whether it be Partialist or Universalist, which has a tendency to obscure, to corrupt, or to pervert it.

For the opportunity of doing so which you have at present given him, the writer has to express his obligation, and remains,

Dear Sir, Yours very sincerely,

March 10, 1851. EKDIKALETHES

REVIEW.

A Map of the Purpose and Duration of the Reign of Christ, with explanatory Notes: to which are added a Few Thoughts upon the Contrast between the First and the Second Adam. By a Lady. London: Simpkin and Marshall; Bradford, Wilts, I. Rawling. 1847.

The Millenium. By William Seabrook.—In two parts. Sixth Edition. Dublin: R. M. Tims; London: Samuel Bagster and Sons. 1839.

Whenever a lady and a gentleman come forward together as candidates for a hearing, in the Republic of letters, as in every other well-regulated Commonwealth, the lady takes precedence.

In the present case, the lady—why need we conceal her name? Mrs Morgan, of Turley, near Bradford, Wilts: there never has been any secret made of it—tries to give currency to the system of Millennialism which she has espoused, by means of a map, accompanied with Explanatory Notes. The title of the pamphlet sufficiently indicates the nature of the Map; and the perusal of the notes will serve to make the reader acquainted with the principles on which it is constructed, and the texts of Scripture by which it is illustrated and confirmed.

Concerning the fair authoress, we must say, that she evinces the possession of abilities of superior order. Great ingenuity, especially. The sacred writings she has evidently read with care, upon them she has pondered, and from them she has drawn her own conclusions. With a laudable and Christian-like desire to benefit her fellow believers, she has given the result of her researches and reflexions to the world.

Should we not mention that she, and Mr. Seabrook, are Universalists upon evangelical principles? Therefore it is that, however much we may have occasion to differ from both, they are the objects of our sincere Christian sympathies and respect.

As regards some points treated of by our female friend, we are thoroughly and delightedly at one with her. Although briefly expressed, nothing can be conceived more beautiful, and to a mind brought into subjection to the Holy Scriptures more conclusive and satisfactory, than her "few thoughts upon the contrast between the first and second Adam." Excepting a very few words of her own, strictly in accordance with the mind of the Spirit, these *thoughts* consist exclusively of the language of Inspiration respecting Adam and Christ, disposed in parallel columns. What can be better? The contrast is at once made apparent to the eye, as well as to the understanding. Here, blessed be God, we are not called on to receive Old Testament declarations, irrespective of the sense put upon them by our Lord and his Apostles. Other views of Mrs. Morgan's gratify us, as emanating from the word of God. Our blessed Lord's reign with his saints, we are certainly no opposers of: indeed, so far are we from calling it in question, that his personal appearing, and its blessed consequences constitute the rejoicing of our heart, being to us obviously as well as scripturally the medium, through which are carried into effect those ulterior purposes of mercy, in the prospect of the realization of which we so thoroughly coincide and sympathize with the authoress. The throne of his father, David, Jesus Christ is certainly exalted to; and over Jews and Gentiles, made new through the power of his resurrection, he sways his sceptre of love for ever.

Nay, much as we dislike, and decidedly as we condemn and protest against all *fleshly* Millennial systems, Mrs. Morgan's among the rest, on account of their *unscriptural* because *unspiritual* character—on account of their making the Old Testament the interpreter of the New, and not, ss should be, the New of the Old—we are not sure, that in the main principle on which our friend's map is constructed, and which runs throughout her tract, she is *altogether* wrong. That there *may be* a succession of æons, ages or periods, before the consummation of all things—that these *may* rise one above another, until the whole finally merges in the *all in all* state—and that to this succession of ages, terminating in the grand Jubilee of creation, the sabbatical year and the seven sabbatical years which preceded the Jubilee, Lev. xxv. *may have had* a typical reference, is not impossible. The thing, observe, is *not expressly asserted. Ages of ages*, however, is a scriptural phrase. And the idea of succession which it involves is a scriptural idea. Therefore, Mrs. Morgan must not regard us as denying *in toto* the truth of the theory which she has so ingeniously, and in a certain sense, so scripturally set up; and which, by means of her map, she has endeavoured to render palpable and intelligible.*

Saying and admitting all this, however, we cannot blind our eyes to the fact

* Perhaps we might be inclined to go a step farther than the authoress has done. *May* not seven, and seven times seven, be understood as terms expressive of indefinitude? Matt. xviii. 22. And *may* there not be hereafter *indefinite* successions of æras in subservieney to the *infinite* result? Observe, we assert nothing dogmatically. We merely put these questions. With Mrs. Morgan's statement of the matter, *scripturally corrected and understood*, we are disposed to rest contented.

of the scriptural objections to which her theory, *as she herself propounds it*, is obnoxious. We say, scriptural objections. For we have no intention to resort to the aid of carnal statements, and human reasonings, in a matter which divine revelation alone can decide. While we cannot like children consent, at Mrs. Morgan's bidding, "to shut our eyes, open our mouths, and see what God will send us"—while we cannot like children be content to have Old Testament texts popped into our mouths, to be swallowed and digested by our fleshly understandings, without reference to those explanations of their meaning which our Lord, through the instrumentality of his apostles, may have seen meet to give—we are very far from *poo-poo-ing*, and contemptuously rejectingany religious system, upon the ground merely of *apparent* incongruity and absurdity. "Let the Lord alone decide, speaking in his own *lively Oracles*," is our maxim.

We would now remark, proceeding upon this principle,

First, that although in a certain sense they *may be* correct, our fair female friend's views are partial and one-sided. True, succession of ages is a scriptural doctrine. But then it is so only with reference to the constitution of the human, or creature mind; and belongs to that inferior class of scripture manifestations, in which creature views of divine things, and not divine things as they really are, are represented and contemplated. It is a truth *relative*, not a truth *absolute*. Accordingly it justifies only *relative*, not *absolute* conclusions.* That God who gave temporarily, typical and inferior revelations of his character, and *statutes that were not good*, Ezek. xx. 25, to the Jews, on account of the infancy of their spiritual condition, and *the hardness of their hearts*, Matt. xix. 8, in subserviency to a higher dispensation or state of things afterwards to be introduced and developed even upon earth—hath also seen meet to leave upon record, as indispensable while the time state of his heavenly church lasts, and in subserviency to higher developements of his character hereafter, many exhibitions of himself and his purposes, having relation merely to the present faculties and capacities of man. But, in addition to these, he has from time to time, in passages obscure and exceedingly revolting to fleshly mind, suggested higher and *absolute* views of the heavenly and divine, by which, when they are made to enter into the understanding and conscience by the agency of the Holy Ghost, the other views, as relative and inferior, are explained and modified. Succession of ages belongs to this class of inferior doctrines. Although true, it is only *relatively* so. It involves an idea adapted and accommodated merely to creature mind. An everlastingly present and unchangeable being, and an everlastingly present and unchangeable state of things as connected with him, however incomprehensible the idea may be by our present faculties, constitute *the absolute*, that is, the reality of the case. See Psalm cii. 24—28. God is the *I am*. Exod. iii. 14. His nature is *the everlastingly present nature*. Matt. xxii. 32.† It is the *true absolute*. In the light of it, and as possessed of it, *succession* disappears. The importance of the *absolute* as explanatory of and modifying the *relative*, or of unchangeability as explaining succession—both revealed truths, observe—we suspect, judging from her tract, the authoress has not sufficiently, if at all attended to. Hence, on her part, limited views of the subject. To economize space and save time, perhaps we may be permitted, instead of quoting them at length, to refer to a collection of scripture statements, as to the distinction between *relative* and *absolute* views of God and divine things, which will be found in the "Summary" given, towards the end of a work, entitled, "The Three Grand Exhibitions of Man's Enmity to God." H. K. Lewis, London. 1845.

Secondly, of what is implied in this succession of æras or ages which is a scriptural doctrine, only *relative*, and not inconsistent with another equally scriptural doctrine which is *absolute*, we have positively no conception, and while in flesh can have none. *It doth not yet appear what we shall be.* 1 John iii. 2. This language is just as applicable to the æra or age which immediately succeeds the present—assuming the succession of seven æra's to be a revealed truth—as it is to the *all-in-all* state, towards which each æra as it is successively

* See Preface to "Divine Inversion," Note, pp. xv, xvi.
† To be read and considered in reference to the Sadducee's objection.

developed tends, and in which all of them are ultimately swallowed up. We can no more, while in bodies of flesh and blood, comprehend the one, than we can comprehend the other. Our faculties, with our bodies, must be raised to the level of a higher state of things, before we can be competent to understand that state. Nothing beyond the close of time, and our new creation completely at Christ's second coming, can be matter of conception or comprehension to us. We can penetrate the veil of flesh, only *by faith*. *We know*—not as having any conception of the matter, but only as crediting God's testimony concerning it—*that when Christ shall appear, we shall be like him*, for *we shall see him as he is. Ibid.* This being the case, supposing us to admit the existence relatively of seven successive ages hereafter, corresponding to the seven Sabbatical periods which preceded the Jubilee, we deny the possibility of our comprehending or understanding, while we are upon earth, the natnre and manner of working of any of these successive periods. They are of *the secret things which belong unto the Lord.* To act upon the principle that we can understand them, while our present faculties are adapted only to a lower range of ideas, is to substitute fancy for truth, human speculation for divine reality. Our friend's notion of seven successive ages, not only each sabbatical, but each capable of being apprehended and explained by us, is therefore a little too much of the *It doth appear what we shall be*, to suit our taste.—Besides, release of a certain number of unregenerate human beings, at the close of each intermediate sabbatical period—which, we presume, is what the fair authoress means, for she has not been particularly explicit on the subject—although, in agreement with the supposed type, it *may be* true is, we suspect, associated in her mind, and in the minds of her supporters, with the idea of the parties thus released having been so thoroughly purged and purified by their previous course of sufferings, as to be prepared and qualified thereby to enter into glory, before their unbelieving and still suffering compeers. To such a doctrine, if held—and we are not without strong suspicions that it is so—we must unhesitatingly demur as unscriptural. It may have found favour with Chauncey, Winchester, Vidler, and Universalists of that stamp, and it may be favoured by Tholuck and other German Evangelicals, but it must be nauseating, as opposed to some of the clearest principles and dictates of God's word, to every well-instructed disciple of the Lord Jesus. There resides no purgatorial efficacy, except in the blood of the Lamb alone. 1 John i. 7, ii. 2. Creature suffering is *penal*, not *purgatorial.* Supposing then, the existence of seven successive sabbatical periods after or during the Millennium, and supposing the release of a certain number of the unregenerate at the close of each of these periods—we say, *supposing*, for we have no direct and authoritative revelation on the subject, and where God says nothing expressly, it surely becomes us to *assert* nothing—then such parties shall be released, at such intervals or intermediate periods, not as having in any way, by means of their personal sufferings, expiated their own sins, or prepared themselves for an earlier deliverance than the rest, but solely as objects of the same sovereign grace, and solely through the medium of the same atoning sacrifice, to which those whom God is pleased to save, by regenerating them upon earth, owe their present deliverance.

Thirdly, if with a view to meet and obviate some of our objections, Mrs. Morgan say, as she does say, that "both Jews and Gentiles shall be in their flesh and blood state, for the *entire* of Christ's reign, viz., for 'the ages of ages,'" p. 7. passing by the absolute ludicrousness of such an interpretation of the phrase *ages of ages*, we take leave firmly, but respectfully and with all kindness to remind our friend, the authoress, that for such an unqualified assertion as this, we have only her own authority. Her text, Ezek. xxxvii. 25, she merely assumes to have the sense which she is pleased to put upon it. So of the texts that follow. Two New Testament passages, she refers to, Rev. xxi. 24—26, and 1 Cor. xv. 51: but as, by her own admission, p. 8, the latter text proves that a resurrection state cannot be a "flesh and blood" state; so, until she can shew that the Book of Revelation is not allegorical, mysterious, and symbolical in its structure, and until she can explain satisfactorily how the succession of day and night which an earthly or flesh and blood state of things

implies, is consistent with a state where, it is emphatically and significantly declared *there shall be no night*, we must respectfully decline her interpretation of the former, and the use which she makes of that interpretation as conclusive in her own favour. Could Mrs. Morgan have produced a single declaration of our Lord, or of any of his Apostles, to the effect that "ages of ages" meant seven successive periods of 7000 years each to be spent by the Church upon earth, and that during these seven successive periods,—notwithstanding that revealed fact of the doing away with the distinction between Jew and Gentile, in Christ Jesus, for which the New Testament Scriptures are so remarkable, Gal. iii. 28, 29, Eph. ii. 15, 16, &c. &c.—Jewish believers were still to be uppermost, and Gentile believers their subjects, we should without a word of comment or murmuring have submitted to divine authority. But it is rather too much for our excellent friend to expect us to allow of her assuming the phrase Jews, in the New Testament Scriptures, and in the Old as explained by them, invariably to signify Abraham's fleshly descendants; and this, too, in the teeth of New Testament passages reclaiming against the meaning, and giving us, in opposition to it, an inspired one of their own. Rom. ii. 28, 29, Phil. iii. 3, Gal. iii. 29, &c. If there shall be seven successive ages or æras subsequently to Christ's second coming—an allegation of our friend's which, without positively either admitting or denying, we are rather *inclined* to admit —they are ages, or æras beyond time: indeed, constitute a series of successive periods, in each of which, as it emerges and is developed, its predecessor, as inferior and subordinate, is swallowed up; just as time, at the period of Christ's second coming, and thereby in the age or æra which immediately succeeds, is itself as subordinate and subservient, and as having answered its purpose, snperseded and expires. Rev. x. 6. See Greek. With the second coming of Christ is connected, not the continuance of earth and its inhabitants as they now are, but such a carrying out of new-creating efficacy, as shall make earth itself new, and as shall, by making them spiritual as to their bodies, destroy the natural and national distinction between Jewish and Gentile believer altogether.* A period of 49 thousand natural years spent upon earth by believers, thereby kept at a distance from the true and *full* enjoyment of their Heavenly Father's presence and glory, which is what our friend the authoress contemplates and anticipates, with either its successive rebellions, successive triumphs, and successive releases; or, (for she has furnished us with no key to the exact understanding of her meaning,) with its successive periods of Jews reigning over beings in flesh and blood, who in spite of their still possessing and being influenced by an Adamic nature which is *enmity against God*, are nevertheless in her opinion willingly, submissive to the sway, and lick the hands of their Abrahamic rulers,—a view of things which implies either a trifling repetition which is unworthy of God, and a going back to past and forfeited states which is inconsistent with the onward progress of revelation; or, that the first promise, Gen. iii. 15, which has established a necessary and irreconciable enmity between *the seed of the woman*, and *the seed of the serpent*, while human nature lasts, is a lie—we at once and decidedly reject. Christianity viewed as a continuance, although also as he fancied an improvement of Judaism, or the Christian church viewed as the external and earthly improved successor of the Jewish one, was one of those vagaries of that able and learned man, the Socinian Taylor of Norwich, which drew into its vortex, and involved in scepticism and infidelity, a vast number of the Clergy of the Church of Scotland some seventy or eighty years ago. Were it not that cool, cautious, and calculating Scotchmen had allowed themselves to be so long and so awefully led astray by this theological *moonshine*, we should have deemed it next to impossible, that—in opposition to the revealed nature of Christ's church and kingdom, as the antitype or substance, not continuation of those of the Jews, as spiritual and heavenly, not fleshly and earthly—there should have been found, even among our warm and enthusiastic neighbours of the Sister Isle,

* May we not, to a certain degree, plead the authority of the authoress against herself? She says, "In the resurrection state, there can be no distinction of nations." p. 8. So say we. Resurrection takes place at Christ's second coming; and, therefore, the distinction between Jew and Gentile, *se judice*, is then no more.

parties capable of anticipating, and rejoicing in the anticipation of a forty-nine thousand years continuance upon earth of Judaism restored, and of the fleshly descendants of Abraham reigning triumphant over Gentiles, and capable of imagining this state of things to be the fulfilment of prophecy, to be the result of Christ's second coming, to constitute his spiritual kingdom, and to exhaust the meaning of a phrase so profound, comprehensive, and significant, as *ages of ages!*

Extremely simple, when understood in the light of the New Testament Scriptures, is the whole doctrine of God's word with regard to the millennium, or thousand years' reign of our blessed Lord. Almost all difficulties on the subject have sprung from a determination to explain the Old Testament literally, in opposition to and in defiance of the inspired and spiritual interpretation of it given by the Apostles.

With the passing away of the Old Testament Dispensation, at the period of Jerusalem's destruction, commenced as had been foretold* two things:—

1. Gentile Apostacy. The Jewish Church fallen, as the mystic Babylon, by means of an adulterous intercouse with *the kings of the earth*, (believers of the truth, 2 Cor. xi. 2, 3.) began to propagate her filthy brood of *fleshly churches.*† To our own day this has continued. With but few exceptions, believers of the truth have been found in this Babylon. They have not, according to the divine command, *come out of her;* and consequently as *partakers of her sins*, they have *received of her plagues.* Rev. xviii. 4. Above all, they have not visibly reigned on the earth. This glorious privilege the great majority of them have deprived themselves of, by their fleshly and secular associations.

2. Confirmed Jewish Unbelief. "His blood be on us, and on our children," (Matt. xxvii. 25,) was their horrid and blasphemous imprecation, when clamouring for the death of Jesus of Nazareth, they stood at Pilate's tribunal. Forty years for repentance were conceded to them. The destined heirs of salvation were, by sovereign grace, plucked out from among them like *brands from the burning.* But their impious prayer at last took effect. Jerusalem was destroyed. The Jewish Dispensation ended. Upon the Jewish mind was thenceforward stereotyped incredulity, and hardened opposition to the claims of Jesus as the Christ. In this state for eighteen hundred years they have remained. Opposed to Jesus themselves, they have, influenced by the full devilish power of fleshly mind, succeeded in dragging down the professors of Christianity, which in reality is a spiritual and heavenly principle, to their own Anti-Christian and fleshly level.

But, hardened in unbelief as the Jews are, they are yet unconsciously and unintentionally witnessing for God, in two very striking respects:—

1st. They are negatively bearing testimony against Gentile views and definitions of the gospel. By preachers and people, the gospel is commonly proclaimed and regarded as a law with which, it is incumbent on us as human beings, to yield compliance. Little are those who thus think and speak aware, that in such misrepresentations of *the glad tidings of great joy*, they are virtually setting aside Christ's salvation, and substituting for it a salvation which the creature is to work out for himself. The Jews in opposition to this, are contending for the law of Moses as the last law which God gave, and intended to give. And they are right. The gospel is not law. It is simply a manifestation of God's character, in the face of Jesus Christ, vouchsafed to the members of the election of grace, by the Holy Ghost. Or, if law, it is only so in the sense in which, when God said, *let there be light, there was light.* 2 Cor. iv. 6. *He that hath ears to hear, let him hear*, Matt. xiii. 9 (see also Rev. xiii. 9) is doubtlessly God's commandment; but in every case in which it is addressed, it carries along with it, like that to which we have alluded, its own accomplishment. *His commandment is*, ἐστι, *life everlasting.* John xii. 50.

2nd. They are also protesting against Gentile notions of the nature and constitution of Christ's church. They are denying by the position which they have taken up, no less than by their language, that God ever had or purposed to have any external church upon earth, besides their own. And in this also

* Acts xx. 29, 30; Rom. xi. 20—23; 2 Thes. ii. 6—10; 1 John iv. 3.

† Rev. xvii. 2, 5; xlii. 18. Εκκλησιαι Σαρκικαι.

they are right. Upon the external and fleshly churches of the Gentiles which, instead of having had like their own a divine origin, are merely the offspring of an adulterous connexion between believers of the truth and their own after it had become fallen and degraded, Rev. xii. 7—9, they are, unconscious that they act as the instruments of God in so doing, pouring contempt. The false pretensions of such churches, they are unconsciously exposing. They are negatively suggesting that a church which is internal, spiritual, and heavenly is the only true counterpart of theirs. Rev. xiv. 1—4.*

This state of things is destined to terminate.

The Jews as a body will at God's appointed time, during the continuance of this world, be given to see and acknowledge Jesus of Nazareth, whom their fathers crucified, to have been the long promised and expected Messiah. Not by returning to Palestine, and again setting up there a system of fulfilled and exploded institutions, but by entering through faith into the antitype of Canaan, their own true land, and by being thus brought to the enjoyment of the better, because antitypical promises. They will not, as fleshly millennialists suppose, go back, and be the means of reestablishing distinctions which in Christ Jesus have been done away with; but go forward as then Jews spiritually and really, and as such one with Gentile believers, to pave the way for the ulterior triumphs of their heavenly and glorified head.

Their unbelief, and long continued resistance to the claims of Jesus of Nazareth will ultimately be overcome, not by fleshly views of the gospel, or by attempts to induce them to enter man-made and fleshly churches—the present most approved methods of Jewish conversion, ineffectual as might have been anticipated, because human and anti-christian—but by God himself, through the New Testament word, revealing to them the gospel as it really is, a series of divine facts, (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.) involving, not the imposition of a new law, but the revelation of Jesus the Christ as having *become the end of* all *law for righteousness to every one that believeth;* (Rom. x. 4;) and by his bringing them, through faith in Jesus into his one spiritual and heavenly Church, not by his entangling them in the meshes either of their own typical and antiquated one, or of bodies, merely human, assuming to themselves a divine standing and character. They shall be converted, by having *glad tidings* of divine facts, glad tidings of great joy, revealed to them by God himself, and by being raised by him to his heavenly church and kingdom; not by being obliged to submit to a human law substituted for a divine one, or by being obliged to submit to the authority of a church of mere human origin, substituted for that external and typical one which God himself at Mount Sinai set up.

Thus and then shall commence visibly Christ's reign on earth, in the persons of men, not merely spiritually enlightened, but as set free from their previous anti-christian and Babylonish associations, enabled to act visibly on spiritual principles.

Believing Jews and Gentiles, then one as true and spiritual Jews, shall have no fleshly preachers of what is called gospel, and no external churches. (Heb. viii. 8—13.) Something like the Synagogue worship will thenceforward characterise them. They shall meet together for the reading of the scriptures, and for mutual edification, not as constituting a church or churches of Christ, that is, not as external and fleshly bodies, but as members of the church that is internal, spiritual, and heavenly, or of the one true church of the living God.

In all this there will be to them no accession of earthly glory. The reverse. Opposition to them from all earthly quarters will spring up. (John xv. 19—21.) Professors of religion of the fleshly type as well as the openly infidel, will despise them. They will realize the language of David, verified first in Christ Jesus, *I will be yet more vile than thus.* (2 Sam. vi. 22.) But their true spiritual glory will be great and increasing. *The spirit of glory and of God shall rest upon them.* 1 Peter iv. 14. As endowed with faith and love in large

* That the apostolic churches were merely part and parcel of the Jewish church,—as external, connected with it, and passing away with it—may be gathered from their always having had for their basis and nucleus, Jewish believers, Luke xxiv. 47, Acts i. 8, ii. 1, &c. ix. 20, x. *throughout,* xi. 1, 19, xiii. 5, 14, &c., 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, xiv. 1, 27, xv. *throughout,* xvii. 1—4, &c. Rom. xi. 16—21, and also from Psalm xlv. 13—16.

measure, and evidencing the existence and influence of those heavenly principles, not only by the greatest purity of life and conversation, but by standing aloof conscientiously and inflexibly from all entangling connexions with fleshly churches, *they shall reign* visibly *on* and *over the earth.* I John v. 4, 5. And this, not as exhausting the full meaning of the phrase, but as the earnest of what is to follow in the time state, during a thousand years.

Strikingly thus will be verified prophetic intimations of the Apostle Paul, as to what should result to the Gentiles from the conversion to God, of the unbelieving Jewish nation *If the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them, the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness?* Rom. xi. 12. And *if the casting away of them, be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead? Ibid:* 15.

During the thousand years, as realized on earth, *Satan shall be bound.* Rev. xx. 1. The world, professing and profane, will not understand what is going on; and will be restrained, by God's overruling providence from proceeding to such acts of violence as would ensure the destruction of the members of the church.

At last, however, will come the grand outburst, and the grand onslaught of Satan, in the persons of an ungodly world, on the Church. This will be followed with Christ's visible appearance, with the removal of the church to his own presence and glory, with the end of time and with the destruction of the world as at present constituted. Rev. xx. 9. 2 Peter iii. 10—12. The true Millennium, of which what had been occurring upon earth was merely the earnest, will then take place. Enjoyed it will be in *the New Heavens, and the New Earth wherein dwell righteousness.* Enjoyed it will be in consequence of the New Heavens and Earth having completely superseded the Old. Is. lxv. 17, with 2 Cor. v. 17. and Rev. xxi. 1—5.

The Millennium in its true and heavenly form, may imply the successive development of seven aeras or ages. It may imply subjugation to Christ, at successive Sabbatical periods, not only of previously unregenerate men, but even of other realms and departments of being besides those with which we are now acquainted. And it may imply, as it continues and progresses, the most wondrous preparations, by means of glory heaped on glory, for the ultimate Jubilee triumph. But the nature and manner of the progress—if progress there be—belongs to unrevealed things; and, therefore, as regards this, Sir Isaac Newton's language, *Hypotheses non fingo,* we adopt as our own.

Two principles, as regards spiritual progress, whether on earth, or in the successive ages of the heavenly state, are certainly revealed to us:—

1. That this progress is effected, not by going back to the earthly, but by going forward to the heavenly. Even in the Apostle's days Judaism, as "decaying and waxing old," was "ready to vanish away." Heb. viii. 13. And against "turning again to the weak and beggarly elements" of the law the Apostle Paul, writing under the influence of inspiration, has entered his sole and decided protest. Gal. iv. 9. See also Coloss. ii. 6—23. Upon this principle, spiritual progress in time implied the leaving of Judaism behind Phil. iii. 13, through resurrection to *newness* of Christian *life;* Ezek. xxxvii. John iii. 3, 5, Rom. vi. 4; and still farther progress during seven Sabbatical periods hereafter, if such there be, implies the leaving behind of every thing connected with earth, even of the first fruits of the spirit themselves, and the advancing more and more into the realms of the spiritual, the heavenly, and the divine. Our excellent friend the authoress, on the contrary, would have it, that the dead corpse of Judaism is to be exhumed and resuscitated—that to it, not a heavenly life, but a restored earthly one, is to be communicated—and that overwhelmed with astonishment and awe at the spasmodic and galvanic energy with which the monstrous prodigy is invested, the Gentile world is to fall down and do it homage. Not to a spiritually Jewish Church reigning over the New Earth with its risen and glorified head, does she anticipate an advance, but to a body of Abraham's fleshly descendants, reigning on the natural earth, subjected anew to exploded and fulfilled institutions, and finding comfort and edification in the shadows of better things to come, does she anticipate being carried back. Need we formally draw the conclusion?

2. Spiritual progress is the result of the supersession of the earthly by the heavenly. God by the mouth of the prophet Isaiah proclaimed, 600 years before the advent of the Messiah, *Behold! I create New Heavens, and a New Earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind.* Is. lxv. 17. On the principle here enunciated and laid down, are all New Testament declarations constructed. New creation is carried into effect by Jesus glorified: at every step of this new creation, there being a supersession or passing away of the old creation; 2 Cor. v. 17; until at last the Old is entirely superseded and entirely passes away, by the entire establishment of the New. *He that sat upon the throne said, Behold I make all things new;* in connection with which, it is laid down that *the former things are passed away.* Rev. xxi. 4, 5.* Thus, as always, it is not by the creature ascending to the Creator, but by the Creator descending to the creature; and not by the Creator preserving and perpetuating the Old creation, but by swallowing it up in the New, that progress takes place. This, surely, is something very different from a perpetuation of the Old creation for 7000, or 49000 years upon earth, being represented as the effect of Christ Jesus putting forth his New-creating efficacy at his second coming.

Enough, dear Mrs. Morgan. Plain is it that while in your apprehension, Christ's millennial reign implies a going back to Palestine, to Moses' institutions, and to a distinction between Jew and Gentile long since abolished—and while according to our view of matters, fleshly Jews shall become spiritual ones, and fleshly expectations on their part shall be exchanged for the joyful recognition by them of the fulfilment of God's promises in the conferring upon them of spiritual and heavenly blessings, in common with their Gentile brethren—there never can be agreement as to this point between us.

Texts heaped on texts, on the principle of Jews and Judaism always in the Scriptures New as well as Old signifying Abraham's fleshly descendants, and Moses' external code of rites and ceremonies, in flat contradiction to what God hath said by the mouths of his Apostles, Rom. ii. 28, 29, Gal. v. 4—6, vi. 15, 16, Phil. iii. 3, &c. we can scarcely be expected to spend a single moment in considering and refuting.†

Turning now to our worthy and esteemed friend, Seabrook, what shall we say to him? So large a proportion of the remarks which we have addressed to our dear sister are applicable to him and to his work, that a few words comparatively speaking to him may suffice.

Already, although not in the capacity of reviewers, we have had occasion to express ourselves highly and respectfully concerning him. As, also, to state our dissent from the millennial notions which, in common with the fair authoress whom we have just been noticing, it is his object to establish and disseminate.‡

What we have said before in regard to his tract, we repeat. "It is interesting and prettily written." There is a grace about it which bespeaks taste, and much cultivation of mind. How beautifully simple the structure of his sentences! His acquaintance with the letter of Scripture and the general laws of biblical criticism, is evidently very considerable. What is more: under the influence of a conscientious regard to God's written testimony, and of an upright desire to set forth what he conceives to be its meaning, has his pamphlet been written. Mr. Seabrook is clearly a God-loving and God-fearing man.

* The whole passage, Rev. xxi. 1—5, should be read with care and in the light of the New Testament Scriptures. Its import is that Christ, the true Adam, having first new-created his bride the Church, the true Eve, ultimately through her descent with him, new-creates all other persons and things. As in his resurrection and ascension, and as in the new creation of his church with him, the old things of Adam and time had as to them passed away, so also shall it be when the fulness of new-creating efficacy is put forth by himself through his church. The Old Creation will then completely expire. The sea, or the unregenerate, Rev. xvii. 15, will then be no more. Ibid, xxi. 1.

† Did not the Holy Ghost, anticipating that aweful perversion of the meaning of Scripture, which is implied in the views of fleshly millennialists, and is referred to in the text, cause Rev. ii. 9, to be recorded? Abraham's fleshly descendents should persevere in New Testament times in calling themselves Jews, and should in that character claim to themselves the fulfilment of God's spiritual promises. Gentile believers, led astray by their pretensions, and for other reasons, should inadvertently concede to them their demands. Both, it is here announced, are mistaken. Since Jerusalem's destruction, not God's people, but "the synagogue of Satan" is the proper appellation of fleshly Jews. To the true Israel of God, and not to those who are Jews merely by descent from Abraham, now belong God's promises and privileges. Hence, only by becoming Jews in spirit, can Jews in flesh inherit them.—See also Rom. ix. 6—8.

‡ "Divine Inversion," Appendix D.

Can we, as loving gospel truth ourselves, help loving and respecting him?

Mr. Seabrook's tract consists of two parts:—1. A series of questions, with answers; and 2. Illustrations of seven kingly titles applied to our blessed Lord.

On his fourth question, "*What do* some *real Christians think of the* MILLENNIUM?" and his reply to it, as the only portion of his first division in which we feel ourselves personally interested, we would remark, that while professing as nearly as possible to exhaust the views of his evangelical readers who differ from him, our author is very far from giving expression to our mind on the subject.—So far from denying, we believe that "Jesus Christ will reign in personal visible glory *on the earth* with the saints." Not, perhaps in Mr. Seabrook's sense of the terms. For the visible reign of the saints, upon this earth, will not bring with it earthly rank and dignity. And when Christ himself comes to reign personally and visibly before his antients gloriously, it will be by removing his church to *the New Heavens and the New Earth, wherein dwells righteousness.*—We do not happen to believe, that "a great increase of gospel light, and conversion to God for a long time, by the preaching of men," is what constitutes *the thousand years' reign.* On the contrary, the kingdom of God, it appears to us, will be set up as fully as it can be on earth and will progress, or the earnest of *the thousand years' reign* will be enjoyed here, by means of God's own conversion of the Jews to New Testament and spiritual views of himself, through his word applied by his spirit; and that the setting up of God's kingdom in these believing Jews with believing Gentiles will be made manifest, not by any accession of fleshly glory to them, but by the amazing power of faith and love in them and by their renouncing all connection with fleshly preachers, and fleshly churches—a step in which perhaps the Quakers, and the Sandemanians, with their various branches, amidst great mistakes and grievous blunderings, have taken the initiative.—And, farther, we believe that the Apostasy, so far from succeeding the thousand years' reign, began while the Apostles lived, 1 John iv. 3, became full-blown as soon as they were removed and Jerusalem had been destroyed. 2 Thess. ii. 1—10, and still continues—thus preceding the setting up of Christ's kingdom, in its earnest form, on the earth.

As to the second and main division of our friend's work, we certainly rejoice to learn from him, on God's own authority, that Jesus Christ is, 1. God's King; 2. King of the Jews; 3. King of Saints; 4. King of the Jews; 5. King of Nations; 6. King of Glory; and 7. King over all the earth. But what of this? Admitting, nay glorying in every one of the kingly titles ascribed in God's word to our blessed Lord—admitting that each different title presents to us his royal dignity under a somewhat varied aspect—and admitting the applicability and significancy of every other title which Scripture assigns to him—we really cannot see what bearing all this has on the establishment of Mr. Seabrook's millennial system—we cannot see what proof the Seven Kingly titles selected and arranged by our friend afford, that there shall be seven successive periods upon earth, during each of which, each one of these seven titles shall in succession be borne. This is the point which Mr. Seabrook and his friends are bound to establish. We have a slight attempt at reasoning in support of it, p. 15. Few as are the words employed, so far from being objectionable on that ground, if satisfactory, they would have given us only the more an opportunity of admiring our friend's powers of condensation. Inconclusive, however, when brought to the test of the infallible standard, do they turn out to be. What we desiderate is New Testament authority for an earthly millennial system, such as that which is here presented to us. Imagination is not what we want. Human assertions and suggestions, both of which Mr. Seabrook gives us in great abundance, are not what we want. Texts taken from the records of a veiled and mysterious as well as preliminary dispensation confessedly divine, 2 Cor. iii. 13—18, Eph. iii. 3—6, (which, so far from being able to explain itself, required in order to its being understood the light of a higher and heavenly dispensation to be thrown upon it, Luke xxiv. 25—27, 45—47, 2 Cor. iii. 14, 16, 1 Peter, i. 10—12, 2 Peter i. 19—21.) are not what we want. Language on the part of our Lord and his apostles plainly and ex-

plicitly asserting what our friend does or what is equivalent to it, and reconcilable with the declarations contained in John viii. 39—44, and Rom. ix. 6—8, alone will satisfy us, and ensure our acquiescence. But what, in reality, has been Mr. Seabrook's procedure in this matter? He informs us upon the authority of certain passages in the Old Testament Scriptures literally interpreted and understood, in direct opposition to the principle of interpretation furnished by an inspired apostle, Acts xv. 13—18, that the Jewish nation shall be restored to the land of Palestine, shall repossess the earthly Jerusalem, shall rebuild the material Temple, shall reestablish Judaism, and shall prepare the earthly throne of David, for the glorified Jesus to descend and to occupy: in consequence of which, in due time, Christ will even in flesh remove from human beings in general, "the shame and sorrow which sin has brought upon the man—nature"—"the natural disobedience of man being *healed*, and therefore, man placed in an entirely new dispensation of government and discipline," upon earth, he, Christ, will set up a future earthly state of things, "partaking of the paradise law of blessedness to man, as a *natural*, and not to man, as a *fallen* creature"—and will so order all matters, even upon earth, that "no more shall there be *hereditary* vice or misery, in any shape or form, but a new economy, in which the glorious reign of the 'Great King' shall be abundantly more extensive in blessedness, than has ever been even the misery of Adam's fall.* pp. 30, 31. Old Testament texts, in abundance are quoted as confirmatory of such views. That is, our author, instead of proving his case by means of a series of New Testament statements positively and explicitly affirming it, first sets up on perverted Old Testament authority, a theory of Jews and Judaism restored to their earthly Canaan state; and then on similar authority, more sparingly adduced by the way, he matches this with another corresponding theory of Gentiles ultimately restored to their original earthly paradisaic state! He would have us to believe, that the immediate effect of the second coming of Christ is the reestablishment of the Old Testament Church temporarily in its earthly form; and, by means of this, of the world also subsequently in its Eden state: instead of recognizing the revealed New Testament facts, that by the putting forth of the power of his resurrection, and the consequent assimilation of all things to himself, Jesus first new-creates, and thereby causes to pass away the old form of the church, 2 Cor. v. 17; and then, by means of this, new-creates, thereby causing to pass away the old form of the world. Rev. xxi. 5, *compared with what goes before*, and 2 Peter iii. 10—13. According to Mr. Seabrook, God contemplates the revival, and for a long indefinite period or succession of periods, of old things; according to the New Testament scriptures, God in Christ has already begun, is now carrying on, and will ultimately complete the supersession and destruction of all old things, by their new creation. Strange to say, our friend, in presenting to us a theory of his own, thus antagonistic to the main facts and statements of the New Testament scriptures, uses the following language:—"This little book [the one now under review], then, dear brethren, contains no *human*† teaching, but simply points you to the divine *written*† testimony of the Spirit." "No *human* teaching," friend Seabrook? Bethink yourself a little. When told in Scripture, that "the wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid," during the New Testament æra, we have unquestionably God's words. But this would not prevent a literal interpretation of them being Mr.

* Attempted to be proved from Rom. v. 20. It has often been the subject of remark, that extremes meet. We have in Mr. Seabrook's agreement with Mr. Robert Owen, as to certain important results, a very striking exemplification of this. Nothing can be conceived more opposite than our dear friend's views of the Deity of the Lord Jesus, and the efficacy of his atoning sacrifice, on the one hand, and "the fundamental laws" of the great father of English and American Socialism, on the other: and yet, strange to say, they both concur in anticipating a state of perfectibility to man upon earth! Mr. E. H. Chapin, of New York, too, whose sentiments in favour of Universalism are of a decidedly Pelagian and Unitarian character, and therefore so far adverse to those of our friend, is nevertheless found expressing hopes in regard to man's future earthly state, almost identical with the anticipations contained in the work before us:—"With a sense of responsibility resting in man, we pray," when uttering the petition, *Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven*, "that the moral evils in the world may pass away, that humanity may be changed to peace and holiness,—may become one with God." On earth, observe; and while still continuing to be humanity. "Looking out upon the wide earth, with the glorious prospect of what it may be, contrasted with what it is—of light and harmony, of righteousness and joy, taking the place of all this sin and woe, we lift the fervent petition before us."—Chapin's Discourses on the Lord's Prayer, pp. 86, 87. Boston, U. S. 1850.

† *Sic in orig.*

William Seabrook's. Supposing us to suggest that in the case of Saul of Tarsus, when converted, see Acts ix. *throughout*, and in the case of parties alluded to in such a passage as 1 Cor. vi. 9—11, we had a New Testament inspired explanation of the meaning of what we have just quoted, we suspect that we should be much nearer the truth, than our friend with his *literal* fulfilments. We respect Mr. Seabrook. We admire him for his manly assertion of what he believes to be true. But while we wish to be as little children in the hands of the Holy Spirit, receiving meekly all that God hath *really* said, and *really* means—*desiring the sincere milk of the word, that we may grow thereby*, 1 Peter ii. 2—yet as exhorted, on inspired authority, *in understanding* (spiritual) *to be men*, 1 Cor. xiv. 20, we cannot childishly take man's interpretation of the meaning of the Old Testament Scriptures, whether afforded in express definitions, or implied in the quotation of God's words in a certain understood human sense. Need we tell you, dear friend, that the last is just as much "human teaching," as if human language were directly employed? Pardon us, brother. Comparison of *spiritual things with spiritual* is the high privilege of believers of the truth. 1 Cor. ii. 13. Discrimination in divine things is both a result of this, and one of the fruits of the Spirit. Heb. iv. 12. Thus it is we discover, that because promises are made to Jews in the Old Testament scriptures, it does not *necessarily* follow, that in the case of Jews according to the flesh merely, these promises are realized. Matt. iii. 9; Acts xiii. 45—48. That because Jerusalem is incessantly alluded to, and its wondrous blessings during the Messiah's time dwelt on, it does not necessarily follow, that the earthly Jerusalem is the sole subject of prophetic declarations. Gal. iv. 21—31. Our friend is above canting and whining. Asserting his own Christian liberty, he respects the assertion of that liberty on the part of others. Highly as he may think of, and decidedly as he may prefer his own millennial system, we are satisfied that, possessed of true, because heavenly liberality of sentiment, he can harbour no feelings of resentment against us for preferring what we deem to be an infallible, because New Testament explanation of Old Testament passages, to his own *literal*, but not on that account, in our apprehension *less human* sense which he is pleased to assign to them.*

With Mr. Seabrook, as well as with Mrs. Morgan, notwithstanding the decision with which we have dissented from and protested, against their millennial errors, we part with feelings of the greatest respect and affection.

One duty is incumbent on us, before closing this article. It is to do an act of justice to our friend, Mr. George Galloway. When speaking of his clever work, in our December number, we represented him as holding, "the resurrection and reign of the saints upon earth with Christ, in flesh and blood bodies, during the period literally of a thousand years." *Universalist*, Vol. i. p. 279. In a private, candid, and most affectionate letter addressed to us by our friend, he questions the accuracy of our statement, and refers us to various passages of his tract, in which he maintains that the bodies of the raised saints are "spiritual and immortal." He particularly instances his language in Division v. pp. 28—33. Now it is quite true, that such is Mr. Galloway's representation of the subject. Expressing ourselves as we did, we had forgotten what he had said in that portion of his work to which reference is here made, and were confounding his system with that of the ordinary classes of millennialists. We had forgotten that the complete spiritualizing of the body, and thereby its complete conformity to the body of Jesus glorified, is what he holds to be one of the results of Christ's second coming, and one of the grand characteristics of the millennial reign. Our friend kindly, but at the same time truly acquits us of all intentional misrepresentation of his views. The fact is we were then, as we are now, puzzled how to make his system, as we understood it, hang together as a whole.—See our notice, especially the paragraph beginning, "Restoration of the Jews, even previously," &c. Our friend's explanation has served to puzzle us yet more. A millennium realized in parties conformed to Christ completely, as being like him possessed of spiritual bodies, we can understand. A millennium realized in parties raised again in flesh and blood bodies, and thereby qualified to associate with believers upon earth, we can understand likewise. But as, according to the former view—a view of the millennium to a certain extent corresponding to our own—the parties are entirely *spiritual*, and consequently invisible to and incapable of associating with beings in a flesh and blood state, 1 John iii. 2, how this can be reconciled with other parts of Mr. Galloway's theory, in which it assumes an earthly aspect, and presents to us associations of spiritual and earthly beings, completely surpasses our comprehension. However, to the benefit of his own statements he is clearly and fairly entitled. Will he kindly accept of our apology? In a recent communication, he expresses himself satisfied, that our language was directed "against a system, with which he has little more sympathy than" we ourselves have. Are we to understand him as anticipating a millennium of the Church, spiritual and glorified with Christ? Then why clog this view with notions that are clearly and absolutely irreconcilable with it? D. T.

* We are glad to see the notice which Mr. Seabrook's *brochure* has attracted, especially in Dublin. It is actually the sixth edition that we have now lying before us. Glorious, scriptural truths (however much intermixed with error,) it does contain, and these can never do harm. God's cause, they serve to promote. To God's word they are instrumental in drawing attention.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

MAY, 1851.

DEUS VOLENS.

In Him we live, and move, and have our being.—PAUL TO THE ATHENIANS.

WHAT the atmosphere surrounding our globe is to those "in whose nostrils is the breath of life" the will of God is to human volition; and just as in a *vacuum* the organs of respiration are incapable of performing their functions, so, let the will of the Supreme be withdrawn, and man ceases to will at all. Nay, we understate the truth if we stop here, for the physical organ may remain though no longer capable of performing its functions; it may still exist though removed from the necessary condition of its action, and may resume its functions when the proper condition of its operation shall be restored. So far the idea "*In Him we* MOVE" is illustrated: but the other component parts of this most pregnant sentence, as it regards the human will—"*in Him we* LIVE . . . *and have our* BEING"—can only be expressed analogically by the correlative physical action and agent, —of the *organ* as well as the *function*. The will of Him who is the all-pervading ενεργεια, is the lungs and air too of human volition. This truth is attested in unambiguous phraseology in both Old and New Testament, and is perfectly consonant with reason and experience. Indeed, the jargon of the Schools on this subject is the result of an inextinguishable repugnance to admit this one simple fact, induced by the supposed truth of the doctrine lying at the foundation of the various theological superstructures which have been raised, and warmly defended against each other by ammunition "hissing hot from hell." It is on this one simple fact, divinely revealed and scripturally applied, that we repose. Yet it is not surprising that the Schools should stick at it! How could God's sovereign volition be the *substratum* of all human willing—of all those theological superstructures to which we have just referred, if the final result of it all was to be disaster, miscarriage, eternal ruin and woe? And so to escape the dilemma, they cut the link which nevertheless subsists between the creature and the Creator, and vainly thought to establish for man a sort of independence!

The devout recognition of the existence and all-pervading power of the Supreme, in space and in time, in the magnificent and the minute, in the abject and the august, in the decline of an empire or the fall of a sparrow, in recondite causes and obvious results,—of a will it may be interposed either more immediately, as in the miraculous feeding of 5000, or indefinitely although not the less certainly and necessarily connected through a long chain of second causes, as in the betrayal of Jesus by Judas,—in all that transpires which affects the present condition and future character and destiny of individuals and nations, is

the Christian's high, enobling and consoling privilege. Let the philosophic (?) infidel imagine that all that the thorough Christian attributes to the unceasing and universal energy of the divine will is ascribable to the operation of "general laws," and be content, like the ostrich, to conclude that the difficulty is met by thrusting his head where he only conceals it from himself. Let the fatalist, in his uneasy dreaming, chill and numb the vast capacities and exquisite susceptibilities of his nature, while he deludes himself with the idea that all things are and move by sheer blind necessity. We rejoice to know, on divine authority, that *of Him* who is infinite wisdom, and *through Him* who is boundless love, and *to Him* who is unfailing mercy, *are all things;*—all things, in their very being as suspended every moment upon his sovereign will,—in their volition or action as deriving from him their power to will or to act,—and in their result and end as contributing one and all, in their measure and in their respective spheres, to the manifestation of his glorious perfections.

We have been sometimes puzzled at the conduct of Christians in reference to the great principle to which we have drawn the attention of our readers. Who has not observed, it may be in the friendly intercourse of epistolary communication, the humble, devout, and most appropriate allusion to the all-interpenetrating power of the divine will through all that transpires, even down to the personal, private and minute affairs of every day life? Thus writes one: "I purpose being in town (D.V.) to-morrow, when I hope to have the pleasure of spending an hour with my friend." Observe the parenthetic piety of this very natural and familiar sentence. The object of the visit may be no more than the interchange of kindly and reciprocal feelings; comparatively unimportant business may bring the individual to town: he is evidently Christian in his communications, and cultivates the devotional feeling of constant dependance upon the will of his heavenly Father. His deep religious feeling discovers itself even in the common-places of every-day occurrence, and the admission that God has a will in reference to all that is minute in his personal history forces itself into the communication to another of his purposes and plans. We say we have sometimes been puzzled at the conduct of such an individual—not at the devout, the Christian, the humble disposition manifested, but knowing that such an one, while he most properly and scripturally, in the significant parenthesis to which we have alluded, regarded the circumstances of his lot as subordinate and subservient to the purposes of the divine will, also looked upon the future and eternal state of myriads of his fellow creatures as contingent; and in the place of *Deus volens* putting *homo volens*, at the same time conscious that, without the real intervention of divine grace, it would certainly be *homo nolens*. Astounding anomoly! that God has a will affecting the *hour* to be spent by one individual with a friend, but no will respecting the *eternity* which unnumbered millions are to spend in inexhaustible sufferings! unless the blasphemy of intention on the part of God even in this should be contended for. How can it be believed, that the fleeting hour, with its sip of pleasure or cup of sorrow, shall be as it undoubtedly is predesigned by *Him who worketh all things*, and yet that the inconceivable eternity shall shape its character after the will of weak, ignorant, erring

man? How can it be believed, that He who would have us *pray for all men* (in which is involved the assertion that all men stand in need of the intervention of divine power), leaves *all men* as some would have it, and *most men* as others would have it, without any purpose respecting their eventual holiness and happiness? How can it be believed, that the benevolent and charitable conduct of a Christian towards a poor wretched and guilty outcast, should be the consequence of God's *putting it into his heart*, while God's own heart is steeled against the same poor creature to all eternity? How can it be believed, that He who "provideth for the raven his food" should have no purpose of love and mercy for the noblest work of his hands this world contains? How can it be believed, that he who fixes the bounds of our habitation here, has not provided in the "many mansions" of our "Father's house" a home for every poor prodigal son? for let it not be forgotten that though the world abounds with prodigal sons (*All we like sheep have gone astray*), they are *sons* after all.—Such a Christian cannot have thought, much less believed about it at all. To such a Christian we submit the following from NEUE's *Repertorium fur die Theologische Literatur:*

RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD. In the whole world there are

Jews . . .	4,000,000	or	5,000,000
Christians .	228,000,000		299,000,000
Mohammedans	100,000,000		110,000,000
Heathen . .	405,000,000		463,000,000
	737,000,000		877,000,000

Of whom there are under Christian rule	387,000,000
Mohammedan	72,000,000
Heathen	277,000,000
	737,000,000

Of Protestant States there are	193,624,000 inhabitants.
Roman Catholic	134.164,000
Greek	60,000,000
	387,788,000

From the above table—which may be looked at from many interesting points—taking the larger number under the head of "Christians" as representing the total who may at the present time be regarded as "safe for eternity,"—though we feel pretty sure that we should give no offence either to Roman Catholic or Protestant, if we were to assume half that number as being a nearer approach to truth,—we have of the nominally or geographically Christian only one third of the population of the globe: consequently out of every three who die only one gets to heaven. No doubt we are much too liberal, but we prefer understating to overstating the views of our friends, willing to look at their position from the point most favourable to it. Nevertheless we shall be reminded that the finally saved will be "a multitude that no man can number," but with such figures and facts patent to the eye of every one the lost must be "a multitude which no" *angel* "can number," for it must defy the arithmetic of all but infinite mind to compute. We

have heard of a methodist minister who on one occasion announced to his flock that, on the following Sunday, his pulpit would be supplied "(D.V.)" in the morning, by the Rev. Mr. M——, but that he himself would preach in the evening "whether or no." We do not vouch for the truth of the story. Now of the 877,000,000 of this teeming earth shall we say that 200,000,000 will be saved, D.V. and that all the rest will go to hell (as commonly understood) "whether or no"? Not so have we been taught of God,—not so have we learned Christ. He who *worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, doth all things well. He will do all his pleasure, his counsel shall stand.* All is ordained by God, and to the manifestation of his own glorious attributes all things are tending; and who would have it otherwise? And who would think of finding the following lines in a hymn-book used by one of the most respectable and numerous dissenting communities of this country?

"Thou givest with paternal care
Howe'er unjustly we complain,
To each his necessary share
Of joy and sorrow, health and pain.

All things on earth, and all in Heaven
On thy eternal will depend;
And all for greater good were given
And all shall in thy glory end."

We could not wish to modify these lines to express our own views, so perfectly consistent with the only standard of truth. Let us receive all that we enjoy or suffer as from the hand of our Heavenly Father; and, as those who know the gracious end, the merciful result, the glorious consummation of *the groaning and travailing of the whole creation in pain together until now*, rejoice in the knowledge of God's will, *because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.* See Rom. viii. 18—23.

Z.

THE APOSTOLIC GOSPEL AND UNIVERSALISM.

How often have we heard the observation:—Amid the numberless gospel systems which prevail amongst professing Christians, and which are unceasingly challenging our attention and our faith, we are completely perplexed and confounded. Their discordant principles and antagonistic theories completely bewilder us, and we are utterly sick of them. Such a confusion of gospel tongues is enough to land us in indifference or disgust."

The fruitless efforts of men to arrive at views, in their estimation, so self-consistent and harmonious, as to satisfy the notions of mere fleshly mind, are only a repetition of what has happened to thousands, who, like them, have listened and read despairingly of ever reaching their point of satisfaction—their haven of rest.

Nor will anything short of the Apostolic gospel—the "glorious gospel of the blessed God," carried home in its light and power to the understanding and the conscience, ever disenthral the minds of men from mere human fictions and false systems.

We have little faith that Universalism, by proclaiming to men God's universal love—that God will undoubtedly save all men—or, that any other mere general form of declaring God's design to save all men, in whatever language the statement may be couched, will be more efficacious than other systems. Nevertheless, the Gospel scripturally proclaimed and understood, is now, as formerly, the mighty "power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth." By the ministry of the Apostles, the gospel, proclaimed in its primal purity, achieved triumphs altogether unparalleled. On the very soil where the blood of the Son of God was shed, its converts amounted to many thousands. In a short space of time it overspread Judea, and its triumphant progress was extended throughout Syria, Lybia, Egypt, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Parthia, and the whole of Asia Minor, where it had opposed to it alike the prejudices, the intellect, and the learning of both Jews and Pagans. Its power was victorious too in the most classic regions of the earth, where Literature, Philosophy, Science, and Poetry had their favoured residence—where Euclid, Aristotle, and Longinus, Demosthenes, Solon, and Lycurgus, Homer and Pindar, Terence and Varro, Atticus and Cicero, Sallust and Livy, Horace, Ovid, and Virgil had written, declaimed, legislated, philosophized, and sung. The power and progress of the Apostolic gospel in these polished regions of the earth, was the marvel of marvels. Here, were the unlettered fishermen of Galilee, encountering the pride of Grecian and Roman philosophy, by preaching "Jesus and the Resurrection," demonstrating that "God had chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise; and the weak things of this world, to confound the things which are mighty; and base things, and things which are despised, to bring to nought things that are; that no flesh should glory in His presence: as it is written, 'I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent.'" Thus it pleased God by the foolishness of Apostolic preaching, to save them that believed. Among Jews and Greeks, barbarian and civilized, bond and free, what then was the precise form—the definite character of this victorious testimony—of this Apostolic gospel?

The scriptures of divine truth furnish us with numerous specimens of Apostolic preaching—of their mode of proclaiming to mankind the salvation of God by the gospel of His Son. A careful, nay, even a cursory examination of these examples demonstrates, that the simple facts of the death and resurrection of Christ, constituted the great message which they were authorized to proclaim to mankind. The good tidings of salvation for the guilty through his death and resurrection—the declaration that he died for their sins, and that he rose again for their justification, were everywhere, to Jew and Gentile, the burden of the Apostolic testimony. Whoever believed this testimony, received the "forgiveness of their sins, and were justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses."

We select a few examples of the style of Apostolic preaching, beginning with the day of Pentecost, when the Apostles were to "receive power, after that the Holy Ghost was come upon them, and to be witnesses unto the facts of the death and resurrection of Christ, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost

part of the earth." On that memorable day, the Apostle Peter preached unto a great multitude, of both Jews and Pagans, assembled at Jerusalem, from almost every known region, the crucifixion, death, and resurrection of the Lord Jesus; testifying, that "God had made that same Jesus whom the Jews had crucified, both Lord and Christ:" which facts when they heard they were "pricked in their heart, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Acts ii. *throughout.* When Peter and John had healed the lame man, who was laid daily at the gate of the Temple, and the people ran together unto them, filled with wonder and amazement at the miracle they had wrought, they spake unto them none other doctrine than that of Christ crucified, and his resurrection from the dead. Acts iii. and iv. chapters throughout. To Cornelius and his friends, Peter preached the same great facts, when "the Holy Ghost fell upon them that heard the word." Acts x. 36 to end. At Antioch, Paul proclaimed to the Jews the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus, as the "glad tidings God had promised to their fathers," declaring that forgiveness of sins, and justification from all things, were by Him alone. Acts xiii.

At Thessalonica, in their synagogue, Paul reasoned with the Jews out of their scriptures, "alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead, and that this Jesus, whom he preached, was the Christ." Acts xvii. To the Athenian philosophers he preached the same truth, of "Jesus and the resurrection." Ibid. Before King Agrippa, he declared the real charges against him to be, that he preached to Jews and Gentiles, "none other things than those, which Moses and the prophets did say should come:—that Christ should suffer, and that He should be the first that should rise from the dead." Acts. xxvi.

In his first epistle to the Corinthians, chap. xv, Paul declares that he had "preached unto them that gospel which he had also received, how that Christ died for our sins, and that he rose again the third day," and then from these gospel facts, prosecutes those sublime reasonings and conclusions, for which this chapter is so justly celebrated.

Christ crucified—the facts of his death and resurrection, were the constant themes of Apostolic preaching. They constituted emphatically the Apostolic gospel—the good tidings to the guilty sinners of mankind. But that the divine truths, which, as corollaries from, or as connected with the primary and fundamental facts of the gospel taught by the Apostles in their intercourse with the Churches, behoved to be believed by, or to be presented at all to the minds of guilty sinners, before they were enabled to realize their own personal interest in the death and resurrection of Christ, is an assumption unwarranted by scripture.

The proclamation to men in general of God's universal love—that as God loves all sinners of mankind, therefore He must love them; and that on such grounds they are entitled to infer and conclude their own personal salvation, is not the apostolic mode of proclaiming the gospel. Nor is it a method at all likely to be efficacious in purging from a sense of guilt the consciences of sinners. The thorough enmity to God of the fleshly mind is such, as to preclude the possibility of any general declaration of God's universal love speaking peace to the conscience. Apart from the gospel facts believed in—of "Christ dying

for our sins, and rising again for our justification," there can be no apprehension of the Son of God at all. The gospel facts of the death and resurrection of the Son of God, and of sin put away thereby, constituted the mighty power wielded by the Apostles for the conversion of men. They formed the substance of the Apostolic testimony, and were reiterated again and again in the ears of the multitude, as God's method of cleansing the conscience from guilt, of destroying sin and death, and of bringing in a divine righteousness, and everlasting life for the sinner. Neither the universal love of God on the one hand, nor the terrors of eternal wrath on the other, formed any part of the apostolic gospel, whatever either Universalist or Partialists may think or assert to the contrary. The simple and divine story, that the Messiah—the Christ—the Son of God, "was crucified unto death, that he rose again on the third day, for the forgiveness of sins and the justification of sinners," was the burden of their glorious message. They did not tell men, that as God had declared his love to all mankind as the result of an eternal purpose to save all, that therefore they had a right, on the ground of natural reasoning of their own, to conclude themselves amongst the number of the saved. Unquestionably, the Apostles taught the great and glorious truth of salvation being ultimately, because freely and unconditionally bestowed upon all men: but they taught it as a revealed fact to those who had already believed the gospel. They did not proclaim it as the gospel message to the promiscuous multitude of Jews and Gentiles; for, as an abstract proposition, the universal love of God to all, in its unlimited aspect, could not have been apprehended. The proclamation of the gospel by the Apostles, was based, undoubtedly, upon the grand scriptural fact of God's love to all in Christ Jesus, but their testimony was not carried home to the consciences of individuals, in the light of God's love to all, but the proclaimed facts of the death and resurrection of Christ, carried home to their understanding and conscience with divine power, rendered manifest the love of God to themselves, as apprehended in the light of these facts believed in. To present the love of God before the minds of men in any other light, would have been to place the truth and character of God upon the level of mere human and carnal reasoning, and to assume a power in the human mind, of concluding from the premises of God's universal love, its own salvation. The wisdom of God, the very antipodes of the wisdom of man, had seen meet to bring men to the knowledge of the truth as it is Jesus, by means altogether without the range and inventions of human reason, and Christ dying and rising again for the salvation of men, as "the wisdom of God in a mystery," was to be the only banner of glad tidings unfurled before a guilty world. Whoever believed the apostolic testimony were saved, and were conscious of their salvation being effected through the inherent divine energy of the truth itself. In the truth believed, they rejoiced with joy unspeakable, arising from a sense of the freeness, greatness, and glory of their salvation by Christ Jesus, and of the love of God manifested thereby to their minds. Their own personal salvation, through the divine power of the truth, was thus not a matter in any way reasoned out from general declarations of the unlimited character of divine love, and of the design of God to save all men; a view of God

which was never presented to their minds, and certainly one which was not likely to be presented to them by those who gave proof of their not understanding such views themselves.

Special, and miraculous divine teaching, was necessary in the case of one of the Apostles, for the purpose of enlightening his mind, as to the design of God to open the door of salvation to the Gentiles; and in the case of all, it is probable that the glorious truth of the purpose of God to save all men was gradually unveiled to their minds in the course of that progressive manifestation to them of the divine character which God ultimately vouchsafed. As in apostolic times, so it is not now necessary to the belief of the gospel testimony concerning Christ's death and resurrection, that men should have proclaimed to them the revealed and glorious truth, that the divine love will be ultimately manifested to all mankind. Nor is there any necessary connexion in the mind of him who has already believed the gospel, between the manifestation of God as love ultimately to all, and the present and everlasting salvation of the sinner through the gospel testimony believed in. To suppose this as necessary, and to preach the gospel after such a fashion, would at once raise the question in the minds of men:—but is the doctrine of the love of God to all, and of the purpose of God to save all, really a scripture doctrine? Can you satisfy us that it is clearly revealed that we may place confidence in it? And thus the fleshly mind would be excited to attempt to ground salvation upon a mere abstract view of the love of God to all. Such views must be dangerous in their tendency, because of the conclusions to which fleshly mind will be tempted to rush, and also as tending to obscure, or keep out of view altogether by unregenerate men, the "narrow way that leadeth unto life" by the "cross of Christ," the only way under Heaven by which men can be saved. Let not Universalists contribute to discredit the doctrine of God's universal love, and the ultimate salvation of all mankind, by any unscriptural modes of presenting these views before the minds of mere carnal men; for, as certainly as the carnal mind is opposed to the Divine mind, and consequently to the Divine method of salvation, will they be abused to licentiousness. Satisfied are we, that pharisaical views of the way of salvation, are not more opposed to the gospel of the grace of God than are any notions of salvation based upon mere general and abstract views of the universality of God's love. While meritmongers are teaching mankind to establish their own righteousness, wholly, or in part, upon the ground of something done by the creature, or upon the authority of some evidences found in them, by which they may assure themselves of their personal interest in Christ, let not Universalists hold up to the world any views of the gospel salvation other than those which are connected with the death and resurrection of the Son of God, the purgation thereby of the conscience from guilt, and the conferment of righteousness and eternal life.

But it may be asked—do we deprecate then the love of God being made the subject of religious teaching to the world? Far from it. On the contrary, we hail every proper and suitable occasion for proclaiming it; but we would do it on the divine plan, after the apostolic fashion. We would preach "Jesus and the resurrection"—his obedience, suf-

ferings, and death for guilty men. Not for some men to the exclusion of the rest: not a partial gospel, or a limited salvation; but we would exhibit the love of God to the guilty and dying children of Adam, as *seen in the facts, and in the light of the death and resurrection of the Son of God.*

This was the mode and style of the apostolic gospel—that gospel which gathered such precious fruits and achieved such splendid success in the first age of Christianity.

In the apostolic letters to the Churches of Christ, to which their preaching of the gospel had given birth in various lands, for their edification, growth, and establishment in divine knowledge and Christian conduct, they unfolded to them wider and more expansive views of the counsels and purposes of Jehovah; "not shunning to declare unto *them* the whole counsel of God." In their intercourse with them in spiritual and divine things, they dilated upon subjects which they never dwelt upon before the multitude, disclosing to them many sublime truths in connexion with the character of God and the work of Christ, for which they were indebted to the infallible inspiration and revelations of the Holy Spirit. Such topics to a promiscuous assembly of Jews and Gentiles, ignorant of the gospel, would have been the mere babbling of unintelligible jargon. As addressed to such persons, they would have been entirely out of place, and equally destitute of that divine adaptation and appropriateness which, in the wisdom of God, characterized the gospel message to the world. Besides, the apostolic gospel was introduced in an age of great intellectual vigour and refinement—when human learning and philosophy were in their zenith, and God, in his wisdom, had determined by the preaching of the cross of Christ, to stain the pride of all human glory—to humiliate the self-righteous Jew—and to achieve a mighty conquest over the corruptions and idolatries of the Pagan world—learned and illiterate. To the scripturally taught mind, there is much in these facts to throw light upon the divine reasons for the proclamation of the mystery of the cross—to them the most absolute "foolishness." Nor does the present aspect and condition of the world justify any deviation from the terms and tenour of the apostolic gospel. Authority for it there is none. The glorious truth of the ultimate manifestation of the love and salvation of God to the whole race of man, we know through divine teaching to be involved in the great facts proclaimed of the death and resurrection of Christ Jesus—the God-man (1 Cor. xv. 21—28); but we know also that this grand consummation can be apprehended and believed in only in the light of our own certain personal interest in this great salvation—in Christ's death and resurrection being our death and resurrection through our union to him, and consequently our victory with him over sin, death, and the grave, and our indefeasible title to his righteousness and immortal life. The essential principle of divine love, it is true, maintains its immutability through all the dispensations of grace and time—unaltered and unalterable; but the peculiar divine method—the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus, by which it has pleased Jehovah to manifest this love to his creatures, constitutes the only gospel we are warranted to proclaim to the guilty sinners of mankind.

REV. WALTER BALFOUR.

The name of this man is dear to every Universalist in America. He is mostly known by his valuable books, entitled, "Inquiries into the Meaning of the Scriptural Words translated Hell, Devil, Satan, and Everlasting."* These have been extensively read and admired, and are still accomplishing a good work. It is not too much to say, that they have done as much towards the spread of Universalism as any half dozen volumes ever issued by any of our presses; and in the department to which they relate they have accomplished more than *all* the rest.

Father Balfour is still living in Charlestown, Mass. although from appearance, he is near the end of his earthly pilgrimage. The editor of the "Gospel Banner" gives, through his paper, a very interesting account of a visit which he recently made him. We copy a portion of it.

"The day was beautifully pleasant; the pedestrian tour was interesting and agreeable, and in due time we stood at the door of his house. An intelligent and accomplished daughter ushered us into a room where sat the venerable patriarch. He was unable to arise without assistance; but he saluted us with much cordiatity of affection, and besought us to draw our chair near to his own for a closer fellowship and a more ready intercourse. We took his palsied hand and arm, and felt as his warm greeting was moistened by the gathering tears in his eyes, that his very look upon us was a benediction. Within the last few years he has experienced two paralytic shocks, which have quite disabled his whole left side. He cannot walk without much assistance, and is mostly confined to his chair and bed. He appeared pale, and bore the marks of an age beyond his years. He is now in his seventy-sixth year. If ever we saw the scriptural figure of a "shock of corn fully ripe," verified in the ripened piety of an earthly being, we thought we saw it in the submissive looks, the patient spirit, and the triumphant joys of Father Balfour. God has brought him upon the last perch of life, and given him wings of faith with which he is just ready to fly away from earth and be at rest in heaven. We asked him if he had seen any cause yet to renounce his faith in a world's salvation? His characteristic reply was in these very words: "I have seen no cause to change this faith; when I do, the world will know it; I am not one of the men who believe a thing right or wrong."

He was led to the investigation of Universalism by several important admissions of Professor Stuart, in his controversy with Dr. Channing—admissions that clearly involved the truth of Universalism. To this circumstance allusion is made in the following extract.

"Father Balfour was born in 1774. His native place was Sterlingshire, in Scotland, a town about thirty-five miles from Edinburgh, and twenty-five from Glasgow. He was educated in the University, was a fellow student of Preceptor Hall, formerly of Anson in this State,

[* We avail ourselves of this opportunity of recommending the works of Mr. Balfour to the attention of our readers, which can be procured through the publisher of this magazine. We purpose discussing their merits, hereafter, in our capacity as reviewer.—Ed. *Universalist.*]

(whom he was the means of converting to Universalism,) and commenced preaching as an Independent or Congregationalist about fifty years ago. He removed from Scotland to Nova Scotia in 1806, and the year following came to Charlestown, where he married the daughter of Deacon Devans. He has lived there ever since, beloved and respected by all who know him. By all sects he is regarded as a true Christian man. He so far changed his denominational views as to become satisfied that immersion is the only valid mode of water baptism; this made him a Baptist, but he did not give up his congregational ideas of open communion. He had the fellowship and respect of Dr. Jedediah Morse for whom he often preached. It was, as we have said, about 1823 or 1824 that his faith in partialism was staggered by Prof. Stuart's admission to Dr. Channing; and as he could not induce the Professor to speak one word to show how that admission could be true and yet Universalism false, he set himself about doing the Professor's business for him. The result was, he arose from his inquiries and his prayers a confirmed Universalist. He is now approaching the grave. It is three years since he preached his last sermon, which, he told us, was for Br. Adams in Malden. He will not probably ever preach or write again. But he has done a good work.—*Star in the West.*

EXTRACT FROM SAMUEL THOMSON'S NARRATIVE OF HIS LIFE AND MEDICAL DISCOVERIES."—*Boyish Days.*—p. 133.

Referring to the period of his youth, he says—"All that time I used to think that if my father's treatment of me was the effect of his religion, I never wished to have any. This was when he was under the strongest influence of the Baptist persuasion, and used to be very zealous in his religious duties, praying night and morning, and sometimes three times a day. He was a man of violent and quick temper, and when in his fits of passion, my mother used frequently to remind him of certain parts of his prayer, such as this, which I never forgot:—"May we live soberly, righteously, and godly in the present evil world."—She was a woman much respected in the town where we lived.

About the time I was fourteen years old, my father left the Baptist persuasion, and embraced that of universal salvation—"By grace are ye saved, through faith, not of yourselves, it is the gift of God."—If he ever experienced a change of heart, for the better, it was at this time; his love to God and man was great, and I had reason to rejoice, for he was like another man in his house. He continued to enjoy the same belief with much comfort to the time of his death, which took place in August, 1820, aged 76. My mother remained many years in the full belief of the salvation of all men, and continued so till her death."

JOHN THOM.

BY HIS SON DAVID THOM D.D. PH.D.

(*Concluded from our last.*)

What was, in the case of Mr. Thom, the source of a character so pure, so elevated, and as a whole so free from those faults and blemishes by which the lives of men, otherwise excellent, are often so sadly disfigured?

Allowing to natural temperament, form and size of brain phrenologically considered, education, and circumstances of a similar kind, all that they can rightfully claim, I pass at once from the consideration of them to point to my father's religion, as affording the true answer to the question. This seems to involve and require a statement of his religious history, and of the progressive development of his religious views sentiments and experience.

His life was emphatically an exhibition of the influence and triumph of evangelical Christianity.

Mr. Thom was brought up in connexion with the Established Church of Scotland,* to the communion of which, both his parents belonged. In early life, he sat under the ministry of the amiable, excellent, and pious Dr. John Gillies, incumbent of the College or Blackfriars' Church of Glasgow, who wrote an interesting memoir, (prefixed to his works) of his able and eloquent father-in-law, Mr. John M'Laurin, (author of the Sermon, entitled, "Glorying in the cross of Christ,") but who is better known as having published a biography of the celebrated George Whitfield.† Many circumstances, among others, his introduction when still young to the highly respectable and pious family of his future wife, induced Mr. Thom to exchange the services of the College, for attendance on those of the Outer High Church.‡ There he heard the gospel proclaimed and enforced in a manner exceedingly pure and scriptural. Robert Balfour, afterwards D.D. (of Princeton College, New-Jersey,) then occupied its pulpit. Concerning this most able, eminent and devoted servant of God, as well as eloquent and impressive preacher, who for a period of thirty-nine years ministered to his attached and Christian congregation,§ owing to the deep obligations under which I lie to his public instructions, as

---

* Presbyterian.

† Dr. Gillies was the immediate predecessor of John Lockhart, D.D. father of William Lockhart, Esq. M.P. for the County of Lanark, and of John Gibson Lockhart, Esq. the distinguished Editor of the "Quarterly Review." With Dr. Lockhart I had the honour to be acquainted, and by him was proposed for licence, as a Probationer, to the Presbytery of Glasgow, in the winter of 1819, 20. The Doctor was familiarly and deservedly known in Glasgow by the appellation of "the amiable Lockhart." A brief, although very interesting account of him, was given in a little book of biographical sketches, which issued from the pen of a clever young literary man, named Finlay, some forty or fifty years ago. (Finlay is the party who is said to have furnished Stewart, the bookseller of Greenock, with the copies of Burns' letters to Clarinda, which appeared at the end of the Pocket Edition of the Scottish Bard's works, published in 1802). Dr. Lockhart, who was a gentleman by birth, as well as by education, social position, and manners, was extremely indolent. Strangers rather too frequently occupied his pulpit. All who knew him, however, and were admitted to any degree of intimacy with him, and to the benefit of his most valuable advice, cannot, if competent, but bear testimony to his great good sense, his possession of a very fair share of learning professional and otherwise, the decided evangelical sentiments with which he was imbued, and his personal piety. His "Sermon on the Death of the Princess Charlotte," is a very good specimen of his style of composition, which was neat, simple, and elegant. One of his sons married a niece of the Thomas Muir, (Thomas Muir, younger, of Huntershill, Esq. Advocate), of whom mention has been made. Between Dr. Gillies and Dr. Lockhart, the pulpit of the College Church was occupied nearly a century.

‡ Now thrown open, and known as the nave of the cathedral. It was first seated, and used as a place of worship, in the reign of Charles I. The celebrated Patrick Gillespie, one of the Scotch Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly of Divines, 1643, 47, and immortalized in one of Milton's Sonnets—

Why is it harder, Sirs, than Gordon,
Colkitto, or Macdonnell, or Galasp?—Sonnet XI.

was its first minister. In this church, Oliver Cromwell, it is said, heard Mr. Gillespie preach in 1650 or 1651: on which occasion, it is related, that the indignation of one of the Lord General's officers having been roused by the freedom of some of the clergyman's strictures, and he having expressed a wish to be permitted to pull him out of the pulpit, was stopped and silenced with a "Let him alone--you are a brace of fools, both of you."

§ From 1779 till 1818.

well as private friendship and patronage, and the feelings of strong affection thereby engendered, I dare scarcely trust myself to speak. I dread being biassed by personal considerations, in a case where calm truth, and rigid impartiality alone should dictate my language. However, if God spare me and your periodical be continued, I may try to bring him, with his exceedingly evangelical views and decidedly Christian conduct, on some future occassion under the notice of your readers, in a separate article. He deserves to be known. Especially by scriptural Universalists.* Enough to observe just now, that to Mr. Thom, the ministry of this most able preacher and divine, no less than pious man, was, in the course of God's adorable providence, rendered exceedingly profitable and edifying. No perverter of the gospel of glad tidings into a mere system of law, was Balfour. What he set forth continually in the light of scripture itself, and enforced by every argument and illustration with which the sacred volume could supply him, was Christ crucified and glorified, as the sole and the divinely appointed medium through which the character and perfections of God are made known by the Holy Spirit, and peace is spoken to the guilty conscience of man: faith in Christ Jesus as revealed in the divine testimony, working by *love to God as having first loved us*, having been in his simple and scriptural theology,† the only source of love to the brethren, productive of all that is heavenly and divine in the mind, and necessarily shewing its existence and influence externally by the performance of *good works for necessary uses*. Titus iii. 14.‡

---

* Not that he ever professed Universalism. And not that he encouraged others to profess it: for his substitutes and assistants, such as Mr. John Russell of Stirling, (satirized by Burns—

"But now the Lord's ain trumpet touts,
Till a' the hills are rairin',
An' echoes back return the shouts;
Black Russell is na sparin'.
His piercin' words, like Highlan' swords,
Divide the joints an' marrow,
His talk o' hell, whare devils dwell,
Our vera sauls does harrow,
Wi' fright that day.

A vast unbottomed, boundless pit,
Filled fou' o' lowin' brunstane,
Wha's ragin' flame, an' scorchin' heat,
Wad melt the hardest whunstane," &c.—HOLY FAIR.

See also "Kirk's Alarm.") Mr James M'Kinlay, of Kilmarnock, (also more than once the subject of the Bard's satire), Dr. John Finlay of Paisley, and Dr. John Love of Andeston, Glasgow, were decided, and even alarming proclaimers of *endless* torments—involving, of course, the Manichean doctrine of *endless* sin. What I mean is, that Dr. Balfour's own constant, sweet, and spiritual theme, the love of God revealed and carried into effect through Christ Jesus, is the true basis, and involves the true ideal of scriptural Universalism.—By the way, the late Mr. French of East Kilbride, was the only one of Dr. B.'s assistants, who occasionally reminded me of his own style of preaching.

† There was one man, besides Balfour, to whose sermons heard from time to time, and to whose private instructions and most edifying conversations, my father considered himself much indebted,—a man, between whom and Balfour there subsisted an intimacy and strict friendship only terminated by the death of the former—I mean, John Snodgrass, D.D. minister of the Middle Church of Paisley, from 1781 till 1797. This able, distinguished and pious man was a near relation of my mother, and was the party employed to tie the nuptial knot between my father and her. Love to God, evinced by a most holy and self-denied life and conversation, characterised Dr. Snodgrass. His superior and highly-cultivated natural talents, combined with a most pleasing and impressive eloquence, occupy. in my view of things, but a very secondary place. His strictly evangelical views of the completeness of Christ's work, and his constant endeavour in preaching to present that work alone to the conscience as the sole foundation of peace and good hope towards God to a guilty creature, have endeared his character to me, and have rendered him, in my apprehension, a nt coadjutor to Balfour. By the latter, his funeral sermon was preached in July 1797, and his posthumous work on the Apocalypse edited.

‡ Probably, a little personal anecdote may serve to illustrate the great simplicity of his religious views, better than a long and laboured dissertation. Presenting myself to this powerfully-minded, but truly humble man, as a candidate for admission to the Lord's table, in 1813, something like the following conversation took place, with a near approach to the very words of which my memory supplies me.—"So, David, you propose taking your seat at the communion table. May I ask, what is your reason for doing so? What do you believe? What is your view of Christ, and the ground of your hope towards God?" With brevity, but with truth, I replied —"I believe that I am a sinful creature, and that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners—even the chief. I have nothing more to say. This truth satisfies me, and speaks peace to my guilty conscience." "Enough," said he. "It satisfies me too. I have no hesitation in admitting you. Upon application to ——— you will get your token." How simple, and yet how profound and glorious, were this man's views of Christianity.

At what time the truth of the glorious gospel first took hold of my father's mind, I cannot tell. From his own statement to me, I judge that he was made *a partaker of like precious faith* with the prophets and apostles, while yet comparatively young. He knew well the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly. The leading doctrines of evangelical religion had been early inculcated, and their native divine tendency had been enforced—if we can speak of any thing which is divine being enforced by what is human—by the eminently holy and exemplary life of his father. The gospel, as a manifestation of what God in Christ is, productive when carried home to the conscience by the Spirit of the earnest of new and heavenly principle, and not as a law of prohibitions or commands imposed on man, had been clearly and scripturally set before him. Good works springing necessarily and yet spontaneously from faith as their only root, and not what are popularly denominated good works made to be the basis of hope towards God, he may be said, in so far as the hearing of the truth was concerned, to have been familiar with. The good and heavenly seed thus sown, God. in Mr. Thom's case, in His appointed time, seems to have blessed. It entered into him—it took up its abode in him—it became in him the earnest of heavenly principle; and, throughout his comparatively brief but active, useful, and honourable life, it manifested its existence and influence by the heavenly fruits of which it was productive. Matt. xiii. 23. The divine word, through faith in its declarations, led to results corresponding to itself. Rom. vi. 16—18.

Until the time of his death, my father continued externally a member of the Established Church of Scotland. There was however a period of which I am immediately to speak, when he had very nearly quitted it. And from what I know of his decided although cautious character, had his life been prolonged for a year or two, I have a strong conviction that, at a still later period, he would have seen to be his duty, no less than privilege, to come out as a marked and zealous, but unobtrusive supporter of the doctrine of Universal Salvation, on evangelical principles. Respecting this, more afterwards.

About the year 1797, the Messrs. Haldane* commenced their crusade, upon what are now termed Independent or Congregationalist principles, against that deadness in religion, and hatred of evangelical truth, combined with growing laxity of morals, which had for many years prevailed in the Established Church of Scotland.† Mr. Thom had long seen and felt that in the Scottish Establishment, indeed that in all Establishments of religion, there was something vitally and essentially wrong. This conviction, rather than any particular love of novelty, led to his frequenting the *Tabernacle*, in Jamaica Street, Glasgow, and there listening to impressive discourses delivered by the Messrs. Haldane, Greville Ewing,‡ William Innes,§ and others.||

* Robert Haldane, Esq. of Airthrey, afterwards of Auchingray, and James Alexander Haldane Esq. his brother, commonly known as Capt. Haldane, from having once commanded a ship in the East India Company's service. The former, author of many valuable publications, died several years ago. The latter, who was also an author, finished his mortal career, at an advanced age, only within the last few weeks. Both gentlemen I knew and sincerely respected.—It may be worth while mentioning, that under Mr. R. Haldane, about fifty years since, while he was engaged in training young men for the ministry, was brought up Mr. Walter Balfour, now of Charlestown, Boston, U.S. a man who is, perhaps, the most distinguished writer in support of Universal Salvation, on the other side of the Atlantic.

† Attempted to be brought to a head by William McGill, D.D. of Ayr, (a very different man from Stevenson McGill, D D. Professor of Divinity in the College of Glasgow), in a work of his published in 1786, to which reference has been made in a preceding note. Dr. McGill's book, to publish which he was urged and importuned by a host of well-known characters who strove to keep in the background, was a bold experiment as to whether or not it might be possible openly to Socinianize the church and people of Scotland.

‡ Afterwards Dr. Ewing, and distinguished as the author of a Greek Grammar, and other productions, indicating great attainments in philology. He was assistant minister of Lady Glenorchy's chapel, Edinburgh, at the time of the Independent outburst. He presided for a long period, first, over the church assembling for worship in the Tabernacle, Jamaica Street, and then over the same body on its removal to Nile Street, Glasgow. I had a slight personal acquaintance with the Doctor.

§ Originally one of the ministers of Stirling. He demitted this charge, in 1798. At a very advanced age, he still continues to officiate to an attached congregation in Edinburgh. A short time ago, the degree of D.D was conferred on him by an American College,

|| The enterprise of the Haldanes, and its success, threw the Moderate Party of the Church of

Pleased with their zeal, recognizing much valuable truth in what they delivered, and satisfied that they were doing much good, he at one time entertained serious thoughts of joining their body. But his ardour in behalf of Independency, or rather of the Independent preachers, was but of short duration. He soon returned to his first love. Independency he might think, and I am almost certain did think, was theoretically considered more consonant with Christian principle and Apostolic practice, than are Established Churches, which are necessarily attempts to secularize a kingdom, emphatically pronounced by its founder and head, not to be of this world.* But secular, after all, he suspected even Independent associations in many respects to be. And the preaching of none of their ministers, indeed, of none of the numerous sectarians whom from time to time he heard, did he find was in point of Apostolic and scriptural simplicity, once to be compared with that of Dr. Balfour.† They, to a certain degree, were always in one way or another *conditionalizing* that gospel which is God's proclamation of mercy *unconditionally* bestowed.‡ Unable to understand faith as simply a passive conviction of the truth of the divine testimony, wrought by God himself through his becoming the witness to his own word in the conscience, and as, although productive of acts of faith, yet not itself an act but a principle of the mind—without any realization in themselves of *the Spirit bearing witness with their spirits*, by means merely of the divine manifestation to them of the truth concerning Christ Jesus—and confounding incessantly God's threatened judgments on *a world that lieth in wickedness*, with his fatherly warnings to the members of his church —Mr. Thom discovered in the Independent system of preaching too much of slavish terror: too much of the *fear which gendereth to bondage*, and too little of the operation of that love *which purifieth the heart* by *casting out fear*. I John iv. 18.§ He was far, however, from either thinking or speaking harshly of the men. He considered them in many cases more mistaken in their modes of expression, than in their real sentiments. He wished them, therefore, *God speed*, in as far as they preached Christ; and in many respects he admired them, particularly for their honesty and devotedness to the cause in which they were embarked, and for that unwordliness of character by which many of them were distinguished. It was to their style of preaching, and manner

---

Scotland into a perfect ecstasy of rage. At the meeting of the General Assembly, May 1798, their fury scarcely knew any bounds. Besides many violent measures which they proposed and carried, their friend, Hugh Blair, D.D. the celebrated author of the "Sermons," then 80 years of age, was employed by them to draw up a pastoral letter addressed to the church and people of Scotland, which having been adopted by the Assembly, will be found among the printed acts of that year. Blair's (I beg pardon, the Assembly's) pastoral, is, like all his productions cold, correct, formal, and cumbrous, justifying Burns' severe remark, that "Blair was the sublime of mediocrity." Largely, as is the custom of the author, is it interlarded with quotations from Scripture, the application of which forcibly reminds one of a similar use of them made in the Bulls and Rescripts of Popes, and the Decrees of Romish Councils.—By the bye, the letter had a very injurious effect, as regards the intention of its author and promoters. It was appointed to be read on a particular Lord's Day, specified in the Act of Assembly, immediately after the forenoon service. It was so. The result was appalling. Thousands, who might never have cared about the matter, had their curiosity whetted by the denunciations of the "Pastoral," and went to hear the Independent preachers. Of these, many became Independents themselves. I shall never forget the words of one of them, Mr. Charles Gray, who had been a pupil of Mr. Haldane's, and was for many years afterwards an able preacher, first Independent and then Baptist, in his connexion:—"Sir, in the forenoon, I heard the Pastoral read from the pulpit of South Leith church. Up to that time I had never thought of going to listen to the Independent ministers. But my curiosity was inflamed. That afternoon I attended at the Tabernacle, Leith Walk, and heard Mr. Haldane preach. In a few weeks I left the Church of Scotland." So much for human wisdom, when contrary to the dictates of human prudence, it allows itself to be carried away by impulse, often overreaching itself. Does not the recent "Papal Aggression," under Wiseman's guidance, afford a specimen of this? I believe that, when too late, the moderate party of the Kirk deeply regretted their having sanctioned that Pastoral letter of Blair.

* John xviii. 36.

† May I be permitted to his, to add my own testimony to the same effect?

‡ Bestowed through the fulfilment and exhaustion of all *conditions* of life-everlasting—especially the destruction of sin and destruction of death—by God's own well-beloved Son, in his own death and resurrection from the dead. Rom. x. 4, Phil. ii. 8, 9, &c. &c.

§ The workings of the *priestly* spirit, too, however unconsciously on their part, it was impossible in their pulpit addresses not to observe.

of inculcating what they considered the gospel, that, as just stated, he objected. He never could see that threatenings to unregenerate men, or inducements to them to put forth efforts in order to come to Christ and believe on him, were agreeable to the revealed will of God. God's inspired ambassadors might command men to believe under a system of prohibitions and commands, Acts iii. 19, Ibid. xvi. 31; and might denounce threatenings against those by whom the command was not obeyed. Acts xiii. 40, 41. Under such a system the Apostles could speak of *the obedience*, ὑπακοη, *of faith;* Rom. i. 5, xvi. 26, 1 Peter i. 2. But uninspired men are not God's ambassadors;* and authority to issue commands to believe to his fellow men, and to threaten them with God's wrath in the event of their discrediting the heavenly testimony, is not now possessed by any human being. Gospel now is simply God's glad tidings of salvation and eternal life to the guilty through Christ Jesus, as recorded in the New Testament Scriptures. Preaching of the gospel is now at the utmost pointing to what God in these Scriptures hath declared. No authority whatever does the truth of God derive from the human instrument who proclaims it † This being the case, the simple proclamation of the love of God in Christ Jesus, and the simple statement of the effects of that love, when carried home to the conscience by the Holy Ghost, in producing a life and conversation becoming it, on the part of Dr. Balfour, my father saw to be more scriptural, and felt to be more powerfully edifying, than absurd, not to say blasphemous offers of Christ by uninspired men to their fellow sinners,—than the most powerful and searching appeals to the mere fleshly conscience, the most severe and well-deserved exposure and castigation of human vices, and the most awful denunciations from mere human lips of God's judgments against transgressors.‡

The truth is, Mr. Thom, years before the Independent explosion, had had his views of the nature and simplicity of divine truth much cleared up and expanded, by a study of the works of Glas and Sandeman, by occasionally listening to the late able and benevolent David Dale,§ one of the pastors of a congregation of old Scottish Independents in Glasgow, and above all by perusing the writings of, and by personal intercourse with that excellent, heavenly-minded, and most talented man, John Barclay, of Edinburgh. Barclay who had been assistant for nine or ten years‖ to Mr. Dow, minister of Fettercairn, Forfarshire, was virtually¶ turned out of the Church of Scotland, not for immorality or misconduct of any kind—for he was a man of remarkably pure and blameless life—but for zealously and efficiently preaching, among other cognate and glorious doctrines of scripture, that of *the Assurance of Faith.*** Of this step, taken by the ruling authority of the Established Church of Scotland, the foundation of the Sect of the Bereans or Scripture-searchers, still existing, was the

---

* God's only ambassadors were the apostles; 2 Cor. v. 20; who although dead yet, like Abel, speak by their writings. See Heb. xi. 4.

† Although even inspired men had, properly speaking, no authority of their own, Acts iii. 16, iv. 8—12, 1 Cor. iii. 5—7, yet the miracles which they were enabled to perform gave, as they were intended to give, weight and authority to their divine message. Heb. ii. 1—4, &c.

‡ Sometimes, it is true, overruled by God himself, in spite of human blundering, to be means of enlightening and converting. No authority or allowance, however, does this afford for our *doing evil, that good may come.*—I may here mention, that often have I been taken by my father to hear Dr. Ewing, Dr. Wardlaw, and other leading Independent ministers. He retained a great respect for them and their labours, to the last.

§ Father-in-law of Robert Owen.

‖ From 1763 till 1772, or 1773.

¶ By a refusal of the Presbytery of Fadoun, confirmed by a decision of the General Assembly, 1773, to grant him his presbyterial certificate. See Minor Acts of the Assembly, 1773.

** While at Fattercairn, in 1766, Mr. Barclay had published his "Rejoice Evermore," a volume of Hymns and Spiritual Songs, which in point of scriptural truth, depth of heavenly experience, and divine power, have never been surpassed by any set of poetical compositions on the subject of religion, from an uninspired pen. In thus expressing myself, I speak advisedly. To be sure, I cannot compromise any trifling literary reputation which I may possess, by representing the poems (!) as exhibiting taste or refinement. Alas! they are often miserable doggrel, and abound with expressions coarse, harsh, and repulsive. Not that these are invariably their characteristics. And not that their author, had he chosen, might not have written better. Genius of a superior order he had, and from time to time evinces; as well as great mental power. Sweetness and pathos, too, not unfrequently obtrude themselves on our notice. But

immediate result.* Owing to the circumstance of Mr. Barclay having often preached with great acceptance in Glasgow, by many pious persons residing there he was known and esteemed. By none more so, than by Mr. and Mrs. Falconer, the father and mother-in-law of Mr. Thom. The sect of the Bereans, it is true, they never joined.† But Mr. Barclay's private society they loved, courted, and profited by; to him, their hospitality was always and liberally extended; he was listened to by them, whenever he spoke publicly in Glasgow; and his writings they carefully studied, comparing them at every step with the scriptures of truth. There was a charm at once of erratic human genius, and heavenly mindedness—some would have deemed it enthusiasm, and some even would have applied to it the term *monomania*—and there was a genuine simplicity and godly sincerity about all Barclay said and did, that perfectly enraptured as well as edified those, to whom the pure word of God and the glorious gospel of Christ Jesus were dear. He was, indeed, emphatically *a man of God.* To Mr. Barclay, John Thom was introduced. A strong mutual attachment soon sprang up between them. Barclay's manner was impetuous, his declamation violent, his temper irascible, and he is said to have been occasionally forgetful of some of the understood decorums of the ministerial office:‡ but in spite of all his defects my father positively loved him. He saw in him, not merely what Thomas Carlyle would call "a genuine man," but a first-rate disciple of the Lord Jesus. This eminent and godly individual, he saw, had no affectation. No disposition to sacrifice to human conventionalisms, what he deemed to be the truth of God. No low, no covetous, no ambitious projects. To be a mere hanger-on at the feasts and *re-unions* of the wealthy—to cultivate that mere outward politeness which, however pleasing and indeed desirable, is but too often the cloak of utter heartlessness and selfishness, at all events is but too often connected with total self-ignorance—and to make a parade of his religion, in order to attract notice and procure worldly advantages—he saw that Barclay abhorred. Courteous, I have been informed,

---

Barclay, in general, has sacrificed manner to matter. And so disfigured are his Hymns by violations of taste (to a certain degree he tried to correct this in his edition of 1776), that one almost wonders how any person of cultivated intellect could ever be persuaded to go through them. If such an one do so, however, and if a lover of the Lord Jesus, he will find himself amply rewarded for his pains. Rich and scriptural statements of divine topics, and a true spontaneous profound outpouring of heavenly-mindedness, such as in no body of hymns of mere human origin he can meet with—not certainly in those of the Wesleys—will he find crossing his path at every step.—This work, so remarkable for its surpassing scriptural piety, was the first of his productions which drew down on Mr. Barclay the vengeance of the Church of Scotland. For having published it he was brought to the bar of the Presbytery of Fordoun. When called on to make his defence he did so with consummate dignity, ease, and self-possession. Every statement in the Hymns which had been impugned he shewed to be agreeable, not only to the Scriptures, but even to the Standards of the Scottish Church. The Presbytery was counfounded. One of its members afterwards confessed, "We felt like little children in his hands. Instead of our judging him, we felt that he was judging us." The same gentleman, up till that time opposed to Mr. Barclay and his views, was given to see with him; and soon afterwards to the astonishment and consternation of his co-presbyters began to preach, and till his death continued to preach that very doctrine of the *Assurance of faith* which, as an ecclesiastical judge, he along with them had sat down, in the person of Mr. Barclay, to condemn.--I may just add, that the Presbytery of Fordoun on the occasion alluded to, finding nothing in Mr. Barclay's work or defence on which they could take hold, were content, after a suitable admonition, to dismiss him from their bar.—The whole forcibly reminding one of Acts iv. 5—22.—The anecdote just given of the feelings and conversion of the clergyman, I had from one who had it from the reverend gentleman himself.

* Mr. Barclay, who had been previously licensed to preach the gospel as a probationer, by the Presbytery of Auchterarder, September 27th, 1759, was ordained as a minister by the Class or Presbytery of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, at that place, October 12, 1773. Both the extract of his license, and the original of his Act of Ordination, I happen to possess. To the latter, among other autographs, (five names in all), there is attached the signature of the able and well-known James Murray, of Newcastle, author of "Sermons to Doctors of Divinity," "Sermons to Asses," "History of the American War," &c. &c.

† Their reasons for this I know; but it is unnecessary to mention them.

‡ It has been alleged, for instance, that when addressing a congregation, under the influence of that strong excitement and obliviousness, which are so apt to be produced by absorption in a favourite and interesting subject, he has been known to take off his wig, and drink water from the basin used in the sprinkling of infants. I doubt the truth of these stories. None of them have come to me properly authenticated. No one who knew him, it is true, ever disputed his warm and impetuous temperament. But in spite of this, he was a man of sense and a gentleman.—See the very well written account of him which appears in a work in 4 vols. 8vo. containing biographies of "Eminent Scotchmen," published by Blaikie, several years ago.

Barclay was—gentlemanlike and dignified even in his deportment, when circumstances seemed to require it; but not exactly polished. He had too much *brusquerie* of manner, to suit the taste of mere men of the world. He was too much *in earnest* for them. Impetuosity was in him the parent of many faults. Under its influence, he was frequently speaking and acting harshly. He was apt sometimes to forget, that in the Lord's house and *family* there are *little children* and *young men*, no less than *fathers* John ii. 12—14—"dwarfs as well as giants" as the amiable, eloquent, and accomplished Augustus Toplady once told him, in the course of a very friendly and animated conversation which these two eminently Christian men had together, a short time before Mr. Toplady's death.* But in principle Mr. Barclay was right. "It is from faith alone" he argued, "that the effects of faith can flow. It is from faith, directed by God himself towards its divine object, Heb. xii. 2. that both the knowledge of that object, and of its own existence can flow: Heb. xi. 1, &c, 1 John v. 20: it being essential to light to manifest itself, in the very fact of its manifesting other things. Eph. v. 13. And, therefore, not as in darkness, but as in the light and as knowing ourselves to be in the light, are we enabled to *walk as children of the light and of the day, and not as do others.* 1 Thess. v. 5, 6. Eph. v. 8, &c." Such, in as condensed a form as I can present them, were some of Barclay's fundamental positions and reasonings. Who, taking scripture simply for his guide, and influenced however slightly by heavenly principle, can controvert them? See Rom. viii. 14—16. x. 4. xiii. 13. Col. ii. 6, &c. Heavenly in itself, the results of the doctrine corresponded in Barclay himself to its nature. Notwithstanding great infirmity of temper, breaking out but too frequently into the language of violence, he exhibited, in consequence of this operation of divine truth upon his mind, much true humility, and lived much above the world by which he was surrounded.† And living in the Lord, he died in the Lord.‡ By means of the writings and converse of this able and pious man, if John Thom was enabled to find out numerous defects in those wondrous human compositions, the "Westminster Confession of faith, and Catechisms Larger and Shorter," as well as became satisfied that Presbyterianism was not exactly of divine origin,

---

* Old Mr. Rowe, who was for a very long period of time Editor of the "Gospel Magazine"—for above half a century, if I mistake not—and who died about eleven or twelve years since, is my authority for this fact. He was present, it seems, when the interview between Toplady and Barclay took place. He describes it as having occurred in the vestry of Orange Street Chapel, London, after a discourse by the former gentleman, of a most powerful and interesting description, in the delivery of which he was listened to, among others, by Dr. Kenrick, Sir Joshua Reynolds, David Garrick, Dr. Gifford, of the British Museum, the Countess of Huntingdon, Lady Ann Erskine, the Hon. Mr. Erskine, the Earl of Dartmouth, John Ryland of Northampton, &c. &c. the text having been these words of the 6th of Genesis, "*The Lord shut him*" Noah "*in*." Death then, 1778, was, Mr. Rowe observes, "making swift inroads on Mr. Toplady's constitution." Although in a state of great exhaustion, the conversation with Mr. Barclay he sustained for about half-an-hour. The details of this affair—somewhat coloured, probably, in Mr. Toplady's favour,—will be found in the "Gospel Magazine," for Nov. 1833, at the end of Mr. Rowe's second notice of my "Assurance of Faith."

† The following anecdote of Mr. Barclay, related to me by my father, may serve to convey some idea, not only of his violence of temper and impetuosity of manner, but also of his self-knowledge, true humility, and decided Christian principle. After a Lord's day forenoon discourse in Glasgow, in which he had delivered many most precious scriptural truths, in a strain of even unusual violence, he had repaired to the house of Mr. Falconer to spend the interval of public worship, and enjoy his hospitality. He seemed to be very uneasy. Unable to retain his seat, he rose and paced the room for a good while, absorbed in thought. Tears were observed to be trickling down his cheeks. At last, coming up to my father and addressing him, he said, "Mr Thom, I have been exhibiting to an awful extent my own accursed spirit to day."—"I think you have, Mr. Barclay," was kindly, but at the same time with his charactertstic honesty my father's reply. "I know I have. I am deeply ashamed of it. But O the preciousness—the felt preciousness of the blood of Christ. Here, here, is my hope." And then, after a brief pause, and with peculiar emphasis, he added: "I know, that for Christ's sake, it is forgiven."

‡ His death took place at Edinburgh very suddenly, on Sunday, the 29th day of July, 1798. In the month of June preceding, when taking leave of my mother, he said—"I have a strong and singular presentiment that I am never to see you again. I cannot account for it, but it is impressed on my mind with peculiar force, that my time on earth is destined to be very short. I feel that I shall soon be at home. No matter. The union of the saints to Christ Jesus, and in him to one another, is imperishable and everlasting. We shall meet again at the right hand of the throne."

he was also preserved from supposing that "all is gold that glitters" amidst the regions of dissent.* He always attended and profited by Mr. Barclay's public instructions, on occasion of his periodical visits to Glasgow. He shewed him affectionate attentions, and extended to him his open-hearted hospitality. He loved him as a Christian father and brother, and testified this on various occasions, and in various ways. Profiting, besides, by his hints, and enabled to see by means of them many of the evils inherent in Congregationalism, my father still clung to the Established Church of Scotland. Rather, for the pure and scriptural preaching and most edifying example, of Dr. Balfour, he found it impossible in Glasgow to substitute any thing better. As in the person of the Doctor he had discovered a man to whom, although in a connexion decidedly objectionable on strong scriptural grounds, Christ was dear, and by whose powerful and spiritual ministry his mind was enlarged and refreshed, he could not be prevailed on to abandon him. Certain he felt, that by going elsewhere he should have fared worse.†

Externally, therefore, as already said, in the Communion of the Established Church of Scotland, or, rather, in communion with Dr. Balfour, and his well-taught, scripturally-living, and pious congregation—alas! how painful to think of exceptions and of instances of conduct on the part of some, sadly inconsistent with their Christian profession—Mr. Thom lived and died.‡

I now approach to the most important and interesting crisis of my father's religious life, and that for the sake of which this memoir has been submitted to the readers of the periodical in which it makes its appearance.

Little was my honoured parent aware, until not a very great number of years before his decease, that the leading principles of Dr. Balfour, and Mr. Barclay, were essentially Universalist.§ And just as ignorant, probably, of the fundamental nature and tendency of the doctrines which they proclaimed and insisted on, were those eminent men themselves. To one of them at least, if not to both, (I speak thus cautiously, on account of what has been communicated to me, within the last 14 or 15 months, regarding one of them, on most respectable authority,) to have propounded the truth of God's universal love in Christ Jesus, would have been to excite towards him who had the hardihood to do so, feelings of the liveliest indignation and abhorence. And as Universal Salvation is commonly held and proclaimed, no wonder. Popularly and fleshlily understood, it is not a doctrine *according to Godliness.* When it is made to rest on the footing of claims which the creature has on the Creator—when it implies perpetuation of creature nature, and reward of human merit—when the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and the new creating efficacy of his resurrection are set at defiance—when regeneration is scoffed at—and when the sovereignty of God, manifested in the election of grace and reign of the saints with Christ in glory, is treated as a fable—nothing to a mind

---

* He died without discovering, although for many years he seems to have been almost on the very verge of discovering that there have existed no *external churches* of Christ (there is one *internal church* of Christ), since the days of the Apostles.

† With Mr. James Donaldson, Mr. Barclay's successor in Edinburgh, John Thom was well acquainted. Mr. Donaldson, although destitute of Barclay's education and genius, was a strong-minded and powerfully-thinking man. Perhaps, in point of mere *mental capacity*, equal if not superior to his predecessor. He had been one of Barclay's converts, in the city of London. I may here add to the list of my father's religious acquaintances, the celebrated Baptist pastor and writer, Archibald M'Lean, author of "Christ's Commission to his Apostles," &c. whom he was in the habit of meeting at the house of his friend, Mr. Andrew Duncan, printer to the University of Glasgow.

‡ My father made no secret of his objections to the Presbyterian worship and discipline, as well as to many parts of the doctrine propounded in the "Westminster Confession of Faith." This never interfered with his recognition as a member of the Church, by pastor and people. However, it operated as an effectaal bar to his admission to the Eldership. Often was he told—"Mr. Thom, considering your character, well-known piety, and standing in society, but for your peculiar religious sentiments, we should long since have urged you to become a member of the Kirk-Session."

§ The gospel of the manifestation of the love of God to sinners through Christ Jesus, as preached by the former, and the fact that the same word of God which charges us with guilt through our oneness with Adam, discharges us from guilt, and speaks peace to our consciences, through our oneness with Christ Jesus, as insisted on by the latter.

taught by the scriptures can be conceived more offensive and nauseating, than a system of religion involving such sentiments. Only, indeed, when the doctrine of *Divine Inversion* comes to be understood as an essential principle of revelation, can one who has been taught from above God's distinguishing love to his church, be brought to acquiesce heartily and thoroughly in God's general love to all.

Mr. Thom was a Berean, or scripture-searcher, indeed. Acts xvii. 11, 12. And as such he never, in point of religious knowledge and love, could suppose himself to *have already attained*, or *to be already perfect*. Phil. iii. 12. Not from love of novelty, but from love borne towards God's revealed testimony, and from a deep and abiding consciousness of his own comparative ignorance of its meaning, he was desirous to know more and more of the mind of his Heavenly Father, by repairing continually to the only source from which information regarding it could legitimately be sought and procured. Hence, *forgetting the things which were behind*, it was characteristic of him to be *reaching forth unto those things which were before*. Phil. iii. 13. Man speaking to him on the subject of religion, he willingly, courteously, and gratefully listened to. But man's statements on the subject, he was careful to bring uniformly to the test and standard of God's infallible word.

Accordingly he made progress. Instead of pacing that same dull round of doctrines humanly conceived and humanly propounded which so painfully distinguishes the great majority of professors of religion, he was *growing in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, and thereby *in grace* also. 2 Peter iii. 18. Without abandoning a single divine truth already known and rejoiced in, but on the contrary seeing previously apprehended scriptural doctrines in more of their lustre, attractiveness, and heavenly glory, he had from time to time new truths of God's word opened up to him. Rather, by divine teaching, into the meaning of truths recorded and contained in the lively and unerring Oracles, he was enabled more and more to enter. To his astonishment, he found them asserting and proclaiming more than not only the world, but even believers of the truth in general are aware of. Christians trying to confine God's testimony within the bounds of their own human creeds, articles and confessions, whether written or oral, and thus virtually whatever they may profess *limiting the Holy One of Israel*, were he observed seriously injuring themselves, by defrauding their own spirits of much divine instruction and nutriment. Not that he confounded the pretended discoveries of human reason with the teachings of God's Holy Spirit. And not that he conceived human beings capable of teaching themselves divine things, or any more capable of making advances in heavenly light by their own efforts, than they were capable of imparting to themselves the faintest glimpse of it at first. Every view which implied power on the part of the creature spiritually to enlighten himself he abhorred and resisted. To carry on, as to begin, the work of illumination, he regarded as God's sole prerogative. John vi. 45. 2 Cor. iv. 6. James i. 17. Negatively, however, when left to themselves, and to human teaching in religion, men he saw not only made no progress, but tended to retrograde. Rom. i. 18, *to the end*. Enlarged in spiritual-mindedness himself, he began to apprehend more and more the meaning of Matt. xiii. 52. And yet, this state of mind tended but to beget in him increasing attention to the precept, *Take heed what you hear*. Mark iv. 24.

Thus disposed and prepared, I remember well the circumstance of one of my father's customers putting into his hands a work by William Vidler, on *Universal Restoration*, with a request that he would read it. The event took place about 1808.

My father read the book. So also did I. Into my mind, it introduced a feeling of disgust. This I mentioned. Mr. Thom, with his usual caution and reflection, told me that he intended taking its statements into consideration, and comparing them with the Scriptures. Many of Vidler's sentiments were, he remarked, clearly opposed to the revealed testimony of God. His attacks on

the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the manner in which he put aside the efficacy of his atoning sacrifice, shewed a mind far from being taught, and far from being under the influence of *the truth as it is in Jesus.* "Nevertheless, inconsistent with scripture, at first sight, I do not find to be every thing that he says. In his book I have met with some statements and reasonings, professedly founded on God's word, which, with my present amount of divine knowledge, I cannot gainsay. These, I must take time to examine into."

About two years after this elapsed. During that time, we had little or no conversation on the subject. Strong reason, however, have I to believe that in the interval, the topic brought under his notice by Vidler constituted the theme of much and prayerful consideration; and that he was frequently and solemnly engaged *in searching the scriptures, whether these things were so.* Acts xvii. 11.*

Few were the works by professed Universalists which he read. Elhanan Winchester's "Dialogues on Universal Restoration," and some of Mr. Douglas' Treatises, were the only human productions in favour of the universality of God's love, that, subsequently to his perusal of Vidler's, he could be induced to pay attention to. These he strictly scrutinized, bringing them to the light, and subjecting them to the authority of the scriptures. Indeed, he was far more solicitous to know what was God's mind, than what was man's mind on the subject.

The first time that I can recollect having seen that excellent, devoted, and most truly pious man, Neil Douglas, the great Scottish preacher of Universal Salvation upon evangelical principles for above twenty years,—was about 1810. It was in my father's company. Why they had met together I cannot tell. Some domestic trials had occurred to Mr. Douglas, if I mistake not. He appeared to be asking my father's assistance, and taking his advice in some matter or another. Promptly and affectionately was my father prepared to assist any one; besides, independently of religion, I am sure that there were few to counsel and aid whom he would be more ready, than a gentleman for whom he cherished so high an esteem as the preacher of Universal Restoration. What my father could, I am sure he did. Moreover, little doubt now have I, hat whatever assistance my father might be giving to Mr. Douglas temporally, he was receiving a rich return for it in spiritual converse and in scriptural instructions emanating from that worthy man's lips.

Cautious in receiving views as divine, and weighing carefully all he heard *in the balance of the sanctuary*, my father, not altogether satisfied, for some years made no open profession of Universalism. He persevered in reading the Scriptures, and in prayerful reflection on their import: committing himself to the guidance of his Heavenly Father. The Unitarianism of many professed Universalists was, I have reason to know, long a stumbling block to him.†

---

* William Vidler was, during his stay in England, the friend and associate of Elhanan Winchester; and, on occasion of the sudden departure of the latter to America, in 1794, became his successor in his London charge. The views of this amiable man were originally what are commonly called Evangelical. But never having been *rooted* and *grounded in the faith*, soon after the beginning of the present century, he made a profession of Unitarianism.

† I was taken by my father to hear Mr. Richard Wright, the Unitarian Missionary, on occasion of his visit to Scotland in 1809. This was in consequence of a most respectable gentleman in Glasgow, an intimate friend of my father's, who was of decidedly Unitarian sentiments, having urged him to hear what could be said in favour of their views. Mr. Wright's bold, powerful, independent appearance and manner, I cannot forget. My father considered him a naturally honest man, although totally ignorant of the truth. Two discourses were sufficient for him.—Having perused carefully Mr. Wright's work, entitled, "A Review of his Missionary Life and Labours," London, D. Eaton, 1824, within the last two years, I cannot help bearing my testimony to the courage, zeal, devotedness, and honesty of the man. Few have ever laboured so hard, and with so great natural sincerity of purpose, to propagate error, as he did. He may almost be styled the Wesley of Unitarianism. With him, something like ardour and enthusiasm in behalf of the cause began to be exhibited, by him it was persevered in, and with him it expired. Into its native icy coldness—its depth of religious stagnation—it has, in Great Britain at least, since the cessation of his labours, relapsed. Could Wright's original Calvinism have had anything to do with his *positive* zeal in behalf of a system of *negations?* His remarks concerning Scotland and the Scotch (pp. 262—307), are curious and worth perusing. Is he not at pp, 267, 268, unintentionally making admissions which tell powerfully against a mere secular education, and powerfully in favour of that method of religious training, by which the Scottish mind has been formed,

Nothing but the express declarations of God's word, and the explanations of difficulties which the Scriptures themselves afford, combined with the comparatively scriptural theology and deep fervent piety of Mr. Douglas, could ever, I am satisfied, have overcome the prejudices, arising from a variety of causes, under which he long laboured against the doctrine of the fulness of God's everlasting love.

Occasionally, my father might have gone to hear Mr. Douglas at a previous period, but it was not until about 1812 or 1813, after partially recovering from his paralytic attack, that I began to discover a liking on his part to constitute one of that gentleman's auditory. Alas! his ability to attend at his, or any other place of worship, was, after this, but of short duration. His removal to the country and increasing debility, at last confined him almost entirely to the house. I should mention, that with the true Catholic spirit which increasing knowledge of the truth produced, there was scarcely any evangelical sect in Glasgow, no matter how poor, obscure, or despised, the meetings of which, for the sake of profiting by their knowledge of the Scriptures, my father did not, for the last seven or eight years of his life, from time to time attend.* This occurred, generally, when Dr. Balfour was from home. For his liking to the Doctor's pure statements of evangelical truths, did not extend exactly to the mixed and mutilated gospels of his ordinary assistants and substitutes. Great were the advantages which, especially in his last illness, he derived from this procedure. Many rich and precious views of divine truth, which otherwise might have remained unknown to him, he had to reflect on. And the Christian visits of many valuable men, whom otherwise he might have remained a stranger to, he enjoyed.

Amidst declining health, my father's spiritual-mindedness grew. *The outward man* might *perish*, but *the inward man was renewed day by day.* 2 Cor. iv. 16.

It was in 1813, the year before he died, that the doctrine of God's Universal love, on evangelical principles, seemed at last to approve itself thoroughly to my father's understanding. When satisfied of its truth, he unhesitatingly avowed it. This, by the way, at the time sadly annoyed me. I was then, and for many years afterwards continued to be a most determined opponent of this truly scriptural and spiritual doctrine.

To the last, although convinced of the unboundedness of God's love, and unhesitatingly declaring his conviction to this effect, I have reason to think that the subject of the present memoir was never completely satisfied as to the propriety and scriptural obligation of commonly and indiscriminately proclaiming it. He seems to have entertained doubts and scruples as to its licentious tendency, when taken up and misinterpreteded by the mere fleshly mind.† What might have been his views in this respect had he been spared a little longer, and had his acqaintance with the doctrine, his experience of its influence on himself, and his observation of its effects on society been enlarged, I am unable to say.

Death was all this while making his approaches towards my dear and

---

disciplined, and nurtured? Among Unitarians, above Richard Wright, in point of integrity, respect for the Scriptures, and high-toned moral character, (also vastly his superior in education, talents, and learning) I know only one individual, my friend, the Rev. Archibald Browning, of Tillicoultry, Clackmannanshire, Scotland. With the exception of this gentleman, the deaths of Cappe, of York, Lant Carpenter, of Bristol, and Richard and F. W. Wright, seems to have been the signal for an abandonment of even the semblance of a respect for the inspired Canon of Scripture on the part of the Unitarian body.

* To these I was often privileged to accompany him. Thus in early life I became acquainted with the views and modes of worship of Glassites or Sandemanians, Bereans, Scotch Baptists, (A. M'Lean's and D. M'Laren's parties), Scotch Independents, (D. Dale's) Walkerites or Separatists, and Universalists, as well as Roman Catholics, Seceders, Congregationalists, Quakers, &c. &c. Thus I had opportunities of hearing John Walker, of Dublin, Neil Douglas, Dr. Wardlaw, and many other celebrated men.

† In this, if the information which I have received be correct, he happens to have coincided with one of the eminent and excellent individuals to whom allusion has already been made. Indeed, with many, to whom abstractly speaking, the truth of universal salvation has, on scriptural principles, been satisfactorily evinced.

respected parent, with slow and stealthy but certain steps. Calmly and resignedly, however, and with sweet and heavenly feelings did he meet the foe. "The King of Terrors" was, as to him, disarmed of "his sting." Nay, he was prepared to welcome him as a friend in disguise. Overcome, destroyed, "swallowed up in victory," death was not only in fact, but in my father's conscience, likewise, through faith on his part in the cross, resurrection, and ascension of his Divine Lord.

Many Christian friends of different religious communions, from time to time, honoured him with their company and refreshing conversations on the things of Christ and of God.

The visits of his revered and beloved Pastor, Dr. Balfour, he always relished. That large-minded, large-hearted, and truly Christian man could bear to listen to my father's honest avowals, without betraying the petty, spiteful, and splenetic feelings which in the breasts of all the ordinary Clergy would have been excited, and would have rankled. Balfour knew well with whom in the person of Mr. Thom, he had to do. He knew him to be a man of deep scriptural knowledge, much enlarged and varied Christian experience, and eminently *spiritual.** While he acted sincerely, I know that, whatever his private sentiments might be, he acted likewise tenderly and affectionately towards my parent. Refreshing to himself, I have heard my father say, was their mutual intercourse.

Not less gratifying to my father, at this period of his life when the shadows of evening were falling thick and deep upon him, were the frequent, sympathizing and most edifying visits of Mr. Douglas. I almost fancy that I yet behold the mild, amiable, benevolent, venerable, and Christian countenance of that most apostolic and devoted man. How shrewd and intelligent, too, the expression of his features! Disliking his leading doctrine as I did at the time thoroughly and conscientiously, his kind attentions to my father were to me very annoying. Nevertheless, there was a something about the appearance of the man that always favourably impressed me, and awed me into respect. Modest in the extreme he was; and yet there was a firmness and a decision of character visible in his whole deportment, which it was impossible for me to overlook. I knew that he was a good man. His singleness of mind, I could not doubt; and the perfect simplicity and integrity of his conduct constituted the subject-matter of common observation. But how distressing to me to think, as I then did, that having erred from the faith himself, he was drawing my beloved parent along with him. No one can form any conception of the uneasiness and anxiety of mind, on my father's account, which at that period of my life I experienced. I could not but see that Mr. Thom's mind was relieved, and his comfort promoted by Mr. Douglas' visits. His love to the Lord Jesus—his delight in him, as his Lord and his God—and the spirituality of his mind, (using *spirituality* not in the German and Unitarian, but New Testament sense of the term, as synonymous with the heavenly and glorified mind of the Son of God, 1 Cor. xv. 45.) I could not but perceive were on the increase. Calmly, sweetly, resignedly was he awaiting his dissolution. *The swellings of Jordan* he was prepared to pass through, as one with him who had himself gone down into the dark *valley and shadow of death,* Psalm xxiii. 4, who had himself *come into the deep waters, where the floods had overflowed him,* Psalm lxix. 2, and who had himself thereby undergone the true baptism; Luke xii. 50, Mark x. 39, Rom. vi. 3, 4, Ephes. iv. 5; and as one with this same glorious being who had come up from the valley of humiliation, and sea of anguish and death, not only as triumphant over both, and as having rendered their temporary conquest of him subservient to his everlasting conquest of them, Psalm lxviii. 18, Col. ii. 13—15, Rom. v. 21, but as having actually swallowed up death, with all its effects and consequences, in himself the ocean of love and

* Not *spiritual* in the fudgy and unscriptural sense of the phrase, as commonly employed among Unitarians, where, as borrowed from the French *spirituel*, it seems to convey the notion of *highly intellectual;* but *spiritual* in the apostolic sense. See 1 Cor. iii. 1, and Gal. vi. 1; and then compare these passages with 1 Cor. xv. 45, and ii. 14—16.

life everlasting. Isaiah xxv. 8, Hosea xiii. 14, Micah vii. 19, 1 Cor. xv. 26, 54. His language, borne out by his evident experience, was that of the Apostle Gal. ii. 20. What real, undisguised, profound, spiritual, heavenly influences was I thus called on to witness the operation of on the mind of my dying parent! And how strong the impression made by them on my memory, after the lapse of from thirty to forty years! Such an observation of the power of true and heavenly religion, the Lord saw in my case to be requisite. Strong and decided, certainly, were then my antipathies to Universalist doctrine. (The Lord has forgiven me, for in ignorance they were cherished and exhibited. 1 Tim. i. 13.) What so likely to arrest attention and impress, as an exhibition of marked and superior godliness, on the part of one holding and avowing a doctrine so obnoxious to my views and feelings! At the time, however, irritation and increased dislike, not acquiescence, was the result. Still, I was preserved from worse acts of unkindness to my father and Mr. Douglas. How durst I interfere? How could I prevent my dear parent enjoying attentions which were to him evidently a source of so much edification and comfort? I did not, therefore indulge my enmity to Universalism, so far as to throw obstructions in the way of Mr. Douglas' visits. I now rejoice that I did not. I kept out of the way, to be sure, as much as possible. I studiously avoided being present at interviews between Mr. Thom and the preacher of Universal Restoration. In various other ways, I indicated my disapprobation of Mr. Douglas' doctrine. But his kind visits, I made no attempts to hinder. These he continued to the last. Blessed, blessed be God, that decided as was then my aversion to the idea of Christ's being the Saviour of all men, I was prevented from behaving in a rancorous and unchristian manner, towards its great professor and preacher, Mr. Douglas himself.*

But let me hasten to the closing scene of my parent's life, as well as to close this "Memoir" of one who, "though dead, yet speaketh" to me, and whose *walk and conversation*, under the influence of Christian principles, I wish to render a means of speaking to others.

Sunday the 16th day of October, 1814, I spent in a great measure at home in my father's company. A presentiment of his approaching dissolution I knew had for some days prior to this occupied my mother's mind, and an idea that his time on earth was not destined to be very long, was, I have strong reason to suspect, not altogether a stranger to his own. Nothing particular, to be sure, to the ordinary eye indicated the approach of any sudden change. He was not to appearance much worse than for some weeks, or months even, he had been; and his spirits, on the whole, were good, I might even say, cheerful. Arrangements had been made for our going on the following day to Edinburgh—by way of Falkirk, where, in order to break the journey and render the fatigues of travelling as little as possible, we were to have spent the first night,—for the purpose of consulting two of the most eminent Scotch physicians of that time on his case. The prospect of a little change of scene, and of a favourable report on the best medical authority, had evidently somewhat cheered and enlivened him. Still an air of peculiar solemnity seemed to all of us to hang over that Lord's day. We even then felt it to be oppressive. And now, looking back on it through the long vista of thirty-six or thirty-seven years, the sense of weight—the feeling of oppression—methinks yet remains. However, by me at least that Sunday was spent not unprofitably. Besides reading several chapters of the inspired volume, and receiving from my father many valuable and spiritual suggestions as to their meaning and bearings, I brought under his notice portions of two works, with the study of which I was then occupying myself. These were Hervey's "Dialogues of

* Those who would wish to form some idea of this excellent man, and his self-denying labours in behalf of the gospel of Christ, may consult the sermon preached on occasion of his demise, by Mr. William Worrall, his successor in Glasgow, January 19th, 1823. We hope to see ere long in the pages of this periodical a narrative of him, analysis of his writings, and view of his character, from the pen of a gentleman eminently qualified to do justice to his subject.

Theron and Aspasio," and Jonathan Edwards' Treatise on "Original Sin." * Clear and sound, do I remember, was my father's judgment that day. With that strong critical discrimination, which without any pretensions to superiority, and without having had any particular human tutoring in the matter he possessed, and which partly from nature and partly from divine teaching he had derived, he took the opportunity of conveying to me much wholesome instruction, as to the beauties and defects of both the authors mentioned. While expressing his high admiration of Hervey's genius, and approbation of the evangelical nature of his sentiments as a whole, he drew my attention to that *verbiage*,—that pomp and glitter of phraseology—that profusion of ornament—and those other meretricious graces, by which his style is disfigured; and found himself obliged to condemn that author's idea of saving faith involving in it necessarily an apppropriation of God, on the part of the creature: the fact being, as he observed, the very reverse. God through faith, or through the manifestation of himself by his word to our consciences, appropriating us, not we appropriating him. Hosea xi. 4, Rom. viii. 29, 30, 2 Tim. i. 9, 1 John iv. 19, &c.—Edwards as a man of the profoundest metaphysical subtilty, and capable of the most wonderful abstractions, he spoke highly of. His work on "the Freedom of the Will," (which I had not then seen,) he advised me to procure and read; observing that it wonld require all the attention, industry, and efforts of mind of which I was capable, thoroughly to understand and master it. While satisfied with the statements of Edwards, and of other evangelical divines as to our sin and death naturally in Adam, and of the necessity of regeneration, or of a new and spiritual birth from above, in order to our admission into the heavenly kingdom, he mentioned his aversion to many of his views, as betraying more of a human, ingenious and puritannical, than exactly scriptural origin. Above all, he censured him for, in common with his class, in his treatise on "Religious affections," and his other works, sending human beings inwardly to study their own mental phenomena and human experience, in order to try if possible to extract from them a ground of comfort and good hope towards God, as necessarily tending to withdraw their attention from the cross and resurrection of Christ Jesus, God's only means of speaking peace to the guilty conscience, and producing *the work of faith, labour of love*, and *patience of hope*. Briefly but very kindly, as knowing my then strong prejudices on the subject, he touched on the harsh and repulsive character of some parts of Edwards' theology; hinting at his complete inability to reconcile them with the inspired declarations of God's word, considered as a whole. Thus passed that Lord's day and evening. How valuable to me its instructions, and the spirit which they breathed! Actually, the savour of them is yet experienced by my mind.—My beloved parent having addressed a few simple, affectionate, and heavenly petitions at a throne of grace, we retired to rest. I then slept with him.

The following morning, Oct. 17, I rose early for the purpose of making some of the preparations necessary for our intended journey. Having asked him how he felt, and received his answer, "much as usual—I have slept well," I went down stairs. My absence could scarcely have exeeeded ten minutes. On my return, I found that my father had fallen down, in what turned out to be an apoplectic fit. He had risen from bed.—My cries brought assistance. Medical aid was despatched for, and as speedily as possible procured. Every proper and available remedy was had recourse to. But all in vain. Death was in the cup. By eleven o'clock, A.M. the spirit had returned to God who gave it.

Consciousness, from the first, seemed to be gone. So that his conversation with me, of the preceding day, was to me his dying testimony.

Such were the circumstances attending the death of one of the most Christianly thinking, and Christianly living men, whom it has been my lot in passing through life to know.

* In which there are masterly observations on John iii. 1—6.

Into competition with the Brainards, the Bernard Schwartzs, the Howards, the Henry Martyns, and the Wilberforces, whose names fill the ear, and whose merits have been sounded by the trump of fame, I have never dreamed for a single moment of bringing my beloved parent. Their sphere was a public one; my father's was comparatively private. Their influence not only upon their own age, but upon succeeding ones, has been felt and acknowledged; his influence was but local and temporary, and is now principally confined to one individual. But his name and character, nevertheless, deserved to be rescued from utter oblivion. Especially in the pages of a Universalist periodical. Against Universalism have been brought, by the Orthodox so called, the charges of its tending to licentiousness of principles and practice—of its involving those who maintain it in a Socinian denial of Christ's Deity and atoning sacrifice—and, at the very lowest, of its rendering the mind indifferent to the nature, magnitude, and evil of sin. Strange to tell, with the orthodox, in proferring a charge of immoral and irreligious tendency against the doctrine of the unboundedness of God's mercy, have often been found combined men professing religious sentiments the very opposite of theirs. To test the truth of a doctrine, alleged to be divine by its *supposed* tendency and fruits, is apt to lead to false conclusions, Rom. vi. 1, 2, and happens not to be always God's way of settling controversies. John ii. 13—17, Acts ix. 1—6, &c. Accordingly our production of *a thus saith the Lord* in favour of Universal Salvation, is the true, simple, and conclusive answer to all the calumnies, and misrepresentations of its antagonists. But how important, likewise, to be able to confront and confute them, by a reference to positive and undeniable facts! How important to be able to shew, that as God's love to the world through Christ Jesus is consonant with the volume of inspiration, John iii. 16, 17, so also with the effects of which, according to that volume, the belief of the truth is uniformly and necessarily productive! Now, in the case of my father, I find myself qualified to adduce a striking example of the heavenly nature and influence of scriptural views of that revealed truth, which *the orthodox* so hate and oppose. And in his case, I am competent to speak, not from hearsay, but as an eye and ear witness. What confessedly scriptural and spiritual view of Christian truth, and what point of Christian practice did he shew himself to be deficient in? He was a sinful creature; and he knew and acknowledged himself to be so on the authority of God's word tracing his sinfulness to Adam's one transgression, Rom. v. 12, and thereby throwing light on, and corroborating the suggestions of his own fleshly conscience. Rom. ii. 14, 15, iii. 19. No ground of hope towards God did he either seek for, or find in himself. It was in the cross of Christ, God's eternal Son, sacrificed for sin, that he was enabled to see, at once sin's enormity, and sin's forgiveness; to see that sin had thoroughly tainted, polluted, and pervaded humanity, and yet to see that sin was thoroughly purged away and destroyed. The manifestation to his conscience by the Holy Ghost, in the word, of sin through Christ's voluntary sacrifice having been atoned for, was what alone he found speaking peace to it. He knew himself to be a guilty creature, but he also knew himself in Christ to be the object of the divine mercy; and under the influence of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice applied to his mind by faith, he lived and acted. Humbled in self, he was lifted up only in Christ Jesus. All this was clearly evinced by his religious tastes. He bore no affection towards Socinian, Pelagian, Arminian, or fleshly Calvinistic doctrines. The simple gospel of God's mercy to sinners, through Christ's atoning sacrifice, as set forth by the evangelically-minded Balfour, was his incessant delight. And equally acceptable to him, was the same simple but certain and glorious gospel, when in somewhat varied phraseology, but on the same inspired authority, and as involving the same divine principles, it was propounded by the impetuous, but heavenly-minded Barclay, as God's appointed way of discharging from guilt, through faith in the revealed fact of their oneness with the Lord Jesus in his death and resurrection, those against whom a charge of guilt had previously been brought, through the revealed fact of their oneness

with Adam in his sin and death: as God's appointed way of *justifying*, by faith in its gracious and cheering message, *from all things, from which* none could *be justified by the law of Moses.* Acts xiii. 39. Catholic in spirit as he was; his ear was open to others besides Balfour and Barclay. He was ever, and delightedly ready to listen to any one, by whom consistently with scripture, it was proclaimed, that *the wages of sin is death, and that the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.* Rom. vi. 23. Faith in a salvation complete in Christ Jesus, and freely bestowed on the guilty through faith, these were from first to last the heavenly principles of my father's holiness of life and conversation. Thus taught by the Holy Spirit speaking in the scriptures, he was prepared to receive from the same divine source, still farther instruction and illumination. And these were not withheld. He discovered in the course of his perusal of the inspired testimony, that as *the living God is especially the Saviour of them that believe*, so is he also generally *the Saviour of all men.* 1 Tim. iv. 10. That to Jesus who died and is risen again, it has been destined and determined, *that every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* Phil. ii. 9—11, *compared with* Isaiah xlv. 22, 23, and Rev. v. 13. That *as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.* 1 Cor. xv. 22. And, by faith he had heard him that sat upon the throne, saying, *Behold I make all things new.* Rev. xxi. 5. Now what was my father that he should resist God? Humbled by the cross of Christ, and bowed down into sweet and voluntary subjection to divine authority by the manifestation of the truth to his mind, Ps. cx. 3, what right had he, (as is, alas! but too frequently done by *orthodox* professors,) to call God a liar in one part of his testimony whose evidence he had regarded and received as true in other parts of it? 1 John v. 9, 10. From such inconsistency of conduct—from such daring and blasphemous presumption—my honoured relative was preserved. Although for a while sorely puzzled and perplexed, and unable to reconcile apparently conflicting divine statements, it was felt by him to be enough, that God had condescended to make any assertion or declaration. Whatever he, found revealed, became to him as such matter of faith: reconcilable and consistent with other revealed facts, as having proceeded from the God of truth, he was certain it must be, and, if necessary to his spiritual well-being and edification, the requisite explanations he was satisfied, would not be withheld. In the mean time, in spite of every difficulty, a believer in the doctrine of Universal Salvation, simply because God had seen met to reveal it, he became. As an honest man, what he believed he professed. And his profession he adorned by *a walk and conversation becoming the gospel.* Evangelical truths previously believed in, so far from discarding, nay, so far from having his confidence in diminished, he now saw with still greater clearness of evidence and appreciated still more highly, by means of the additional divine light which he found the doctrine of God's Universal and unlimited salvation, to shed upon them. So far from such truths hanging more loosely about him, he found himself clinging to them with increased and determined pertinacity. His love to Jesus, as *his Lord, and his God*, John xx. 28, he found wondrously enlarged. The sovereign good pleasure of his heavenly Father, evinced in the election of grace,—in the predestinating, calling, justifying, and glorifying, of those whom he had fore-known—and in the bringing of those many sons and daughters to glory, through their being born from above here, and their being thoroughly conformed to God hereafter, he felt to be increasingly amiable. And that deep, unsearchable, and indescribable hatred of sin, which the cross of Christ displays as one of the grandest emanations and expressions of divine love, became to him more and more the subject-matter at once of meditation and glorying. Gal. vi. 14.* What was there in all this, Socinian or unevangelical? To his divine teach-

* When the life of excellent Neil Douglas comes to be published in this magazine, it will, if I am not greatly deceived, be found to present religious results, almost precisely identical with these which are disclosed in the biography of my dear parent. Would that we had the lives of James Relly and John Murray from some one competent to do justice to the evangelism of their sentiments!

ing, the divine effects exactly corresponded. Increased holiness and heavenliness of mind and conduct sprang evidently from his more enlarged views of heavenly truth. Cast by God himself, through increased manifestation to him, by the word, of the truth and import of his heavenly testimony, more and more into *the form* or *mould* of revealed *doctrine*, Rom. vi. 17, was it surprising if he came out of it, bearing more and more its stamp and impress? Surely, when we consider the aspersions which by ignorant and prejudiced men are flung so copiously on Universalist sentiments, and when we consider how few they are by whom these are evangelically held, it was not desirable, when the fitting opportunity offered, that the life and experience of such a man, as John Thom, however comparatively humble and obscure he might be, should be altogether thrown away. God's truth in its progress and influence, it serves remarkably to illustrate. Shewing an individual under the influence of the scriptures, and of the spirit of God speaking in those scriptures, led on to the discovery of God's love as universal, from previous discoveries of that love as partially manifested—shewing that superior views of the truth, in his case, so far from superseding and destroying, tended rather to throw light on, and thereby to confirm, whatever in inferior views was heavenly and divine—and shewing increased spirituality of conduct, to have resulted in him from the increased spiritualization of his mind by the communication of more enlarged and consistent views of the testimony of God—not only does the preceding attempt at a biographical sketch, tend to stop the mouths and silence the cavils of the spuriously orthodox, but it may also, if God see meet to bless it, be found to fling an additional barrier in the way of the spread of those Socinian and spuriously liberal notions of Universal Salvation, by which the United States of America are now overrun, which are so awfully rampant in Germany, and against which it has been the aim and desire of the conductors of this periodical to put Christian readers on their guard.

THE "PRIMITIVE CHURCH MAGAZINE" AND ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

In the "Primitive Church Magazine" for July, 1850, pp. 208, 209, there appears an article, headed, "Eternity of Future Punishment," to which is appended the name, "Dr. Jamieson." We presume that it is a quotation from some work or speech of the learned gentleman.

Concerning this quotation, or extract, we have no intention to speak at any great length. It exhibits some ability, especially of the *ad captandum* kind. As to its Christian principle, information, or honesty, perhaps the less said, the better. Advantage is taken of the common translation of such terms as ἀιων, and ἀιωνιος, to *speak great swelling words of vanity*, 2 Peter ii. 18, and try to impress weak and unstable minds. Complete ignorance of the merely *relative* nature and meaning of the phrases just referred to is evinced; as well as of the hint given by our blessed Lord, in his rebuke to the Sadducees, of the necessity of testing all views of God and divine things which are *relative*, by such as are *absolute:* Jehovah the *I am* or *everlasting one* manifested as God, and his divine, that is, everpresent and unchangeable nature, not a nature like that of man which implies succession and change, constituting the ultimate, indeed the only standard of truth. See Matt. xxii. 23—32, particularly 29—32. Insinuations, besides, are made by the Doctor which might, with little difficulty, be turned against himself. Human assumptions and reasonings are without hesitation employed, as if they were equivalent to express divine statements. In this painfully unchristian extract, the man who would sacrifice the *infinitude* of divine love—God is love, 1 John iv. 8, 16—to his own exaggerated and false, because unscriptural notions of the divine justice—the man who would impose bounds on the infinite goodness of God, by assuming to be God's counsellor, Rom. xi. 34, and to be able to shew what it is fit and unfit for

goodness to do, Matt. xx. 15—has actually the unblushing effrontery to charge evangelical believers in the entire satisfaction of divine justice by the cross of Christ, *the infinite one in flesh*, Matt. i. 23, 1 Tim. iii. 16, John i. 29, with an intention of "glorifying one [divine] perfection at the expense of another;" and of supposing, that "goodness is in some distant period to triumph over justice"! Where, ignorant and presumptuous man that thou art, would thy personal salvation have been, had not, in the cross of Christ, mercy to thee a guilty creature, been shewn to be strictly reconcileable and reconciled with the sternest demands of justice; or, to use the strong and expressive phraseology of the apostle James, had not there *mercy rejoiced* (marginal reading *gloried*) *against judgment?* James ii. 13. And darest thou say, presumptuous man, that that blood of Christ Jesus, God's eternal Son, which can satisfy justice, and reconcile it with the exercise of mercy in thine own case, is incapable of achieving the same results in the case of any other standing exactly on the same footing with thyself—thus venturing to deny the *infinite* efficacy of our Lord's atoning sacrifice? To thine inmost conscience, if thou knowest thyself to be a sinner saved by grace, do we make our appeal!—But why go through the tissue of misrepresentations, and displays of ignorance of God's word and gospel, with which the extract from Dr. Jamieson abounds? Only in the event of the Editor of the "Primitive Church Magazine" wishing it, and the columns of his periodical being thrown open to our strictures, are we prepared to analyze sentence by sentence, and then to consider as a whole, such a mass of prejudice, misconception, shallow views of the scriptural system of Christianity, human and inconclusive reasonings, and arrogant feeling, as the extract in question in almost every line of it betrays.

This extract or quotation having come under the notice of a respectable and pious Baptist—a gentleman who has never professed any sympathy with us in our Universalist views, indeed, a gentleman with whom we have scarcely any, if any personal acquaintance*—its gross ignorance not less astonished, than its total want of common fairness and candour shocked him. Influenced by that honest regard to truth, which is one of the most prominent characteristics of the indwelling and operation of Christian principle, he wrote a letter respecting Dr. Jamieson's article to the Editors of the "Primitive Church Magazine," which appears in the Number for January last, pp. 14, 15. Clear, comprehensive, pointed, sensible and scriptural, so far as it goes, is this communication. Well calculated, in our opinion, to induce any right-minded man, who may have fallen inadvertently into error, to pause and reflect. How admirable is, according to the revealed mind of God, the following passage:—"I will only *now* allude to one other objection of Dr. Jamieson's to this doctrine, which is, that it has a tendency to encourage men in sin. This being merely an opinion of his own, unsupported by any scripture or fact, I might content myself with expressing my own opinion to the contrary: but I will do more. I assert that

---

* We *may have* seen him, and we *may have* conversed with him—but at the present moment we have no recollection of either. This we are certain of, that were we to meet him on the street, we should not be able to recognize him.—His aged, venerable, consistent, respected, and pious father, we have long and intimately known. This gentleman was, during a great portion of his life, a most useful and we have reason to believe a most successful preacher in the Baptist Connexion. In advanced age, he is still a staunch and most devoted adherent to the cause. Notwithstanding the difference of doctrinal sentiments particularly as to Universal Salvation subsisting between himself and us, we have always cherished a more than ordinary regard for him. His pure, blameless, and holy life,—his meek resignation to the divine will—his love to the Scriptures—and the influence which his belief in their truth is exercising over him—have been too apparent to permit them to be overlooked. Frequently has he in public addressed friends of ours. Although unable in several respects to see with us, we in his leading doctrinal views see eye to eye with him. He loves the divine sovereignty—he holds the doctrine of the election of grace, and of God's everlasting and indefeasible design to bring all its members to glory—he has always proclaimed salvation through the cross of Christ alone—and he is clear and explicit as to the power of Christ's resurrection to *raise* from *death in trespasses and sins* to *newness of life*, those who are *heirs according to God's purpose*, and to whom it is given to believe on his name. Take along with this, our aged friend's illustration of the power of his doctrinal sentiments, by *a life and conversation becoming the gospel*. Such doctrines, and such a practical exemplification of their truth and influence, have always rendered this venerable man's ministrations most acceptable to us.

the fact of man sinning with a high hand and outstretched arm, in all ages, notwithstanding his professed belief in eternal torments, as the result, is a powerful argument against the Doctor's reasoning. Man, in his natural state, requires no *encouragement* to sin: it is his nature and inclination to sin, and he can do nothing else; and if he were not restrained by the unseen hand of God, and by the laws and customs of civil society, a more fearful hell than this world would be, could not be conceived of."*—The letter having been printed (Query —was it because it happened to be written by *a Baptist?*) is followed by a paragraph on the part of the Editors, breathing the language of *ostentatious candour.* "[We insert the foregoing, because we wish to afford 'a fair field and no favour.' Perhaps next month, our correspondents, or ourselves, may furnish some reply.—Eds.]"

Early in the month of February last, the January Number of the Primitive Church Magazine was sent to us. Up to the time of receiving it, we were *entirely ignorant* of any thing on the subject of "Eternal Punishment" having appeared in its columns. Indeed, we are not ashamed to say that, until then, we were ignorant of the existence of the periodical itself. "A Baptist's" letter we read with sincere pleasure and satisfaction. O how refreshing, (alas! how comparatively rare,) to witness exhibitions of the power of true Christian (always scriptural) principle! To witness *the truth* operating as a principle of *truth!* At the time, we knew nothing whatever of the authorship of the communication. The gentleman from whom it turns out to have proceeded, we never for a moment suspected. Two Liverpool Baptist friends of ours we thought of. But to neither of them did we put the question, as to his having written the letter. In utter ignorance of the source from which it had emanated, did we remain, until Lord's day, the 6th instant, (April,) when its author was made known to us by a Christian friend. We were, we confess, taken somewhat by surprise. And rather pleased, that we had addressed no interrogatories on the subject to any other party.

Attention to these dates and minute facts is necessary, in order to appreciate thoroughly our vindication of "a baptist" and ourselves from an imputation cast on us by the Editor.

In the April number of the Primitive Church Magazine, p. 131, the Editor in that Postscript to which we shall have occasion again to advert, says, "Nor can we conceive for what purpose our correspondent [A Baptist] has mixed up questions so distinct, except it be to bring the sentiments of the Universalists by a side-wind into our pages." And then, after an allusion to ourselves, "Now we are not aware that we hold any doctrine that we are not prepared at a suitable time, and in a suitable manner, [what time more suitable than the present?] to defend from the scriptures; *but we are not all disposed to be drawn into a discussion in this indirect, not to say clandestine manner.*"† [Grandiloquent enough; particularly considering that the discussion had been originally provoked by himself.] If the meaning, of the Editor be—and no other interpretation can be put upon his language, viewed in itself, and

* Precisely similar in substance, and not dissimilar in phraseology, was a remark which we once heard made by a very orthodox and pious clergyman of the Church of Scotland, who never was suspected, and who never could with any justice have been suspected of cherishing the slightest sympathy with Universalist doctrine. We allude to the late excellent George Wright, D.D., one of the ministers of Stirling. Conversing in our hearing with the late Colonel Callender, of Craigforth, one day in 1822, in reply to a question put to him by the Colonel as to what he conceived to be the influence of Socinian, Arminian and other false doctrines, in leading to the commission of evil, the Doctor observed:—"I do not attach much importance to religious speculations, however erroneous viewed as a source of misconduct. Undoubtedly, falsehood cannot produce the effects of truth. But it appears to me to be a mistake to trace the malpractices of human beings in almost any case to their religion. These have a totally different origin. They spring directly from the corruptian, sinfulness and wicked propensities of the human heart. A man who has a liking to drink, or a propensity to the indulgence of any other vice will, when the temptation is present, and the occasion is offered, be found rushing into it, he his religious notions what they may. Fallen nature, and the particular phases which in different individuals it assumes, constitute the grand sources of immorality." Dr. Wright's remark we were forcibly reminded of when we perused the language of "a Baptist" above quoted.

† The italics here are ours.

taken in connexion with the context as well as with the circumstances of the case—that the letter of "a Baptist" which appeared in his January number, was concocted in concert with us, or *that we had anything whatever to do with the drawing of it up*, the more-than-insinuation being that we aided and abetted the writer in its composition and transmission, in order thereby to get an opportunity of introducing our views into his pages, and forcing him, willing or unwilling, into a discussion of their merits,—we say, if this be his meaning, then he utters, to use the phrase attributed by Swift to his Houyhnhnms, "that which is not." The preceding details should of themselves be enough to substantiate our denial. But that there may be no ambiguity, or mistake, as to the matter, we state:—The extract from Dr. Jamieson was published last July, Mr. ——'s letter was written in November, and inserted in the Number of the P. C. M. for January. With Mr. ——, its author, we have had no conversation for years *at least;* and between him and us, or between others in his name and us, no communication of any kind ever took place until we received the message from him, last Sunday, 6th April, to which allusion has already been made. Up to the moment of writing this, Saturday, April 12th, we have not seen him. Already have we mentioned our ignorance of the existence of the "Primitive Church Magazine," until the January Number was sent to us; and to this fact we now add, that the extract from Dr. Jamieson, although previously heard of, was only seen by us for the first time last Sunday. Surely, this is explicit enough. It is our "yea" and "nay" declaration, conveyed in no ambiguous terms. What then becomes of the paltry and contemptible insinuation of "clandestine" conduct on our part?

Having had, as already stated, the January number of the periodical in question forwarded to us early in February, and having perused the remonstrances of "a Baptist," we immediately drew up and despatched to the Editor the letter, a copy of which accompanies these remarks. There was sent along with it, likewise, a private and most respectful note. The insertion of the letter intended for the public, we claimed as a matter of right and common justice. We had been somewhat wantonly attacked. This was our defence. It was not too long. There was in it nothing of the nature of abuse. To the scriptures, not to human authority, we made our appeal. Evangelical religion we did not assail. The letter was such as would afford him the gratifying opportunity of shewing to his readers what the sentiments of "evangelical" Universalists *really were*, as well as enable him to expose us where we were wrong.—His expression of a "wish to afford 'a fair field, and no favour,'" induced us, we confess, to anticipate on his part, not only as a Christian and therefore a truthful man, but likewise as a man of *exemplary candour*, its immediate insertion.

The event, however, shewed that we had misinterpreted the sense of *candour* as understood by the conductors of the "Primitive Church Magazine," and consequently had "reckoned without our host." When the March Number came out, there appeared, not our letter, but an apology for its non-insertion. The Editor had been unwell. This certainly we regret. We trust that he is now restored to the enjoyment of his wonted health. Illness of body, with onerous mental engagements to discharge, involves, we know, a most irksome and undesirable state of things.

To the Editor, early in March, we again wrote, on this occasion somewhat hurriedly. Still, most kindly and respectfully. In substance:—We expressed our sympathy with him, in his recent attack of illness. At the same time we suggested, that his apology for the non-appearance of our letter, under the circumstances of the case, savoured rather more of the mere man of the world, than of a believer of the gospel influenced in his conduct by heavenly truth, exactly to suit our taste. He, or another in his columns by his permission, had gratuitously assailed us. The insertion of an explanation, or more properly of a simple and accurate statement of our views was, in common justice, so obviously due to us, that it should have taken place without delay, even although at the expense of excluding other matter. Not only high-minded feelings of generosity, but even low, every-day, ordinary maxims acted on in their inter-

course with one another by mere men of the world dictated such a course. How much more a Christian desire to cultivate *the things that are lovely and of good report!* Phil. iv. 8. He was reminded that we were not ultroneously thrusting our views upon him, so as to get them brought under notice in his pages.* Besides, to take away all ground for an insinuation of the sort, rather a statement of views wherein we professed to agree, than of points of difference, would be found to be the prominent characteristic of our letter.—We were parties standing on the defensive. We felt ourselves to have been unjustly assailed, and we were decidedly, but calmly and temperately setting our assailants right. The Editor was kindly, but in unequivocal terms reminded of the *only conclusions* which could be deduced from his declining to insert our letter: inability to answer it, or at all events to sustain his former charges; or unwillingness to let the real sentiments of Universalists be known. We deprecated, for his own sake, such procedure on his part. To set him down as treading in the footsteps of a man of the world, under the guise of the Christian profession, was, we informed him, far from being our wish. We wanted to regard him as a Christian man, influenced in his actions by Christian principles. Of these, a constant love to truth, and rigid adherence to its dictates, even at the expense of being obliged occasionally to say *peccavi*, was one. Eph. iv. 15; Acts xxvi. 9—11. Hence our second appeal to him. Hence our hope that he would act as a Christian man, under the circumstances of the case should do. We then quietly, but unequivocally informed him of what our course would be, should he withhold from us the very slender *modicum* of justice which we claimed and were entitled to. Not menacingly; for threatening in most cases we deem low, as well as absurd: being calculated generally to defeat its own object. We mentioned our purpose contingently, that there might be no complaint afterwards of having been taken by surprise, and that no imputation on our Christian integrity might be possible. We were, we confess, particularly solicitous that the grace of doing a handsome thing, in a handsome as well as Christian manner, might be the Editor's own. Hence the then strictly private and kindly nature of our communication. But we went farther. We informed him, that even if compelled by his refusal, (which we could not allow ourselves to anticipate,) to publish our letter, with comments on the whole affair, in the "Universalist," we made no pretensions to our defence of our own sentiments, and most unwilling inculpation of his conduct, obtaining a very large circulation, or being seen by a numerous and influential class of readers. We distinctly stated, that a very large circulation the "Universalist" had not. Respectable might be its subscribers—some of them Baptists, and some of them occupying an exalted position in society, but they were comparatively speaking few: far from holding any proportion to the goodness of the cause in support of which they had embarked. Such as they were, however, before them, in the event of justice, and the treatment dictated by common candour being withheld from us, the whole matter would be laid. Earnestly did we deprecate the necessity of being obliged to take this step. Our letter was closed with an appeal to the Editor's conscience and good feelings.—The foregoing is the substance of our hastily, but as to its subject-matter deliberately written second communication. Not having preserved a copy of it (it was drawn up and despatched too hurriedly to permit us to do so), we are obliged, after the lapse of about five weeks, to draw on our memory for its contents.

The April Number of the "Primitive Church Magazine" has unfortunately satisfied us, that all our efforts to induce the gentleman *doing the editorial* in its pages, have been thrown away. A notice on the cover laconically informs all concerned, that our letter [of February], along with another from a Christian friend, of the existence of which until we saw the notice we were entirely ignorant, was "respectfully declined."

---

* Surely the Editor must have forgotten all this, as well as have overlooked the whole facts of the case, when he penned in his "Postcript" the not particularly handsome or Christian insinuation, about a "clandestine" attempt on our part, to draw him "by a side-wind" into a discussion of the doctrine of Universal Salvation.

Instead of grappling with our statements, and trying to evince their inconsistency with scripture and with one another—in which, if successful, something would have been achieved for the *partialist* cause—the letter of "A Baptist," which appeared in the January Number, which is most excellent and most satisfactory as far as it goes, but which agreeably to its scope and nature scarcely enters upon the more vital points involved in the Universalist controversy, is made the subject of comment in a flippant, and we are constrained to say not over-good-natured article, to which its author is pleased to give the title of "Editorial Postscript." Although assuming the form of a reply to "A Baptist," it is evident from the contents, that our communication, which he had not the candour to publish, was either lying before him or full in his recollection.

As we purpose dealing with these editorial strictures in a somewhat more minute and formal manner hereafter, we would now content ourselves with observing passingly, that they are characterised,

1. By a most wanton and unjustifiable imputation on "a Baptist," occasioned by his having endeavoured to give a candid statement of views opposed to his own. He is told, that "if not already a Universalist, he is not far from it." Are we to consider this utter disregard of the language and feelings of a pious man, who has honestly and conscienciously disavowed Universalism, ("I am not a Universalist,") as a specimen of the fairness and candour with which the Primitive Church Magazine is conducted?

2. By what, in any other than a professed follower of the Lamb, we should have unhesitatingly stigmatized as a pettifogging attempt to represent "a Baptist" as intermeddling with what did not concern him and us, and thereby to back out of the necessity of discussing the doctrine of Universal Salvation altogether, by pretending that Dr. Jamieson's remarks had to do *rather with* Annihilationists, *than with* Universalists. Indeed! And this in spite of the Dr.'s own language, "How can goodness be dispensed to those who have been finally impenitent, *in abridging their torments,** or in effecting their annihilation?" combined with the reasonings that immediately follow, as well as with the whole scope of his article! Universalism and annihilationism were, it must be plain to every unprejudiced reader, both equally in the Dr.'s mind when he sat down to the composition of the extract in question.

3. By a view of Universalism which indicates not very accurate, extensive, or profound acquaintance with the subject. He speaks as if all Universalists as a matter of course believe in "future sufferings being terminated—by *restoration* [of the unregenerate] to the divine image and favour." And he speaks also of evangelical Universalists "connecting the denial of everlasting punishment with the universal *restoration* of mankind." Waiving the consideration at present of language otherwise objectionable, it is sufficient to remark just now, that against the notion of God's *restoring* any previous state of things, whether it be the Jewish Church, or the paradisaical condition of man, the labour of a number of evangelically minded Universalist writers have, for a long series of years, been expressly directed. *Restoration*, unquestionably, was the theory of Universalists of a former day, as it is the theory of many still. Not, however, of all. Not of the majority of those who write in the "Universalist;" the only present accredited organ of the body. God, according to these men, *advances* in the execution and development of his heavenly plans: through the resurrection of Christ Jesus *making new*, first, the members of his Church, 2 Cor. v. 17, and ultimately *all things*, (men of course among the number of *all things*), Rev. xxi. 5, 1 Cor. xv. 28, Isaiah lxv. 17, 2 Peter iii. 13; and in connection with this arrangement of *advance* or *progress*, so far from *restoring* any *old things*, all *old things*, it is expressly declared, *pass away*. Isaiah lxv. 17, 2 Cor. v. 17, Rev. xxi. 4. God's purposes are accomplished, not by the *restoration* of the *pure earthly*, but by the *supersession* of the *earthly* by *the heavenly*. 2 Cor. v. 1—4, 2 Peter iii. 12, 13.

---

* The italics are ours.

Further analysis of the "Postscript" we suspend just now: only, concluding with a hint to the author, that upon his own hypothesis of the great efficacy, *even in the case of those who are not believers in its truth* of God's threatenings of endless torments, then *a fortiori* in the case of those *who believe the doctrine*, it should have still greater efficacy; and if its truth, and the proclamation of its truth be indispensable to deter from evil and lead to holiness, then why try, as evangelical men profess to be doing, to weaken, if not destroy its sanctifying power and tendency, by substituting for it the knowledge of salvation by Christ's finished work, and that principle of *love to God*, as *having first loved us*, by which *fear is cast out?* 1 John iv. 18, 19. Surely, the so called evangelical are, on their own shewing, guilty of a sad and mischievous blunder. The preaching of endless torments should be their gospel; and every proclamation on their part of the crucified and risen Jesus as the Saviour from wrath of those who believe in his name, is so far a subversion of their favourite principle of holy living, and an opening of the floodgates of licentiousness:—Let them see to this.

We now subjoin a copy of the letter, which was forwarded to the Editor of the "Primitive Church Magazine," which from its cover and his Postscript he appears to have received, and which although twice solicited he has declined to insert. Surely a simpler, plainer, and more inoffensive set of statements, on the part of individuals unjustly attacked and misrepresented, can scarcely be conceived! D. T.

To the Editor of the "Primitive Church Magazine."

SIR,— Liverpool, February, 1851.

A Christian friend having put into my hands your number for January, of this year, my attention has been drawn to a letter signed "A Baptist," which is inserted in pp. 14, 15.

Being a "Universalist," and pastor of the only congregation in Liverpool known by that appellation, I presume that myself and friends are the parties alluded to in "A Baptist's" letter.

Fair and candid, indeed, are the sentiments which in that communication are expressed. It is most creditable to the writer. "Speaking the truth, in love," seems to be the principle on which he acts. I therefore sincerely thank him. However, he is not more fair and candid than the occasion requires.

To those who worship with me at Bold St. Chapel, as well as to myself, the word of God alone, opened up to the conscience by the Holy Ghost, is the only source of our acquaintance with the attributes and perfections of Jehovah, as these are displayed in the person and work of Jesus Christ.

Adam's sin and death we know only through faith in the word of revelation; and to the same sacred source and lively oracle likewise, are we indebted for all our acquaintance with the divine righteousness and life of *the second man, the Lord from Heaven.*

Now with all who know, love, and are influenced by *the truth as it is in Jesus*, I am satisfied, that *except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God;* that election is of sovereign grace, through the righteousness of of Jesus Christ, *God over all blessed for ever*, alone; that *straigt is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life and few there be that find it;* and that from reigning with Christ and God, the unregenerate are completely and for ever excluded.

With all believers of the truth, I am satisfied, that the punishment of creatures,* although penal, can never be purgatorial: purgatorial efficacy residing in that blood of Christ alone which *cleanseth us*, believers, *from all sin;* just as new-creating efficacy resides alone in the power of Christ's resurrection.

And with all who know the truth I am satisfied, that that *faith which is of the operation of God*, uniformly and necessarily *works by love; purifying the heart, crucifying the flesh with its affections and lusts*, and lifting our minds more and more *to things that are above.*

---

* *Guilty creatures* of course was meant. Note now added by me, D. T.

Such is a very meagre outline of our leading sentiments. They will, you cannot but remark, justify what "a Baptist," has so kindly, candidly and Christianly written. And if inconsistent with statements in Origen, Jeremiah White, Stonehouse, Elhanan Winchester and authors of the Unitarian American Universalist School we cannot help it. We own no teacher but our glorified Lord. And if Dr. Jamieson, whose letter I have not seen, has chosen to assail Universalists, indiscriminately, without having made the requisite enquiries, I can only say that I deeply regret his having done so. It is desirable in every case to make ourselves thoroughly acquainted with a subject before we write about it for the public, and above all before we assail others.

Undoubtedly it has fallen to the lot of myself and a few others, by divine teaching, to believe in the Lord Jesus, as second and spiritual Adam, 1 Cor. xv. 45, as well as second and spiritual Abraham, and to reject that Manicheism, which by making *sin infinite*, (as, if the torments of *sinners* be *endless*, or *infinite*, it must be,) would place it on a level with the *infinite righteousness* of Jehovah. (*Indefinite* sin is, as is proved by the necessity of the sacrifice of the *Infinite One* in flesh, in order to put it away: *infinite*, however, it [sin] is not. 1 John ii. 2.) Still farther: we prefer believing with John and others taught by the Holy Ghost, that our Lord came *to destroy all the works of the Devil*, 1 John iii. 8, to supposing, with fallible men, that he came to confirm for ever *any one* of them. — Can we be wrong in crediting God's inspired testimony?

In my "Assurance of Faith," "Three Questions Proposed and Answered," (now in its Third Edition,) "Dialogues," (in its Second,) "Divine Inversion," and "Three Grand Exhibitions," &c. my views on many scriptural topics are stated.—True, the world has not cared much about them—but they have not been *altogether* unnoticed.—If confuted from Scripture as to what I have advanced in these productions, I yield. To God's word I bow implicitly. But to attempt to fasten sentiments on me the opposite of those which are dear to my heart, merely because other men styling themselves Universalists have held them, is not the way of confuting me. For views avowed by myself, I am amenable,—not for the views of others.

With much respect and Christian love,

I am, Sir,

Yours, in the bonds of the gospel,

D. THOM.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

SIR,—Christian philosophy is the head stone of human philosophy; for to know "What is truth," is to know God and eternal life. See Zech. iv. 7, and read "what is truth," as written on the headstone.

Truth has been the apple of discord cast among us in the question of "Who shall be saved?" Hence all our divisions—the sectarianism of the Church—as see Matt. x. 34, &c.

Out of the multitude of types given in the Scriptures, I would present your readers with that of Jacob wrestling with the Angel. For the true Jacob is Christ, who wrestles with the Spirit of Darkness, as of the law, and prevails over it: from whence his name, Israel.

The law is the Elder Brother, whom the younger, by taking on him the similitude of Sin, undermines and obtains the blessing of the Father. For the law is Esau surnamed Edom, or the earth-born and bloody-minded—whom, saith the Lord, I hate; but Jacob have I loved. Jacob, by love, appeased the wrath of his brother; as it is written—Kiss the Son lest he be angry.

I believe, therefore, with Jacob, that "this [earth] is the terrible place"—the place of punishment as of Death; the dwelling-place of evil—and that in passing out of it, as by "a gate," we shall ascend, as by "a ladder," unto Him from whom we, as to our Spirits, came down.

The 110th Psalm is beautifully connected with this wrestling of Jacob, who wrestled "until *the break of day*." "Let me go, for the day breaketh," said the power of darkness. "Nay," said Jacob, "I will not let thee go, unless thou bless me." So the morning light, which is the spirit

of truth and love, the God of the day" 1 Thess. v. 5, prevailed over the darkness—the power of darkness [the law] blessing the light! John i. 17 and 27.

Thus the birth of truth and love is "from the womb of the morning;" as springing out of darkness [chaos and old night]; the light coming "in all the beauty of his holiness!"

Connect this with Rev. xxii. 16, "I, Jesus, am the root and offspring of David;" and I am "*the bright and Morning Star.*"

Now the root of David, דוד, is love; the spirit that begets all, and which works in all flesh—working in man, in the power of sin, until he come in the light of the *holy* spirit of love, to overcome sin in all the lusts of the flesh. See Matt. xxii. 54; John i. 5. Behold then in love the power that overcomes sin and death, giving the victory to man; and for ever extinguishing the power of hell.

Prove to me there is a hell of eternal torments, and you prove to me that God is not love; and that the power of hell is the ALMIGHTY!

Prove to me that punishment is extended beyond the limits of this world—as beyond this our carnal body of the flesh, and you prove to me that God, who made man in a body of weak and sinful flesh, *is not just;* neither is he "the justifier of the ungodly;" as of his own work! For "we are God's workmanship."

I am, SIR,
Your obedient Servant,
J. W.

DEAR SIR,—I beg to state that I never had the slightest suspicion that Dr. Thom intentionally misrepresented my views in his critique of my work on the Millennium, which appeared in the December number of "The Universalist." Had I charged him with such a mean purpose, I am convinced, that to those who know him, I would only have manifested my ignorance of the Doctor's character. I nevertheless gladly and thankfully accept of the apology which his keen sense of justice has prompted him to make in your last number, p. 100, for his having inadvertently classed his humble servant with those Millennialists who look for the resurrection of the saints to reign with Christ in flesh and blood bodies. It appears that he had been led into the mistake of supposing that we took a fleshly view of the resurrection of the saints, by his taking it for granted that we must have seen, that beings purely spiritual, in body as well as in mind, are necessarily invisible to and incapable of associating with men in the flesh and blood state. He concludes with the following interrogatories: "Are we to understand him as anticipating a millennium of the Church spiritual and glorified with Christ? Then why clog this view with notions that are clearly and absolutely irreconcilable with it?" Now we frankly confess, that we are unable to explain *how* spiritual and immortal bodies can be seen by the eye of flesh; yet, if we are to believe the testimony of Scripture concerning Christ, there can be no mystery as to the fact. Christ was both seen and felt by men in the flesh and blood state, after his resurrection. He did not only associate with them, but did eat and drink with them after his resurrection to life and immortality. And why should we have any more difficulty in believing that the risen and glorified saints will be seen by mortal eyes, and will eat and drink with men on the earth, than we have in believing what is recorded concerning our Lord? Will the Doctor deny the spirituality of our Lord's resurrection? We think not.

One thing, however, is certain, and that is, that the spiritual body cannot be seen *as it is* by the eye of flesh. It can be seen, for it has been seen; but to the mortal eye, it can only appear as a flesh and blood body—at most, as a glorious material body, as Christ was seen by Peter and John on the mount of transfiguration. The spiritual eye alone is capable of seeing spiritual bodies as spiritual. When it is said that "we shall see him as he is, for we shall be like him," it is implied that there is a way of seeing Christ, yet not as he is. And so with the saints who shall be conformed to Christ in their resurrection, as being like him clothed upon with spiritual immortal bodies, they will be seen by their brethren in the flesh, and will eat and drink with them, we have no doubt: but they will not be seen (save by one another) as spiritual; for, to the mortal eye, they must wear a mortal appearance.

To some it may appear that to suppose the spiritual bodies of the risen and glorified Church capable of receiving nourishment from the fruits of the earth, the common food of mortals, is to entertain a low conception of the spiritual state; but, to my mind, the idea is presented in a different aspect. It gives me a more exalted conception of the power and purity of that spiritual, heavenly, and divine life that shall animate the bodies of the faithful; for by it I can see that this life will have power to convert earthly things into spiritual things. The food that the saints will eat will be the common fruits of the earth; the divine life by which they will be quickened, will change these earthly things into the spiritual substance of their own bodies. The fleshly life changes the food that we eat into flesh, the spiritual life will change it into spirit. Here is earth converted into heaven, by the power of the divine life in the saints. The idea of the saints eating and drinking literally makes the future life more a reality. Real bodies must have real bodily nourishment. The contemplation of the divine perfections will sustain the inward man; but, if we are to have bodies at all, we must have real bodily sustenance.—Trusting that these remarks may tend to give unity and consistency to my views of the Millennium, I respectfully request, dear sir, that you will insert them in your next number.

Sincerely yours,
GEO. GALLOWAY.

ERRATA.—VOL. II. Page 3, last line; for "bestow him," read "bestow on him."—Page 5, line 12 from top: for "there," read "then."—Page 60, line 11 from bottom, for "praised," read 'prized."—Page 116,—Notes: line 13: for "Fadoun," read "Fordoun."—Same page, line 15: or "Fattercairn, read "Fettercairn."

THE UNIVERSALIST.

JUNE, 1851.

THE HELL OF CHRISTENDOM AND THE HELL OF HEATHENDOM IDENTIFIED, AND COMPARED WITH THE HELL OF SCRIPTURE.

The doctrine of future punishment as maintained by the professed Church of God, it will not be difficult in its chief characteristics to define; for occupying, as it does, as important a place in the current Christian Theology as any other real or supposed Christian truth—as it is an article of the orthodox faith, prominently set forth in almost every sermon preached by those who see in themselves and their pulpit ministrations the realization of the glowing picture of prophecy—"How beautiful are the feet of him that bringeth glad tidings, that publisheth peace,"—it must be familiar to every mind.

In some quarters, from various motives and influences, its more gross and grotesque features are softened down, it may be, for ears polite, by those who nevertheless maintain its eternity, its inconceivable misery, and perfect hopelessness and despair. Its awful characteristics, however, are essentially the same. Theological writers are prolific in their descriptions of the condition of the lost; and lest we should be charged with presumption or misrepresentation, we will, instead of attempting a sketch of our own, quote from one or two avowed defenders of the doctrine. Let us hear what one of the most celebrated theologians of the Church of England says on this subject.*

This learned divine represents the "eternal privation of God and of Heaven" as "the most intolerable of all the sufferings of the damned in hell;" and when the quotations we shall make shall have been pondered, let the reader, if he can, give this consideration due weight:—"I dare confidently say, the loss of Heaven, and the omission of glory, is far more bitter than all those pains which are to be suffered in Hell."

"The damned persons shall be eternally branded with the infamy of their offences; so that they shall be scorned and scoffed at by the devils themselves; men and angels shall detest them as infamous and wicked traitors to their King, God, and Redeemer. And as fugitive slaves are marked and cauterized

* Let it not be said that the learned and accomplished Bishop Jeremy Taylor, D.D., is not now regarded as an authority in this matter. His writings still live, and are highly and in many respects justly prized. A new library edition of his works has recently been published by the Messrs. Longman, and the extracts in the text are taken from a cheap recent reprint of his "*Death, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell.*"

with burning irons, so this infamy, by some mark of ugliness and deformity, shall be stamped upon their faces and bodies. (Isaiah. xiii.) So ignominious shall be the body of a sinner, that when his soul returns to enter it, it shall be amazed to behold it so terrible, and shall wish it were rather in the same state as when it was half eaten up with worms.

"And that which adds misery to their calamity, they shall be banished from Heaven, and made *prisoners in the profound bowels of the earth;* a place most remote from heaven, and the most calamitous of all others, where they shall neither see the sun by day nor the stars by night; where all shall be horror and darkness, a land covered with the obscurity of death, a land of sulphur and burning pitch, a land of pestilence and corruption. Into this land of punishment and torment shall be banished the enemies of God."

"The tyrants of Japonia invented a strange torment for those who confessed Christ; they hung them with their head downwards, half their bodies into a hole digged in the earth, which they filled with snakes, lizards, and other poisonous vermin; but even those were better companions than those infernal dragons of the pit of Hell; where into not half, but the whole body of the miserable sinner shall be plunged."

After describing generally the condition of "the damned in Hell," he observes "Besides this, every sense from his particular object, shall receive a particular punishment."

"The eyes shall not only be grieved with a scorching heat, but shall be tormented with monstrous and horrible figures," &c.

The hearing while it suffers "from the ever burning and penetrating fire," is to be saluted with "the fearful and amazing noises of thunders, howlings, clamours, groans, curses, and blasphemies." Prison and sanitory reform was not thought of in the era which produced a Jeremy Taylor, hence he speaks of the "unsavoury smells so proper to prisons," as by no means "awanting in that infernal dungeon; for first that fire of sulphur, being pent in without vent or respiration, shall send forth poisonous scent; and if a match of brimstone be offensive here, what shall such a mass of that stuff be in hell! Secondly, the bodies of the damned shall cast forth a most horrible stink of themselves, and that more or less, according to the quality of their sins." And again:

"Hell is the world's sink, and the receptacle of all the filth in this great frame; and withal a deep dungeon where the air hath no access. How great must the stink and infection needs be of so many corruptions heaped one upon another! And how insufferable the smell of that infernal brimstone mixed with so many corrupted matters! O gulf of horror! O infernal grave! without vent or breathing place! Eternal grave of such as die continually, and cannot die, with what abominable filth art thou filled!"

This is a specimen of the doctrine of "the Church" on this subject. Writers and preachers in our own day have given up more or less of the *literal* in their descriptions of hell, and they speak of the material fire and the immortal worm as *figures*. But while they thus relieve the senses, and overwhelm the "immortal soul" they take care to remind us that *as figures* they only faintly suggest the *reality*,—that if the symbol be so dreadful, *much more* terrible must be

the thing symbolized! If therefore the Hell of the 19th century differ from that of the 18th,

"'Tis only change of pain, a bitter change, severer for severe!"

To this effect is the following from a late leader among the dissenters:—

"Concede, or demand, that these can only be figures. They are figures, at least, of an alarming kind. Why are figures, and of such an order, employed? Because the naked truth, the absolute reality of the retribution, cannot be set before our mind. It is too intimate, too intense, to be made known in any abstract manner. There is no idealized, soul-like, language fitted to express and explain it. To supply the deficiency images are sought. But, therefore, it follows that if the full force of these images be understood, still a vast amount of signification lies beyond them, they being, after all, confessedly inadequate, except to shadow out the fact. Nor can guilty presumption more egregiously err than when it soothes itself by the thought that these are *only* images: they are only images, and consequently what they intend is inconceivably more severe." Hamilton's *Rewards and Punishments.* pp. 323, 324.

We need not quote more; suffice it to say that according to the more gross or more refined state of an individual mind, is the Hell of Christendom conceived of as material in its punishments after the fashion of the first quoted author, or as mental, after the fashion of the second: but both, let it be borne in mind, as dependent upon the supposition of man's possessing an *immortal soul.*

Let us see, in the second place, if anything corresponding to these opinions obtained in the heathen world.

The doctrine of eternal punishment is founded upon that of the immortality of the soul. "The Egyptians," according to Herodotus* were the first to, maintain that the soul of man is immortal." The Chaldeans regarded the human mind as an *emanation* from the *divine nature.* The Persians according to Zoroaster, held that "the human soul is a particle of divine light." India was early visited by Pythagoras, Anacharchus, Pyrro, and others, who afterwards became eminent philosophers of Greece. It seems probable, also, from the adjacence of India to Persia, that the tenets of the Persian Zoroaster modified to a great degree, if they did not form the notions of the ancient Indians, whose philosophy was based on the doctrine of emanation. Enfield observes, that "with all the other eastern nations they conceived the soul to be a particle or an emanation of that intellectual fire, by which they believed the universe to be animated."

The distinct individuality and immortality of the soul was most indubitably the doctrine of the ancient Egyptians. The bodies of bad men were publicly disgraced at their death—kings even not being exempted from the ordeal to which they were subjected. "It was not the dread of this temporary disgrace, however, which the Egyptians were taught to look upon as the principal inducement to virtue: a far graver consideration was held out to them in the fear of that final judgment which awaited them in a future state, where they were

* Herod. ii. 123.

to suffer both for crimes of omission as well as of commission, and where nothing could shield them from the just vengeance of the gods. The same doctrine is put forth in the writings of Plato, who in his seventh Epistle, says, 'it is necessary, indeed, always to believe in the ancient and sacred discourses, which announce to us that the soul is immortal, and that it has judges of its conduct and suffers the greatest punishment when it is liberated from the body.'

"The commission of secret crimes might not expose them to the condemnation of the world; they might obtain the credit of a virtuous career, enjoying throughout life an unsullied reputation; and many an unknown act of injustice might escape those who applauded them on the day of their funeral. But the all-scrutinizing eye of the Deity was known to penetrate into the innermost thoughts of the heart; and they believed that whatever conscience told them they had done amiss was recorded against them in the book of Thoth, out of which they would be judged according to their works." Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, vol. v. pp. 438, 439.

Historians trace the philosophy of Greece to Egyptian parentage, and its mythologies and various sects bear more or less the impress of those notions which were current among the most ancient people of the world. Conquered by Alexander, Egypt was subsequently brought under the Grecian yoke; and thus a process of assimilation in customs, manners, and philosophy, was commenced, which, long after the time of Alexander, was carried on among those oriental nations under the rule of Greece. And hence that confusion of opinion which often obtained in the Alexandrian and Christian schools. In Alexandria, chiefly, the Grecian philosophy was found grafted upon the ancient oriental wisdom. Peopled with emigrants from various countries, Alexandria—built by Alexander with the view of making it the chief seat of his government—became the emporium of learning, philosophy, and religion. Egyptians, Grecians, Jews, and others, were protected in the maintenance of their own peculiar opinions, and thus Egypt became overspread with every kind of existing philosophy.

The Ptolemies, after Alexander, for political reasons, encouraged the existing state of things. Learning was fostered, the Alexandrian Library was enriched by a vast collection of books, a college was established. What the Egyptian princes had by their munificent patronage effected for philosophy in Alexandria, was by the Roman emperors sustained; and distant countries were visited and instructed by those who went forth from this seat of learning, for a long period. At length it was taken by the Saracens and plundered of its literary treasures.

"Philosophy during this period, suffered a grievous corruption, from the attempt which was made by philosophers of different sects and countries,—Grecian, Egyptian, and Oriental, who were assembled in Alexandria,—to frame, from their different tenets, one general system of opinions. The respect which had long been universally paid to the Schools of Greece, and the honors with which they were now advocated by the Egyptian princes induced other wise men, and even the Egyptian priests and philosophers themselves, to submit to this innovation. Hence arose a heterogeneous mass of opinions, of which we shall afterwards take more particular notice, under the name of

Eclectic Philosophy; and which we shall find to have been the foundation of endless confusion, error, and absurdity, not only in the Alexandrian School, but among Jews and Christians; producing among the former that spurious kind of philosophy, which they called their cabbala; and, among the latter, innumerable corruptions of the Christian faith." *Enfield's History of Philosophy*, vol. i. p. 539.

Greece, in her turn, was subdued by the arms of the Romans; but Rome, instead of impressing upon Greece its mental characteristics, yielded to the superior wisdom and eloquence of the vanquished; and the conquerors, contrary to the common result, adopted the opinions and manners of the conquered. Under the Empire, the Roman poets and historians unquestionably received the tincture of the Grecian philosophy.

From the Eclectic sect, which took its rise in Alexandria, Christianity, already sadly distorted by Judaizing teachers and Gentile philosophy, towards the end of the third century, received still further corruption. "In the infancy of the Alexandrian School," says Enfield, "not a few among the professors of Christianity suffered themselves to be so far deluded by the pretensions of this sect, as to imagine that a coalition might with great advantage be formed between its system and that of Christianity; and this union seemed the more desirable, as several philosophers of this sect became converts to the Christian faith. But the consequence was that Pagan ideas and opinions were by degrees mixed with the pure and simple doctrines of the gospel; the fanatical philosophy of Ammonius corrupted the pure religion of Christ; and his church became a field of contention, and a nursery of error."

In Judea, in consequence of the conquests of Alexander, the Jews, contrary to their ancient habits, mingled much with foreigners; "a circumstance," says Enfield, "which, left to its natural operation, would have led them imperceptibly into the adoption of foreign opinions and customs." The influence of their Alexandrian brethren was also pernicious, and so manifest was the effect of Grecian philosophy and the Egyptian mysteries under the joint reign of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, that some of the zealous advocates for the purity of the Jewish faith and worship denounced *anathema* upon any who should teach Grecian wisdom to his children. "No *anathema* however," says Enfield, "could prevent the spread of Grecian learning among the Jews."

Our space forbids a notice of the Jewish sects generally. The Pharisees were the most influential and important. They not only held the doctrine of the soul's immortality, but that of *metempsychosis*. The doctrine of transmigration was admitted by the Pharisees; their belief, according to Josephus,* being, "that all souls were incorruptible; but that those of good men were only removed into other bodies, and that those of the bad were subject to eternal punishment."†

"Starting from the development of certain ideas, which the Old Testament

* Bell. Jud. ii. 8, 14.

† The Buddhist, and other religions have admitted the same notion of the soul of man passing into the bodies of animals; and even the Druids believed in the migration of the soul, though they confined it to human bodies. Cæs. Bell. Gal. lib. vi."—Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, vol. v. p. 448.

really contained in the germ, they formed their system by combining with it many of the elements derived from Zoroastrian or Parsic opinions; and at a later period (after the time of Gamaliel) with much also that they borrowed from Platonism." *Neander's Church History*, vol. i.

The space we have designed for this article precludes our giving anything like a complete historical sketch of the subject, though by doing so we should doubtless obtain a much more advantageous position from which to compare the belief of the Christian with the heathen world. We have introduced so much of history, however, to assist us to account for as well as discover the identity which subsists between the hell of heathendom, and the hell of Christendom.

The notions entertained by our own Saxon forefathers on the subject of a future state must not pass unnoticed. To how large an extent is the present cast in the mould of the past! And how true, in reference to opinions as well as other things, the words of the wise man, "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be."

"HEL.—Among the fearful beings whose power was dreaded even by the gods, was Hel, mistress of the cold and joyless under-world. Called, through the fate of battles, to the glories of Wælheal, the Teutonic or Norse hero trembled at a peaceful death, which would consign him to a dwelling more desolate and wretched than even that which awaited the fallen warriors of heroic Greece, and many a legend tells of those whose own hand saved them from a futurity so abhorred. But Hel was not herself the agent of *death;* she only received those who had not earned their seat in Opin's hall by a heroic fall, and the Wælcyrian or Shieldmays were the choosers of the slain. The realm of Hel was all that Wælheal was not,—cold, cheerless, shadowy; no simulated war was *there*, from which the combatants desisted with renovated strength and glory; no capacious quaighs of mead, or cups of the life-giving wine; no feast continually enjoyed and miraculously reproduced; no songs nor narratives of noble deeds; no expectation of the last great battle where the *einherjar* were to accompany Allfather to meet his gigantic antagonists; no flashing Shieldmays animating the brave with their discourse, and lightening the hall with their splendour: but chill and ice, frost and darkness; shadowy realms without a sun, without song or wine or feast, or the soul-inspiring company of heroes, glorying in the great deeds of their worldly life.

"For the perjurer and the secret murderer Nástrond existed, a place of torment and punishment—the strand of the dead—filled with foulness, peopled with poisonous serpents, dark, cold, and gloomy: the kingdom of Hel was *Hades*, the invisible, the world of shadows: Nástrond was what we call *Hell.* Christianity however admitted no goddess of death, and when it was thought necessary to express the idea of a place of punishment after death, the Anglo-saxon united the realm of Hel with Nástrond to complete a hideous prison for the guilty: the prevailing idea in the infernal regions of the Teuton is cold and gloom;* the poisonous snakes, which waking or sleeping seem ever to have haunted the Anglo-saxon, formed a convenient point of junction between his

* "Fire was too cheerful in the north to be sufficiently an object of terror: it appeared otherwise in the east, where coolness is the greatest of luxuries."

own traditional hell and that which he heard of from the pulpit, in quotations from the works of the Fathers; and to these and their influence alone can it be attributed when we find flames and sulphur, and all the hideous apparatus of Judaic tradition, adopted by him. In this fact seems to me to lie a very important mark of ancient heathendom, and one which the clergy themselves admitted, a belief in which they shared, and which they did not scruple to impress upon their flocks, even in spite of the contrary tendency of their authorities: it will be sufficient to refer to the description given of hell in the poetic Saloman and Saturn, a composition redolent of heathendom: on the defeat of the rebel angels, it is said, God

'for them he made a hell,
a dwelling deadly cold,
with winter covered:
water he sent in
and snake-dwellings,
many a foul beast
with horns of iron;
bloody eagles
and pale adders;
thirst and hunger
and fierce conflict,
mighty terror,
joylessness.'

"Even in their more orthodox descriptions, ecclesiastical poets, though naturally adopting the Judaic notions, cannot always shake off the old, habitual tradition of their forefathers, but recur to the frost, gloom, and serpents of Nástrond, and the realm of Hel; of which a passage already quoted from Beda is ample evidence."—Kemble's *Saxons in England*, vol. i. pp. 392—395.

We have seen, from the valuable work of Kemble, how the current doctrine among us was, through Judaizing Christian teachers, grafted upon the old Anglo-saxon hell; and enough has been said to shew how the Jews, through their intercourse with heathen nations, adopted heathen notions,—notions with very little modification maintained throughout the Christian world in the present day. Some features may not be traceable upon the doctrine as now held which were conspicuous in ancient times, and some characteristics of the hell of modern times may not be found in that of antiquity. But from what we have adduced respecting the latter it may be seen, even to the very phraseology, how remarkably coincident are their leading features with those of the Hell of Christendom.

That the heathen in their notions respecting the soul and its immortal destiny, came very near to the truth we have often been told by orthodox divines, and the striking coincidences between their philosophical tenets and what are assumed to be the teachings of divine revelation have been insisted on as so many proofs of the genuineness of *natural religion*. Need we, then, enter at length into a discussion of that which is generally admitted and even insisted on by our opponents? By them is the identity *claimed*,—by us it is readily conceded. But as evidence of the truth and reality of either the immortality of the soul or the doctrine of eternal torments, we emphatically deny that it

has any claim to be, on the same grounds that we dispute the claims of what is commonly called natural theology.

We conclude this part of our subject in the words of Professor Stuart of Andover, no mean authority on such a question as this. He says, "The *Amenti* of the Egyptians, corresponded to the *Hades* of the Greeks, and the *Tartarus* of the Latins." Mr. Stuart also identifies the orthodox hell with the heathen Tartarus; and he might have added, the Nástrond of the Anglo-Saxons.

(*To be concluded in our next.*)

THE GREAT EXHIBITION.

"And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me."—John xii. 32.

THE most glorious display of "The Industry of all Nations" at the present period attracts everybody's attention and secures the admiration of the rich and the poor, the old and the young, the wise and the simple, the foreigner and the native. The mind of the thoughtful is drawn to it as by necessity, and the ideas engendered by its contemplation are vivid, multifarious, expansive and enduring. For ourselves it supplies delightful retrospections and still more ecstatic anticipations on subjects of a character infinitely more important than that which prompted them; as much so as "things which are eternal" are beyond, in weight and moment, "things which are temporal and seen."

We said "retrospections," for we are called to *look back* on the grand exhibition within the broad and deep expanse of the wonder-studded *past*. And what see we there? We see God opening His hand and flinging buoyantly forth innumerable worlds to occupy, enlighten and empeople a portion of boundless space. To "the sons of God," that "sang together,"—to "the innumerable company of angels," what a deeply interesting, what an incalculably glorious exhibition was this! The manifestation of God's natural perfections, in a plenitude that caused these pure and blissful spirits to shout aloud for joy! Then *light*, the most perfect image of its Maker, glowed through the universe the homage that was its duty, and *mind* gratefully dwelt on the glorious theme, because wholly for *it* this great exhibition was planned and made! Then man was formed in the image of God,—the creature from the mere "dust of the earth," with a power to perceive, love, serve, and adore his Creator, by an immaterial, incorruptible principle within. Then the creature man opened to other creature-minds the wisdom, power, and goodness of God; and wonderment occupied each individual faculty at what may have to follow this luminous but mysterious display of divine purpose, and what the progressive developments of His glory and His praise! Was not *that* a great exhibition when man fell and became so corrupt that God sent the deluge to punish and destroy the inhabitants of the earth? was not *that*, when in thunderings He proclaimed His law to a trembling, conscience-smitten world? was not *that*, when He gave the far-seeing infallible *prophecies*, to prove the authenticity of His religion, and supreme excellence of His name? But especially was not *that* when the Son of His love came on earth to suffer, fulfil the law, and die a sacrifice for guilty but heaven-favoured man? O! was not *that* a great exhibition? Look at the *incidents*:—In that *life* what an unravelment of divine grandeur! what an opening of the scroll of heavenly inscription to universal gaze! what a disembowelment of hidden treasures—of mental depths! What a study for all the genius, all the talents of all that live. The manger-birth! The angel-anthem! The cloven skies, and the voice of God! The desert-struggle, and its victory! The sound of the gospel trumpet! The parting supper! Then

awful garden! The base betrayal! The bloody cross! The mystic tomb! The glorious resurrection! The ascension to the throne of light! What scenes of wondrous, miraculous, moral, intellectual, spiritual mightiness!—holy creations!—refulgent manifestations! and magnificent instrumentalities! all by the one quiet, unobtrusive, humble, and even *ignominious* existence of a lonely being, who *thus* could manifest the whole of Deity for the weal of the whole of His creatures,—the whole of goodness for the sake of all that is bad,—God for man—

"Exhausted Deity on human weal."

What an exhibition, was *this!* But look at its momentous *consequences*—the conversion of the world, the establishment of His kingdom; the spread of His Truth; on, on, on, even until the greatest display of the Godhead will be given when it shall be said,—

"Then cometh the end," when will be "*gathered together in one all things in Christ*, which are in heaven, and which are on earth;" when "God shall be all things to everything;" when "there shall be no more *pain*;" no more *death*;" when "*sorrow* and *sighing* shall flee away;" when God's oath, by *Himself* and His own *Being*, shall literally be verified, that "unto Him shall *every knee* bow and *every tongue* confess," "who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will;" when Christ shall have "*destroyed the works of the devil*"—"drawn *all men* unto Him;" when "*all flesh* shall see the salvation of God;" "old things are passed away, and *all things made new;* and when every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and *under the earth*, and such as are in the sea, *and all that are in them*, shall be heard saying, Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb for ever and ever!" will not *this* be an exhibition of God's mind, purpose and glory, such as will fill the universe with amazement, joy and anthems of praise?

And then the largeness, the grandeur, of the boundless, holy *spectacle!* The perfection of *every department* thereof! *the unity, appropriateness and completeness of the gigantic whole!* In human displays, even of the most costly character *Imperfection* somewhere or somehow is the necessary accompaniment; the finger of "Fallibility" *must* be impressed; the creature-failing, can never be absent! But *here* in God's great exhibition, not one blur, not one defect can ever appear! This work cost Heaven its largest, divinest architectural and munificent capabilities, to design and elaborate; took millions of years to found and fabricate; and on it rests, for entirety, beauty, order and glory, all its name, all its views, all its very *existence*! The complicated but symetrical exhibition, the achievement of a God, with all His Infinite Perfections *wholly engaged* in the mighty work!—all that ever He made administering to His matchless theme! The worm with its perfect mechanism of structure joins the cherub, with his holy greatness of thought, speed and power to do!—Man, with his puny arm, unwittingly, *by opposing, serves!* Devils, with larger thoughts and bolder enterprise, only more grandly—doing the same! Worlds, unconsciously rushing through immensity in every "*silence* speaking His praise!" animalculæ—a myriad in a dew drop— *doing no less*! Every ray from every puny taper magnifying His Wisdom,—the innumerable beamings from a thousand suns, doing *no more—no less*! The glowworm and the comet, —each needful, each *alike* administrative to the completeness of the picture of Divine execution! The *darkest* midnight, the most broad and deeply mysterious *evil*, as much as the most splendid *sunshine*, and most conspicuous *good*, all alike "working" for the *perfection* of the mysterious yet simple and ineffably glorious *entire*! What a Revelation of the Deity! what an exhibition of Infinite Skill, boundless mercy and praise—*this*! The climax of God's work in time, to illustrate His Being, Nature, Properties, and character *ever* to wrap intelligences, when "Time," the great theatre of its enactment, "shall be no more!"

But what will this last and greatest event *exhibit?* We must briefly reply:—

1. It will exhibit the fact that, whatever may *appear* to the contrary, God's self-originating *Purpose* must infallibly be accomplished:—

2. That man's *opposition*, or that of any other creature, or all creatures together, will only be made *promotive*, instead of *retardative*, of God's Will and Pleasure:—

3. That Christ's entire work was intended to be *applied* to all creatures that its provisions could concern:—

4. That God's *mercy* is not like man's creeds,—*partial*, and therefore *imperfect;* but *infinite*, or *boundless*, like all His other attributes; and therefore *effective to every being that needs:*—

5. That God's *Holiness*, joined with his Wisdom and Power,—*all infinite*—must ultimately expel *sin* from His dominions:—

6. That *sin*, and *suffering*, its consequence, must both *end* when their ultimate object, viz. holiness and blessedness, be realized, and that in every possible case:—

7. That *God's glory* and His *creatures' weal*, must of necessity, *go together*.—

8. That an *eternity* of future *blessedness* will infinitely more than compensate the creature for what he may have *temporarily suffered*, to carry out the Divine Plans:—and

9. That the natural, and especially the *moral* Perfections of Jehovah, thus exhibited to an intelligent universe, (incomparably surpassing, in beauty and glory, anything that *this*, or all other worlds can produce) will become the source of felicitous and endless contemplation to their pure and increasingly exalted intellects, while the eternity of the Supreme rolls on; and that every single pang, which they themselves have suffered for His purposes, "shall work out for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," when "Jesus shall have delivered up the Kingdom to the Father, that God may be, *all in all*!"—God who was in Christ, reconciling the world (Kosmos) unto Himself.

Let us, then, with pious rapture, look forward to *seeing* this Great Exhibition—this magnificent, most momentous manifestation of God in all His works and ways; "forgetting the things which are behind, may we reach forth to those which are before, for the prize of our high calling of God in Christ Jesus!"—For, "when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is!" "Come Lord Jesus, come quickly!"

"Tune your harps anew, ye seraphs!
Join to sing the glorious theme!
All on earth and all in heaven,
Join to praise Immanuel's name!
Hallelujah!
Glory to THE REIGNING LAMB!"

EDWARD COCK.

THE "PRIMITIVE CHURCH MAGAZINE" AND ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

THE "*Primitive Church Magazine*" is closed against "a Baptist;" and the slender modicum of justice he sought has been denied. Its "*clear stage*" has been swept away like a mushroom, and a meaning to "*no favour*" has been developed by the conduct of the Editor of that periodical very different from that which it conveys to us, and not precisely in accordance with the idea which, we presume (judging from those sacred Scriptures which they have handed down to us), would have been suggested by the expression to the *real primitive church*.

What the Editor of the *Primitive Church Magazine* has not the common honesty to do we are enabled to do for him, having received the following correspondence from "a Baptist" which, as it speaks for itself, requires nothing further by way of introduction.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

SIR,—The Editor of the Primitive Church Magazine having refused insertion

to my reply to his "Editorial Postscript" in the April number, conduct upon which I will make no comment, I shall be obliged by your inserting a copy, which, anticipating such a course, I have kept.

I would also take this opportunity of confirming, in every particular, the statement of Dr. Thom in reference to this subject in your number for the present month. Yours truly,

Liverpool, May 7, 1851. A BAPTIST.

To the Editor of the "Primitive Church Magazine."

SIR,—I cannot allow your editorial remarks upon my letter in the January No. to pass unnoticed, and I appeal to your sense of justice for the insertion of the following:

Your imputation that my letter was written for the purpose of clandestinely introducing another subject by a side-wind, I most emphatically deny, and I had not the slightest knowledge of any other persons, either here or elsewhere, having written you on the subject.

In my view of the subject, the non-eternity of punishment for sin, and the universal salvation of the human race, are inseparably connected. All schemes seeking to prove the annihilation of the unregenerate, or a purgatorial and limited state of suffering, I reject as unscriptural, and can only see the punishment of sin taken away by the sacrifice and atonement of the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, who came to destroy death and him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil; and so manifest Eternal Life as the gift of God.

As you have imputed motives to me, I would ask, to what motives am I to impute your refusal to allow this subject to be discussed in your pages, after having devoted so large a space to the endeavour to establish the eternity of future punishment? The present is a question of far greater importance than the controversy which called your Magazine into existence. My only desire is to discuss it on scriptural principles, and truth (like gold in the crucible) never loses any thing by being tried.

It is not sufficient answer to say that *you cannot receive* the doctrine of Universal Salvation, if that doctrine can be proved from the word of God. I do not mean the uncertain salvation, dependent on the will of man, as taught by Arminians, but a certain, eternal, unconditional salvation, according to the scriptures of truth, and shining there from the first promise to the end of the Book.

There are many questions involved in this subject, which I am willing to discuss if opportunity is afforded, both from the general principles of Scripture, and the revealed character of God, "who is the Saviour of all men, specially of them that believe" (1 Tim. iv. 10). I maintain firmly the special salvation of the election of grace, by the revelation of Jesus Christ in them, but I think I can see also the ultimate salvation of every creature, "who shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God (Rom. viii. 21)."

I would refer you to the 5th chapter of Romans for the inspired testimony as to the universality of the imputation of sin in Adam and of righteousness in Christ to every man, and to the summary in the 18th verse of that chapter, "as by the offence of one judgment came upon *all men* to condemnation, *even so* by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon *all men* unto justification of life"—for, "as in Adam *all* die, *so* in Christ shall *all* be made alive." (1 Cor. xv. 22).

If universal salvation be taught, as I conceive it is, in so plain and distinct a manner in the word of God, it is obvious that the passages which *appear* to teach an eternal life in misery must have another meaning than that commonly ascribed to them, for there is no contradiction in the word of God, all is harmony and truth, and if we see it not it is owing only to the darkness of our minds; "in Him is no darkness at all."

With regard to the fear of eternal torments having any influence in restraining man from sin, and the opposite doctrine being dangerous, as taking off that restraint, I cannot see that you have at all answered the statement I before made. Unregenerate men act only from the fear of man, "there is no fear of God before their eyes (Rom. iii. 18), they know not God, but are at enmity with him and the aboundings of iniquity are only restrained by the mighty but unseen hand of God in his providence, who in effect, says to every man, "Hitherto shalt thou go but no further," and man has no more power to commit sin than he has to make himself righteous, but as he is permitted by his Maker (John xix. 11). The proof, or illustration, you adduce in support of your view, is that of a person quickened to feel himself a sinner; on such the dread of the anger of God has an effect such as you describe, until the love of God is shed abroad in his heart, and he sees that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin."

I remain,

Yours truly,

(Signed) A BAPTIST.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Should the doctrine of Universal Salvation be proclaimed to the world?

Dear Sir,—A letter from Anetazo in No. 14 having given occasion for a reply from Ekdikalethes published in Nos. 15 and 16 of the Universalist, Anetazo finds himself constrained to make a few remarks on the reply, the author of which being so much according to Anetazo's own heart, and some of his sentiments so completely in harmony with his own—there cannot be much difference between them in any thing of real importance. Both correspondents agree in the following statements contained in the reply. "We neither withold nor conceal, nor have we any wish to do so, nor are we afraid to tell any truth, that the word of God communicates to us. We contend for proclaiming the apostolic gospel, the glad tidings of God's mercy to sinners, salvation God's gift to the guilty. The gospel really means the salvation of all men however men may misunderstand it. We should have no hesitation in placing the scriptures in the hands of unbelieving men. —That God loves me, and loves you, and loves all, and that his love will be effective in carrying out his purpose of salvation to me, to you, to some, to all—are all statements which we believe and rejoice in." Being both agreed in these statements they must therefore be agreed that "God's universal love" may be proclaimed to all. The chief difference seems to be in the *manner* of proclaiming it. Ekdikalethes says, "the gospel preached by the apostles was, God loves and forgives sinners." Anetazo says, "The fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ is not preached unless when it is proclaimed, that God loves and forgives all." Anetazo is challenged to produce one instance in which the apostolic preaching expressed the latter to the unbelieving world. Without assumption, or presumption, we think it may be concluded that the apostles would adhere to the rules of their *commission*. They were sent forth to preach the gospel to *every* creature. To them was committed the *word* of reconciliation, which is this, "God was in Christ reconciling the *world* unto himself not imputing their *trespasses* unto them." This is a proclamation of the universal love and forgiveness of God to *all*. "In thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed;" this is the gospel and was proclaimed by the apostle to those, who denied the Holy one and the Just, who with wicked hands crucified and slew Jesus of Nazareth. Acts. iii. 26. This gospel was also preached to the unbelieving Galatians. Gal. iii. 20. Let this do for *one* instance at present. Read 1 Cor. xiv. there you will find the congregation of believers, commanded for the sake of the unlearned and unbelieving, to speak in words easy to be understood, that the unlearned and unbelieving who might come in might hear *all* that was proclaimed to believers. *Where* then, or why, the distinction between the preaching the universal love of God to believers, and the proclaiming of it to unbelievers, when both parties are to *hear all* proclaimed?

But we should do as they (the apostles) did: so says the reply. Of the apostles Jesus said he that heareth *you* heareth *me*. This cannot be said of us. Unless we speak as the Oracles of God, without adding to, or taking away from the sayings of the Revelation of God. Our teaching and proclaiming is merely *human*—by the *will of man*; not as before the scriptures were completed, by the *will of God*. Man may now tell his brother man that he is fully persuaded that the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are true and divine, but he cannot make his brother see that it is so—God only can so persuade and teach In this the most learned man under the sun, can do no more than an ass and colt could do, if like Balaam's ass it could speak in a human tongue. We are allowed to "answer *every* man who asketh us a reason of the hope that is in us, with meekness and fear." He who asketh, whether he is a believer or an unbeliever, may be told that we have the hope of eternal life because God who cannot lie promised it before the world began. Titus i. 2.—that we hope for glorious liberty, because the *whole creation* is subjected in this hope, Rom. viii. 20. and shall be delivered,—that we have the hope of salvation, because God will have *all* men to be saved, and *his will* ever was, is, and shall be *done* on earth and in heaven,—that we believe Adam enjoyed the hope of eternal life, and understood the love and forgiveness of God to be *universal* because it was promised before the world began—promised in the words addressed to the unbelieving serpent, before Adam was driven

out of the garden to till the ground, which was at the beginning of the world. We believe that Abraham *so* understood God's love and forgiveness: he looked for a better *country* and no doubt for a *blessing* far superior to the temporal blessings of Palestine. We do not think Nicodemus was a believer in the Son of God when he first came to Jesus by night—he did not believe *earthly* things—he was not born of God—how could he believe in the Lord from heaven? There is no doubt that he *became* a true believer in the Lord Jesus Christ. We think the passage Matt. vii. 6, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine," is by many misunderstood. The passage should not have had a *paragraph* prefixed. It is in close connexion with the sayings of Jesus going before, and ought to be understood as forbidding the practice of parading our fasting, praying, and almsgiving *before the world to be seen of men*. We do not think that the passage has any reference to the *manner* of preaching the gospel. But after answering those who ask us a reason of the hope that is in us, we ought by all means to guard against using any expression that may have a tendency to lead those addressed, to imagine that what we have stated is an "improvement" on the apostolic testimony, or an attempt to substitute the wisdom of man for the wisdom of God. All that we can state, over or under, the bare words of the Bible, is neither more nor less, nor else, than mere *human opinion*. It appears that Ekdikalethes is afraid that the preaching of forgiveness of *all* to unbelievers is apt to suggest the thought that as God loves *all*, just as they are, he is disposed to overlook their sins, and thereby hide the display of the greatness of God's hatred to sin and wrath against sinners. Anetazo is afraid that keeping back the proclamation of God's love and forgiveness of *all*, has a tendency to suggest, that sinners must be otherwise than *as they are* ere they can expect that God's love and forgiveness will be extended to *them*, and may thereby raise that smoke of the bottomless pit, which breathes forth, "*stand by thyself, come not near me, I am holier than thou*. Both correspondents thus seem afraid of "limiting the Holy One of Israel." The one of limiting his *hatred* and *wrath*—the other of limiting his *impartiality and love*.

Acts xiii. is rejected as being one instance of the Apostles' proclaiming God's universal to unbelievers. Anetazo continues to look upon it as an instance to the very point of the challenge. The audience of the apostle at that time consisted of contradicting, despising and blaspheming Jews, and demon-worshipping Gentiles, not a believer or true worshipper of the Father amongst them, so far as we can learn. —To these Paul proclaimed "I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles that thou shouldest be for *salvation* to the *ends of the earth*." Can there be a proclamation of a more universal salvation than this? We maintain that the Jews understood it so, for they blasphemed, because the Gentiles were put on a level with them; they would not have eternal life unless it were bestowed on them on account of some *worthiness* in themselves—while the Gentiles rejoiced and were glad that forgiveness was extended to them *as they were*. The apostles did proclaim the gospel in its integrity, but they no where *limited* salvation to those who *believed* it. When they said whosoever believeth shall be saved, they declared a truth; but these words are not the gospel: and when they added he that believeth not shall be damned, it is clear that their meaning was that the gospel would not *profit* those who believed it not, but the condemnation hanging over them *before* they heard it would *abide* upon them. Though our sins are really forgiven, this joyful *truth* cannot *profit* us while *unbelieved*—yet our unbelief cannot make it a lie. "What if some did not believe, shall their unbelief make the faithfulness of God of none effect?" It cannot be.

If we believe not, he abideth faithful, he cannot deny himself. He hath said and sworn that in Christ all families of the earth shall be blessed—it *shall* be so. Many of the believing Jews thought that salvation was restricted to those who could count their genealogy from Abraham, and did not see that sinners of the Gentiles could be saved. Genealogies are now no more. There is neither Jew nor Greek. male nor female, common nor unclean, the wall of partition is out of the way—there is one common faith, one common salvation, *alike* for the *far off* and the *nigh*, all being one in Christ Jesus; so, that which was in part a mystery in other ages, is now made known to all since the day of Pentecost Eph. iii. 5.

How can one see God's love to *himself*, a *sinner*, and not see God's love to *all*, eternal life being the *gift* of God? An answer to this by any one will be acceptable to

April 28th. 1851. ANETAZO.

Dear Sir—Herewith a few scripture extracts concerning the risen Lord Jesus Acts 10—41, are kindly presented to the attention of those Christian brethren and sisters who, at present, think it *impossible* there can be *any intercourse*, in the *Millennial Resurrection age*, between *spiritual* beings and *natural* beings that have not yet passed through death.

The appearances of, and intercourse with Jesus *after* His resurrection.

To Mary, as a *Gardener*. John xx, 14
To the two *Marys*. Matt. xxiii—9, 10.
To two disciples, as a *Stranger*. Luke xxiv, 13.
To Peter. Luke xxiv, 34.
To the Apostles, (Thomas *absent*) Luke xxiv, 36.
To the eleven, (Thomas *present*.) John xxiv, 26.
To above five hundred, *at once*. 1Cor. xv, 6.
To *all* the disciples, on the *sea shore, the third time*. John xxi, 12, 13, 14.

They all *saw* Jesus with their *natural, bodily* eyes, as *plainly* as *before* His death: and some of them did *talk—eat*—and *drink* with Him. 1 John i. 1, 2

Yours truly,
W. S.

Sir,—Can any of your readers favour me, and those who take an interest in your magazine, with brief, but authentic memoirs of James Relly, Nathaniel Scarlett, Neil Douglas?

Indeed, with memoirs of any, belonging to this country, who during their earthly career were zealous for the cause of God's Universal love?

The lives and actions of men who, in their day, were *burning and shining lights* of the Universalist denomination, most fervently desirous am I to become acquainted with. Others, I doubt not, concur with me in the wish just expressed.

I am, Sir,
With earnest wishes for the success of your periodical,
Yours respectfully
D. THOM.

Errata in May No.

Page 124, line 14 from top, *for* worse *read* overt. Page 134, line 4 from top, *for* threatenings *read* threatening. Page 134, line 9 from bottom of text, the word sufferings should have been written instead of punishment.

REVIEWS.

A Few Thoughts suggested by the perusal of a Tract, entitled, "The Groaning Creation Delivered." By Paroikos. Brighton, 1847.
Variety in Unity, a Universal law of Truth. By John Fawcett. Brighton, 1849. —(Procurable through H. K. Lewis.)

Many of our readers are well acquainted with the name of Major Fawcett; and all of them have been interested, we should add, edified by those productions of his which have from time to time appeared in our columns under the signature of *Paroikos.* (*Stranger*) We use the freedom thus unhesitatingly to point to him as the author of both the pamphlets now lying before us, as, besides his language at the end of the second one, "The salutation of John Fawcett with my own hand," he expressly there appropriates to himself, the tract entitled, "A Letter addressed to J. N. D." &c. and publishes the productions of *Paroikos*, along with this tract, as his own.

We have room only for a very few remarks on both the works, the titles of which appear at the head of this notice.

Nothing can be conceived more scriptural, or more to the point, than the "Few Thoughts" on the "Deliverance of the Groaning Creation." Instead of having recourse to vague human reasonings, or vain human speculations, the Major at once draws attention to the sense in which the Greek word κτισις, *creature or creation*, is employed in the sacred writings. Nineteen times does it occur in the New Testament. Shortly, simply, and satisfactorily are the various significations assigned to it in our Version, brought under notice, considered, and disposed of. Ultimate deliverance is by many, (including Matthew Henry, among others,) allowed to be the portion of all creatures, except unregenerate men. The absurdity, as well as flat contradiction of express divine declarations made elsewhere, which is involved in thus arbitrarily excluding from creation, its most important constituent element, in order to satisfy the requirements of a mere human theory, is most happily exposed. And the whole passage, Rom. viii. 19—23, "tortured into miserable contradiction and absurdity, to support the popular notion of the endless punishment of the wicked," is rescued from the clutches of its tormentors. "So perish all human notions before the sacred Oracles," exclaims the Major; and so say we.

His "Variety in Unity" is characterised by the same excellencies as his other productions. He fairly states, rather quotes at length, the views of antagonists in their own language, and then fairly and manfully grapples with them. Having done so he proceeds to shew, in a manner brief, but clear, truthful, and impressive, that "Variety in Unity" is God's order in creation—the Unity illustrated, beautified, perfected by the Variety. Undoubtedly, the idea is not a new one. It is strictly scriptural.* And in the pages of Jeremiah White we meet with some most pleasing and striking illustrations of it. But our worthy and esteemed friend, Major Fawcett, is no mere copier of others. He has wrought out the problem for himself; or, rather, in the light of scripture, he has been led to see the truth, and appreciate the value of the principle for which he contends. Hence he presents to us his view of the subject, if in few words, at all events with great power, freshness, and originality. We rise from the perusal of his tract, if lovers of the scriptures, with a conviction, that no human articles, creeds, and confessions, and no human works on the subject of religion, have ever exhausted, or ever can exhaust the fulness, rich exuberance, nay infinite copiousness of the discoveries made in God's word; that the final salvation of all men, through the death and resurrection of the God-man, Christ Jesus, is one of the ways, in which the manifold wisdom of

* Compare such passages as Eph. iii. 10, see *Greek, Ibid.* 18, 19, Heb. i. 1, &c. &c. with Gal. iii. 20, Rom. xi. 33—36, &c.

God is disclosed to the Church; and that the whole of that boundless variety of manifestation of which the gospel is the grand medium, is subservient to the shewing forth of the essential unity of him, who is "without variableness or the shadow of turning." James i. 17.

To our readers let us affectionately and earnestly recommend the procuring and perusal of the tracts mentioned at the head of this article, as well as of all the Major's productions. D. T.

Baptismal Regeneration the Doctrine of the Prayer-Book. By a disbeliever in Baptismal Regeneration.—Brighton, 1850. (Procurable through H. K. Lewis.)

Looking at this ably-written, valuable, and seasonable tract, we are reminded, that we have never yet tried to do justice to a larger production of its author, in which the doctrine of Universal Salvation is vindicated with amazing power, and in a manner the most condensed. Should we be spared, and should this periodical be continued, we shall endeavour, at some no distant period, to make up for our apparent neglect.

The publication now before us consists of two letters by J. N. B. (John Nelson Bond, Esq,) which have appeared in the "Patriot," (the former of them, after having been refused insertion by the "Record,") and of an Appendix.

Both letters, indeed the whole tract, have for their object, not certainly to promote the cause of Puseyism, for that the author loathes and repudiates, but to shew, that in the matter of Baptismal Regeneration, the Puseyites are more consistent with the language, and sentiments of the Anglican liturgy, than are their evangelical opponents. The subterfuges to which the latter have had recourse in order to justify their use of the Baptismal Service, he logically, and mercilessly demolishes. So perfect is his train of reasoning, that assuming the truth of his premises, there is no escaping from his conclusions. Rich is his exposé of what is called "the judgment of charity." No wonder that the letter which tore away the veil from this delusion, was refused admission into the columns of the "Record." A thoughtful and prayerful perusal of it might have had a tendency to convert some evangelical clergymen of the Church of England, into dissenters from her communion. Mr. Bond's second letter is, if possible, still more powerful in its statements and reasonings, than the first! He was in penning it evidently under less restraint. In it, he tears to pieces the subterfuge of the Prayer-Book permitting the officiating minister, in baptizing the child, to intend, by its *regeneration*, merely *an introduction into the visible Church of Christ*, as distinguished from that *real change* which is indispensable to *admission into the true and heavenly Church of the living God.* For this able and unanswerable letter, the evangelical clergy of the establishment will not, we suspect, thank our friend.

In the Appendix, Mr. Bond sets himself, with the same vigour and success which he has displayed in the letters, to the assault and overthrow of the theory of "a conditional and hypothetical regeneration," being all that is implied in the Baptismal Ritual.

On the whole, the tract may truly be spoken of as *multum in parvo.* A more scathing and blasting thunderbolt, from an unexpected quarter, has seldom and so justly fallen on a body of men, many of whom, notwithstanding the false position which they occupy, and the miserable apologies for an eclesiastical malpractice to which they have recourse, Mr. Bond and we cannot but respect. D. T.

"The World that shall be, or the Good Time that's coming." The Closing Lecture of a Course delivered at the request of the Church of England Institution, in the Royal Amphitheatre [Liverpool] on Monday Evening, March 24th. 1851. By the Rev. Hugh M'Neile, D.D. Liverpool. 1851

If long and pompous flourishes of trumpets, and a name known and popular wherever Church of Englandism is professed and upheld, could ensure scrip-

tural accuracy and truthfulness of statement, we should have found them in the lecture before us.

But alas! in no age has mere human ability applied to the consideration of the scriptures, been a guarantee for the discovery and promulgation of divine truth; or has "the shrill clarion of fame" necessarily designated him, to whom God hath vouchsafed the knowledge and love of his most blessed word. Human talents and acquirements have, in but too many cases, afforded their possessors the means, with greater effect, of perverting the heavenly testimony; and the applauses of listening crowds, while shewing that the *vox populi* is not certainly the *vox Dei*, have but too often tended to give weight and currency to their misrepresentations. Truly, *not many wise men after the flesh are called.* 1 Cor. 1. 26. To have our human wisdom in matters of religion superseded by that which is divine, as it is out of sight the most precious, so is it the rarest of all God's good and heavenly gifts.

We have been led thus to think and speak, by a perusal of the painful and unscriptural piece of writing which we are now setting ourselves to the task of animadverting on.

Had it proceeded from a disciple of Condercet or Robert Owen—had its author been a professed Unitarian, Neologian, or Socialist—we should have considered him to be labouring in his proper vocation, and to be uttering sentiments which, however captivating to the popular ear at the present moment, we had nothing whatever to do with. We should have acted on the principle of allowing *the dead, to bury their dead.* But Dr. M'Neile is in the full "odour of orthodoxy." He is a man of professedly evangelical sentiments, to whom for years the church-of-England public of Liverpool have been looking up as their great Hierophant, and to whom enchanted auditories in various parts of the United Kingdom have been listening as one of the principal living expositors of the precious effects of Christ's blood, and resurrection from the dead, upon the conscience. Such is the individual who has chosen to stultify himself and destroy the *prestige* of his evangelism, by first delivering, and then publishing a lecture, in which the dreams of infidels and arrant fleshly enthusiasts are ratified, and the scriptural hopes of God's children are unceremoniously thrown overboard—in which the fall of man, the promises of the future Messiah, the giving of the law, the coming of God's own Son in flesh, his death on the cross, and his resurrection and ascension to God's right hand, are represented as having been subservient merely to *the bringing of things back to the point from which they originally started!* Does not an assault on God's revealed purpose so outrageous,—does not a view of things at once so inconsistent with scripture, and so distressingly offensive to all who having *borne here the image of the earthy*, are looking forwarded by faith to their *bearing* hereafter *the image of the heavenly*, 1 Cor. xv. 49. render it the imperative duty of all whose minds have been brought into subjection to divine testimony, and who have the opportunity of lifting up their voices in its behalf, to put fellow believers on their guard, and to enter their solemn protest against delusions, under which Winchesterian Universalists, no less than a large body of Milliennial professors of the Partialist school are found labouring?

Important is the subject, but from circumstances our notice of the lecture must be brief.

Mrs. Morgan assuming the literal meaning of the Old Testament scriptures to be true, and that she herself is qualified to interpret, and apply that literal meaning, has, as we have recently seen, indulged us with a view of the Jews, and Gentile nations, enjoying, subsequently to Christ's second coming, a forty nine thousand years residence upon earth, prior to that grand Jubilee of Creation, in which all preceding states and æras are, according to her, to terminate. This, as a professed explanation of God's word is certainly bad enough. It was reserved for Dr. M'Neile, however, to improve on the notions of our fair friend. After having supposed, that when the conflagration of the earth shall have taken place, it will be renewed and restored much as it appeared in the

days of man's Paradisiac state,* and after having supposed a further restoration to mankind of material bodies, matter, according to him, having no necessary connexion with sin,† the learned and eloquent Doctor anticipates, that on the earth thus restored, and in bodies thus restored, we are to live not for *forty nine thousand years,* which is the modest computation of our worthy Universalist coadjutrix, but *for ever.* We are to get back for ever the Jewish Dispensation! We are to get back for ever the Paradise of Eden! Mrs. Morgan, in imposing a limit to these *restored blessings,* (?) was moderate certainly as compared with Dr. M'Neile.

That we commit no mistake in thus giving the drift and scope of the Doctor's Lecture, is plain, not merely from incidental expressions such as those quoted in preceding notes, but from the fact of his having avowed it to be his grand object to shew, concerning the world as it shall be, that "we may learn the most important lessons of revelation, under the following heads:—

"First, a glimpse of it is given in Paradise.

"Secondly, a description of it is given in Prophecy.

"Thirdly, a specimen of it is given in the Ministry of Christ.

"Fourthly, a caricature of it is given in the assumptians of Anti-Christ.

"And, lastly, the principle of it is given us in the Ten Commandments of God." Pp. 9, 10. [The close is somewhat queer; but as the Doctor has chosen thus to express himself, we cannot help it.]

In plain English, according to Dr. M'Neile, we are perfectly able to discover from scripture, and perfeetly competent to understand with our present faculties, what during the future reign of Christ we are destined to be. And this because the future is in some respects a restoration of the past, and in others, is visibly disclosed in the present. Whether or not this is to give the lie, in no very equivocal terms, to the word of God, the spiritually taught reader must judge.—"It doth not yet appear what we shall be," saith the Holy Ghost. 1 John iii. 2. It doth appear, clearly and unmistakably what we shall be, is the comment of the able and popular Church of England Clergyman.—"Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him," is, in the Old Testament Scriptures, the language of inspiration with regard to New Testament blessings, Isaiah lxiv. 4, and is in the New Testament Scriptures, the same language, with regard to future and heavenly ones. 1 Cor. ii. 9. The eye of man in the earthly Paradise hath seen, the ear of man in listening to the language of prophecy literally interpreted hath heard, and the mind of man beholding Christ manifest in flesh hath been enabled to conceive the things which God hath in store for us hereafter, is the way which our uninspired champion of a pseudo-orthodoxy takes of shewing his reverence for the truth of God.—Christ "shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself," is the grand prospect of futurity wherewith God comforts the members of his Church. Christ shall come back to earth, resume, and live for ever again in a body like our present material one, is our author's manner of inspiring comfort, as well as of modestly correcting the mistake into which God has been betrayed on the subject.—Such is a specimen of the contradictions to the heavenly testimony with which every supporter of a fleshly millennialism, and Dr. M'Neile among the rest, is necessarily chargeable. Such is a specimen of the modes in which the Lord of Glory is, through the

* "And where do we expect that this change will be manifested? Why here—here in this earth, this identical world; here where the evils which we as yet deplore did exist. We allege that the rectification will be where the dislocation was: that *place* enters into the purpose of God, as well as character and condition; and that here in this world, where the evil came to pass, and lasted so long, *the good shall come to pass, and last longer, even for ever and ever.*" p. 8. [The last italics are ours.]

† "There is no *necessary* connexion between matter and sin, matter and decay, matter and death. The connexion we now so painfully experience is an adventitious one, brought in by sin, *and to be driven out by righteousness.* [The italics ours.] It is in no way inherent, whether the matter be that of the globe we tread upon, or that of which the human body is composed" p. 12.

medium of giving the lie to his word, *wounded in the house of his* professed *friends.*

The late celebrated Dr. Chalmers is dragged in by his brother graduate and theologian, as a co-witness with him to the truth of his theory. This is a part of his tract in which we conceive our author to be eminently successful. To the chord touched by the minister of St. Paul's, Liverpool, the language quoted from the Scottish preacher vibrates in perfect unison. Neither the appellant, nor he to whom the appeal is made, appears ever to have risen by faith above *the present.* Both are found indulging in dreams which represent the heavenly as a repetition of the earthly; and which, confounding the divine with the human, by supposing the former to be identical with the latter, Ps. l. 21,* hold out to Socinians, Neologians, and other fleshly religionists, of a similar description, the prospect of the professedly evangelical, at no distant period, coming to a better understanding with them, than they are now prepared to avow. How sweet and captivating, because intelligible by fleshly mind, the pictures drawn by the Scottish and Irish Doctors, of green fields, smiling valleys, bubbling streams, and enchanting landscapes, in that future state which it is the object of their declamation to describe and recommend! Why should the open Socinian, Pelagian, and Arminian, who are expecting to carry up their nature and virtues with them into the heavenly state, quarrel with men like Dr. Chalmers and Dr. M'Neile, who shew such an amiable solicitude to spare them all this trouble, by bringing down the heavenly state to the level of the earthly?

To Dr. M'Neile, and all other dreamers and enthusiasts like himself, whenever especially the scriptures are attempted to be brought in by them as confirmatory of their theory of human nature and human life, either as now, or in a somewhat improved form, being restored hereafter, our simple and scriptural statement is, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature," 2 Cor. v. 17, and "Behold I make all things new." Rev. xxi. 5. That is, Christ died and rose again, not to bring matters back to their former earthly state, or to any thing like it, but to supersede a state that is earthly, by a state that is heavenly. He died, to end the old creation, in ending sin; he rose again, to establish the new creation, which was effected by his swallowing up of death in victory. Therefore it is, that in making things new, old things of necessity pass away. Isaiah lxv. 17, 2 Cor. v. 17. *Restoration* of Adam's nature, through Christ Jesus, however great a favourite it may be with *fleshly* minded men, has no place in the *spiritual* vocabulary. Adam having by sin forfeited *human nature*, Jesus, the second Adam, by righteousness bestows *the divine nature.* 2 Peter i. 4.

So far from being able to comprehend the future state, or to map and define it as Dr. M'Neile affects to do, we only know and rejoice in the prospect of possessing it, by that faith which is content to postpone all apprehension of its nature, until we shall be *like Christ and see him as he is;* 1 John iii. 2; and it is our present total inability to take in the slightest conception of the surpassing and infinite glory of that state, not our ability, with Dr. M'Neile, to restrict and limit it by human apprehensions of its nature, thereby rendering it attractive to the sceptic and the infidel, that imparts to it such value and importance in our eyes.

D. T.

A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Wiseman, on the Power of the Keys of St. Peter; shewing that there is no Successor either of Peter or of Paul. By Robert Stark, of Torquay, Devon. Exeter, Latimer; Torquay, Elliot, Cochrane, and Wreford. 1851.

Those who have any recollection of the "Biblical Enquirer," and who happen to be familiar with the notions of the "Salemites," will no doubt feel some

* "Where do we expect that this change will be manifested? Why here—here, in this earth, n this identical world." p. 8.

interest in having brought under their notice another production from the fertile pen of Mr. Stark.

Like every thing else written by that gentleman, the tract before us indicates clearness of head, vigour of intellect, no inconsiderable logical power and acumen, and amazing acquaintance with the letter of Scripture.

Perhaps, four fifths of Mr. Stark's letter are entitled to our prompt and unqualified assent. He admirably exposes the delusion of the existence of a distinct order of men in New Testament times, who, although humanly taught and humanly ordained, hold the rank, and possess the privileges of the divinely taught and divinely ordained apostles; and, having disposed of the figment of Apostolical Succession, he gives a lucid and scriptural view of what is implied in *the keys of the kingdom of Heaven* having been committed to, and used by Peter. Above all, we are pleased with the remarks made by him in the 12th, 13th, and 14th pages of his tract, as to the attempts of fallible and uninspired men to fence round, and secure from danger, God's infallible and inspired testimony, "by means of articles, catechisms, and canons" of their own invention; and as to the fact of any one called a layman having just as much authority, and in proportion to his acquaintance with the Scriptures being just as well qualified to speak concerning them, as a Bishop. The "Gospel now stands recorded, and is open to all alike. Men may read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest it. Men may study it, and lecture on it, according to the best of their judgment and understanding. A Bishop may do this, and a layman may do the same, but neither the Bishop nor the layman can claim any divine authority or appointment; neither the one nor the other is a successor of the Apostles: the rule, authority, and power, which existed in the Apostolic age, were abolished, and terminated with their ministry." p. 14.

We wish that in speaking of *private interpretation* our friend had hinted, however transiently, that the real translation of the words in 2 Peter i. 20, referred to,* is *self-interpretation*, or *its own interpretation*. This not only the ordinary sense of the Greek word ἴδιος, bnt the scope of the passage undeniably shews. The great object of the Spirit here, using the instrumentality of the Apostle Peter, is to make it apparent, that as Old Testament Prophecy was not understood by those to whom it was originally committed to writing, so neither now is it capable of explaining itself to us. "Holy men of God spake," not as their own will or the will of man prompted, but "as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" and as a meaning thus lay hid in their own words, which as mere automata in the hands of God, they were incapable of comprehending themselves, so neither could it be comprehended by others, except by means of a subsequent and higher revelation. (Would that fleshly millennialists, our M'Neiles, Morgans, Seabrooks, and others, would but ponder on this!) Noticing the import of the phrase "*self-interpretation*"—that is perceiving and shewing that no Old Testament prophecy is able to interpret itself—our friend Mr. Stark would we think have been enabled, with even greater power and success than he has displayed, to adduce the language of the New Testament in proof and illustration of many of his positions. Not self-interpreted, but interpreted solely and throughout in the light of the person, work, and glory of Jesus Christ is the language of ancient prophecy.

One grand objection (for it is not the *sole* one), on our part, to the views of Mr. Stark and the Salemites, has for many years been his and their attempt to make *the end* of the *Mosaic Dispensation*, synonymous and synchronous with *the end* of *the world*, and of *all things*. We have a specimen of their endeavour to make a Procrustes' bed of a favourite human theory, and to stretch, rack, and torture the Scriptures upon it, towards the end of the pamphlet now lying before us. No doubt there, as always, much ingenuity is evinced. But, alas! ingenuity is all the praise which, as respects this matter, can be awarded to our friend's labours. To accomplish his object, of course, 2 Peter iii. 11—14, and corresponding passages, although occurring in the New Testament, and therefore

* Ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως.

in that portion of God's word which is explanatory of the Old, must have a sense assigned to them, inconsistent with their implying a termination of this present world. And other New Testament prophecies, especially 2 Thess. ii. 1—10, must, notwithstanding the hint given, verses 6—8, as to the necessity of the legal dispensation passing away, before the state of things there spoken of could begin to be developed, be so squeezed and confined, as to have had their full accomplishment, within ten or fifteen years, after they were written. Besides, our friend seems never to have learned the lesson which a perusal of John xix. 28, *Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst,*—of verse 30th, IT IS FINISHED,—and of the facts recorded, verses, 31—35, together with the inspired comment on them, verse 36th, *these things were done, that* THE SCRIPTURE SHOULD BE FULFILLED, (see also verse 37th),—observe, after *all things had been already accomplished*, verse 28*th* —might, if duly attended to, have taught him, viz. that one class of *all things* might be accomplished, while another class of *all things* yet remained to be so. —We regret these vagaries of Mr. Stark. They are sad blemishes upon the face of a system, in many respects very valuable, because very scriptural. When will men come to learn, that God's word will no more submit to be confined by human diagrams and definitions, than by human "catechisms, articles, and canons"? D. T.

The Substance of a Sermon on the Seventeenth Article of the Church of England, preached in the district Church of Houghton, Cumberland, on Lord's Day, January 5, 1851. By the Incumbent. [Rev. John Buck, D.C.L.] London R. Groombridge & Sons, 5 Paternoster Row; Carlisle, Charles Thurnam, English Street. 1851.

THE POWER OF THE KEYS.—*A Sermon preached at St. Clement's Church, Manchester, on Sunday Evening, Jan.* 5, 1851. By the Rev. J. Leighton Figgins, A.B. Incumbent. London, Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.; Manchester, Simms & Dinham, 16, St. Ann's Square. 1851.

[Both Sermons published by request.]

SOMEWHAT singular is it that the two Sermons, the titles of which we have placed at the head of this article, should have been preached on the same day, should by the kindness of their respective and respected authors have come into our hands in the course of the same week, and should be the productions of two gentlemen, the one of whom succeeded the other in the ministry of the same church.* These curious coincidences, rather than any particular connexion between the topics of which the two discourses treat, have induced us to place and speak of them together.

Notwithstanding considerable differences of opinion, we have had the pleasure of enjoying the friendship and intimacy of both the clergymen, whose pamphlets now lie before us. Indeed, we can number among our acquaintances also, Dr. Buck's predecessor, and Mr. Figgins' successor in St. Matthew's.† Anything like this we cannot say respecting the incumbents of any other church or chapel in Liverpool.

The sermon of Dr. Buck takes for its text, 2 Thess. ii. 13, 14. In reality, as the title intimates, it treats of the doctrines laid down in the Seventeenth Article of the Church of England, and seems to be one of a series of discourses

* St. Matthew's, Key Street, Liverpool. This was originally a Presbyterian place of worship; and in it, in April 1777, we have been given to understand, were ordained at the same time, the Rev. John Yates, afterwards of Paradise Street Chapel. and the Rev. Hugh Anderson of Toxteth Park Chapel. After coming into the hands of the Established Church, it had a great variety and rapid succession of officiating clergymen. Dr. Buck occupied its pulpit from about 1836 till 1838; and Mr. Figgins from 1833 till 1844. Not a vestige of it now remains. Its site, and the ground attached to it, form a portion of the *terminus* of the Liverpool, Southport, and East Lancashire Railways.

† These are the Rev. Mr. Gowring, well known as a writer in the "Gospel Magazine," who officiated in St. Matthew's about 1834 and 1835; and the Rev. Robert Townley, B.A. who was Minister during 1841, and the early part of 1845, and is now incumbent of the Universalist Church, Charlestown, Boston, United States.

preached by its able, learned, and esteemed author, in exposition and vindication of the truths asserted in the great Anglican Formulary. Highly and decidedly Calvinistic is this composition of the Doctor's, in its whole strain. Its leading topic is the sovereign and distinguishing love of God to the members of his Church. "The purposes of the Godhead, secret to us until they are revealed by the Holy Spirit," it proposes to consider, and does consider, "in a three-fold point of view: his decretive will—his electing love—his predestinating grace." Clearly, consistently, and powerfully, as might have been anticipated, does Dr. Buck handle his subject. He is no Universalist; indeed, the decided foe of God's boundless mercy. But, in spite of this, his views are so far scriptural. So far as he goes, we see little or nothing to object to. Some phrases, perhaps, we might have liked altered. But where, upon the whole, the matter is so excellent and unobjectionable, we are not disposed to be hypercritical.

Our friend Mr. Figgins, has written with a direct reference to the recent Papal Aggression. The power of the keys entrusted to Peter, Matt. xvi. 18, 19, furnishes him with the groundwork of his discourse. In opening up his subject, he enquires first, "What is this power, and to whom was it committed?" in answering which, he ably and satisfactorily blows to pieces the doctrine of "Apostolical Succession."—His answer to the second question, "To whom was the language of the text addressed?" allows a certain priority and pre-eminence exclusively to Peter. Qualified and explained as Mr. Figgins' words under this head are, we see nothing that is positively objectionable in them. On the contrary, we think he establishes his point. Peter certainly did use the keys of the kingdom of Heaven in opening it, first to Jews, Acts ii. and afterwards to Gentiles, Acts x. Perhaps we should have liked better, if Mr. Figgins, either in the text or in a note, had adverted to that magnificent and most instructive criticism of Granville Penn, on the language of verse 18, occuring in that eminent man's "Annotations on the Book of the New Covenant," in which he renders it extremely doubtful, if the words, *Thou art Peter*, were ever uttered by our Lord at all. Σὺ ἐιπας, *thou hast said it*, is nearly if not quite as ancient a reading as Σὺ ἐι Πετρος, *thou art Peter;* and uncial letters, without spaces between the words, and written contractedly, produce equally both readings. CTEIΠC, or ΣΥΕΙΠΣ, may, when extended, be either συ ἐιπας, or συ ἐι Πετρος—a state of dubiety in which no witchcraft is required to tell us to which side the Church of Rome would lean, and on the propagation of which lection its influence would be brought to bear. Does not συ ἐιπας directly express the very meaning, which the majority of Protestant interpreters have by a roundabout way sought to establish?—Under the head of Mr. Figgins' reply to his third question, "What is the meaning of the most important words in the passage?" we encounter some most interesting and important observations on "keys," "kingdom of Heaven," "binding and loosing," &c. Altogether, this is a very valuable portion of a very valuable sermon. To its able, eloquent, and scripturally-minded author, we return our best thanks, and hope that from the success of this *coup d'essai* of his, he may be induced soon to venture before the public again.

Mr. Figgins, no more than Dr. Buck, makes a profession of Universalism. No matter. We bless God for the measure of truth that has been revealed to him, and desire to profit by his scriptural teaching, to the extent to which it goes.

D. T.

Speech of HENRY DRUMMOND, Esq., M.P. *in the House of Commons, on Thursday, March* 27, 1851, *on the Second Reading of the "Ecclesiastical Titles Bill."* With a Preface and Notes. London: Thomas Bosworth, Regent Street. 1851.

A MOST seasonable publication. Public opinion requires to be rectified as to what Popery is, and as to its workings and tendencies. Mr. Drummond's speech, which when delivered in the House of Commons, and as reported in

the newspapers, was telling enough, now that it comes out with the addition of painful, but most important notes, disclosing a state of things, the re-introduction of which into England every right-minded Protestant has reason to deprecate, may well excite serious reflection. Popery, however foul and abominable, considered merely *as a religion*, has a right to the most perfect tolerance. But Popery, under the guise of religion assuming a secular character and aspect, —introducing monasteries and nunneries, invading death-beds, clutching at spoil, and interfering with education and the laws of the realm,—requires on the part of our government and legislature, not merely *surveillance*, but the exercise of a severe and wholesome control. D. T.

Faith and the Evidences; Faith and Miracles: being an Extract from an Unpublished Essay on the Idealism of Christianity. By PETER HATELY WADDELL, Minister of the Gospel, Girvan. London: H. K. Lewis, Gower Street North; Menzies, Edinburgh; Gallie, Glasgow. 1851.

FEW productions indicate more masculine vigour of mind, more power of condensed thought, and greater ability to go down to the bottom of things, than do those of Mr. Waddell.

The pamphlet now lying before us, which purports to be an extract from a larger unpublished work, is eminently calculated to sustain, if not even to advance, the author's previously well-earned reputation. Worthy is it of the writer of "Protestant Delusions," and "The Sojourn of a Sceptic."

It consists of two chapters. The one is entitled, "Faith and the Evidences;" the other, "Faith and Miracles." Both are truly excellent. They almost exhaust the subjects of which they respectively treat. In new, striking, and original views, presented in a new, striking, and original manner, they positively abound. In reading—in acquaintance with many of the more prominent characteristics of continental philosophy and theology—in divine teaching imparted through that alone source of what is true, spiritual, and heavenly, the Bible—they shew our author to be no mean proficient. As regards acuteness, comprehension, and massive power of intellect, set off and graced by an imagination rich but under strict control, we know few of the present day who are Mr. Waddell's equals, much less superiors.

We certainly do wish, that, with his other high qualities, our author had combined a little more simplicity, or rather power of simplification. We wish that he had shewn a little more deference for the common understandings of mankind. Enlightened and vigorous minds, like his own, will read and appreciate his magnificent treatises. But what of the multitude? Alas! we fear their courage, like their understandings, failing them almost at the outset of their perusal of a work like this. Would that Mr. Waddell could have broken down its contents a little more into fragments, calculated for digestion by the popular intellect. Some, no doubt, will in spite of the difficulties which condensed and profound thought, admitting of no repose, throw in their way, press on and be benefited. Perusal of a tract like this is well fitted to brace up and give tone to the mental energies. But how many will be deterred from making the effort!

As to Mr. Waddell's grand, and upon the whole most truthful divine sentiments, an acquaintance with the scriptural theory of "Divine Inversion," can alone enable them to be understood and appreciated. D. T.

Reasons why Christians believe in the Doctrine of Universal Salvation. Tavistock: T. S. Chave. 1850.

THIS is a delightful and most useful manual of Universalist doctrine. A great proportion of it is expressed in the language of inspiration, and therefore carries with it the greatest weight. Under a certain number of heads, as, for instance, "The disbelief of truth does not make it false," "God's perfections must harmonize, or he is not God," "Evil," "The will of God and the will of man," "The will of God is love," "God will overcome evil with good," &c.

quotations from God's word, and from the works of writers on the universality and infinitude of God's love are set down. We find, likewise, towards the end of the tract, a careful selection of "Questions," such as, "Has God power over all men? Shall man's unbelief frustrate the purposes of God? Can God change?" &c. &c. all "answered by the word of God." The whole being followed up by a series of reasons, "Why we believe Christ is God manifest in the flesh."

The pamphlet closes with a brief, but most pointed poetical view or abstract, 1, of Arminianism, 2, of Calvinism, and 3, of Universalism.

Altogether, we know few tracts better fitted than this to be put into the hands of persons enquiring as to the extent of God's love, who have hitherto been ignorant even of the elements of the subject, and who cannot command time for a minute and protracted investigation. And this, because to God's word alone it points, as having authority to decide in the matter. Useful, likewise, it may be even to those who contemplate carrying out their researches farther.

D. T.

Farewell Address to the Church Assembling at the late Countess of Huntingdon's Chapel, North Street, Brighton; with the Correspondence that has passed between the Minister of the said Chapel, and one of the late Committee of Managers. (Henry James Esq, Lieut. R.N.) London: C. M. Firth, 1846.

These ably written letters of Mr. James, breathing throughout the spirit of manly independence, combined with Christian and benevolent feeling, we have long intended to notice. It is of no consequence that they have been for some years before the public. A good thing does not lose by being kept. Painfully interesting are the facts which the pamphlet now before us discloses.

Mr. James, author of the "Address," &c. and Mrs. James, had, it appears, for a long period of time been members of the late Countess of Huntingdon's connexion, and were in full communion with the Society assembling for worship in Brighton, under the ministry of the Rev. Joseph Sortain. A conviction of the love of God to man extending farther than to the Church, or first fruits of the spiritual harvest, having been introduced into their minds, they, particularly Mrs. James who was active and zealous in every good work, seem honestly to have brought the fact under the notice of their Pastor. Books on the subject of Universal Salvation were left by them for his perusal. At first, it looks as if Mr. Sortain wished to carry himself gently with them. He probably did not like to come to a rupture, and part with, two such excellent and respectable members of his body. Nay, he seems at one time even to have gone so far, when conversing with Mrs. James on the subject of punishment, as to have said: "I do not myself believe in the eternity of punishment; but it will not do to preach this." p. 34.* But after a while, for what reason does not appear, Mr. Sortain saw meet to change his tactics. Mr. James was, first of all, by his orders, prevented addressing a missionary prayer meeting; and was subsequently deprived of his office as a member of the Committee of Management, as well as, with Mrs. James, debarred from the Lord's table. With some other acts of petty spite, and ecclesiastical overbearing, the aforenamed Pastor, aided by his wife, seems to have rendered himself chargeable. Eager did this gentleman shew himself, as many of his class have done, by the exercise of severity towards those professing to believe that "the living God is the Saviour of all men," to guard himself against the imputation of favouring a doctrine which, whatever may be its *divine* claims to regard, is unfashionable and unpopular.

The conduct of Mr. Sortain gave rise to the publication of the "Address," and "Correspondence" now lying before us.

Well worthy is the whole of a careful and attentive perusal—especially the long letter bearing date 29th Nov. 1845. Seldom have we met with a more

* Respecting how many more of the *soi-distant* orthodox, have reports of similar language having been used been brought to our ears.

powerful and telling application of the *argumentum ad hominem*. Mr. Sortain's own language contained in a then recent publication of his, in favour of the right of private judgment and personal liberty of conscience, is quoted against himself with most damaging effect. But more; while the precipitancy and arbitrariness of his conduct are exposed, some of the grand and most precious declarations of God's word, respecting the universality of man's redemption and salvation, are admirably brought in and enforced. What above all things we rejoice to observe is, that Mr. James's language, although pointed and spirited, is uniformly gentlemanlike, and stamped with the impress of Christian feeling and principle.

Speaking of a charge brought by Mr. Sortain against Mr. James, of his system subverting man's moral responsibility, the latter gentleman says: "with respect to my holding views which destroy, as you are pleased to assert, man's moral responsibility, I deny the fact. Hitherto, you have contented yourself with the mere assertion that I do so; it is sufficient for me to oppose, as I stedfastly do, my statement to yours. I hold man now, and ever from the first, responsible to God who made him, as a creature to his Creator—as a creature, I say possessing intelligence and affections. Man manifested dislike to the declared will of God, and opposition to it; in this he was morally wrong; and such mankind have proved themselves to be, as mere natural men, from Adam downwards to the present day. They are morally wrong; they have naturally conscience, more or less enlightened, of being wrong; they are morally responsible; and moreover, they are dealt with by the Lord, according to such their inalienable responsibility. The wages of sin is death, the punishment of death; death reigns by sin, Rom. v. and some moreover who do not partake of the first resurrection, Rev. xx. 6, the resurrection of the Just, undergo after their resurrection at a later period a second death in the lake of fire, according to their desert. But still God's gracious purpose in Christ Jesus includes them, and touches them all: Death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed; God shall be all in all. 1 Cor. xv. Surely, it is too much to be told, and, moreover, to be summarily dealt with, according to such declarations unsupported by Scripture proof, that the views which I hold destroy man's moral responsibility. I challenge you distinctly to make good your assertion on Scripture grounds, or else to retract the same." P. 21.

Another quotation we cannot resist the pleasure of making. It has respect to the word of God as the sole court of appeal in religious controversies:—"When this has been done, another assertion you have also ventured to make in the same communication of yours of October 15, may be allowed to carry some weight. I quote your own words to Mrs. James, written in vindication of yourself. 'I feel sure, however, that your own good feeling will tell you, that no such consideration should weigh against what I, what all the ministers by whom you have been taught—what the Church Catholic considers vital truth.' Certainly, as a question of fact, I may venture to disallow, as I do, that such doctrine as I hold, has been considered by the Church Catholic to be opposed to vital truth. This cannot be shewn; but even if it could, the appeal still lies to the word of God. To Him we are debtors, and not unto man; and though it is true, (notwithstanding the sweeping assertion in which you have indulged), that many have held, and that many still hold such doctrines as those wherein I rejoice, and am thankful to my Heavenly Father, I forbear to bespeak from their case any patronage of my views; and content myself, as in duty bound, with enquiring both of you and of others who may condemn me for my tenets, 'What saith the Scripture?'"

To our friends we say, read and circulate this excellent pamphlet. In some respects, we may differ from the respected author. Nevertheless, the truths for which he contends, and for avowing which he has suffered, are too valuable, and the manner in which he maintains them is on the whole too scriptural, to permit us at present to advert to either minute or more important discrepancies.

D. T.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

JULY, 1851.

THE HELL OF CHRISTENDOM AND THE HELL OF HEATHENDOM IDENTIFIED, AND COMPARED WITH THE HELL OF SCRIPTURE.

[CONCLUDED.]

AFTER quoting several passages, in which he thinks it "probable" that future punishment is taught in the Old Testament Scriptures, Professor Stuart * observes,—"The probability that *Sheol* designates the *future punishment* of the wicked, in the passage just cited, depends, perhaps, in a great measure, on the state of knowledge among the Hebrews with regard to future rewards and punishments. I am well aware, as I have already hinted above, that there are critics who maintain that the Hebrews had no knowledge or belief of any such doctrine. But as it is now past all doubt, that the ancient Egyptians (of Moses' time) did believe and teach very expressly the doctrine in question, I am not able to comprehend how Moses, "who was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," should have been ignorant of this doctrine. Nor, as I have already said, can I be persuaded without strong, nay, irrefragable evidence, that the people of God, among whom were patriarchs and prophets, knew less respecting a future state of rewards and punishments, than their heathen neighbours who were wholly destitute of any special revelations."

Is not this a remarkable passage in the work of the most eminent living defender of the orthodox hell? The Egyptians believed in future punishments—Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians—therefore the Hebrews must have believed in future punishment. The Egyptians believed that the soul of man was punished by transmigration into a pig—Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians—therefore the Hebrews believed in transmigration.† The learned Professor, backed though he be by Doctor Samuel Davidson—must excuse us if we decline placing any reliance upon such an argument (although the Hebrews should appear more ignorant than their heathen neighbours) as that God's ancient people held the doctrine of the soul's immortality and future punishment, because it was embodied in the wisdom of the Egyptians, until it can be shewn that their *wisdom* was *from above*. We believe in the authority of Moses, and are content to follow the inspired account of the matter as recorded by his pen. We presume, with Professor Stuart, that as Moses was acquainted with the

* *Exegetical Essays on Several Words relating to Future Punishment, with a Recommendatory Preface by Samuel Davidson, LL.D.* Edinburgh, 1842. p. 88.

† And so the sect of the Pharisees did in our Lord's time, as we learn from Josephus.

philosophy of the ancient Egyptians, he could not have been ignorant of their doctrine respecting man's future existence and condition. But, instead of countenancing the idea that Moses believed their notions to be true, we find in his *silence* respecting them in his five books, most satisfactory evidence that they were false. From Moses is handed down to us the account of the creation of man; but from that account we have no more authority to assume the immortality of the soul, than we have the immortality of the body.* Moses has recorded God's threatened punishments, and many of the punishments which were inflicted for the sins of men; yet we do not read of their infliction upon the immortal soul beyond the grave, much less of their endless duration. Moses was the medium of communication to man of God's laws, yet he is silent as the grave respecting the "world of woe" being the penalty of transgression. But "he that despised Moses' law died without mercy" (by stoning) "under two or three witnesses," and "every transgression received a just recompense of reward." Heb. ii. 2. Now "Moses verily was faithful in all his house." (Heb. iii. 5). But if man has an immortal soul to save, and a world of woe to escape, Paul has made a mistake in characterising him as *faithful*—the conduct of Moses is utterly inexplicable, and our "faithful preachers" are showing us wherein Moses was deficient; for no declamation such as we now hear proceeded from his lips, nor from any who were sent to denounce God's judgments upon the sinful and impenitent.

"The immortality of the soul" is neither the language nor the doctrine of Scripture. Even amongst the heathen, those who taught it admitted that their best arguments failed to yield them satisfaction.† Such is the glimmering and flickering *light of nature!* Only the light of divine revelation could disclose the truth respecting man and his destiny, and this light we have: *life and immortality are brought to light by the gospel*—by the glad tidings which were first made known to man after he had sinned. Indeed until man had sinned, upon him immortality could not be conferred, and to him it could not be revealed. Mortality is swallowed up of life, and corruption puts on incorruption, not by the perpetuation of the mortal and the corruptible—but by their supercession by the immortal and the incorruptible: not by creation (we are not created immortal souls) but by new-creation. There is no such thing as *human immortality*, although human beings by possession of the blessings of the gospel, become partakers of immortality. As descendants of Adam we are not immortal, for in Adam we all die; and there is as much ground in reason for the pre-existence of the soul to man's birth, as there is for its continued existence after his death. The gospel claims the absolute and sole right of discovering to us immortality which heathenizing Christians not only assume to be discoverable independently of Revelation, but assume for that nature which Revelation declares to be dying, perishing, and corruptible.‡

* Immortality is an attribute of the divine nature, the nature which cannot sin. If, therefore, because man is said to be made in the divine image, he must be considered *immortal*, not less certainly, must he be considered *sinless* or incapable of sinning, which nobody has yet maintained.

† Cicero, the philosopher who speaks with more satisfaction than any of the ancient sages confesses the uncertainty and obscurity of his mind when not immediately sustained by the arguments which appeared to favour the doctrine.

‡ It is to the *gospel*, and not to *Revelation* merely, we rejoice to know that we are indebted for the discovery of life and immortality—a fact which shivers the doctrine of "immortal woe" to

Thus, then, the doctrine upon which eternal punishment rests, is neither supported by scripture affirmation, nor by valid argument, and we are warranted in inferring, that as there is no immortal soul to bear it, there cannot be any endless torment to be sustained.

What, then, is the hell of Scripture? There are four words in the original scriptures which are all translated *hell* in our authorized version. These are *Sheol*,* *Hades*, *Tartarus*, and *Gehenna*. We are not disbelievers in *hell*, adopting, however, the original signification of this word, and not the meaning it is now made to bear. We have seen how Judaizing Christian teachers appropriated the old Anglo-Saxon word and associated it with the heathen *Tartarus*. Gradually, however, and by slow degrees, it must have come to bear the almost† exclusive sense now attached to it. The word *hell*, corresponds in its signification to the Greek *Hades*, which the Seventy employ in rendering the Hebrew *Sheol*. In this all our best critics are agreed. That the actual Gehenna (literally the valley of Hinnom), cannot be *literally* the hell of Christendom is also assumed by all orthodox commentators, who claim it as the name of the abode of lost souls only in a figurative sense, which goes for nothing until such a place is proved literally to exist. And "*Tartarus*," Professor Stuart observes, "occurs no where in the Scriptures. But a *denominative* verb, ταρταρόω, which means *to send to Tartarus, to confine in Tartarus, to punish in Tartarus*, occurs in 2 Peter ii. 4." "It is occasionally employed in the later classic writers, for the under. world in general; but in such a connection as to shew, that it is only when writers mean to speak of the whole as a region of gloom, that they call it Tartarus." p. 113. According to this admission, then, of so acute an opponent of Universal Salvation, *Tartarus* does not certainly mean the world of woe, for the later classic writers used it indiscriminately, even of all who had departed this life, and if the Apostle Peter used it according to classic usage, he used it we presume as "the later classic writers" would employ it, for assuredly, as Balfour shrewdly observes, "Peter was a *later* scripture writer.‡ The angels to whom Peter refers were confined in "chains of darkness" (not fire) a phrase eminently expressive of "gloom." We dismiss *Gehenna* and *Tartarus* without further remark, as beside the question now under discussion and confine ourselves to *Sheol* and *Hades* of which our *hell* is the proper translation.

---

atoms. *Revelation* supplies us with information on many subjects which in themselves are not calculated or designed to produce gladness and cannot be called *gospel*, as, for instance, the origin of the human race, our connection with and descent from one individual, and many things naturally productive only of painful emotions such as the turpitude of human guilt, &c. Life and immortality are revealed—but they are revealed or brought to light in the gospel. Indeed, immortality could only be brought to light by the gospel; it implies perfection, divinity, and involves all the blessedness of the divine nature: it is a boundless ocean—always pure; it is "the fulness of God."

* Dr. Campbell in his Sixth Preliminary Dissertation says, "In my judgment it (*Sheol*) ought never to be rendered HELL, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by Christians." See Dis. "In regard to most of the cases in which they have rendered the word *hell*, it may be doubtful whether they meant thereby to designate *the world of future torment*." Stuart's *Exegetical Essays* with recommendatory preface by Doctor Samuel Davidson. p. 76.

† The original use of the word in the form of a verb, *to hele*, is still extant, in the south west of England particularly; and the writer not long since had a servant in his family who used to express the fact of her covering over anything by the word *heling*. We presume the compilers of the Book of Common Prayer had the original signification of the word in view when they say "he (Christ) descended into hell."

‡ An Enquiry into the Scriptural Import of the Words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna, by Walter Balfour, p. 97.

The Old Testament usage of *Sheol* suggests darkness, silence, ignorance, unconsciousness. Neither a place of happiness nor misery is represented in Scripture as being in *Sheol;* and instead of indestructibility being ascribed to it, we are told in Hos. xiii. 14, that *Sheol* is to be destroyed. Paul represents the conquering Saviour as triumphing victoriously over it as a vanquished foe, and St. John discloses its final destruction. The hades of the heathen contains an Elysium and a Tartarus, and the invisible world of Christendom contains a heaven and a hell, which we have seen correspond thereto. Now, if the orthodox invisible world, or hades, be identical with the hades of Scripture, their heaven and their hell share the same fate. The hades of Scripture, on the contrary, contains neither a heaven nor a hell. Satisfactory proof of this we think will be found in an impartial examination of those passages of Scripture in which the word occurs. Thus Gen. xxxvii. 35, Jacob says, "I will go down into the grave (Sheol) unto my son mourning. That *Sheol* is not heaven, is obvious from the fact of Jacob's grief, and that it is the orthodox hell, our opponents do not maintain. Num. xvi. 32, explains verse 30 of the same chapter. Deut. xxxii. 22, has been already explained in the *Universalist.* In Job xiv. 13, Job prays that God would hide him in *Sheol.* From the various connections in which the Old Testament word occurs we come to the conclusion that it was associated with death and the grave; and that it conveyed generally the idea of negation of all that appertained to human consciousness, inclusive of all the multifarious sources of joy and grief, happiness and sorrow. Thus, to the wicked, worldly-prosperous man, it bore the aspect of an enemy, and to the oppressed and distressed it assumed the character of a friend.

The New Testament synonym of *Sheol* is *Hades.* Not only is *Sheol* rendered *Hades* in the Septuagint version, but in the New Testament *Hades* is employed as the the translation of *Sheol*; see Psalm xvi. 10, and compare with Acts ii. 27. The question arises, and it is an important one, has the word *Hades* a more definite signification in the New Testament than Sheol has in the Old? That it has not *exclusively* the sense of *place of torment* beyond this life is agreed by all critics. That it has that sense at all we do not think has been satisfactorily proved by anybody. That so *different* a meaning to that which *Sheol* bears should be attached to it, is, *a priori*, highly improbable. And that, besides the requirements of other parts of Scripture, its actual use indicates a different sense, we have not the shadow of a doubt.

To the author of "Dialogues on Universal Salvation," we are indebted for some valuable remarks on the subject of *Hades.* This writer we presume would not dispute the view we have taken of the Old Testament *Sheol;* but perceiving that some words have acquired a characteristic signification in New Testament phraseology, apparently sanctioned by these examples, he remarks that a more determinate and special idea is conveyed by *Hades.* We refer our readers to his recent works for his views on this subject. Whether we understand him correctly as attaching a purely negative idea to the term we are not quite sure; we cannot at present see that Scripture invests it with any thing of a positive character. We think that as death is the negation of physical life, Hades may denote the negation of or exclusion from

"life" otherwise called "eternal life" and "the kingdom of Christ." "*Life* and *immortality* are brought to light by the gospel." From *life* unbelievers are excluded; they "*perish*." Believers on the contrary, *shall never perish*." Believers and unbelievers are, however alike subject to bodily death. Body and soul are distinguished by Paul. Believers are risen with Christ; this resurrection is not that of the body, it must be that of the soul. As partakers of the resurrection-life of Christ, *Hades* can have no power, such as death, has over them. From Hades the soul of Christ was raised the third day; from Hades then believers must be free. But what of unbelievers? Is the triumph of Christ over Hades by the preservation of believers from its domain, completed? or will it not be a prospective triumph until all who have perished shall be "made alive?" We believe that when the purposes of God are realized in the salvation of all men, that then, and then only will be actually accomplished the victory of Christ over Hades, that "then," and then only, "shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory." But this deliverance of unbelievers from death and Hades does not restore to them the Adamic life (which would only be to bring them back to *mortality*,) nor does it invest them with "life" or "eternal [etaneous] life" (which, as proper to believers,* is only the earnest of immortality,) but it introduces them to the possession of immortality—that state in which God will be "all in all." Etaneous life is to be succeeded by immortality of which in believers it is the earnest. Hades is to be destroyed by him who is the Saviour of all men. In etaneous life we have the speciality of salvation, and in the destruction of Hades its universality. Whether the specific character of Hades which we have noticed be regarded as according to the mind of the Spirit or not, we think enough has been observed to mark the broad difference subsisting between the hell of Scripture and the hell of Christian heathendom; and while we cannot but regard death and Hades as enemies, it is our privilege eschewing all the absurdities and cruel inventions of our Egyptian neighbours (content as Moses was to be less wise than they, notwithstanding the exclamations of sage Professors at our wilful ignorance) to know that they are *vanquished* foes. And in prospect of that higher and fuller manifestation of the divine glory whereby God is able to subduc all things unto himself we rejoice, "yea, and will rejoice," with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

Z.

THE CHRISTIAN'S GROUND OF ASSURANCE.

If inherent sanctification, or a considerable increase of it, is considered as the proper ground of assurance, those who are most humble and sincere, and desirous of being conformed to the will of God, will be the most perplexed and discouraged in the search after it. For they of all others will be least satisfied with themselves and have the quickest sense of their defilements.—Rev. John Newton.

*Believers are those who walk by faith and not sight; the actual enjoyment of immortality with all the bliss the immortal nature involves, however constituting as it does the full fruition of divine mercy supersedes the condition of faith, faith is lost in sight, and the earnest absorbed or swallowed up in the substance.

SIMONY.

In a book recently published called "The Bards of the Bible" by George Gilfilian (360 pages—fine paper and beautiful type)—there may be seen the words following. "There is for example Simon Magus, the begetter and name giver of a distinct and dreadful crime Simony, an original in wickedness, a genuine child of hell. No mistake about him. He thinks every thing and every person has its price, and would bribe the very Spirit of God. You see him returning from Peter's scorn and curse, blasted, cowering, half ashamed, but unconverted.' The works of this author are already numerous, brilliant and widely circulated. They have the praise and approbation of not a few of the wise and prudent of our day. We think such a passage as this especially deserving of consideration and propose to make a few comments upon it.

We shall begin with the homely address so often used by his old companion and schoolfellow Alexander Rutherford—i.e. "*Dear George*"—O that thou hadst cast the *beam* out of thine own eye, before thou said so much about the *mote* in thy brother's eye! Let him who is not, directly or indirectly, guilty of this dreadful crime Simony, cast the first stone at Simon Magus.

What was the sin of Simon? He thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. *Pastors* are the gift of God. Eph. iv. 11. Of the things called visible Christian Churches, few there are who do not *purchase* their Pastors with money. But *eternal life* is the *gift* of God. Do not all those who hold *conditional* views of salvation think that eternal life may be *purchased?* Their language is, except ye believe what we call the gospel—unless ye accept what is called an *offer* of salvation—except ye lay down the arms of rebellion—except ye submit to be saved, &c. ye *cannot* obtain eternal life. Now a gift is bestowed in every sense of the words *unconditionally* and *gratuitously* upon the *undeserving* and in no sense in the way of reward, or wages; therefore when it is thought that any exertion however small on the part of man is necessary to the enjoyment of eternal life—that *something*, be it what it may, when considered *essential*, is a *price* given for it—is a *purchasing* of the gift of God. All who hold *conditional* views of salvation, whether directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally, think that eternal life, the gift of God, may be purchased. If eternal life is suspended on any thing wrought in, or done by the sinner it is not of the *grace of God*, but of *the work of man*—it is man saving himself by his own powers and energies. Some Conditionalarians pretend to deny this, by saying, "although salvation be conditionally bestowed, all the powers and faculties with which we believe, accept, submit, &c. are *given* us of God, therefore all is of grace, all being the gift of God." But this is only to place the source of salvation elsewhere than in the stone, the sure cornerstone, which God has laid in Zion, and piously to deny the *only* source of our salvation. And those who, like the Pharisees of old, thank God that they have been enabled to fulfil the condition by which salvation becomes theirs, are equally under condemnation with them in quietly assuming that the condition of salvation is now fulfilled by or in them which was fulfilled eighteen hundred years ago by the Son of God himself. Beware all ye Conditionalists, ye Pharisees of this day lest ye be found guilty of Simony

thinking that eternal life may be *purchased*, and it be said thy offered price perish with thee."

But a word or two for Simon; let him have fair play, be he what or where he may. We have the recorded words of the Holy Ghost, "Simon alsobelieved and was baptized;" and we have the words of the Lord Jesus Christ, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." How comes it that so many in the face of this not only *doubt* the salvation of Simon but *assert* that he was turned into an eternal hell of endless torment? Was Simon's sin a sin against the Holy Ghost? No! Peter exhorted him to pray for forgiveness. Peter when a believer on the Son of God, whose faith could not fail, for Jesus prayed that it might not fail—yet even to oaths and cursing, denied the Holy one and the Just. Was Simon's sin greater than Peter's? Was Simon excluded from the blessing which shall come upon all families through Christ the seed of Abraham? Thousands have said so; and yet it is true that Simon believed: and *he that believeth shall be saved.* If *one* may believe and not be saved—so may *all*, and what then becomes of the strong-hold of Conditionalists? What becomes of this assurance of salvation, *because we know we have believed?* And if one who *believeth* may be damned, why may not one who *believeth not* be saved?

Do Conditionalists *understand* the scriptural meaning of the words "shall be saved" and "shall be damned?" By the words "shall be damned" a great many understand *shall be consigned soul and body to endless torture.* Now it is impossible to produce one passage in the whole of the Old and New Testaments where the words have such a meaning. Indeed the expressions seem to be misunderstood by all excepting the few here and there, who having been taught of God, are fully persuaded that eternal life is *unconditionally* bestowed, and according to that *wisdom without partiality*, bestowed on *all.*

From the words of Peter many have concluded that Simon had neither part or lot in eternal life—whereas the plain meaning of the words of the Apostle is, that Simon had neither part nor lot in the giving of the Holy Ghost by the *laying on of hands*, a gift which the Apostles had *exclusive* of all other men.

To Simon it was said "thy money perish with thee." Some have thought that to *perish* signifies to be consigned to endless suffering, but such a meaning of the word is not to be found in all the Bible. What can we understand by *money* enduring endless torment? Where have we a single hint in the whole passage of "Peter's scorn" or "curse," alluded to by the author of the "Bards of the Bible?"

The Apostle Paul said to the believing Corinthians "For ye are yet carnal, and walk as man," 1 Cor. iii. 3. and he says of himself "I am carnal, sold under sin" Rom. vii. 14. Were those words expressions of the scorn or curse of Paul?

Let it be for a moment admitted, that Simon was unconverted; so was Peter when he denied the Holy one and the Just. For Jesus said, When thou art *converted* strengthen thy brethren. But though Peter denied his Lord even to oaths and cursing, yet he was all the while a believer in the Son of God, and Jesus had prayed that his faith might not fail. Peter was converted. Who dares to say that Simon was never converted? Simon was in the gall of *bitter-*

ness. Peter wept *bitterly.* When the flesh, old man, or human nature of Paul was let loose to torture him as with a thorn, the Lord said unto him "My grace is sufficient for thee." Is the same *grace* not sufficient for Simon the sorcerer? Let us ever remember the following words, Judge not, lest ye be judged. With God is forgiveness—God is love. To whom much is forgiven the same loveth much.

While we beware of justifying the conduct of Simon, and of countenancing the "dreadful crime Simony," let us also beware of judging Simon to endless torture, lest we be found limiting the justice, goodness, and mercy of Him who is infinitely, eternally, unchangeably and impartially LOVE.

ANETAZO.

PLAIN QUESTIONS TO PLAIN MEN, ON THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD, AS A DOCTRINE HELD BY PARTIALIST DIVINES AND SUPPOSED BY THEM TO BE SUBVERSIVE OF UNIVERSAL SALVATION.

WHAT *is* Divine Sovereignty? Is it an abstract right, an irresponsible privilege, a claim to lawless action, whether in itself just, proper, or suitable? or is it on the contrary? Is it not rather a divine claim, or right, to act in any way that shall be the most agreeable to infinite wisdom, holiness, goodness, truth and power? (Psalm cxv. 3, Job xxiii. 13, Prov. xix. 21, Heb. vi. 17, Eph. i. 11, Rev. xix. 6, Is. xlvi. 10, Rom. xvi. 27, Col. ii. 3, Ps. xlvii. 8, 1 Chr. xvi. 34, Rom. ii. 4, Deut. xxxii. 4, Is. xl. 12—31, Rev. xv. iii. Phil. ii. 13.)

Are not the words uttered in the parable by our Lord,—"Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own," (Matt. xx. 15) *perverted,* when used to imply absolute, abstract, arbitrary sovereignty in God? Are they not given to shew that, as any man may dispose of his own property as he pleases, if the purpose be in itself *just,* so God can bestow his *unmerited favour* on whom He pleases, without a just complaint from the non-recipient thereof? Would the context indicate *punishment,* and that of ceaseless torture, to the complainants, or simply and exclusively especial and allowable favours to the privileged by the "householder," and the God of all grace? "Is thine eye evil *because I am* GOOD?"

In the many other passages of Holy Writ, where the Supreme is declared to "do all His pleasure," &c. is there the slightest indication of that "pleasure" being the *endless torment* of millions of beings who are irretrievably lost? Is not that "pleasure" declared by infallible Truth to be *the exact contrary*? (Eph. i. 9, 10, John iii. 7, Phil. ii. 13, 1 John iii. 5—8, 2 Pet. iii. 9, 1 Tim. ii. 3, John xii. 32, Phil. iii. 21.)

Whenever the doctrine is stated, or implied, that "God has a *right* to do what He *pleases,*" (the phrase usually adopted by our opponents) is it not evident that He lays claim so this prerogative, because *it must ever please Him to do what is right*? (Deut. xxxii. 4, Gen xviii. 25, Ps. xi. 7, xlviii. 10, xcvii. 2, Dan. ix. 7, Heb. i. 8.)

Are not the principles of action that are in themselves *right,* or in themselves *wrong,* clearly pointed out and *contrasted* in sacred Scripture, for our safe

judgement thereon? and must not the same rules of essential truth be eternally applicable to *all intelligences*, whether human, angelic, or divine? By these selfsame rules are we not permitted to prove and defend the Holiness and Justice of God in relation to His creatures? May we not safely, then, believe that God *cannot*, because He *will not*, act the contrary of such rules, being Himself essentially Holy and Just? If so can it be "ignorance," "presumption," "impiety," or "crime" in us thus to employ the universal *test* given indiscriminately to use? (Jer. xvi. 11. Psalm cxix. 142. 1 John iii. 4. Rom. xiii. 10. vii. 14. 16. 12. Gal. v. 14.)

Do *we* "limit the Holy One of Israel" in contending that even Divine Sovereignty *cannot* do what His holy law and His own nature *forbids* to be done? (Heb. vi. 18. Titus i. 2. 2 Tim. ii. 13.) Does not God bind Himself, "limit" Himself, when He states that He "*cannot do*" what is *wrong to be done?* Do not *they* rather "limit" Jehovah who limit His *Love* and *Mercy* to but a *part* of His creatures? *they* who contend that God's sovereignty deprives both of their *infinitude*, which must deprive them of *existence*, and Him, also, as a consequence of His Being, in whom they *essentially inhere*? (Psalm cviii. 4. lvii. 10. lxxxix. 2. Hab. iii. 2. Col. iii. 14. 2 Chron. xx. 21. Matt. xix. 15—17. Psalm xxvi. 10. John i. 11. Exodus xxxiii. 18—19. Psalm cxlv. 9.)

The sovereignty of God is evidently a *relative* attribute; it arises *out of* His Supremacy. The Love and Mercy of God, like His Holiness, Justice and Truth, are *innate*, and *necessary* to His Moral Existence; therefore they are unyielding to any circumstances, and uncontrolled by any Powers, intrinsically or extrinsically, belonging to God or any other being in His dominions. Can they be *curtailed*, then, even by the sovereignty of God? (1 John iv. 8. Ps. lxxxvi. 5. Mal. iii. 6. Lam. iii. 23.)

Whatever, to any being, it be *morally wrong* to do, could it ever be *morally right* to create defenceless, doomed creatures, (who could have no control over their *existence* nor the *circumstances* of their birth) that they may unwittingly aid in carrying out the divine plans, and then, to glorify their Maker's power, be suffered endlessly, and ever-increasingly, to endure His burning wrath, when a perfect *substitute* was by Himself provided, and an adequate "*price*" *paid* for their deliverance, with all obstacles removed, except that of the Creator's IMPLACABLE WILL? Could such a fact be other than wholly antagonistic to the entire spirit of God's law, which is the transcript of His own Holy Mind, yea to all His attributes, purposes, and ways, as in scripture and nature plainly set forth? (James iv. 17. Matt. v. 44. Rom. xii. 21. 1 Tim. iv. 14—16. Acts xx. 35, Rom. iii. 10. Psalm lii. 1. Eccle. ii. 26. Psalm cxlv. 7. 8. 9. 14—16. 17. 21. John. i. 14. Eph. ii. 7. Job. xi. 6. xxxvi. 5.)

Are not Mosaic and gospel morals the reverse of every phase of the doctrine of Sovereign Will without moral law, or supreme power without moral guidance? Do not all God's perfections harmonize with themselves and with His written law? Are not the combatted orthodox views of them discordant and conflicting? Order is heavenly, discord is from beneath; can divinely wise and just sovereignty *act them both*? (1 Cor. xiv. 33. Phil. iv. 8. Gal. v. 14.)

Is the plea that "the Sovereignity of God but leaves the sinner where it

finds him" a truth, when it is an obvious fact that the sinner could not have been created but for that sovereignty; would not have been omitted from "the covenant of grace," but for that sovereignty; and would have been *eternally* blessed in the paternal smile of heaven had not that sovereignty determined the reverse? (Rev. iv. 11. Acts. xvii. 25. Dan. iv. 35. Isaiah. xlvi. 10. Rom. ix. 12. 13. 15. 16—23. 27. Psalm cxv. 3. Job. xxiii. 13.)

A *petty* sovereign would have but contracted power to act out irresponsible and arbitrary sway; a *mighty* sovereign must have proportionably larger power, did he resolve to do the same; which would be the greater, more baneful curse to creation? If we thus judge of our adored Almighty Sovereign—from the creature to the Creator—what must be, by the orthodox creed, the logical conclusion? We should tremble to reply! (Isah. lv. 9, Rev. i. 8, Isah. lxii. 15.)

If divine sovereignty be the will and power in God to determine what is wisest and best to be done, how can it be its *exact contrary*? viz. a will and power to decree what He is supposed to chose, even to have no rule but power and self-aggrandisement; loving pomp without praise, and obedience without love; gloating in the endless agonies of the lost *millions*, for the splenetic, tyrannical gratification of *one*?—which are the inevitable consequences of the creed we oppose!

Were an affectionate Father also an equitable sovereign, who could be *just in unlimited mercy*, would or could he fail to be *compassionate* with effect, to a rebellious, wayward child, who inherited wild, daring and wicked propensities? He would have frequent occasion severely to chastise him, but would or could he be *for ever inexorable* to his cries for forgiveness? *for ever disinclined* to relieve him from his woe? Would he obtain forgiveness for himself if he so refused it to another, especially his child? If such enormity *man* could not be charged with, who has but *finite mercy*, how can we accuse of such a deed, in millions of cases, the *infinitely merciful* God? (Mal. ii. 10. Eph. iv. 6. Heb. xii. 9. Matt. vi. 9. Isaiah ix 6. Rev. xv. 3. 1 John l. 9. 1 Pet. iii. 18. Rom. iii. 26. Zec. ix. 9. Isaiah xlv. 21. xl. 10. Luke x. 30—37. xv. 11—32. iii. 7. Isaiah lvii. 16. lxv. 24. Luke xi. 8—10. xviii. 1—8. Psalm l. 16. Rom. i. 29—31. Tit. iii. 3. Dan. ix. 9. Mic. vii. 18. Isaiah xxx. 18. Hab. iii. 2. John vii. 37. Lam. iii. 17, 23. Psalm lvii. 10.)

Would the lover of pagan rites, that teem with reeking blood, be ashamed of comparison of his gods with the Sovereign of *some* Christians' creed? Would not their boasted deeds of inconsistency, absurdity, cruelty, and thirsty revenge, be more numerous, more baneful of the two? Shall we blasphemously give "Christ fellowship with Belial?" Shall we give our religion a dishonourable superiority among such claims as his? Would such claims honour God? Rather would they not defile His worship, disgust reflectors, and make infidels of a world?

The sovereignty of God is only *one* of His perfections. It rules no other, although others rule it; it destroys no other, and no other destroys it; it agrees with all the others, and all the others agree with it. Can it, then, *oppose* the *infinitude*, and therefore *existence*, of God's *mercy?* Can it thwart the sacred claims of unyielding *justice*, which demands blessedness "*for all*,"

through the infinite merits of Christ? Can it destroy the equity of the claim of any that are "*purchased*" by those merits? (1 Tim. ii. 6, 1 John ii. 2, 2 Cor. v. 14, 1 Cor. v. 19, John v. 51, Heb. ii. 9, Isah. liii. 6, Heb. ix. 26, Isah. lxiii. 16, Gal. iii. 13, iv. 15, 1 John iv. 10, 1 Cor. xv. 3, Gal. i. 4, John vi. 51, Matt. xxvi. 28, Isah. liii. 12, Lev. x. 2, John i. 29, Rom. v. 12—21, Rom. viii. 23, 1 Tim. iv. 10, James ii. 13, Isah. liii. 11, Job xxxiv. 23, viii. 3.)

A sovereignty that comports with absolute *wisdom*, infinite *power*, and boundless *benevolence*, can *impart* ultimate ill to none; *allow* ultimate ill to none—without ultimate ill to itself! Can ultimate ill ever belong to, or disturb the repose of, "the *ever-blessed* and *immutable* God?" (Rom. xvi. 27. Col. ii. 3, Eph. iii. 10, Ps. lxvi. 7, Rev. i. 8, Ps. lxxxvi. 5, cxlv. 9, Mic. vii, 18, 1 John iii. 58, 2 Pet. iii. 9, 1 Tim. ii. 3, Ps. xxi 11—13, Isah. xliii. 13. xlviii. 9—11, Ps. cxix. 12, Rom. i. 25, ix. 5, James i. 17, Mal. iii. 6, Ps. xxiii. 13.)

A sovereignty that glories in using power to agonize the weak, in whatever circumstances placed, *all for its own private ends*, while having means honourably to avoid such infliction, is the condemnation of all thoughtful, moral, and intelligent natures. Can angels approve, men adore, or God practise it? (Ps. ciii. 14, Rom. viii. 20, Lam. iii. 33, Prov. xvi. 4, Jer. x. 23, Job iv. 19, Titus iii. 4, margin, 1 John iv. 14, Rom. x. 13, Matt. xi. 28, xii. 20, Isah. xxx. 18, Col. i. 20, 2 Cor. v. 19, Isah. xlix. 24, 25, Ps. cxi. 4, 1 John iv. 8, James v. 11, John i. 11, Hab. iii. 2, Neh. xiii. 22.)

Imperious, vindictive, and arbitrary sovereignty is *mean* in man, is a *crime* in devils, can it be *good* or *great* in God? (Ps. x. 18, Deut. xxiii. 16, Acts x. 38, Ps. liv. 3, Luke xxii. 31, Ps. xxxiv. 8, lxix. 16, cix. 21, Ecc. ii. 26.)

If *partiality* be sovereignty, or sovereignty be *partiality*, the Scriptures declare it to be not an attribute of God. (Ezek. xviii. 25). Can God claim as a perfection a property that His word repudiates? (John v. 39, James iii. 17, Deut. x. 17.)

In conclusion, we would solicit a careful connected study of the texts referred to in this paper. We think they clearly affirm or imply views of the sovereignty of God the reverse of those holden by our brethren, who seem to believe that it sanctions any species of conduct, even if in itself *wrong—wrong* as compared with God's holy law, or *wrong* as denounced by the whole tenor of Holy Writ! The Scriptures breathe forth the hallowed sentiment—"*That be far from Thee, Lord! shall not the Judge of all the earth do right!* (Gen. xviii. 25). With this view of the conduct of the Most High to His helpless, although sinful creatures—the children of men—may our hearts with joy respond "Hallejujah! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth!"—"He hath done all things well!"

London, June 15, 1851. EDWARD COCK.

REVIEWS.

Discourses on the Lord's Prayer. By E. H. Chapin. Boston: Tompkins. 1850.
Hours of Communion. By Edwin H. Chapin. Boston: Tompkins and Massey. 1846.

Did any of our subscribers happen to attend the great Peace Congress, which held its sittings at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, last Autumn? If so, were they present when a good-looking, corpulent, middle-aged individual from the United States of America, clerical in his attire, and with the bearing of a gentleman, delivered an oration, which by its manly sense, simplicity and perspicuity of statement, and fervid impassioned eloquence, perfectly thrilled and electrified his auditory? The speaker was Edwin H. Chapin, Pastor of the Universalist Church, Murray Street, New-York.*

During many years Mr. Chapin has taken a distinguished place among the pulpit Orators of America. His sweet simple diction, his manifest sincerity of purpose, his highly cultivated taste, and his impressive elocution have all operated in his favour, and contributed to this result. He is resorted and listened to, not only by natives, but also by strangers, as one of the literary "lions" of the Yankee Metropolis. Crowds are always in attendance at his place of worship. And no wonder. If we are to judge from the productions which now lie before us, the language of sense and sobriety, the lessons of prudence and experience, will always be heard from his lips. Profound, he may not be; but he is never inflated or bombastic. His style is formed on correct models. To be useful rather than to shine, seems to be his object. And in what we cannot but deem his favourite walk, he has been eminently successful. It gratifies us to observe an announcement in "The Trumpet," (Boston, U. S.) of May 24th. that in Usher's "Universalist Pulpit," No. ii, there is to appear a sermon by Mr. Chapin, on the subject of "Good Works,"—to this able and eloquent preacher the very next place having been assigned after old Hosea Ballou.† "This number," Mr. Whittemore informs us, is to be accompanied with "an admirable likeness of the author."

Mr. Chapin is, if we mistake not, an acquisition to the American Universalist body, from the Episcopalians. He is thus, like Le Fevre, the late Menzies Rayner, and Townley, one of their educated men.‡ And no small ornament to them he is. In private life, gentle and amiable, with a considerable dash of constitutional indolence—better pleased with the last review of a new book, than with bustle, shew, or "the busy haunts of men"—he is, nevertheless, from the moment that he enters the pulpit,§ where he appears to be in his element, quite a different man: inspired with unwonted energy, and prepared to enforce on the minds of his audience, in a manner the most impressive, whatever he may think likely to conduce to their advantage. His ministrations in Charlestown, one of the suburbs of Boston, are not yet forgotten.

But a truce to all this. It is with Mr. Chapin as a writer and a divine, and not as an orator, that we have to do in the present article.

The two works the titles of which we have put down, are the only productions of this gentleman, save and except a solitary sermon perhaps, with which we chance to be acquainted. Having perused them both with interest as well as care, we fancy ourselves competent to pronounce an opinion on their merits. And, in a literary point of view, that opinion is a most favourable one.

---

* An address by this gentleman to the members of the Tuckerman Institute, Liverpool, on the eve of his return voyage to the United States, created a strong sensation, and was highly and deservedly lauded in the local papers.

† Now in his eighty-first year, and still preaching occasionally.

‡ The names of parties reared and ordained as clergymen of the Episcopal Church alone, we have mentioned. American Universalists however, besides such as these, can boast of many other highly educated and profoundly learned men, who, like Dr. Ballou, would shed a lustre on any religious community.

§ Desk, we believe, would be the more appropriate term, being that which is in common use among our Transatlantic friends.

Regarded as compositions, the "Discourses on the Lord's Prayer," and the "Hours of Communion," are characterised by many excellencies. Great clearness of conception and perspicuity of statement—the distinct enunciation of his propositions, and a strict adherence to his plan in the proof and illustration of them—transparency of ideas—a singularly neat selection of epithets—a style pure, classical and elegant, without stiffness and without straining—copiousness exhibited in an eloquence that is perfectly easy and natural—and occasionally a condensation of thought, which, as contrasted with his ordinary manner, affords relief, and brings along with it the charm of variety. He surprises us from time to time with flashes of genuine wit, and not unfrequently hurries us rapidly along with a torrent of powerful declamation. This last tendency of his mind, however, he is careful to keep within due bounds. That good sense with which he is so largely endowed, and his cultivated taste, prevent the display of anything like extravagance. Hence, although sometimes a declaimer, he is never turgid. The study by Mr. Chapin of Channing's works, and admiration on his part of them and their author, may, in consequence of unintentional imitations by him of their style, occasionally be detected. But the minds of the two men were constituted too diversely, to permit their thoughts and expressions to run much, or for any great length of time together, in the same channel. There is about the subject of our present notice far less mannerism—far less of that starched stiffness, and sometime seven stereotypedness of phraseology—for which his illustrious predecessor was so remarkable. Mr. Chapin writes easily as compared with Dr. Channing. And, as the result of this, we peruse his productions with more comfort. If Mr. Chapin sometimes involves us in speculations, and employs language, which require the full exercise of our reflective faculties, this happens but rarely; for in general, when reading what he has written, we find ourselves in company with one who has no wish unnecessarily to tax our patience or attention, and who is addressing us in the simple, easy, almost conversational style of an educated gentleman. If our author possess not Channing's depth, comprehensiveness of vision, and philosophy, he more than compensates for the want of all these, by a better apprehension of what pulpit addresses to a mixed auditory should be, by greater variety in his topics, and by a far more simple and impressive manner of treating them. Quinctilian himself would have conceded to Mr. Chapin the right to take his place among those, who have been at once accomplished writers, and effective rhetoricians.

We like our author for having retained the old-fashioned practice of dividing his discourses, and for keeping his divisions constantly before the minds of his hearers and readers. Not that he carries this to the Puritanical extreme. Far from it. Avoiding minute, tedious, and irrelevant subdivisions, and encumbering himself as little as possible even with principal heads, there is enough done by him in this way, to distinguish one topic from another, and to obviate confusion of ideas on the part of those whom he addresses. And then, how beautifully brief, especially in his "Hours of Communion," he can, when he pleases, contrive to be! *Ne quid nimis* is evidently, in more than one respect, his motto.

"Hours of Communion," consisting almost entirely of addresses on Sacramental occasions, embrace among other topics treated of, "The Lord's Supper considered as a memorial," "The Crown of Thorns," "Christ within us," "The Cross of Christ," "Religion founded in character," and "Christ after the resurrection." All, viewed merely as pieces of composition, are deserving of great praise. And the "Discourses on the Lord's Prayer," as might have been anticipated from the title, take up and consider in succession the various clauses of which that divine abridgement of devotion consists. They amount to nine in number. A few valuable criticisms are interspersed. But in general, they are mere *conciones ad populum*—plain and yet finished specimens of that mode of address. By the illiterate, they may without any great mental effort be understood, and they are calculated to please even the most fastidious.

Our preceding observations on the literary characteristics of the author, are equally applicable to both of his works. They both display the same beauties and excellencies, and, it is painful for us to say it, they both labour under the same defects. His excellencies are moral, no less than intellectual; his defects pervade and vitally affect his whole religious system.

It is impossible to rise from the perusal of the "Discourses," and "Hours of Communion," without feeling satisfied, that we have been listening to the prelections of a sound-minded, well-read, amiable and estimable man. Our teacher, we are well assured, is a scholar and a gentleman. Modest and unassuming is he always in the highest degree, never making claims on our notice or giving himself airs of superiority; and, therefore, the more readily are his eminent intellectual qualifications felt and acknowledged. But Mr. Chapin in his writings, appears in a far more exalted capacity, than merely as a man of talents. He takes a high place among authors who have made utility their object, and whose productions are eminently practical. He is a most valuable instructor in morals. He may in this respect challenge a comparison with Johnson or Blair. Not that the result would be always to his advantage. We may miss in him the moral penetration, and grandeur of moral conception, which we meet with in the former; and the accuracy, copiousness, and minute faithfulness of delineation, which distinguish the latter. But in our apprehension, he is in many points of view superior to both. Not only is he free from that pomposity of manner, and glitter of words,—that heaping up of sentences —which constitute such drawbacks on the "Rambler," and "Idler," and that prosy, monotonous, tedious diffuseness, which so often dispose us to yawn over the sermons of the Edinburgh divine, but he is a far better practical writer than Johnson and Blair. His topics are better selected, his motives to dissuade from evil are better adapted to influence the heart and affections, and to the scriptures, as the grand source of pure morality, are his appeals constantly made. He may not possess Johnson's strength of mind and learning, nor may he be Blair's equal in point of industry and discrimination; but as regards genius he will bear to be compared advantageously with either, and as regards honesty of purpose, and real utility, we have no hesitation in pronouncing him to be the superior of both. Mr. Chapin possesses an excellent acquaintance with men and manners; and he has marked with no ordinary care and precision, the self-deceptive workings of the human heart. He has probed deeply the motives of conduct. The secret tendencies of man's mind he can expose, and the appropriate moral counteractives to evil he knows well how to apply. To far fetched analogies, and wire-drawn distinctions, he shews no favour. His views are broad and practical, and his illustrations are sought for and found in facts and circumstances with which his audience are familiar. He is emphatically the preacher of every day life. Sound morals he enforces, and aberrations from the strait path of integrity and purity he denounces, with a constant reference to scripture, in the language of strong, practical, unmistakable common sense.

Amidst such claims on our attention and respect, what is there lacking on the part of our author? One thing, and that the most important of all. Mr. Chapin, throughout his discourses, shews himself to be totally ignorant of the character of God, as revealed in the everlasting gospel. He has never apprehended what is implied in *God's* being *just*, when *he is the justifier of the ungodly*.

Strong as this assertion is, it is nevertheless true. To Mr. Chapin, it never has been given to understand the scriptural character of Jesus Christ, and consequently to understand the character of God, which in Jesus Christ alone is revealed and displayed. John xiv. 9.—Ibid: i. 18, xvii. 3, Heb. i. 3. To him, Jesus is but a creature. And his death, accordingly, but the death of a creature. Sin, however grievous in its nature and consequences it may be, can, he fancies, by a mere act of God's mercy be put away; and Jesus, notwithstanding the many true, striking, and beautiful things which he says regarding him, and his making him to be in some vague unexplained way the

medium of salvation,* is, after all, at the utmost merely our exemplar, in whose steps we are bound to tread if, like him, we would attain to glory. The following is the highest view of the subject which our author seems to have been capable of taking:—"Our essential wish, mingled with poignant regret, is to be reconciled to God—to feel that He has, as it were, forgotten our transgressions, and turns upon us the light of his countenance. The belief that our sins are forgiven causes us to possess a full sense of rest; the troubled mind grows calm, its tormenting suggestions sink as the waves sunk when Christ said, 'Peace, be still.' This is the *subjective* method of forgiveness, vaguely expressed, as all spiritual experiences must be;" (?) "this is our own feeling as to pardon—and I do not know that it is necessary for our philosophy to penetrate further. It does not alter the substantial result to know precisely, what is meant by the forgiveness of sin; whether it simply implies reconciliation, or *whether the punishment of sin is remitted also.*†" Discourses on L. P. p. 123. Dislike of the doctrine of atonement, combined with a feeling of dubiety as to what is the actual state of matters, all this painfully displays. "Does not alter the substantial result?" Ah! Mr. Chapin, it does "alter the result very substantially" indeed, in as far as the conscience is concerned, not to speak of what is higher, if when the enormity of sin happens to be suggested, and when a suspicion that we need pardon is introduced into the mind, on the one hand we are given to feel, as well as know, that in the sacrifice of Christ, as having borne the wrath of God against sin, sin hath been swallowed up; and, on the other, we are led to suppose that by some unexplained means, or on the performance of some unknown conditions, sin has been or may be removed. In two very *opposite* states of mind, indeed, are we according as we possess, and are influenced by the one view or the other. If in Jesus, as God, and in his righteousness as divine, we behold sin completely and for ever taken away, and ourselves forgiven, the discovery to us of this as fact, constitutes in us the very principle of the forgiveness of others.‡ Whereas, according to you, upon our forgiveness to others depends our own forgiveness, and, consequently, all our hopes of life everlasting. Your idea is that mercy is either bestowed absolutely, or that it is dependent on creature acts; ours, that while it has its origin in God himself, alone, it is carried into effect through the complete punishment and exhaustion of sin, in the death of God's eternal Son, Jesus Christ. Rom. v. 21. vi. 23. With you, as seeking from reason and philosophy what they cannot reveal, or as content to be ignorant on the subject, all is uncertainty; with us on the contrary, as having through faith been given to receive God's simple testimony as to the efficacy of Christ's blood, all is certainty. In a word, you are prepared, on some hap-hazard, to make a leap in the dark; whereas we *are light in the Lord*, as having been given to believe, that in Jesus Christ as God, and in his atoning sacrifice, sin, with human nature as that from which sin proceeded, was brought to an end, in subserviency to the new-creation of man, through the power of Christ's resurrection.—O, Mr. Chapin, can a system like that which you advocate, a system of peradventures, speak peace—certain, abiding, divine peace—to the guilty conscience, and inspire it with the assured hope of life and immortality? Can anything short of the *infinite* entering into and superseding the *indefinite* of the fleshly mind, by swallowing up in us the *indefinite* sense of guilt, do so; and where, except in Jesus revealed to us as God, and in his righteousness and life revealed to us as divine and as ours, have we this *infinite*? Gal ii. 20. Let us approach somewhat more closely to your conscience, dear Mr. Chapin. You are not quite at ease. Your invariable language, whenever you have occasion to speak of sin and the means of its removal, shews the unsettled state of your mind on the subject. Your old Episcopalian teachings and prejudices are struggling in you with the results of your present Unitarian associations. You would fain, if you could, reconcile the

* This he does more particularly in his "Hours of Communion."

† The last Italics are ours.

‡ Forgiving one another, *even as God for Christ's sake*, HATH FORGIVEN *you*. Eph. iv. 32.

two things. Most manifest is this, in your "Hours of Communion." But the accomplishment of your object you find to be impossible. Salvation by Christ looked at scripturally, implies, in the first place, the fact of sin having been put away, by the sacrifice or destruction in himself, pure and perfect, of the nature to which sin attached; Psalm xxvi. 6; John i. 29; Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iii, 13; Eph. v. 2; Heb. vii. 26, 27; Ibid: ix. 26; and, in the second place, the fact of the new-creation in himself, by means of his resurrection, of those who had formerly been Adam's descendants,—their human nature being superseded, by the superinduction on them of the divine nature. 1 Cor. xv. 49; 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. iv. 23, 24; Phil. iii. 21; 2 Peter i. 4. *For if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature, or new creation.* 2 Cor. v. 17. See also Gal. vi. 15. Such views as these, however, do not suit your present connections. And to such views you are in your present state of mind, as far as some latent suspicions that they *may be* true will permit you, decidedly opposed. Ignorant of the glory of God as revealed in the finished work of Christ alone, and of the vileness of human nature as evinced, not only in its return to *the dust from which it was taken*, but in the fact of its utter and everlasting destruction and supersession in Christ Jesus—entertaining high notions of the dignity, virtues, and destination of him, whom, as Adam's descendant, God pronounces and treats as accursed, rescuing him from the curse only in consequence of its having been borne by His own Son, exhausted by him, and converted, through the new-creation of man in his resurrection into a blessing—you are assisting your present allies in their puny and futile attempts, by means of human wisdom and power, to erect upon a foundation of sand that fortress of salvation and those bulwarks of heavenly grace, which the wisdom and power of God himself have already constructed and established upon the firm and durable basis of the rock of ages.*

Not that Mr. Chapin is, as respects divine truth, the most unscriptural of the American Universalists. Far indeed is he from being so. There are in his first and second "Discourses on the Lord's Prayer," and there occur in some parts of his "Hours of Communion," passages which would almost tempt one to say, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." Our author's mind is naturally a sober and a serious one. He has observed much in man that has escaped the observation of his present associates, and he has reflected on what he has observed. The view presented to him has been anything but satisfactory.

* Mr. H. Bacon, one of the ablest, most ingenious, and most poetical of the present generation of American Universalists, has an article in the "Trumpet" of May 31st, entitled, "Jesus a destroyer." We confess to having opened our eyes wide, when these words first caught our attention. "What! Has the truth at last been discovered by these men?" we involuntarily exclaimed. "Have they found out the destruction of man as *bearing the image of the earthy* in Christ's death, in subserviency to his being new-created, by being made to *bear the image of the heavenly*, in Christ's resurrection?" We began eagerly to read. The two or three first sentences seemed to be approximations to the truth, if not actually expressive of it. But we were doomed to disappointment. It was, after all, a mere repetition of the old Socinian dodge. Jesus "destroys nothing that is good. He annihilates no attribute of the soul. He palsies no faculty God has given, to enable man to progress in knowledge and virtue," &c. Alas! we have here just the nature of the old man cleansed from its evil, and confirmed in its good. It is man purified from his evils, but taken with his virtues to heaven. Not so teaches God's word. Man, in Christ's death, according to it, ends. Soul, with all its attributes and virtues, no less than body, is through Christ's manifestation in soul and body, and sacrifice of both, superseded and destroyed. When Christ arose from the dead, it was not to restore man's nature in whole or in part, in soul or in body, but completely to supersede human nature by the divine nature. Our creature self in Christ's death terminated; a divine self in Christ's resurrection is our portion. *I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless, I live: and yet not I, but Christ liveth in me*, Gal. ii. 20. Jesus, in flesh, was God united to man; Jesus, in spirit or as risen, is man united to God. In him as God, and as one with man, man's accursed nature ended: in him as God, and as one with man, man appears blessed by being new-created. This is simple divine fact. Jesus is the Saviour, through being "the destroyer." Destroying man as an old creature in his own death, he bestows upon him newness of life, by new-creating him in his resurrection. Soul is superseded by spirit. Soulical body by spiritual body. See 1 Cor. xv. 44—54. Thus, complete destruction of human nature, as accursed, is involved in the conferring, through Christ, of the blessedness of the Divine nature. Every passage of Scripture which has occasion to refer to the death and resurrection of our Lord, either implies, or expressly recognizes this doctrine. Rom. vi. 3, 4. Ibid. viii. 10. 11. 1 Cor. xv. 49. 2 Cor. v. 17. Mr. Bacon's paper contains many excellent observations, all neutralized by the unscriptural and revolting theology of which he is so distinguished a supporter.

Human nature he has seen disclosing some rather ugly aspects. Sanguine however in his temperament,—conceiving the progress which man is making in literature and science, to indicate a power on his part to make progress in religion likewise,—surrounded by parties disposed to be liberal in their dealings with the word of God—by parties whose test of the meaning of heavenly truth is that by fleshly mind it may be understood, and who are therefore, unconsciously often to themselves, substituting the conclusions of reason for the dictates of revelation—and what explains the whole, still unenlightened from above by the scriptures themselves, Mr. Chapin tries to patch up such a system and view of things, as may satisfy his own conscience, and satisfy the consciences of others. An excellent moral teacher, in many important particulars he is. So much so, indeed, that we have no hesitation in confessing ourselves to have been struck and edified by many of his correct and beautifully-expressed statements and powerful appeals to the conscience. But as a preacher of the gospel? Alas! what gospel is, our friend has yet to learn; and, therefore, in his present position when speaking of Christ, and of God as revealed in Christ, he is little better than *a blind leader of the blind.* To him, gospel is a pleasing and plausible human theory, gathered from scripture and reason conjoined, as to the happiness of man hereafter; not glad tidings divinely revealed to the conscience, through the infallible record, of sin swallowed up in the atoning sacrifice, and eternal life freely bestowed through the resurrection, of Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour.* Great talents, and above all an admirable capacity for the instruction of others our friend undeniably possesses. Should it please our Heavenly Father, ever to make known to him Christ's Deity, and this, through causing him to experience in his own conscience the efficacy of Christ's blood, as the blood of him who was God manifest in flesh, to cleanse him from all sin—should it please our Heavenly Father to make known to him his oneness with *the second man, the Lord from Heaven,* and to give him to experience the divine power of Christ's resurrection, by his new-creation in heavenly light, and heavenly love something vastly different from and superior to mere moral reformation—with what energy and success might he, like another Peter, become instrumental in *strengthening the brethren,* Luke xxii. 32, and might he, like another Apollos, *help them much which have believed through grace.* Acts xviii. 27.

Painful, inconceivably painful, is it for us to have had occasion, from time to time to recur to the condition of the minds of those who profess Universalism in the United States. But a regard to the truth of God demands, that from a statement of the facts of the case we should not shrink. God's revealed character is far dearer and of far more importance in our eyes, than the sparing of men's feelings. And, besides, the knowledge of what has happened across the Atlantic may operate salutarily as a warning to our English friends. Human free will, conditional salvation, and a mere moral change of sentiments and conduct, substituted for God's sovereignty, the finished work of Jesus Christ, and the new-creation of the conscience by divine truth and divine love, are now the idols of American Universalists. How awful the delusion! How discreditable to the doctrine of God's unbounded love!! The truth—the glorious truth which we so highly prize, and so dearly love—is thus made *to stink in the nostrils* of hesitating, but serious and godly professors. "Can we join, or even countenance men, who disown Jesus as God,—who degrade his blood and deny

* Except in God himself, the creature could not have ended, and yet have lived for ever; could not have ended as bearing the image of the earthy, and yet have lived for ever, as bearing the image of the heavenly. For it is the prerogative of God alone to destroy and yet to make alive. Jesus, God manifest in flesh, as united to man, could alone bring man's accursed nature to an end in himself, by himself as man enduring the curse and exhausting it, and exhausting it by exhausting the nature to which the curse attached; and the same Jesus, God glorified in spirit, could alone, as thus uniting man to himself, communicate to him his own blessed and heaveuly nature for ever. It is the oneness of man with God, in the person of Jesus Christ, that could alone have ensured such results. So the Apostle thought. *He was crucified with Christ; and yet he lived with him.* Gal. ii. 20. We must insist on these scripturally revealed facts, even at the expense of much repetition.

its efficacy, by representing it to have been merely the blood of a creature—and whose evident design it is to bring in a flood of Socinianism and Infidelity upon the land? Certainly not." Such are the feelings, and such the language of many, in whose minds the doctrine of endless torments is, on scriptural principles, already shaken. They dread, they shrink back with horror from contact with the system of Universal Salvation now prevalent in America. Rather would they "endure the ills they know, than flee for refuge to" the still greater which "they know not of." Unitarians will of course welcome the liberalityand progress of Mr. Chapin and his friends. Not so those to whom Jesus hath been revealed as *their Lord and their God,* and who by means of the blood of the Lamb, applied and sprinkled by faith, have had peace spoken to their guilty consciences. May God preserve the members of his Church in this country to whom the infinite riches of his grace, and the fulness of his love have been made known, from such a chimera, and from countenancing such a caricature of heavenly truth, as have found favour in the eyes of American professors.

Several other considerations have occurred to us in regard to the works now lying on our table, but the length to which our notice has already extended, prevents any reference to them.

Having spoken highly of Mr. Chapin's eloquence, we select the three following passages as illustrations of it: the two former, from his "Discourses on the Lord's Prayer," and the last, from his "Hours of Communion."

D. T.

"Stand, then, in imagination, of a summer's morning, upon a field of battle. Earth and sky melt together in light and harmony. The air is rich with fragrance, and sweet with the song of birds. But, suddenly, breaks in the sound of fiercer music, and the measured tramp of thousands. Eager squadrons shake the earth with thunder, and files of bristling steel kindle in the sun. And, opposed to each other, line to line, face to face, are now arrayed men whom God has made in the same likeness, and whose nature he has touched to the same issues. The same heart beats in all. In the momentary hush, like a swift mist sweep before them images of home. Voices of children prattle in their ears. Memories of affection stir among their silent prayers. They cherish the same sanctities, too. They have read from the same book. It is to them the same charter of life and salvation. They have been taught to observe its beautiful lessons of love. Their hearts have been touched alike with the meek example of Jesus. But a moment——and all these affinities are broken, trampled underfoot, swept away by the shock and the shouting. Confusion rends the air. The simmering bomb ploughs up the earth. The iron hail cuts the quivering flesh. The steel bites to the bone. The cannon shot crashes through serried ranks. And under a cloud of smoke that hides both earth and heaven, the desperate struggle goes on. The day wanes, and the strife ceases. On the one side there is a victory, on the other a defeat. The triumphant city is lighted with jubilee; the streets roll out their tides of acclamation, and the organ heaves from its groaning breast the peal of thanksgiving. But under that tumultuous joy, there are bleeding bosoms and inconsolable tears. And whether in triumphant or defeated lands, a shudder of orphanage and widowhood, a chill of woe and death runs far and wide through the world. The meek moon breaks the dissipating vail of the conflict, and rolls its calm splendour above the dead. And see now how much woe man has mingled with the inevitable evils of the universe! See now the fierceness of his passion, the folly of his wickedness, witnessed by the torn standards, the broken wheels, the pools of clotted blood, the charred earth, the festering heaps of slain. Nature did not make these horrors, and when these fattening bones shall have mouldered in the soil, she will spread out luxuriant harvests to hide these horrors for ever."—*Discourse on the Lord's Prayer*, pp. 84—86.

"And this leads me to consider the *blessedness* of these means." (Ability and opportunity to obtain our daily bread.) "My friends, let us appreciate the ordinance by which it is necessary to use the means, before we can obtain our daily bread, or any temporal good. Considering he benefit of strenuous thought and diligent exertion, should we not be thankful that bread does not come *spontaneously* to our hands? In one word, is not *Labour* a wise and glorious ordinance of Providence, an ordinance to be remembered in our prayers and our thanksgivings? To be sure, we can imagine a world in which there is no work. A world bathed in incessant summer, whose seedtimes and harvests are ever mingling, whose springing influences perpetually ascend, whose fruitage perpetually ripens, through all the procession of the golden year. A world in which man would never feel the sting of want, and where the felicities of being would unfold without his effort. But we cannot conceive any such world, connected with human peculiarities and necessities, one half, one tithe, so glorious as our

old world of *struggle* and of *labour*. For, wherever God has admitted man's agency, the noblest results, the achievments of real worth and splendour, are the fruits of patient and sinewy toil. They have come from the suggestions of want and the problems of difficulty; they have been won in wrestling with the elements; they have been torn from the womb of nature. Labour, with its coarse raiment and its bare right arm, has gone forth in the earth achieving the truest conquests, and rearing the most durable monuments. It has opened the domain of matter, and the empire of mind. The wild beast has fled before it, and the wilderness has fallen back. The rock at its touch has grown plastic, and the stream obsequious. It has tilled the soil, and planted cities. Discovery accompanies it with its compass and telescope. Invention proclaims it with its press, and heralds it through the earth with its flaming chariot. It is enriched with 'the wealth of nations.' It is crowned with the trophies of intellect. Its music rises in the shout of the mariner, the song of the husbandman, the hum of multitudes. It rings in the din of hammers, and the roar of wheels. Its triumphal march in the progress of civilization. There are lands of luxurious climate, and almost spontaneous production; yet who looks there for freedom and virtue, for the bravest hearts, and the noblest souls? But the elements of liberty, the glories of intelligence, the sanctities of home, and the institutions of religion, abide in sterner soils and beneath colder skies—where the fisherman feels his way through the mist that wraps the iron sea-coast, and the reaper snatches his harvest from the skirts of winter. And who would not pray—'Give us the manly nerve, the strenuous will, and the busy thought, rather than golden *placers*, and diamond mines?' And, instead of a realm sick with spontaneous plenty, and desolate with riches, who would not prefer the granite fields that grudge their latent bounty, since they induce not only the exertions, but the *blessings* of toil?" *Discourse on the Lord's Prayer*, pp. 104—6.

"Christ's religion is appropriately called 'the religion of sorrow.' Not that for one moment we would sanction the idea, that it is a gloomy religion, or that it is only to be associated with death, decay and tears. It is the religion of sorrow, because in it alone the troubled soul can find consolation. It alone has answers deep enough to satisfy the soul of man in affliction. It is appropriate to every condition of life. It sanctifies our joys, and alone gives us happiness permanent, serene, and pure. Still, the human heart more instinctively seeks its aid in the season of affliction. Its attractiveness is seen more clearly then, because the garish lights of this world are put out. The shadows of evening have fallen upon this earth, the cross and the sepulchre stand out in relief before us, and heaven reveals itself with all its orbs of light. We find that this world, to which we have confined our efforts and our hopes, is but a little sphere after all, and that an eternity, full of vast interests, encompasses us. And the word of eternal life, the promises of the gospel, the teachings of Jesus, infuse better hopes and more enduring strength into our souls, and we feel that nothing can supply their place. For its fitness to the soul of man in affliction, then, while it is none the less fitted to him in prosperity—for its power and consolation in the hour of grief—the religion of Christ is appropriately called 'the religion of sorrow.'"—*Crown of Thorns, Hours of Communion*, pp. 63, 64.

A Conversation between an Endless Damnationist and a Universalist. By J. N. B. (John Nelson Bond.) London, H. K. Lewis, 15 Gower Street North, 1849.

Strong masculine sense, vigorous logic, honesty, intimate and experimental acquaintance with God's word, and deep and decided piety, are characteristics of this most excellent work: the whole being imbued with and breathing a benevolence which is felt by us to be positively refreshing.

Seldom have we risen from the perusal of a controversial piece of writing, which has made upon our minds so pleasing, as well as powerful an impression. Intellectual superiority, evinced in appropriate criticism, reasoning in which it is scarcely possible to detect a flaw, the sifting exposure of hollowness and insincerity, and the demolition of time-honoured fallacies, makes itself felt by us in every page. This, no doubt, constitutes merit of the highest order. But our chief gratification, no less than edification springs from this, that we encounter in Mr. Bond more than a mere veteran in the field of polemics. Listening to him we find ourselves addressed by one who is eminently under the influence of the spirit of the glorified Jesus; and, as the result, have our liveliest spiritual sympathies excited, and our affections powerfully drawn out towards those Records which, as they were dictated immediately by the Holy Ghost, so

is the indwelling of their truth in our consciences by faith, the only source in us of all that is heavenly and divine. In *the word of the Lord* he delights; and accordingly *strong in the Lord* and *by the power of His might*, he manifests himself to be. Upon such a display of power, the wisdom and science of this world, although occasionally stung to the quick by it, professes to look down with contempt. But with our author, prosecuting his triumphs in the strength of God and by the instrumentality of his word, is united in purpose, love, and joy, the small band of those who are *called* and *chosen, and faithful*. Rev. xvii. 14.

The writer of the "Dialogue," now under consideration is entitled to take his place among the most accomplished of our theological gladiators. Dexterous in the use of his favourite weapon *the sword of the spirit*, it scarcely costs him an effort to give a mortal stab to the ablest adversary of the truth; and intimately conversant with the tricks and subterfuges of scholastic divinity, it seems to be a mere plaything with him, to entangle fleshly-minded objectors in a network of sophistry of their own weaving.* Several times, in perusing his work, have we been tempted to compare him with one of those *athletes*, a single blow from whose brawny and sinewy arm is enough to lay prostrate the most formidable combatant, and one kick from whom suffices to send objectors and objections bounding away into the realms of space. That this is no exaggeration of our friend's merits, intellectually considered, even the most cursory glance bestowed on his production will shew. One blow, and the thing is done. The objection stalks forth in the attitude, and with the bearing of a Goliath, but in an instant it is defeated and disposed of, slain with the smooth pebble from the brook and we hear no more about it. Mr. Bond is not a man to trouble himself with petty arguments. He likes to encounter the strength of a difficulty, or, in popular phraseology, "to take the bull by the horns." And, having overcome it, he leaves minor enemies to be dealt, with and discomfited by others. "Can you bring forward any other reason?" "Well, then, as you have hitherto failed to prove this, you must try again." p. 74. "Then we need not devote any further time to the consideration of this celebrated line;" p. 83, are specimens of our friend's summary, and yet satisfactory method of bringing his antagonist to a point and of dismissing defeated arguments. Mr. Bond thus knows both when and where to stop,—an attainment, as is well known by all who are largely read in controversial divinity, but rarely to be met with. And yet, it is not this which we principally admire in the pamphlet now lying on our table. It is the scope of the whole, combined with the self-denial apparent throughout, that delight us. To the scriptures Mr. Bond would have our attention constantly, we might almost say exclusively directed—for it is the God revealed in the scriptures, whom it is his great desire and object to glorify. Tempted is he, from time to time to take up carnal weapons, in the way both of offence and of defence; for they are had recourse to recklessly by adversaries of the truth, they lie beside him in great abundance, and eminently qualified is he to make use of them. But he rejects the temptation. The well-tempered *sword of the spirit* has been put into his hands; and he knows that it is sufficient for *the casting down of high thoughts*, and the demolition of *strongholds* See 2 Cor. x. 4, 5. Eph. vi. 17. It is God's weapon for the contutation of error. It is that with which the Son of God, during the days of his flesh, foiled Satan in his every assault. Matt. iv. 1—10. To the employment of it, therefore, our author endeavours to confine himself; with a *thus saith the Lord* as his watchword, and the divine testimony as the lamp contained in the carthern pitcher, like another Gideon he sallies forth into the camp of the Midianites and Amalekites; and at variance among themselves—*hateful and hating one another*—he has the satisfaction to behold the enemies of the truth fall by mutual strokes, no less than by the wounds inflicted by heavenly weapons.†

* It is as a *Retiarius* that Mr. Bond excels. Skilful unquestionably is he in the use of the sword, but in the expertness with which he flings his net over the head of a sophistical antagonist, he has but few equals.

† See Judges, vii, *throughout*.

By some, we admit, Mr. Bond's "Conversation" will be felt to be unattractive, nay to some, even, it may present a repulsive aspect. Dry and hard, in point of style, it unquestionably is. We meet here with none of the sweet graces, the playful irony, or the varied learning of a Blaise Pascal;* nor are we carried along by the ease and eloquence of an Elhanan Winchester. There is here no rest—no repose—for the reader. His reasoning faculties are from the beginning to the end of the Dialogue, kept incessantly on the stretch. Argument after argument is stated—deduction after deduction is brought under his notice—and objection after objection is met and refuted. The language throughout is that of a well-educated man, and we cannot but feel that we are for the time being the associates of a gentleman. But imagination is a faculty in which Mr. Bond is either deficient, or the aids of which he disdains. Perhaps, he discards it, as conceiving that its exercise might interfere with his main object, which is to state, enforce, and ensure the triumphs of the pure and unadulterated word of God. Whatever may be the cause of the want, fancy, whether in flashes or in more prolonged exhibitions, here certainly we have not. But what to the man of science should be preferable, we have here divine facts sustaining divine theory; and what by the Christian, in every work on the subject of religion must ever be the grand *desideratum*, we have here the revealed testimony of God, after having been thoroughly sifted, and exposed to every species of adverse pleading, made the sole and exclusive ground-work of a sentence of condemnation on a popular fallacy—a sentence, the justice and propriety of which, assuming scripture to be heavenly and divine, it will take more than human learning and human sophistry have ever yet accomplished, to be able to overturn. Mr. Bond's "Conversation" is the most scripturally logical *hand-book* in favour of Universalism, that has ever yet appeared.

One "Conversation between an Endless Damnationist, and a Universalist" occupies the whole of the 92 closely printed pages, of which the work subjected to our critical revision consists. We could have wished for the author's sake, and for the sake of the glorious truth which it so ably advocates, that it had been broken up into three, four, or more dialogues or sections. We think that thus partitioned, it would have told far more effectively. Indeed the strict logic of our author's style, and his condensed method of treating his subject, rendered such divisions as those just hinted at, indispensable. As composed and arranged, the close print, and the necessity of vigorous, incessant, and sustained attention, throughout nearly 100 octavo pages, are apt to rebut and revolt ordinary minds. However, there the Dialogue stands, a monument of scriptural skill, and scriptural piety. Refute it, who can. The Endlsss Damnationist is no Arminian. There are not put into his mouth weak, puling, *namby-pamby* arguments, which a child with a pat might overthrow. No. Mr. Bond gives to his adversary his due proportions, and places him in the most advantageous position which he can occupy. It is *soi-disant* orthodoxy in its most gigantic form, that he assails. The two interlocutors are both Calvinists in their fundamental principles, and Calvinists of the highest order too. The doctrines of God's sovereignty, and electing grace, they both acquiesce in; and the purposes of God, whatever attempts men may make to frustrate them, they are both satisfied shall in every respect be fulfilled. Upon one question, and one only, is the whole controversy between the speakers made to turn, namely, what is God's ultimate design with regard to the human race? In the discussion of this, no unfair advantage is taken, and no leading argument in favour of endless damnation is overlooked. The strongest objections to the doctrine of Universal Salvation are stated in the strongest manner; snd are never by a side-wind, bnt always directly, and by appeals to scripture authority, met and confuted. Calvinism, as a whole, is established. Rather, Calvinism, as the best human system of divine truth which previous ages had produced, in so far as it agrees with God's word, actually receives at the hands of Mr. Bond, greater

* Who that has ever read his *Lettres Provinciales*, can forget them? Who in particular can ever forget the sarcastic, withering logic of the 14th?

confirmation than either the Bishop of Hippo, or the Genevese Reformer, had been able to impart to it. But Calvinism, as imputing to God the making of sin and sufferings infinite, and thereby identifying itself with some of the worst sentiments of the ancient Manichees, meets with no mercy at his hands. Nay, he attacks and beats it on its own ground. We have no hesitation in saying, that the victory is complete. And this solely, because, in the case of our friend, Mr. Bond, the mind of man has been overruled in its choice of weapons, and in its use of them, by the mind of God.

The following passage, which we have accidentally turned up, will serve to give the reader a specimen of our author's style, and manner of reasoning:

"*E. D.* True; but bear in mind that my particular view, as you call it, is drawn from the Scriptures.—*U.* That is to say, is drawn from what you *believe to be the meaning* of the Scriptures."

"*E. D.* Just so.—*U.* Please to refer to Neh. ix. 6: 'Thou even thou, art Lord alone: thou hast made heaven the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth with all things that are therein, the seas and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all.' Now do you not understand from this passage that *literally, all things*, inclusive of men, and of *all* men, were created by God, and are under his providential superintendence and care?—*E. D.* Certainly I do.—*U.* And I presume the principle of interpretation, upon which you judge this to be the meaning of the passage, is no other than that of taking the words used, and, *especially*, the word 'all,'—the *only* one in the passage by which such Universality is *expressed*, or *can be supposed* to be expressed,—in their natural sense, their plain and obvious meaning?—*E. D.* Exactly so.—*U.* Now, if any one were to say that he excluded those who are called the 'children of the devil' from the 'all things' spoken of in this passage, in consequence of a belief that the *devil* was their Creator and *not God*, would you not think that he was taking a most unwarrantable liberty with Scripture in thus limiting the word 'all,' for no other reason in the world than to prevent its clashing with this particular opinion of his, as to the extent of *creation* by God?—*E. D.* No doubt I should."

"*U.* Well, but according to your own admission, *you* have no better reason yourself for limiting this same word 'all,' and the expressions 'every,' 'the world,' 'the whole world,' when salvation is spoken of. Is it not for the selfsame reason that you do so, viz. to prevent their clashing with *your* particular opinion, merely substituting the extent of *salvation* for that of *creation*?—*E. D.* I cannot deny that it is.—*U.* Then you must either consider that *every one* is at liberty to mould the meaning of scripture to his particular opinions, or that for some reason or other, *you* are at liberty to do so while *others* are *not*. You admit, it appears, that *all* are not. You must, therefore, consider yourself to enjoy some special privilege in this matter. Is it that you consider yourself to be infallible in your opinions upon religious subjects?—*E. D.* Of course, I do not consider myself to be *naturally* infallible, but I do believe this, that I am under the Spirit's teaching with regard to the extent of salvation, and, *therefore*, infallible in my opinion upon that point.—*U.* But do you not think there are many of God's regenerated children, thinking differently from you on certain points of doctrine, who believe themselves to be under the Spirit's teaching with regard thereto, whom you, however, believe to be in error both as to the supposed fact of being under the Spirit's teaching on such points, and also as to their particular opinions thereupon?—*E. D.* I certainly do.—*U.* Then what grounds have you for settling it as quite out of the question, that you may be in error upon the particular point we are discussing, (the extent of salvation,) and also in thinking that you are under the Spirit's teaching with regard thereto?—*E. D.* I admit the difficulty this question places me in; but, my good friend, if I believe that only *some* are to be saved, what am I to do with those passages, in which the words we are discussing are used with reference to salvation?—*U.* Really I think your own question places you in a far more awkward position than mine does; if *you*

believe that *only some* are to be saved, what are you to do with those passages in the word of God, which declare, in language as plain as any that could be used, that *all* are to be saved? I admit the difficulty of having to contend with such passages as these, nor do I know of any way of getting rid of it so effectual as cutting them at once out of the Bible."

"*E. D.* A truce to irony: you are aware that my opinion is founded upon what I believe to be the truth of the Bible.—*U.* Well, but *what* passages in the Bible are we to found our opinion upon as to who shall be saved, if not upon those which are most *simply* and *distinctly declaratory* upon *this very point?*" &c. &c. pp. 15, 16.

There are a few things to which we might object in Mr. Bond's theory: such, for instance, as the nature of the judgment which he anticipates being pronounced at Christ's second coming. But where the sentiments are not only, on the whole, so coincident with our own, but what is of infinitely more importance, so thoroughly scriptural, we cannot find it in our heart to have recourse to what might have even the appearance of carping and cavilling.

We must now bring this hasty notice to a close; and we do so by observing, that one reading, nay, two or three readings of this most valuable pamphlet, will scarcely suffice for the reader to do himself and the author justice. It may be fitly perused many times, and at each successive perusal with increasing advantage. And however dry and repulsive it may be felt to be at first—however fatiguing its demands on our reflective energies—an increased acquaintance with it, and with those Scriptures to which it incessantly appeals, will be found to bring out beauties in it of which we were not previously aware, and to inspire us with an interest in it which we had not previously experienced. Divine truth will, by means of it as an index pointing to the only source of such truth, become in our eyes increasingly glorious. In a word, this is one of the very few controversial treatises on the subject of religion, perused by us in the course of a somewhat prolonged literary life, concerning which we can honestly declare with reference to the integrity no less than skill with which its discussions are conducted, to its scriptural character, and to the exceedingly suggestive nature of its contents, that *decies repetita placebit et juvabit.**

D. T.

"MAN AND LAW."

"I am satisfied that the nature of every being constitutes the law of that being; in other words, constitutes the authority to which the being is in all its powers, faculties, and propensities, subject. Proceeding upon this principle, as the nature of the cat and that of the dog constitute the laws to which these animals respectively are subject, so does the fleshly nature of man constitute the law to which he naturally and necessarily, both as to body and mind, is subject likewise. Indeed, the principle is of such universal application, that, with the exception of God alone—in whom his nature is subject to his will, that is, is subject to himself—the nature of every being constitutes the law, the only law, to which properly speaking that being is subject, and which it obeyst. —But to return. Adam's body was first created, and then his mind, as we learn from Gen. ii. 7; and the same progress, from the previous existence of body to that of mind, takes place, as we know, in all his descendants. That is, man was originally *of the earth, earthy;* or had first imparted to him a body composed of earthly materials, with which a mind suitable to its earthly nature was afterwards associated. The mind was thus, by its very creation, made to depend on the body; and man owed an allegiance to the law of flesh, or to the constitution of his fleshly nature, before by any possibility he could owe an

* Mr. Bond's smaller tract, entitled, "Universalism, or the Eventual Blessedness in Christ of all Mankind, the Doctrine of the Bible," &c. London, H. K. Lewis, 1850, deserves, at least, a passing notice. Its proofs of "the Nature of the first Communication to Abraham," its "Appeal to Candour," its "Answers to Objections," and its "Questions proposed to High Calvinists," are all, in their several ways, most excellent. They each and all indicate a master's hand. What can be better than the following *morceau*, extracted from the "Questions;"—"Does not Universalism set at nought the atonement? Yes, certainly; if *extending* the design and result thereof to *all mankind*, instead of *limiting* them to a *few*, is setting it at nought: but not *otherwise*."

† ["Divine Inversion," pp. 82—86.]

allegiance to any other law. Flesh is man's lawgiver and rightful monarch; and, from the law of flesh, he can by no efforts of his own—no means of his own devising and executing—withdraw himself. To a being thus situated, that is, thus previously owing allegiance to the law of flesh as the law of his nature, one law of God, in the shape of the prohibition imposed on Adam, was addressed. And this not to render our natual progenitor subject to divine law, or to evince his capability of ever becoming so; but to make manifest the utter impossibility of his nature ever being subjected to divine law, in consequence of its having been previously subjected, and of the allegiance which therefore it owed to the law of flesh. Of this, the one transgression of Adam afforded ample and sufficient evidence. It shewed that his mind, as fleshly, was *not subject to God's law; neither, indeed, was able to be so.* That as fleshly, its very nature constituted *a law of sin and death:* requiring, merely, the imposition on it of a divine prohibition, in order to bring out and display what it actually was."—*Thoms Dialogues on Universal Salvation.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

SIR,—The author of "An Analytical Arrangement of the Holy Scriptures," recently published, will be much obliged by your inserting the following *substituted correction* in your forthcoming number. R. B. R.

Vol. II. page 488, line 26, after "*taught* false doctrines"—read as follows. Doctor Bloomfield also should not have ignored Mr. Farmer's work on this subject (a work which convinced Primate Newcome,) particularly the following passage, which shows that "the reality of possessions could not be directly and immediately determined by the authority of Christ and his apostles without great impropriety.

"For the miracles performed upon the demoniacs were designed for the conviction of *unbelievers;* they were the means used to bring them over to the faith; and consequently their nature was to be judged of and determined by the test of reason alone, before men believed that is, before men could admit the authority of their performers, or pay any deference to their judgment. And therefore, if you say that Christ or his apostles interposed their authority to decide the present question, you not only affirm what cannot be proved, but you reproach these divine instructors with a conduct unbecoming and absurd; you make them urge their authority in a case to which it could not extend, and upon persons by whom it was not yet acknowledged, who ought to be left (and who accordingly were left) to judge or themselves, as the circumstances of the case itself might seem to require. What St. Paul says concerning the gift of tongues is equally true with respect to the cure of demoniacs: it is *for a sign,* not to them *that believe, but for them that believe not.*"—Farmer on Demoniacs, p. 221, 222; 2nd. Edit.

See also Dr. Arnold's remarks to the same purpose, given in the note on Heb. i.

I omit to notice other matter in the Doctor's note, which must stand or fall with that now considered.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

DEAR SIR,—In No. 18 (for June last) there appears a reply by "Anetazo" to the writers of two letters in Nos. 15 and 16 (for March and April of this Magazine). As he continues to confound statements which we endeavour to point out were essentially different, puts forward his own deductions and conclusions were express Scriptural declarations are demanded, takes little or no notice of arguments directed towards the nature and reasons of the difference between us, and assumes as undoubted things which we either doubt or deny, we see no propriety in further occupying your space with the controversy. We would only refer the reader to the careful perusal of the correspondence already published, and also to the article in No. 17 (for May) entitled "The Apostolic Gospel and Universalism," the authorship of which we are at present in ignorance of, but which we are glad to find so ably supports us in our opposition to the views of "Anetazo." Again thanking you for the opportunity you have given him of expressing his sentiments on a point which he considers of no small importance, the writer remains,

Yours very sincerely,

EKDIKALETHES.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

AUGUST, 1851.

PEACE ON EARTH.

WHATEVER may be the fortunes or misfortunes of Peace Societies, and Peace Congresses, we cannot but heartily commend the Christian and benevolent spirit by which they are called into existence; and though no more be accomplished by them than a *protest* against the principle and practice of war, such protest is as honourable to those who make it, as it is condemnatory of those who *delight* in war, nor can it be without salutary influence upon the minds of men.

How naturally has human glory come to be associated with the battle field and victory! Glory urges the warrior to the fight, and stimulates his thirst for blood, and nerves his arm for resistance to the death. Glory! and at the sound, from the domestic circle he hurries forth whose ambition lures him to face the foe! He whose cup of joy was filled from affection's fount and whose happiness flowed from sources of good will and neighbourhood with those around his smiling homestead, shuts and steels his heart's sensibilities against all the gentle and peaceful influences of his seclusion, and pants to be a conqueror, and will die for *glory!* Contrast this with the fact involved in the angel's song—"peace on earth." Glory is by man associated with *war*; the glory of God is bound up with *peace*—"glory to God in the highest, on earth peace." Military glory is acquired through uncompromising determination to trample down and crush a foe. The glory of God is achieved by the humiliation and submission of him by whom all the glory of the world ("he is our peace") is secured. The glory of the one is war, of the other, peace; the one is effected by hate, the other by love.

The pastoral life is eminently suggestive of tranquillity and repose. To shepherds watching over their flocks, amid the stillness and serenity of night, was the announcement of *peace* most appropriately made. What a contrast does this shepherd's field present to the field of battle! The one is honourable and useful; the other pernicious and destructive. A king for some imaginary insult, it may be, summons his armies—his glory must not be compromised—and presently his revenge is gratified by the sacrifice of the flower of manhood and the cry of the widow and the fatherless. Something more than an imaginary insult demands the execution of justice at the hands of the King of kings—his glory he will not give to another—his glory is maintained, and *peace* on earth is secured.

We rely with unwavering confidence on the realization of a prospect

so delightful: nor would we damp the zeal of any peace advocate by suggesting that the peace he is pursuing may be but a phantom. We look upon the annunciation to the shepherds, as not only an expression of "good will to man" but as a *prophecy*, with the accomplishment of which is interwoven "the glory of God." We are, however, compelled, by respect for the authority of Scripture, to draw attention to certain things which belong to the peace which Christ came to accomplish, as essential to its realization and consummation as a matter of fact.

"I came not to send peace on earth, but a sword," says the Saviour. "What a contradiction!" exclaims the sceptic; and yet it is perfectly consistent and philosophical. "Whence come wars?" asks an apostle; and the reply is "Of your own lust for war." And so from Cain, the first murderer, to the present time, has been most fearfully and constantly developed the truth attested by Scripture and experience, respecting human nature, that its essential characteristic is—"hateful and hating one another."* Peter iii. 3. The sword is the precursor of peace, as light is of day—as chaos is of order. Progress involves controversy. The *agitated* waters become pure. We may dam up a running stream, but by and by the waters overflow, our barrier is washed away and it rushes onward with increased impetuosity. The enemy may be cowered, his hostilities may be laid aside, he may seem to be a friend, but a favourable opportunity presents itself, the mask is withdrawn, and we are surprised into a deadly conflict. Peace on earth, it is true, is the ultimate end of the advent of the Prince of peace, but in order to its realization and enjoyment, there must be conflict, strife, destruction, victory. This is absolutely necessary. The fact that human nature is diametrically opposed to the divine nature (Rom. viii. 7), is the proof. Compromise, even if it were possible, might purchase the *semblance* of peace—*real* harmony would be unattained. But with the Almighty there is no such thing as compromise; with Him is no variableness or shadow of turning. Hence, he girds his sword upon his thigh, and rides forth, conquering and to conquer. Our Lord, in finishing the work which his Father gave him to do, knew how to sympathize with his servant Paul, when he said, "I have fought a good fight;" for not until he had exhausted the strength of the last enemy, did he lay down the sword. Sin was vanquished, and the nature that had sinned was sacrificed: over death and hades he completely triumphed. And thus was the way opened for substantial and abiding peace. As it was with our Lord so must it also be with his servants. The sword must not be returned to its scabbard till the enemy be vanquished. The heart of every Christian, indeed, is the arena of the same conflict which is to be carried on in the world. Here is a microcosm wherein the powers and principalities, the spirit and the flesh, the heaven-born and the hell-born, do strive with restless hostility. The Church militant carries on the struggle. But let us not confound the Church militant with man's militant Church which is ever being agitated and divided by internal strife. The members of the true Church militant strive, not against each other, but "together, for the faith and hope of the gos-

* Let those who think this a libel on human nature, recall some old private friendships, and think what has become of them when self-interest has been thwarted, &c.

pel." Not within the Church do they draw the sword, but they go after the Captain of their salvation, "without the camp, bearing his reproach." We are thorough believers in "the perseverence" and final triumph "of the saints." Hostilities have never ceased, nor has a temporary truce ever lulled the battle into a momentary calm. The strife waxes hotter, and will yet increase: nor until He, whose right it is to reign, shall have made the kingdoms of this world the kingdom of our God and of his Christ will the struggle be over. But the crisis is past (John xii. 31); the battle is the Lord's; the shout of victory anticipated will be echoed by the shout of victory achieved: the last enemy will have fallen, and "then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." And then there shall be war no more, but peace shall flow as a river.

Jesus is the conqueror: sin and death are fallen foes. But our weapons, though mighty, are not carnal. Hatred in man to God, is opposed by love in God to man; and before the omnipotence of him who humbled himself even to the death of the cross, every high thing that exalteth itself is brought into willing captivity to the obedience of Christ. Man's hate, man's *enmity is slain.* Man, created anew, shall be at peace with himself, because at peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Self-interest will not be extinguished, but promoted in the sympathy he will cherish with the divine purpose and the identification of his own well-being with the blessedness of universal man. Perfect harmony will reign where the dissonance and discord of sin only was manifest. *But the end is not yet: we see not yet all things put under him.*

But who doubts the glorious consummation of Christian hope? This world, it is true, upon whose projects (even its schemes of benevolence and goodness) so much effort is bestowed, is found

> "A broken reed at best, but oft a spear,
> On its sharp point peace bleeds, and hope expires."

But omnipotence is pledged to accomplish the promise made, and solemnly ratified, and sacredly confirmed,—the promise which was solace to the first sinner, which rejoiced our father Abraham, was the burden of prophecy and of the song of angels, and made old Simeon say, "Lord, now lettest thou Thy servant depart in peace."

And is there nothing in all this to stimulate the zeal and warm the hearts of those who, after the Christian model, advocate peace on earth? Is there not something which imparts assurance to their hopes and reality to that which unbelief would suggest is little better than a pleasing dream? Is not their argument strengthened by the consideration that universal peace is involved in the fulfilled purposes of God? And is not the thought that we are all hereafter to live in holy brotherhood —being the children of God—a reason and a motive for beating swords into plough-shares and spears into pruning-hooks here? If there be no end to sin there is no end to enmity, and if there be no end to enmity, universal peace is a mere chimera. But we are not dreamers. As believers in God's revealed purpose we devoutly and joyfully anticipate the annihilation of sin, and with it the advent of abiding, perfect peace.

THE EXPERIENCE OF A MIND IN SEARCH AFTER TRUTH.

Dear Sir,—It has occurred to my mind that a plain and brief statement of some portion of the history or experience of a mind in a search after truth, during the past 13 years, may not be uninteresting or unprofitable to some of your readers.

The majority of persons whose minds are directed to the subject of religion adopt, from education or some other reason, the creed and formula of some one of the denominations or sects, and live and die in a profession of that creed, with little, if any, examination whether it be truth or error, indeed with many their own creed is the standard of truth; another class are tossed about with every wind of doctrine, and ultimately abandon all profession and become sceptics; whilst a third class, renouncing all creeds, as inconsistent with the scripture and with the nature and tendency of divine truth to lead the mind onward from one developement of the divine character to another, launch on the ocean of truth, daily seeking the wisdom which is from above to lead them into all the truth as it is in Jesus, independent of all human teaching and worldly wisdom, being taught that the foolishness of God is wiser than men and the weakness of God is stronger than men, and depending upon his gracious promise that all his children shall be taught of himself. The latter class have a struggle and conflict to pass through which no language can describe. Discovering, the further they advance in the knowledge of God, that there is still an immeasurable and unfathomable height, depth, breadth, and length unexplored, and into which they cannot penetrate but as they are led gradually by the heavenly teacher, and finding at every step the enmity and opposition of their earthly nature to all that is divine and spiritual, they feel that strait is the gate and narrow the way that leadeth unto life.

I was born and brought up a member of a Baptist family, professing what are called High Calvinist doctrines, and at the somewhat early age of 20, my mind was quickened into divine life, and my attention powerfully awakened to spiritual things. I had a long experience of the fear which hath torment, and laboured hard, by day and night, by reading, by hearing, and by prayers, to obtain life and peace; and, as much of my reading and hearing (as I now see) was more calculated to rivet the chains of my bondage than to lead me into the liberty of the gospel, I was kept in a fluctuating state between hope and despair; sometimes in peace and joy, but more frequently in darkness and distress. The conflict and distress of mind I passed through cannot be expressed: those who have been in the same furnace well know its heat and its effect. Early in my spiritual life, there arose in the congregation to which I belonged, a fierce strife between two parties, respectively Arminian and Calvinistic. I took a lively interest in the subject, and had a strong leaning to the Arminian side, and for a long period I devoted hours of the night to the study of the word of God upon those points, with a desire to establish my mind in the Arminian doctrines, but the result was my settled conviction that the doctrine of the Scriptures was absolute, sovereign, unconditional salvation for man by the Son of God, either for the elect Church only, or for all. But not then seeing how salvation could be both special and general, I became a member of the strictest sect of Calvinistic Baptists. After some years communion with them, I came gradually to the conviction that their system and manner of preaching was too limited and confined: they alone had the truth and the whole truth, all else were in darkness, and under the profession of the deepest humility and self abhorrence there was the grossest pride and Phariseeism. After in vain attempting to bring about a change in their principles and practice, I left them and joined another society of Baptists, professing the same doctrines, but, as I thought, free from that bitter and exclusive spirit, but alas! I could get no settled rest. I found there a *profession* of the doctrines, but a ministry in general either opposed to or inconsistent with them.

At various periods my mind was much exercised upon the subject of eternal torments for the unregenerate, which I could not reconcile with an unconditional salvation, and upon the various systems, of annihilation and otherwise, proposed in opposition to that doctrine; but I was unable to reconcile them with the scriptures of truth, and although I could not understand many portions of the Word except upon the principle of eternal torments, I found *that* opposed to my views of the revealed character of God, and thus was kept in a painful state of doubt and uncertainty. The letter of John Foster, in one of the early numbers of your Magazine, exactly describes the state of my mind at this time.

At length I met with a friend professing the principles of Evangelical Universalism, and first heard from him of a system which reconciled the difficulties I had been contending with, by showing a present and manifested salvation of the election of grace, in harmony with the doctrines I had previously believed, and the ultimate salvation of the entire race of man by the destruction of the earthly nature and gift of a new and divine nature, when sin, and death, and hell, shall be destroyed and God shall be all in all. It is not necessary, nor can I intrude so much upon your pages, to explain by what means I have arrived at this stage of divine knowledge, suffice it to say, that from the scriptures alone do I derive my confidence in the truth, and that although I cannot pretend to explain every passage in consistency with this view, I find no difficulty in reconciling it with the general principles of Scripture, and with all that is revealed of the character of the unsearchable One, who is declared to be the Saviour of *all men*, specially of them that believe, and who has given in his word numerous revelations of his gracious purpose to create all things new, and to destroy death and him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil; who has revealed his name as the Lord God, merciful and gracious, keeping mercy for thousands and forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin, and who has in his Son made an end of sin and brought in everlasting righteousness, and will deliver every creature, now groaning and travailing in pain, from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

Finding many things still in the word of God dark and mysterious, but desiring to bow my mind in submission to all that is there declared, I count not that I have already attained or am already perfect, but press forward after greater manifestations of the knowledge of him who is "Love." Your's truly,

A SEEKER.

THE FREE CHURCH AND ALL OTHER PROFESSING CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

We can scarcely afford our readers a higher treat, than by the insertion of the following article, from the pen of that accomplished writer, Thomas Mulock, Esq., which appears in the "Northern Ensign," of July 3rd. Mr. Mulock is not a Universalist; and to some of his statements, especially those regarding the nature, and near approach of the conversion of the Jews, we decidedly demur. But with the exception of what occurs towards the latter portion of the paper, and of two or or three things besides, the spirit and the language of the whole is at once so scriptural and Evangelical—the views are so beautiful and so beautifully expressed—that we cannot prevail upon ourselves to withhold from our readers, the gratificatien which has been afforded to ourselves. D. T.

One of the richest blessings which the God of all grace is about to shower down upon his church and people, is the clear scriptural knowledge of the use, scope and operation of the law of Moses, as spiritually shone upon by the *Sun of everlasting righteousness*—even Christ the Lord and King of Glory. Whilst it is an immutable truth, that all believers in the Son of *God are dead unto the law*, and *delivered from the law*,—Rom. vii. 4, 6.—yet it is equally true, that so long as the sun and moon shall endure, Christ's glory in *magnifying the law and making it honourable* will shine forth in the holy acknowledgments of his righteous and ransomed people. *The law* served as a *schoolmaster to bring*

unto Christ, but when *faith is come*, so as to supersede the rigorous rule of the schoolmaster, still the instruction authoritatively imparted remains indelibly and blessedly engraven on the minds of God's enfranchised children. *The law was a shadow of good things to come*, and, as such, is worthy of eternal thanksgiving and praise; for in the law is foreshewn the sufferings and glory of the Lord Jesus. Luke xxiv. 44. The more, therefore, we discern of the pre-eminent perfection of the *new covenant* the more we shall have our understandings opened to behold the typical excellency of the *Old Testament*. The special meaning, particular purport, Divine design, and holy prefiguration of all the Levitical ordinances, will be interpreted to us by the Holy Spirit, whilst leading believers into sacred fellowship with Christ. All *priesthood*, all *sacrifices*, all *tithes and offerings*, under the law, will be spiritually resolved into new covenant worship of the Son of God; and for this all-sufficient reason, that *Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.* Thus, too, all the blessings of the fulfilled law will become manifestly the portion of believers, as being one with Christ, and therefore fully entitled to claim *all* the benefits flowing from *his* perfect obedience.

In the frequent repitition of the solemn sanctions of the law, we always find that the complete fulfilment of God's holy commandments is invariably insisted on. The eternal God demands present, perfect, and unswerving submission to his most righteous will; and guiltiness in *one* point is declared to be guiltiness in *all*. Every man who knows God's law is *a debtor to do the whole law;* and in failure of entire obedience, becomes liable to the destroying penalties of God s *curse*. Deut. xxviii. 15. Looking nakedly at the Decalogue, it is plain that every human being whom it reaches must either instantly perish or be *consumed with dying;* for man has no natural power, in his fallen state, of complying with any commandment of God. The creature is all evil, body and soul, and consequently no righteous requisition can ever control or induce him to obedience. Why, then, it may be asked, was a law given with the full foreknowledge of a total incapacity on the part of man to fulfil it, or even any part of it—for universal obedience is inexorably and rightfully exacted? To which we reply in the Apostle's words, *Wherefore, then, serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made. The promise* (of life and immortality) *was made to Abraham, and his seed, which seed is Christ.* Abraham's righteousness and blessedness consisted exclusively in his simple belief of the Godhead of Christ; and from that faith his descendants so departed as to sink themselves in sin akin to the iniquities of the heathen. But especially did the rebellious murmurings of the children of Israel, after their deliverance from Pharaoh and his host, call for the penal promulgation of the law from Sinai's Mount which was awfully declared in the midst of *fire*, with surrounding *blackness and darkness and tempest;* all significant of the terrors of God's unalterable justice towards transgressors. The words then uttered with a *great voice*, and which were subsequently *written by the finger of God upon tables of stone*, constitute the irreversible rule of man's obedience, and make upthe total sum of what is Divinely designated as —The Law. The subjoined sacrificial ordinances, although under the same solemn sanction, were compassionately contrived by the *Father of mercies* as a *shadow* of gospel *good things*, in prefiguring the propitiation of Christ; and yet they marked out the law as a *ministration of death;* forasmuch as they plainly proved that *without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.* Here shines forth, in typical glory, the gospel union of God's righteousness and mercy. Sin must be destroyed, or sinners must perish! for sin is the implacable enemy of the Holy Lord God, who is "of purer eyes than to behold iniquity. So long as sin is suffered to be in existence, it will manifest an irreconcilable opposition to the Deity. Upon this subject almost all theological writers have erred from the truth of Scripture. They have failed to discern that sin must be destroyed; it can never be subued, or modified, or mitigated. Death, therefore, which is visible destruction of physical life, is the proper "wages of sin;" and a second death, invisible by bodily organs of sight, is

denounced as the ultimate destruction of impenitent souls persisting in intellectual evil before and after the dissolution of corporeal constitution. Sin being, in its essence, the total alienation of the creature from the Almighty Creator, it is infinitely incurable in its nature, and is incapable of restoration to righteousness. Wilful departure from the only true God is separation from love, life, peace, joy, and holiness for evermore! for having "left their first estate," neither fallen angel, nor fallen man can ever return to their forfeited condition of happiness. The case of lost spirits is hopeless, and with their irrevocable doom we have nothing to do; but for lapsed men it pleased the God of glory and of all grace to provide a redemption full of measureless mercy, and yet inflexibly combined with ineffable justice. Sin is *made an end of*, while sinners are *saved*. Death is abolished, and eternal life is substituted in its stead. The Scriptures, when read with the eye of faith, speak spiritually but of *two* men in our world,—the first and second Adam—the former all sin and death, the latter all life and immortality:—and in the true knowledge of these two we are taught the *law* and the *gospel*. The law discovers, denounces, and punishes to the uttermost, all sins of thought, word, and deed, proceeding from the fathomless fountain of man's corrupt nature, so "that every mouth may be stopped, and that all the world may become guilty before God." Rom. iii. 18. The false and pernicious expounders of God's holy word, have throughout Christendom flung a Satanic obscuration over the terrible theme of man's apostacy from God, which is universally the same with the posterity of Adam. Of every generation it may be truly and specially said, "all flesh hath corrupted his way on earth." Man's fall, which led to the perpetual procreation of our utterly vile and evil nature, was the wickedest work of the devil, but so fully in the merciful foreknowledge of the *only wise God*, as to be met and overcome by a glorious avenger, even "the Lamb, who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world." 1 Pet. i. 19, 20. It is not our intention in this paper to handle the great mysteries of election and predestination, which are immutable acts of the Divine mind, and which are traceable, as to a supreme cause, to God's *everlasting love*. Jer. xxxi. 3. Suffice it to say, that in the eternal purpose of *the Father*, Christ, who is one with the godhead in essence, majesty, immortality, and immutability, was appointed heir of all things, and very specially head of his body, the Church, which most holy Church was chosen in him before the creation. The Church was set up representatively in the person of Adam, who was formed in *natural* perfection, although not a *spiritual* man. 1 Cor. xv. 45, 46. Immediately on the fall, God's predetermination to destroy sin and death, by the vicarious sufferings and death of the Messiah, was announced to our first parents, but four thousand years of guilt and misery on the part of man, and of grace and mercy on the part of God, were to roll onwards before the promised Mediator and Saviour should be manifested in the flesh. Two great penal periods are, however, emphatically noted; the reign of death from Adam to Moses, and the reign of sin from Moses to Jesus Christ. It was needful that the strength of sin and its exceeding sinfulness should be fully drawn forth under a dispensation of law, holy, just, and good, to make it undeniably clear that man's enmity to truth, righteousness, and holiness was and is unalterable and unappeasable. Christ, therefore, in the fulness of time, appeared in the flesh in our world to finish the transgression, to make an end of sins, to abolish death, to destroy the devil, to fulfil all righteousness, and to establish, in lieu of the first Adam, a renewed race, perfectly conformed to the image of God as it shines forth in the face of Jesus Christ, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. Now the Holy Ghost's testimony in the word of life to Christ's resurrection proclaims the perfect accomplishment of all the vast designs of Godhead in the person of the Lord Jesus. He hath suffered; he now reigns. He was by imputation chief of sinners; he is now king of saints. He was sown in weakness; he hath been raised in power. He was the man of sorrows; he is now crowned with everlasting joy. Every promise in the whole word of God hath been verified to Christ himself as being head over all things to the Church. After eighteen

hundred years of Gentile abuse and blasphemous perversion of the grace of Christ, the true Israel, the "seed of Abraham by faith," are, we confidently aver, about to be restored, magnified, and pre-eminently blest and honoured above all people on the face of the earth. The apostolic dispensation of the gospel to the Gentiles is come to a full end, for the new covenant, in its immensity of everlasting righteousness and eternal salvation, swallows up all preceding dispensations of the riches of grace.

Paul, the most gifted of the apostles, and the special messenger of God to the Gentiles, admits the inferiority of his mission to somn sublimer glories which were, to him, in prophetic prospect. "For we know in part and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." The essential superexcellency of the "new and better covenant" consists in the "revelation of Jesus Christ," as having, by his divine obedience, "magnified the law and made it honourable." All conceivable righteousness on the part of fallen man will vanish away as a diabolical day dream, on the instant that Christ's spiritual snbjection in body and soul to the perfect will of Jehovah everlasting shall be revealed by the Holy Ghost. Jew and Gentile will see themselves cut off presently and eternally from all righteousness, except they be gifted with faith in the Son of God; for where can righteousness be found in heaven or on earth except in the single person of the worthy Lamb, in whom it hath pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell? All who have not faith in Christ's priesthood and intercession will find themselves to be "debtors to do the whole law," eternally apart from Christ's "obedience unto death. It is through Christ's life of subjection to the Father's will that believers stand in a state of everlasting perfection before God, righteous and holy in the righteousness and holiness of Christ's walk in the flesh, whilst bearing the imputation of sin, and the horrors of the curse. No tongue can tell the happiness, security, glory and honour, of the new covenant which is essentially the union and communion of Christ's Church with Christ's glorified person. No Gentile appropriation of mere doctrinal truth can ever approach to this blessedness, which is the promised "manifestation of the sons of God." Rom. viii. 19. Isaiah lx. 4.

To us who write these heart-cheering words the speedy stretching forth of Christ's arm for the *everlasting salvation of Israel* is an infallible certainty which rests on the promise of God made to Abraham and fulfilled by Christ, *the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead.* Never was Gentile pride and power in more palmy pre-eminence than at this hour of doom! Look at the nations of the earth, madly calculating upon permanent prosperity and PEACE, ay, peace universal, as the result of a vast Babylonish bazaar, concentrating symbols of the world's wealth under a babyish house of fantastic *glass*! Royalty, aristocracy, prelacy, and people, steeped alike in frenzied forgetfulness of the all-important truth that there can be no *peace* for mortal man, except that which *hath been made by the blood of Christ's cross!* Whilst foolish men are anticipating long years of ease, progressive improvement, and international exchange of social benefits, we boldly tell them in the name of Israel's God that the *times of the Gentiles* are wholly run out. *For the day of the Lord is near upon all the heathen! as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee; thy reward shall return upon thine own head.* The implacable persecution of the Jews by every Gentile community is come up in remembrance before God. They have not been trampled down because of their sinfulness in rejecting their Saviour, for the Gentiles have *crucified Christ afresh* with unspeakably greater ungodliness: but the true cause of cruel persecution has been the Gentile enmity against God, who fixed upon the *seed of Abraham* to be a *chosen people unto himself.* But saith the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, *the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come.* Instead of peace, the nations are about to have war and judgment. *Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles: prepare war. Beat your ploughshares into swords, and your pruning hooks into spears. Let the heathen be wakened.*

and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat; for there will I sit to judge all the heathen round about. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered, and the kingdom shall be the LORD'S.

THE DEER OF SCRIPTURE.

THERE are three kinds of Deer mentioned in the Old Testament. The three Hebrew words are—יחמור Yagh-moor, the Fallow Deer. איל Ahy-yahl, the Hart and Hind. צבי Ty'vie, the Roebuck.

These three Hebrew words mean first the red, second the strong, and third the glorious, and they shew such points in the character of our Saviour as are sufficient for our salvation.

First the red. Who is this asks Isaiah that cometh from Edom (Edom or Etan means red, Genesis xxv. 25. to be red, ruddy;) and wherefore art thou red in thine apparel? The answer is The year of my redeemed is come and there was none to help or uphold; therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me: so he was their Saviour, Isaiah lxiii. 1, 2, 4, 5, 8. Vengeance for sin (in the Hebrew, to inflict a penalty) was in the heart of the Lord, for the day of retribution had arrived, verse 4, and man must have perished if He whose fury was roused against them had not undertaken to tread the wine press alone (the wine press of the fierceness of Almighty God, (Rev. xix. 15) for of the people there was none with him, ver. 3.

The sins of man having caused the blood of Christ to be shed, are hence typified under the colour of red. Your sins though they are red as crimson or scarlet says Isaiah i. 18. shall be made white, for He who speaks in righteousness mighty to save, Isaiah lxiii. 1. has sprinkled that blood upon his own garments, staining his own raiment, Isaiah lxiii. 3, has clothed us with the garments of salvation Isaiah lxi. 10 washed white in the blood of the Lamb. Rev. vii. 14.

The Fallow, Deer then, shews our Lord and Saviour as having taken our sins upon himself which have produced the curse of shedding innocent blood. Let us next see what trait of character the Hart points out respecting our Lord.

The Hebrew word for Hart איל means strength, might, from the curved or twisted horns of a stag or ram.

David calls God the horn of his salvation, his Saviour, 2 Samuel xxii. 3. and Psalm xviii. 2. and Zacharias; when saying that God was about to visit and redeem his people, thus prophecies of our Saviour, God has raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David, Luke i. 69, that we should be saved from our enemies, ver. 71.

Thus we see Christ, as the stricken Deer, bleeding for our sins, and, as the Hart, mighty to save.

He it is who has the power to set the hinds free, so that their agility is a proverb. For to us, his saved ones, is this promise. It is God that girdeth us with strength and maketh our ways perfect; and it is thus added in the beautiful figurative language of Scripture:

He maketh our feet as hinds feet, and setteth me upon high places, Psalm xviii. 33; thus shewing our freedom from falling even when exalted, and whereas we were once lame and blind and deaf as regards a life with God, we shall be so no more for our movements shall be free, even as the Hart's Isaiah xxxv. 6. or typically, being made free from sin by the strength of Christ as pourtrayed in the Hart, we need not fear to fall on whatever elevation we are placed.

The third word for Deer used as Roebuck means splendour, glory. Christ is represented as covered with our sins as with a garment; then he reveals himself to us as the strong one; and, thirdly, we see Him having conquered death, covered with splendour and glory which we are to share.

In red apparel He trod the wine press alone, he had none of his people with him. In his character of the strong one his horn is raised to gain salvation

and the hind or his saved ones, represented as the bride of the Revelation (xxi. 9) is shortly to be covered with the glory of God, ver. 11, that splendour and glory which is expressed in the word Roebuck or Roe; For my beloved, says the bride, is like a Roe or a young hart upon the mountains of Bether, Sol. Song. ii. 17.

Bether denotes a place of division or border-land, thus pourtraying that Christ is the connecting tie between Earth and Heaven.

The day, the true day has not yet broken upon us and the shadows are still upon the mountains, so our Royal Hart is not yet visible to us. Sol. Song ii. 17. We get glimpses of Him from behind the wall or through the lattice. Sol. Song ii. 9. He has gained his own freedom and he has gained freedom for us.

We hear his voice: he comes leaping upon the mountains, skipping upon the Hills. Sol. Song ii. 8; and he will make our feet as Hinds' feet. Habakuk iii. 19, so that we shall be able to follow him wherever he goes. John x. 4; for we shall know his voice, and he has given us eternal life that we cannot be plucked away from him. John x. 28.

Then when the morning breaks the shadows will pass away, all walls and lattices too will be removed; and we who have hitherto seen through a glass darkly, shall then see face to face. Now indeed we know in part but then we shall know even as we are known. 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

ANECDOTES FOR THE SOCIAL CIRCLE.

In 1827 Mr. H. King, of Springfield, Mass. had a conversation with a Mr. Crocker on Matt. xvi. 25, 26—"For whosoever will save his *life* shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his *life* for my sake shall find it; for what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own *soul*? or what shall a man give in exchange for his *soul*."? As they could not agree on the meaning of the last verse, they agreed to refer it to Rev. Wilbur Fish, Principal of the Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham—when the opportunity presented this was done, and the following conversation ensued.—*Mr. King.* Is the Greek word translated life in Matt. xvi. 25. the same which is translated *soul* in verse 26? *Prof. Fisk.* To use the word *life* instead of *soul* in verse 26, would make nonsense of the whole passage. Mr. K. I ask you, sir, if the Greek word is the same in both places? Prof. F. The word translated *life* in ver. 25 is *sometimes* translated *soul.* Mr. K. This is not an answer to my question. I have been informed that the Greek word thus differently translated, is precisely one and the same. If that information be incorrect, it is your duty as a public teacher, to contradict it, and let me know the truth—I expect an unequivocal answer. Is the word translated *life* in verse 25 the same that is translated *soul* in verse 26? Prof. F. It is; but to translate it *life* in verse 26 would make nonsense of the whole. Mr. K. Very well. If the revelation of God to man be *nonsense* unless man alters it, let us know it. The reader, by making the substitution, can readily see that the original "*nonsense*" is more rational and correct than orthodox sense,—for "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God."—*Universalist Companion for* 1851.

Home-made Scripture.—An "orthodox" Clergyman was reading Balfour's Second Inquiry, when a Gentleman called for a short visit, who avowed his belief in the general correctness of the work. The clergyman, with an attempt to entrap his friend, asked him if he believed that the word *devil* sometimes means wicked passions, and sometimes wicked men. The friend answered in the affirmative. "Then" says the learned divine, "what does the Bible mean where it speaks of the world, the flesh and the devil? It seems the devil is something distinct from the world and the flesh." The friend very modestly asked the Clergyman to turn to the passage; but even Cruden's Concordance refused to point it out to him!

The People or the Devil,—which shall be destroyed?—At an Asso-

ciation held at Maine, Capt. S. from R. attended. On his return home, he called on an old acquaintance, an orthodox deacon, who invited him to stop to dine. He did so. "Well," said the deacon, "where have you been journeying?" "To our association." "Who preached?" Several; and among others Mr. S. from B." "Ah, was he there? And what had he to say?" "Why, said Capt. S. he told us that the devil would be destroyed, and the people delivered; instead of the common doctrine of the day, which teaches that the devil will be saved and the people destroyed. That, said the deacon, is a strange doctrine—that is not in my Bible—the devil will live for ever. Where was his text?" "In Heb. ii. 14—18. That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them who were all their lifetime subject to bondage." "My Bible," said the deacon, does not say so." He called for a Testament, and found it read the same He then called for *another* that read the same! By this time he was much agitated and called for his "English" Bible, saying to Capt. S. "There is no depending on the American Testaments." He read his English edition, but it read the same! It does read so, Captain; but it appears to me that it cannot mean as it says, for I have always thought that the devil would live for ever and the people would be destroyed. Why, Captain, if that text is true, all men will be saved!" Have you any objection to that, deacon? "No—No; if it is God's will, I have not" Well, sir, Paul says that God "*will* have all men to be saved," This closed the conversation on the subject.—*Ibid.*

A Mr. L, formerly a Methodist preacher, but a man of great integrity as well as shrewdness and benevolence, by dwelling on his favourite dogma of sinless perfection, finally became a Perfectionist, and was exceedingly earnest in advocating the singular views of these people, as they were generally held some years ago in central New York. Whether his zeal for the extreme view of sinless perfection and his shrewdness in puzzling his Methodist brethren or whether it was his having left the Methodist ministry—certain it is he was especially disliked by a travelling Methodist preacher who often officiated in Mr. L's neighbourhood. This methodist preacher to all the importance of the most of his claims added very little knowledge, less charity, and a great stock of waspish irratibility of temper. It was enough to make his eye flash and his lip quiver to see Mr. L. enter his meetings. Bnt to hear him shout "Amen" to any *liberal* or *generous* sentiment that the preacher uttered, was hardly endurable. One evening the Rev. Mr. W. held a meeting and Mr. L. of course seated himself right in front and fully facing the preacher. The prayer was shortly commenced—with a petition for the recovery of sinners, came "Amen!" from Mr. L. Another petition for perfecting the saints, brought forth a louder "Amen" from Mr. L. and an angry frown from Mr. W. Another petition for the spread of the gospel to all nations and the salvation of the world was greeted with a still heartier "Amen" from Mr.L. The incensed preacher scarcely knowin'gwhat he said uttered with quivering lips—Oh Lord, if *that* man is going to heaven send thy *servant to hell!*" "Amen and Amen!" thundered forth the imperturbable Perfectionist; but scarcely had he muttered the words before two stout and braving Methodists seized him by the collar and landed him sprawling in the street. It is presumed that Br. W. and his zealous congregation, after that fiat, worshipped God *in the beauty of holiness*" and "in the bonds of *peace.*"—*Ibid.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Reviewer of Mrs. Morgan's "Map &c. of The Reign of Christ."

My dear Brother in Christ,—I have read your review of my little tract.

Of course I could not expect you to speak favourably of whatever might appear in it contrary to your own sentiments; but where you have opposed, you have done it in a kind and Christian spirit for which I sincerely thank you.

I wish, however, to correct a mistake into which you have fallen with regard to my views concerning the punishment of the wicked, and

which I have no doubt arose from my not being sufficiently explicit as to my views of the years of release.

You will perhaps be surprised to find so many resurrections laid down in the map attached to my tract, but if we consider the types as shadows of good things to come, I know not to what the year of release can refer unless it be to a resurrection unto life every year of release during Christ's reign for all those who shall suffer the second death.

Another reason I would give for the number of resurrections is, that there shall be degrees of punishment, as all shall be judged according to their works. So that *some* out of those who shall suffer the second death shall be raised to eternal life *much sooner* than others, that they may enjoy the remainder of Christ's reign. But some, I suppose those who worship the Beast, Rev. xiv. 9—11, shall be shut out of the entire, and rise to eternal life only at the last resurrection, at which period they shall be introduced into the Kingdom of the Father along with the rest of creation.

A difficulty may perhaps arise in your mind with regard to the kind of body the wicked shall have at the resurrection to condemnation, Dan. xii. 2, John v, 29, Acts xxiv. 15, Rev. xx. 12—15, and how they shall be converted. The texts which say, He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption, and If ye live after the flesh ye shall die; (this must mean the second death, for those who live after the Spirit die the first), would lead us to suppose that they shall be raised with a body capable of dying, and the punishment is called "the second death," and we know that the first death is a *literal* death, and the scripture contrast is life and death, and not a happy immortality and an unhappy immortality. (Rom. vi. 21—23, viii. 2, 6, 13, Jas. v. 20, Rev. xx. 14, and xxi. 8). They die again; they are burnt to death in the lake of fire, which is their second death, after which they rise to immortality through Christ. 1 Tim. vi. 16, 2 Tim. i. 10.

The way they shall be converted is, I think, by sight, when they stand before Christ to be judged; Thomas and Paul were instances of conversion by sight. But some may say, would Christ condemn to the second death those who believe in him? I reply, does Christ cause his believing people in this age to suffer, pine, and die the first death? We know he does. The wages of sin is death, and our natural body *must* die; so the wicked, who shall be raised in their natural body must die again; but as they will believe in Christ when they *see* him, and be then born of the Spirit, they shall be entitled to a resurrection unto life in God's appointed time, some at the first year of release—others at the second, and so on, according to their works; for some do much more evil than others. Every resurrection unto life is a time of restoring, and these resurrections, typified by the years of release, are the *times* of the restitution of *all* things."

I agree with you in thinking that punishment is penal, and not purgatorial. My few thoughts upon the contrast between the first and the second Adam, ought to have proved that I believed all were saved by Christ, and not in any other way.

I do not think that Christ came to prevent us suffering the evil effects of our own, and that of our father Adam's sin, as in that case we should neither be afflicted nor die, both of which we all suffer; but he came to bring resurrection and eternal life, and the forgiveness of sins.

The second death was never propounded to Adam. "In the day thou eatest thereof dying thou shalt die," for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return: this was the penalty of his sin, and of which we are all partakers, "for in Adam all die."

But that we should not lie in the grave for ever and be annihilated, God sent forth His Son, the second Adam, who went down to death that he might *conquer* it, and bring resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 21) and eternal life; and this he did for all the children of the first Adam, "for in Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor. xv. 22.

The lake of fire is for the devil and his angels, (Matt. xxv. 41), and for all those of our race who follow their example in their opposition to God and his will, (see Rev. xxi. 8), and in which they suffer a second death.

I would indeed be inconsistent with myself, "if at one time I stated that" Christ's sufferings alone atoned for sin, and at another, that the endurance of a sufficient quantum of suffering on the part of the creature, is the cause of his being set free."

I do not believe that sufferings of any kind, however great, can atone for sin: nothing but the work of Christ can do that; and I believe that that has been done for the whole world. 1 John ii. 2.

I apprehend the use of punishment is, to make the sinner *feel* the *evil* of *sin*, also to *destroy* his *fleshly body* by a second death, after which he is raised to life eternal, in *consequence* of his *union* with *the second Adam*, having received the forgiveness of sins through faith, he having been previously converted by sight when he stood before Christ to be judged.—John vi. 40, 1 Tim. ii. 4.

Another purpose answered by punishment is, that God's power and his hatred to sin may be made known. Exod. ix. 16. He must have vessels of *wrath* to make his power known, as well as vessels of mercy to make his love known. Rom. ix. 22. And the Scriptures plainly declare that unbelievers shall rise to condemnation, (Dan. xii. 2, John v. 29, Acts xxiv. 15, Rev. xx. 12—15, and xxi. 8), and that believers shall rise to life eternal. Here is the scripture contrast. But in the midst of wrath God remembers mercy, and the vessels which were marred in the hands of the potter shall be made new again, to the praise of the glory of his grace who "maketh *all* things new." Rev. xxi. 5.

Believers are not exempted from chastisement or punishment any more than unbelievers; they are also made to *feel* the evil of sin in various trials and afflictions on account of their own sins, (Psalm cxix. 67), and finally, death, on account of their father Adam's sin. 1 Cor. xv. 22, Heb. xii. 11.

Although God *forgave* David his grievous sins, yet he punished him severely for them. 2 Sam. xii. 1—13. See also his dealings with the children of Israel. When they rebelled against him, he afflicted them, though afterwards he forgave them. See Judges.

Punishment and forgiveness are not inconsistent with each other; they go hand in hand in God's dealings with his creatures. We correct our children to make them feel the evil of their conduct, and to be reformed by it, and afterwards we forgive them, and restore them to our favor; and are we more righteous than God? Will not he also forgive his disobedient children? are they not his by creation? Surely he will, for he has said so. Col. i. 20, Phil. ii. 10, 12, Rev. v. 13, 21—25. He will carry out the same necessary discipline in the next life, (that is, during Christ's reign) towards them, as he does to all in this life. Rev. xx. 11—15.

If sinners were pardoned without being punished, they would make light of sin—they must be made to *feel* the evil of it, in order to know its heinousness. That there are degrees of punishment the Scripture plainly declares, viz. "Such shall have *greater damnation*," "It shall be *more tolerable* for Sodom," &c. "The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment," &c. Luke xi. 31. Matt. x. 15, xxiii. 14. Would punishment be according to *works*, if all were punished alike? Should the moral man who dies in unbelief, and the man who commits all mauner of crimes besides dying in unbelief, be put upon a par? Certainly not! God will shew himself just in all his dealings with the children of men, and he will render to every man *according* to his works. Rom. ii. 6—16.

Seeing then that the Scripture declares that unbelievers shall be punished, and that it equally declares that all that die in the first Adam shall have eternal life in the second Adam, how shall we make these statements harmonize but by seeing the purpose of punishment, viz. that all may know *from their own experience* the misery and evil of sin, which will enhance the value of being set free from it when they are made new. And also to shew God's attribute of power, and his hatred of sin to all his creatures.

God will judge [govern] (Zech. vi. 12, 13) the world by Jesus Christ, (Acts xvii. 31) and it is during his reign the difference is made between the righteous and the wicked. The former are *rewarded* (Luke xiv. 14, Matt. x. 42) according to their works, though not *saved* by their works, and the latter *punished* according to theirs: and Christ reigns until he destroys death, and makes *all* things new; he then gives up the kingdom to the Father, from whom he received it, and becomes subject to the Father, that God may be all in all. 1 Cor. xv. 21—28.

You say, you think I find some difficulty with regard to the resurrection body of the wicked.

I reason thus: if the scripture says, "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die, and he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap *corruption;* and that it also says, the wicked dead shall be raised, judged, and cast into the lake of fire to suffer a *second* death, I very naturally conclude that they are raised with a body *capable of dying*, or they *could not die*, and it is said of the righteous "neither can *they die any more*," (Luke xx. 36), which implies that others can. And these are my reasons for my assertions with regard to the resurrection body of the wicked.

I beg to say you quite mistake me if you suppose I hold a simultaneous resurrection of the just and unjust. If you look at my map you will see there is an interval of a thousand years between them. The just come with Christ (1 Cor. xv. 23), and the unjust are raised a thousand years after (Rev. xx. 5, 12), but the consummation will not be until the *end of the ages* of Christ's reign (1 Cor. xv. 50—54) at the grand jubilee, when Christ shall give up the kingdom to his Father, at which period the all-in-all state begins. 1 Cor. xv. 28. You say, and very rightly too, for God also says it, "that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God." No, certainly not *as such*, not without being washed, &c. but the Apostle says, "*such* were some of *you*, but ye are washed," &c. and blessed be God, *all* the children of Adam shall be washed in the blood of the Lamb (the second Adam) and enter into the kingdom of *their Father*. Then shall all creation sing the Jubilee Song, Glory, and honor, and praise, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb for ever and ever, Amen. "Hallelujah."

Permit me to notice another error you have fallen into, with regard to my views, which is, that you do not perceive that I make a distinction between the Jews and Gentiles, who will be in their flesh-and-blood state; and the saints who will be in their resurrection state, both dwelling with Christ upon the earth at the *same time*.

The saints will be visible, having bodies;—they will be like the angels; and *amongst them* there will be no *distinction of nations*. These will not be the *subjects* of Christ's kingdom, but will be "*joint heirs*" *reigning with him*. Christ has made them unto his God "Kings and Priests, and they shall *reign* on the earth." If they are to reign they must have *subjects;* and if they are priests they must have *persons* to *minister* to, and to *teach*. Who then are these persons? Paul says, "know ye not that the saints shall judge (that is, govern as kings and priests) the world." What world then is it the saints are to govern? This very world in its renewed state, renewed by the Spirit, so that they will [not be at enmity with God any more than Christians are now. The risen saints will be their kings and priests, so that they will be well governed and taught.

This state of things will last for the ages; or, as I think, for forty-nine thousand years, according to the types of the Sabbatical years up to the grand Jubilee.

The texts you quote to prove there is now no outward distinction between Jew and Gentile, have reference only to their *justification* in the sight of God, and not with regard to their *outward distinction* in the *flesh*, as you may see by Gal. iii. 28, which if taken in your sense would prove there was no outward distinction in male and female, bond and free. The Apostle says, all these are *one* in Christ. Yes, certainly, for "he that is joined to the Lord is *one spirit;*" but this does not supersede the necessity of the *outward distinction* in the flesh of Jew, Gentile, &c. and it is plainly revealed in Scripture, that this outward distinction shall be kept up during the ages of Christ's reign.

You think that when Christ comes, time shall cease. What is eternity but a succession of time? You refer to that passage in Revelation, where it is said, "and there shall be time no longer;" that is, as Burgh says in his lectures on Revelation, "there shall be no *longer delay but that* in the *seventh trumpet* the *mystery* of God shall be *finished*." "No night," refers to the heavenly Jerusalem state, (Rev. xxi. 24, 26] which will be on the earth when Christ is reigning, because there will be heavenly and earthly saints together on the earth at the same time, viz. the church or the elect, in their resurrection state, and the nations and Jews in their flesh and blood state, for it shall be a heavenly and earthly state. God's will shall be done on earth as it is done in heaven.

I believe the New Testament is in perfect harmony with the Old, and that the Old will not contradict the other. The 24th Matt. is a prophecy of what shall happen to the Jews in the *latter day*, when Jerusalem shall be beseiged by the anti-Christ, and when not one stone of the Temple shall be left upon another, which shall not be thrown down, which is not the case now, as the foundation, some of the pillars, and part of the wall yet remain, and are under the Mosque of Omar, as Judge Noah, of New York asserts in his address to his brethren the Jews, and by which he wanted to prove that Jesus Christ was a deceiver; the judge not knowing that the prophecy refers to the *latter days of this* dispensation, & is yet to be fulfilled.

The generation which should *witness* the things of which our Lord prophesied should not pass away until all should be be fulfilled. It should have been trans lated *that* instead of *this* generation. The generation that was alive in our Lord's time, must have passed away even before the siege by the Romans, and the things of which Christ and the prophets prophesied, did not happen at that siege. *All* nations were not brought up against the Jews (Zech. xiv.); Christ did not come (Matt. xxiv. 30); the Jews were not delivered from their enemies (Zech. xii. 9); nor were the Romans destroyed. All this is yet to be fulfilled. Zech. xii. and xiv. Joel iii. Rev. xi. 2—18, which proves that the outward distinction between Jews and Gentiles is not done away. In Luke it is written that Christ is to sit upon the throne of his father *David*, and be the glory of his people *Israel*, as well as a light to lighten the *Gentiles*. Peter tells us the same thing in Acts ii. 30, and Paul says in 1 Cor. xv. 25, that Christ must reign until all enemies are put under his feet. See also Acts xxvi. 6, 7. The writer of the Hebrew knew he was writing to Jews who well understood the prophecy concerning the second covenant, and which they knew included the return to their own land, as well as having God's laws written in their hearts, and therefore he did not quote all that the prophet said upon it; he merely directed their attention to the *time* when God would make the second covenant with them, and said, "Behold the days come." He quoted from Jer. xxxi. which whoever reads must see that the return to their own land is as much part of the covenant, as having God's laws written in their hearts. He then said that the first covenant was *ready* to vanish away, but which it has not yet done; for they are still under it, and will be until Christ comes, and then the second shall be confirmed to them, for *to them* belong the *covenants*, and the blood of it has been shed; but they rejected their king, so he left them until they shall say, "blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Matt. xxiii. 39. No one can read Revelation (which is a prophecy of future things) without seeing the distinction which is made between Jews and Gentiles. Consult the following texts, Rev iii. 9, vii. 4—9, xi. 2—8, xx. 9. So we see that the New Testament *confirms* to the Jews all the promises of the old.

Praying that the Lord may lead us into *all* truth.

Believe me, dear Brother,
Yours in the best bonds.
MARIA MORGAN.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

SIR,—May I call your attention to "A Refutation of Calvinism, &c. &c. by Geo. Tomline, Lord Bishop of Lincoln, and Dean of St. Paul's. Fourth Edit. 1811.

"I shall endeavour to prove that the doctrine of Universal Redemption is asserted in Scripture, and maintained in the public formularies of our church, and that there is no authority in either for the Calvanistic doctrines of Election and Reprobation" p. 185.

This quotation is from the fourth chapter, entitled "Of Universal Redemption, Election, and Reprobation," which in his preface he states is his charge (with additions) delivered to his clergy at his triennial visitation, and which he published at their request in 1803.

The fifth and sixth chapters contain 380 quotations from the fathers in support of his doctrine, the refutation of Calvinism, and generally of a tendency to support Universalism: the book is very commonly purchased at about 2s.—600 pp. Coming from a bishop of the church, and that pastor the *tutor of the celebrated William Pitt* (had he not been so formerly, in the times he published his book, he would, in all probability, have been unfrocked) may serve the cause of Universalism.

"In the New Testament every expression which can denote universality, is applied to the merits and sacrifice of Christ; at the birth of our Saviour the angel of the Lord declared to the shepherds, "Behold I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people." p. 187.

"The sin of Adam and the merits of Christ, are here pronounced to be co-extensive; the words applied to both are precisely the same. Judgment came upon all men—the free gift came upon all men. Many were made sinners—many were made righteous. Whatever the words all men and many signify, when applied to Adam, they must signify the same when applied to Christ. It is admitted that in the former case, the whole human race is meant; and consequently in the latter case, the whole human race is also meant. The force of the argument is destroyed; and the most acknowledged rules of language are violated by so interpreting this passage, as to contend that all men are liable to punishment, on account of the sin of Adam, and that few only are enabled to avoid that punishment through the death of Christ. Nay, we are even told, that where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; but how can this be, if sin extends to all, and grace is confined to a part only of mankind." pp. 189, 190.

I remain,
Yours truly,
June 19, 1851. J. B.

REVIEW.

Some First Principles of a Christian Faith: the Beginning being made known by the End. By JAMES WAPSHARE. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1850.

NOTHING can be conceived more diverse than the condition of Universalism in the United States of America and in England. In the former, only one system of it seems to prevail. Since the days of John Murray and Edward Mitchell, and since the abortive efforts made about twenty-five or thirty years ago by Charles Hudson (then Rev. now Hon.), Paul Dean, and others, to set up the sect of Restorationists in opposition to that of Impartialists, every thing seems to have given way to the theory of the latter. That is, to the theory of old Hosea Ballou. Every American work on the subject of Universal Salvation which we now take up, whatever may be the constitution of its author's mind, in whatever way he may have been brought, up and under whatever external cir cumstances he may be placed, presents to us Ballou's notions, either entire, or with some slight modifications. Christ's Deity scoffed at—his sacrifice, as the victim of divine wrath, and as by the shedding of his blood expiating sin, trampled under foot—and regeneration by light and love, the earnests of the divine nature, exchanged for moral amendment in feelings and conduct. Such is the system constantly wafted to us from across the Atlantic. It is Arianism, or rather Humanitarianism—it is human reason subjecting to itself divine revelation—it is, in a word, Hosea Ballou throughout. It is Moliere's *toujours perdrix*. No change. No relief. No variety.*—Not so, with us, in this old, and, in the estimation of our American friends, worn-out country. Here such is the state of Universalism, that it almost looks as if *every man did that which was right in his own eyes.* Fixed human standard of doctrines and sentiments, we have none. *Nullius addicti jurare*, &c. At the present moment there is not visible among us any Dead Sea of sameness and formality. On the contrary, all is stirring and agitated, like the healing waters of the Pool of Bethesda. John v. Views concerning Universal Salvation with us are almost as diversified, as are the minds of those to whom in the light of Scripture, and by the teaching of God's Holy Spirit, the doctrine has approved itself as true and divine. We have Universalists holding that God inflicts limited torments hereafter; and we have Universalists who doubt, if not even deny, the endurance of sufferings by man beyond the term of this present life. We have Universalists who maintain that God restores the Old Testament Israel, the land of Palestine, and the earthly Paradise; and we have Universalists who deny that God does any such thing: their view, on the contrary, being, that God has done altogether with the former state of the church and state of man, and that he is carrying matters forward from the Jewish Church in flesh, to the Christian Church in spirit; from man, in his old created state, in the Paradise on earth, to man, in his new created state, in the Paradise of God. We have Universalists inclined

* The adoption of Ballouism, as the recognized formula of the system of Universal Salvation in America, although rapidly approaching to its consummation, is not yet complete. A few Arians, like our friends Whittemore and Ryder, bear up slightly against it. And in old Walter Balfour there are vestiges of his lingering attachment to a more scriptural creed. Besides the German Tunkers of Pennsylvania, and their descendants, shew pretty unequivocal symptoms of their country's well-known tendency to free and independent thinking. Can those who agreed with Edward Mitchell in his modified Arminian Universalism, be yet quite extinct? We have now lying before us a very able work, by H. H. Van Amringe, of Pittsburgh, Penn. (1843,) entitled "Nature and Revelation," which may be regarded as not less a protest against American Uniiversalism, than against the common forms of orthodoxy, so called.—Notwithstanding all these exceptions real or apparent, however, the remark in the text is true. The system of Hosea Ballou is at present the predominant, and nearly the all-absorbing form of Universalist doctrine in the United States of America.

to the Arminian theory; and we have Universalists contending for the divine sovereignty, the subserviency of creature will to the Will of God, and the election of grace, with as much firmness and decision, as Calvin himself. We have Universalists who think, that all scripture was fulfilled at the period of the destruction of Jerusalem, and that Christ's second advent then took place; and we have Universalists who, while they acknowledge the great and sweeping changes which occurred 40 years after our Lord's resurrection, and, especially, admit that the whole miraculous system then passed away, yet consider that prophecy is under certain aspects, and in many ways, still being fulfilled, and that it will continue to be so until the consummation of all things. In short, no one system of Universalism, existing at present in Great Britain, overshadows and overpowers every other. We have among us the greatest variety of sentiment, and the greatest freedom of scriptural discussion. All, however, within certain bounds. Or, rather, all recognizing certain fixed divine principles. Bowing, or rather subjected to the authority of God's word, by the manifestation of its heavenly truth to us by Himself, in proportion to the increase of its influence and reign over us, reason, as shadow, is in us superseded by revelation, as substance. Hence, we neither have, nor can have any association or communion with Rationalists, that is, with those who in any respect whatever would place reason in the chair of authority over Revelation—would ascribe to the human the power of interpreting the divine. Deniers of Christ's Deity, setters aside of the fact of his blood alone cleansing from all sin, and magnifiers of the virtues and destiny of human nature (of that nature which in Adam became accursed, and in Jesus is destroyed,) may call themselves Universalists if they will. This of course, we cannot help. But as their contempt for our antiquated notions, and narrow prejudices, as they deem them, precludes the possibility of their uniting with us, so does our love to Jesus and confidence in him, as our God as well as Saviour, combined with our sense of the honour that is due unto his name, forbid the possibility of our having any species of religious communion with them. Men who expect to reach heaven as human beings, and who fancy that their human virtues will not be altogether unavailing, even when subjected to the immediate scrutiny of God's all-seeing eye, can have nothing, except a name, in common with us, whose hopes of glory rest exclusively on our accursed human nature having been destroyed in Christ's death, and on our having been made new creatures in him, through his divine righteousness, and by the power of his resurrection.

Now lying on our table, and the immediate subject of our critical notice, is a work, the views propounded and developed in which, as in other productions of its able and respected author, although decidedly and gloriously Universalist, we find it impossible to bring under the head of any system of Universalism, or, indeed, of any other religious ism, with which we happen to be acquainted.

"What," it may here be enquired, "are Mr. Wapshare's habits of mind, and mode of writing? Perhaps, a few preliminary observations with respect to these points may be serviceable, in the way not only of elucidating the character of the author, but also of explaining your present embarrassment."

Mr. Wapshare, with great and varied learning, with abilities of a very superior order, with unquestionable originality both of thought and expression, with a highly cultivated mind, and with astonishing powers of composition, is one of the most discursive, and at the same time, probably one of the most incomprehensible writers of the present day. His extraordinary ingenuity, while to it we owe some of the most useful suggestions, and instructive ideas, concerning the meaning of God's word, which we recollect ever to have met with, is continually betraying him into mysticism, and into the employment of language which not one reader in a hundred will be able thoroughly to apprehend. Which, indeed, not one reader in a thousand will take the trouble to endeavour to apprehend. Since the days of Baron Swedenborg, no theological writer so completely resembling that eminent mystic in fancy, and in the exercise of the inventive faculty—not in his religious notions, certainly—as our author,

has sprung up.* All that Mr. Wapshare has published displays more or less his great powers of imagination. His diagrams and pictures do so in a superlative degree. But, however curious, taken along with the works in which they make their appearance, they tend but to perplex the mind, and baffle the comprehension of the ordinary reader. Not that our friend's productions are absolutely unintelligible. Let a man but brace up his mind to the task of perusing, and trying to understand, Mr. Wapshare's "Scripture Revelations," and the treatises by which he has followed it up, and we have no hesitation in pledging ourselves, that intellectually he will find himself both enriched and strengthened by the effort. He will meet with ideas that he never met with before. Ideas at once new and valuable. We grant, that some things he will be startled at, and that some he will unhesitatingly reject. But if, as the result, he shall be set upon enquiring—even should his investigations terminate in his dissenting from the author—his labours will not have been entirely thrown away. Clearer views of truth in general, new relations of it previously unobserved by him, and the correction and removal of many mistakes, will not improbably constitute his reward. We can declare this to have been the effect, in our own case, of a careful study of several of Mr. Wapshare's numerous, suggestive, and most extraordinary performances. While perusing them, we have more than once held some such soliloquies as the following with ourselves: —"Well, however ingenious and plausible, this is wrong. Wrong, as expressed by the author. Some facts have escaped his notice—some phenomena have been overlooked by him—which, if taken into account, would have considerably modified his conclusions. He has forgotten Bacon's caution, against indulging too freely the tendency of the human mind, *advolare in generalia.*† Hence, there has been a little too much of rash and unauthorized theorizing. But, after all, does not profound truth lie couched in this observation of his? Suppose we strip it of a little *verbiage*, prune it of some other excrescences and luxuriances, define somewhat more precisely the terms employed, add a few things which have been omitted, and point out a necessary distinction or two—why, then, have we not a proposition which commands our ready and unqualified acquiescence? Have we not a truth, which, in its present form, and with the requisite qualifications, is altogether new to us? Inaccurate, and in many other respects faulty, however original, these compositions of Mr. Wapshare's are. As it is, however, has he not, just now, brought under our notice, a most valuable idea, which was previously strange to us, and for which we owe him our heartiest acknowledgments?"

Whatever may be Mr. Wapshare's habits of study—irregular, although varied and extensive we suspect them to be—he is dreadfully discursive in his mode of writing. He is the most thorough-bred intellectual sharpshooter, whom it has been our lot to encounter. Rather, he is a sportsman, who going out nominally in quest of a particular species of game, say, grouse, blackcock, or ptarmigan, has no objections to bag hares, pheasants, partridges, or any thing else that may come in his way. His object may be to bring down some error respecting the extent of God's love; but off, in the meantime, goes a shot at a bishop. The practices of those who substitute the darkness of reason for the light of revelation, he may be desirous to expose; but, the opportunity having been afforded, his inclination to have a pop at the tractarians, it is impossible for him to resist. Nay, if the birds are shy, and fly into the territory of a neighbour, he will without hesitation abandon his main argument, (what we frequently ask ourselves, is it?) to follow them, through ten or fifteen pages, into the new ground which they have chosen. Really we learn from Mr. Wapshare, and we learn what is extremely valuable. But we pay well for our

* In the indulgence of fancy, and in a faculty of comparison which suggests the most unexpected resemblances, Professor Bush, of New York, the able and learned author of "Anastasis," and the devoted admirer of Swedenborg, is never once to be named in the same day with Mr. Wapshare.

† Vid. *Novum Organum.*

instruction. We are constrained to follow him, through field and brake, in breathless haste, in his almost endless excursions and discursions. To drop metaphor: no two minds, both most able, can be conceived more diverse in their respective methods of treating a subject, than those of Mr. Bond, whose merits we last month strove to draw attention to, and Mr. Wapshare. In the former, all is logic, point, and condensation, sometimes almost to a degree that is painful. By the latter, we are kept continually on the trot, dropping one idea to run after another, until in not a few instances the spot from which we originally started, is lost completely in the haze of distance.

After what we have thus said, in reply to a supposed question put by the reader, as to Mr. Wapshare's leading mental qualities and style, should we be asked what is his peculiar system of Universalism? we confess that in answering it, we would experience no small degree of difficulty. In the treatise now before us, it is presented. So is it at greater length, and with greater minuteness, in his other, and larger works. All able—all clever—all learned and ingenious—all worth perusing. The one now under review we have, as in duty bound, read with more than ordinary care. That in our friend's view, the fact of God's being love assures the ultimate salvation of the world, is plain. That in his opinion, no human resistance can conntervail or frustrate the divine purpose, is manifest likewise. Many most just, pointed, and scriptural proofs of this he adduces. But he is constantly puzzling us with sentiments which we find it impossible to reconcile, we do not say with those of Calvin, but with those of Scripture. Is there not something which looks like—we do not say that is—an identification of Satan with Christ? Is not the language used such frequently as to seem to confound the Church with the world in the matter of salvation, nay, to do away with the distinction between the Church and the world altogether? Does not he represent obedience to the prohibitions and commands of law on the part of the creature, as identical with the operation of love?—the fact being, that love, as the principle of the divine nature, is not subject to law, and that of itself *the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus*, it constrains to and produces effects corresponding to its own nature, quite independently of the power of any other and inferior system of law. Rom. vi. 14. Other objections we have. But we wave the consideration of them. We do not—we cannot—understand Mr. Wapshare's system *as a whole*. Glorious truths he propounds, and scripturally establishes. The Deity of the Lord Jesus he clearly maintains, and in his atoning sacrifice he clearly rejoices. But does he understand new-creation, or see how carried into effect through Christ risen and glorified the new-creation supersedes the old? Isaiah xlv. 17. 2 Cor. v. 17. 2 Peter iii. 12, 13. Rev. xxi. 1—5. Some passages look as if he did so. And yet many other passages seem to intimate, that, according to his notions, human nature is amended and perpetuated. We confess ourselves fairly puzzled. We strongly suspect, that concerning the subjects of divine mediation, and the distinction between human nature and the divine nature, his views are vague, and rather philosophical than scriptural. Perhaps, in thus judging we are mistaken. Dear Mr. Wapshare, could you in four, five, or even eight or ten, or any reasonable number of simply expressed and categorical propositions say, how, in your apprehension, atonement is carried into effect? What in reference to human nature, is implied in new-creation? Is mind identical with spirit? What are the peculiar privileges of the Church of Christ, both here and hereafter? Is sin properly inherent in flesh, to the exclusion of mind? What is the Church of Christ? Is it external, or does it consist of a body of individuals who never had, and never can have external unity, and are destined only to appear united *at the resurrection of the Just?* In what respect are the members of the Church the objects of divine election? How is the will of man subject to the will of God, and how is man's responsibility shewn to be strictly and thoroughly reconcilable with the Sovereignty of God? You often speak, dear friend, as if the clergy of the Church of England were Christ's ministers. How, unless the Church of

England, and the Church of Christ be identical can this be? Surely *the Church of the living God, the general assembly of the first-born whose names are written in heaven*, is something essentially different from any human institution, past or present. Have the goodness to say, too, in brief and intelligible phraseology, how divine law, as consisting of prohibitions and commands, Exodus xx. &c. and as having had Christ for the end and fulfiller of it, Rom. x. 4, is reconcilable with the imposition of law, in the same form, on believers of the gospel? Especially, when Rom. vi. 14. declares, that Christians *are not under the law, but under grace*, and when the whole scope of the chapter in which those words occur is to shew, that love, not law, is the source of heavenly and divine conduct? Perhaps having answered preceding questions, you will kindly furnish us with a key, by making use of which we may be enabled to understand, how apparently conflicting passages of your works are to be rendered self-consistent. Do try, dear friend. With your great abilities, and putting a little restraint upon your discursive propensities, surely what is now asked for may be easily accomplished.

We have said that Mr. Wapshare is discursive. And so he is. Rambling from topic to topic continually. But we do not feel inclined to say, that to the same extent he is diffuse. Whatever may be the subject that for the time being he takes up, his style is singularly lively and energetic. As a not unfavourable specimen of his mode of writing, we submit the following :—

"The sum of all truth, as of all faith, is that God the Creator is, in Christ crucified, the Redeemer of the world created by him. In Christ crucified, the light is given by which heresy retraces its steps, and the wanderer is brought back to God, the God of all truth. For the truth is this: that as in Adam *all* die, so in Christ shall *all* be made alive. For as born into the flesh ye have all borne his *earthy* image; (which image we have seen is that of sin ;) so also shall you all bear his heavenly image; being in the resurrection made like unto Christ. (1 John iii.) For our God is the Saviour of sinners. We, as created, as carnal, are the body of sin—there is none righteous no not one. He, therefore, came not to call the righteous, but *sinners* unto repentance calling upon every man to know God, as only wise and holy; a God of Grace, the Saviour of a World, the Spirit of Love that pardoneth every sin, (Ps. ciii.)'

"Pride rejects this doctrine of the perfect satisfaction made for sin, and the salvation of the whole world; as clearly written, 1 John ii. 2: a doctrine which to the Jew, or the disciple of the law is a stumbling block, and is foolishness unto the wise of the Gentiles. These, while preaching salvation by faith, make it *conditional* on works; as on some meritorious act, or mental deed of their own! So confounding themselves and others. Are these not foolish? (Rom. iii. and iv.) These stagger not at the principles here laid down; but draw back at the necessary conclusion! They see not that 'to enter the kingdom of Heaven' is a mental or spiritual possession of the truth, by which the believer in the salvation of our God hath peace with God on earth, a foretaste of the peace which in heaven is eternal. It is Belief which gives this peace. To this knowledge, and to the peace of Faith many are called, but few are chosen. For the power is not with man, but with God. The knowledge to which the elect few, or those which are thus chosen attain is the gift of God —is by the predeterminate counsel of His will, who knew the end from the beginning; they being elected unto faith, that they might preach faith unto those who are bound by the law, as the power of God unto salvation (1 Cor. i. 24.) We say, this faith which the elect receive by *hearing*—and that by the hearing of the word of God, and not by the dogmas of men,—shall by the preaching of those who receive it, be the common faith of the whole world. For all, from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof, shall believe in the salvation of our God. (See Jude 3, and 24, 25. Is. xlv. 21.)"

"Faith worketh love both to God and man. He therefore who hath the true faith goes forth as a Preacher out of love to God, (2 Cor. v. 14,) and not to please himself, or, in any manner to profit himself. And his preaching is

to this effect. God, in the beginning, called from out the countless host of Heaven, ONE whom, as created man, he ordained to be the Father of all mankind; making him a little lower than the angels, that by knowledge he might be raised above them. This, his seed, is called a natural seed. Of this natural seed God called or elected also ONE, even Abraham, to be the Father of a select body—a body to be taught of God, and to bring in salvation in the person of Jesus, as prefigured by the offerings of the law, and especially by the Paschal Lamb. For the law, as given by Moses, is figurative in all its works; the Paschal Lamb being for a figure of Him who as the giver of the Law, in putting an end to the law of works, is the bringer-in of a better hope. For the Law maketh nothing perfect. Under it man lives by sight, and not by faith." (?) "God, therefore, when making an end of the law, elected some out of the Gentile world, as called by his Apostles, to be the recipients of His truth—even that the whole law is fulfilled by Love—a truth which no man could have discovered—but which is revealed from Heaven by His Holy Spirit,—the Spirit of Christ Jesus crucified—the Spirit that spake unto Saul—the Spirit of Divine Love, which in sanctifying the heart, makes of the persecutor *a new man*. We say, this is that Truth which the Gentile Church, or the Body that is elect of God to worship Him in spirit and in truth, are called on to believe. But have they heard the voice that calls to them? Verily, they have heard; but they have not believed its report! Are there, then, none who have believed? Yea, truly, there are. But these are His secret ones; a peculiar people, (Titus ii. 14;) a people condemned as heretical, and whose voice is not heard amid the tens of thousands of those who preach the wisdom of men, and not the wisdom of God. 1 Cor. ii. 5, 8.) Would you know them? Go to the haunts of poverty—to the outcasts of the world—to the couch of sickness—to the bed of death. There will you find them in whom is His Spirit distributing to the needy the supplies necessary for our human wants; and pouring into the soul, the oil and wine of an *undoubting* faith—the faith that proclaims love to all, and the glad tidings of salvation (Is. l. ii.) Such love melts the sinner's heart: who receives his visitor as an angel from God. Such love asks no questions as to particular sins,—for all are sinners—but calls on every man to strike the conscious breast, saying, God be merciful to me *a sinner*—a confession which is to every man the seal and surety of salvation,—for it brings Wisdom to the proud. (1 John i. 9, 10; James v. 16.)" &c. p. 13—17.

"Some first principles" &c. consists of two parts: first, The principles themselves laid down, (?); a part which extends from page 3 to page 40; and, secondly, a "Postscript," concerning the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Exeter, the Gorham Controversy, Tractarianism, and various other important matters, occupying the rest of the pamphlet, from page 41 to page 90. Truly, the activity, energy, and learning of Mr. Wapshare, and his desire to promote the interests of his fellow men are marvellous. He states honestly and fearlessly what he believes to be truth, and he evinces himself to be a zealous opponent of error, in whatever form it may present itself.

Have we put the proper interpretation upon Mr. Wapshare's language when we regard him as maintaining the dogma of creature free-will? He certainly seems, on more than one occassion, to express himself to this effect; and yet we hesitate in ascribing to him an opinion, which would set one part of his theory at variance with another.

The gentleman upon one of whose productions we have now been commenting, will we are certain, excuse the freedom which we have used both with him and with it. Although personally unknown to us, he has long been the object of our unqualified respect; and if one feeling more than another has predominated in our mind while composing this article, it has been that of regret, that endowed with such talents, and possessed of such an acquaintance with the scriptures, as he evidently is, he should have failed to do himself the justice that he deserves. D. T.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

SEPTEMBER, 1851.

THE UNKNOWN GOD.

"MAN is a worshipping animal," says a certain writer, "and an animal so morally *prone*, though physically erect (what a centre of strange extremes is he!) that he tends downwards though with his eye he pierce the heavens." Downwards truly! Even when his imaginary gods have been endowed with greater strength, with higher powers and brighter glory—what beasts! what brutes! what monsters!—how how cruel, despotic, unjust and ignoble they have been! When his eye has led him to people the bright heavens above with arbiters of his destiny, his heart has invested them with those attributes which constitute the very worst manifestations of his *prone* nature: and thus the sun has been turned into darkness and the moon into blood and the stars have fallen from heaven! And man—the noblest in form and feature of God's works—has regarded his own image as a suitable object of worship. But here again his *prone* disposition has worked itself out in the vilest, ugliest, and most monstrous shapes of burlesque and caricature conceivable. Why, man! why did you not take the living object, or at least employ your skill in sculpturing the best representation, rather than mock thyself and thy Maker with such insulting figures and fancies? Nor does his prone disposition find its *ne plus ultra* here. "Vain in his imaginations, his foolish heart was darkened," and to the "image made like to corruptible man," were added "birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things."

The grossest superstitions, the most flagrant immorality, the lowest degradation, are invariably found connected with the *lowest* views of deity; and we are persuaded, that, on the contrary, in proportion to the purity and truth of the idea of the God who is worshipped by a man or a people, will be the purity and elevation of the worshipper. But the God of whom man conceives is naturally endowed with those attributes of which his own consciousness informs him; and thus he thinks of Him as *altogether such an one as himself*. Our good folks laugh at the idol curiosity which the missionary brings home from those who have been induced to abandon their worship, but we sometimes think that if the God of these Christian people could be revealed to the eye, he would not present a *very* striking contrast to the heathen idea, and that many an innocent would be perplexed, and in his wonderment would ask if it be God or devil.

The woman of Samaria who boasted of the worship her father's had for ages offered on Gerizim was told by Him who revealed the true God—"*Ye worship ye know not what;*" and the Athenians ignorantly worshipped at the altar erected to *the unknown God*. The Jews who

boasted of their descent from those who had direct visible communion with God, were told by Him who *knew their hearts*, that they were of their father the devil. And while men self-complacently deified the offspring of their own corrupt imagination, they were reproved by God manifest in the flesh, who declared that *no man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son should reveal him.* The fatherhood of God and the sonship of man are the *media* of mutual recognition; hence the words, *I never knew you,* are applicable to all who have not yet been brought into this intimate relationship with the Father, a relationship based upon and subsisting by *love.* Hence also the apostle John writes, "He that loveth not knoweth not God, for God is love."

The Athenians were superstitious—they ignorantly worshipped the unknown God—they assigned to him a dwelling place made with hands—they failed to recognize his paternal relationship to the whole race of man—they made light of the resurrection of the dead. We think these Athenians have their descendants in the present day throughout the Christian world, and that the apostles might appropriately preach a similar sermon to that which he delivered on Mars' hill to many a professing Christian congregation.

1. Superstition is the child of ignorance: hence the devotion of ignorance will be always found in close alliance with superstition. "Ministers of religion"—the very phrase has become rank with superstition—ministers—and we do not especially blame them, people love to have it so—are an order of inferior mediators between God and man. The *sacredness* of religion is enhanced by *their* authority; the efficacy of prayer is augmented by *their* official devotion. The validity of baptism is unquestioned if performed by *their* consecrated hands; and while with some the administration of the Lord's supper by an unordained functionary is all but a desecration, the partaking of it without a minister at all is utter profanity! The mother must be "churched" by the minister: the child must be "christened" by the minister: the young man must be married by the minister: and the old man must have "Christian burial" at the hands of the minister—and a vast amount of religion is infused and consequent benefit realized by all this ministry. The charm of baptism, the passport of the supper, and the "service" (!) for the dead and the other functions of the clerical office are only one congeries of superstitious forms by which modern Athens is characterized. In a thousand ways, as respect God's being, providence, and grace, Paul might now say, "I see ye are too superstitious."

2. Though God be not avowedly worshipped as the unknown God, yet he is so worshipped. *His nature* is not known. Would the Christian world be so full of querulousness, jealousy, hatred, wrath, strife, if they knew the nature of God? Would there be so much suspicion of his goodness, so much uncertainty of hope, so much dread of his wrath, so wavering a faith, so doubting a love (where love exists) if they knew that God's nature was love? Would there be so servile a spirit, such a "bondage spirit" as Cromwell has it—such meanness, such fear, such want of confidence, so much spurious humility, if their God's paternal, loving nature were known?

3. And then how Athenian-like is the conduct of those who bear the name of Christian in reference to the dwelling-place of the Infinite.

When we hear a Bishop pleading in the house of Lords for a worthy and becoming *locale*—greatly concerned at the thought that some protestants at Rome worship the Father of their spirits in so lowly a place as a granary—a matter about which the apostles appear never to have troubled themselves—we are reminded of the formal, outward, ceremonial character of the religion even of enlightened Protestants. The building appropriated to divine *service* (?) is called "the house of God,"* "the gates of Zion," "the temple," "the church," &c.; and the Almighty is presumed to manifest himself especially in such a place. Hence a sacredness is attached to it. To enter it is to come into God's presence, and to leave it is to be dismissed from the presence of the Lord,—and the *service* is over. "Howbeit, the most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands." Acts vii. 48.

4. The Athenians did not recognise the fact that all men are made of one blood, and are the offspring of God. The Apostle James speaking of that unruly member, the tongue, says "Therewith bless we God even the father, and therewith curse one man, who is made in the likeness of God." There stands a worshipper, thanking God for his discriminating grace and distinguishing love; he blesses his Maker that he has been made to differ from an ungodly world—that he does not lie and steal, that he believes in Jesus Christ and hopes through his merits and persevering faith to have an abundant entrance into heaven. In one pocket he has the receipt for the dollars he paid only yesterday for yonder piece of goods—an abject slave, who has just been torn from wife and children and home for ever. From the other pocket protrudes the cat-o-nine-tails with which he is not sparing in asserting his Christian dignity. This Christian and that poor slave are of *one blood*—the offspring of the same Almighty power. There declaims the humanly-appointed and self-designated "ambassador for Christ." Now he speaks the words of hope and consolation: the Holy Spirit is complimented upon the success of the embassy. He promises his flock that on the attainment of a certain amount of knowledge, faith, and experience, and practice of good works they shall be allowed to cherish the hope that the gates of hell shall never prevail against them.—And to the rest—the unclean, whom, to the astonishment of poor Peter, God pronounced to be cleansed, he is, guided by assumed divine authority, (you might sometimes think he was swearing) dealing out endless damnation with most orthodox zeal and prodigality. He is the ambassador of he knows not who, forgetting that God has made of one blood and redeemed with one blood all nations upon the face of the earth, and *hath determined the times before appointed, and even the bounds of their habitation*, a truth alike destructive of the Pharisaic boasting engendered by by the one, and the black despair often produced by the other mode of address. And

5. The Athenians mocked at the resurrection of the dead. The government of the world by Jesus Christ was the doctrine, for the truth of which he adduced as proof the fact of his resurrection from the dead. The subject of the apostolic preaching was "Jesus and the resurrection."

---

* "Whose house are we" writes an inspired apostle. The temple of the Jews was typical of that edifice built up of *living* stones, whereof the apostles are the foundations, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.

There are some in the present day who call in question the fact of the resurrection of Jesus, and there are more who keep in the back ground the vital importance of the doctrine of the resurrection. We hear far more of the death of Christ than we do of his life. But the resurrection of Christ is our only hope. Had he merely died and not risen again our faith would be vain—there would be no future life. But there is not a Scripture fact for which greater and more irrefragible proof is afforded. Christ rose to God's right hand, he rose to immortality—to a blessed life. His resurrection is the ground as well as the pledge of ours—of all men. *For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.* By creation, God, through Adam, sustains a relation to all men; by new creation or resurrection, he, through the second Adam, sustains a relation to all men likewise. The first is natural, the second is spiritual; and the former is the type of the latter.

But of superstition—ignorance—worldliness—selfishness—and Sadduceeism a thick veil has been woven by which the perfections of the Almighty have been concealed. Upon it the dust of eighteen centuries has been settling—dust raised by those whose feet which should have been beautiful as the messengers of the gospel of peace. The Church instead of reflecting the divine benignity has presented a sadly distorted image, and the treasures of which it has been the depository have been cruelly and criminally locked up in its own Pharisaic exclusiveness. The living waters, of which if a man drink he shall never thirst, have been measured out from their own poluted tanks of stagnation, and the bread of life has been doled out at "high protection prices," adulterated, and almost burnt up with the heat of their terrible fire: they would "*guard the gospel*," in utter obliviousness of the twelve baskets of fragments after the multitude had all eaten and were filled, and of the hand which is open to supply the wants of every living thing. And as long as the vindictive, unjust, unholy unmerciful, unloving and unlovely doctrine which assigns millions and millions of our fellow creatures to the jaws of eternal, unutterable woe, is maintained, we have little hope that the matter will be better understood. "Oh! righteous Father, the world hath not known thee." J. P.

SIR GEORGE STONHOUSE AND UNIVERSAL RESTITUTION.

Universal Restitution, considered as a Scripture doctrine, was first debated between the years 1729—1735 by a Society of twelve young Collegians of Oxford, emphatically called the Holy Club, who at length disagreed and split into different factions. John Wesley was the tutor, and, of course, president of this Society; and he, with his brother Charles, Mr. Morgan and one or two more, supported the merit of works. George Whitfield and James Hervey (author of the *Meditations*) adopted the Calvinistic side of the question. Messrs. Delamotte, Hall, Hutchins and Ingram trimmed, and became Moravians.

The Rev. George Stonhouse of Hungerford Park (afterwards Sir George Stonhouse of East Brent in the county of Somerset; Baronet), had been labouring to reconcile the different opinions of his fellow

collegians, till he stood alone in support of his favourite tenet; viz. that Universal Restitution was a scripture doctrine; and as the arguments he used with his different opponents had ever prevailed, they severally promised him that if he would collect his thoughts together in a discourse upon that subject, it should receive a candid answer. He married, in 1739, a daughter of Sir John Crisp, Bart. a niece and heiress of Sir Nicholas Crisp, Bart., with whom he had an elegant seat at Darnford near Blenheim, Oxon, which he left to go on his travels with the sole view of consulting the Syriac copies of the New Testament in the different libraries of Europe, under the idea that our Lord delivered his discourses in Syriac and not in Greek. He was on his travels near twenty years, twelve of which he spent in Germany, chiefly with Count Zinzendorf. During his peregrination he became such a proficient in the Syriac tongue, that he wrote a very copious grammar of that language, and was so indefatigable in his Scripture studies that he was able immediately and without hesitation to translate any passage in the Bible into thirteen different languages.

He published his "Universal Restitution, a Scripture Doctrine," in 1761, a volume of 468 pages octavo, sold by Dodsley, London, and Cadell of Bristol. Although this book surprised the learned world, it was never answered. A Quaker, indeed, of Philadelphia corresponded with the author upon some points of it, which produced his "Universal Restitution further defended" (148 pages, 8vo.,) and was printed by W. Pine of Bristol, 1768, and sold also by Dodsley, London.

The following conversation occurred between John Wesley and Stonhouse about 1771—

Stonhouse. Ah! John, there are only you and I living out of us all. *Wesley.* Better you had died too, George, before you had written your book. *Stonhouse.* I expected you would have eaten up my book at a mouthful, John, but neither you nor any of the rest, though you all engaged to do it, have yet answered a single paragraph of it. *Wesley.* You must not think your book unanswerable on that account. I am able to answer it, but it would take up so much of my time that I could not answer it to God." This declaration so stung Sir George as to put him upon writing "Universal Restitution vindicated against the Calvinists," (176 pages 8vo.) and printed by Farley, Bristol, 1773. He also published, "Evangelical History defended in answer to Farmer's Enquiry," for which I have no date. In 1786 he also published "Apostolical Conceptions of God, in a series of Letters" (180 pages 8vo). In 1787 a second part of the last tract (160 pages). He died at a good old age, 5th December, 1793, and was buried at East Brent, Somersetshire where he had purchased an estate of £700 per ann., and resided upon it the last twenty years of his life. He was presented to the Vicarage of Islington, 1738, and resigned it in 1741, in consequence of a dispute he had with a wealthy dissenter, to whom he refused to administer the sacrament in a qualified way: after some time and money spent in law, both became tired, and the public were not the wiser for the termination of the suit.

His Works, first published 1761, and others subsequently up to 1787, have all remained unanswered to the present time. Universal Restitution having thus been before the public ninety years as a Scripture

Doctrine must remain as such till these several books shall be refuted.

In consequence of a dispute between his great-grandfather and his grandfather, the former resigned the patent of the Baronetage into the hands of Charles II. and obtained a new patent for a younger son; he therefore succeeded to the title on the death of a nephew. He would not permit himself to be distinguished by it either in his letters, deeds, or securities, or even in his will. He died without male issue Dec. 5, 1793, as stated before; and as he succeeded a nephew he was succeeded by a nephew. The Rev. James Stonhouse, M. D. Rector of Great and Little Cheverel, Wilts, residing at Bristol Hot Wells, who published in 1788 "Every man's assistant and the sick man's friend" (Dedicated to his son, Rev. Timothy Stonhouse of Oriel College, Oxford) died Dec. 8, 1795, aged 80, enjoying the title only 2 years and 3 days. It further appears that the nephew whom Sir George, our author, succeeded, was Sir James, who died at Ragley, April 13, 1792, aged 74. Sir George therefore did not enjoy the title 20 months. J. B.

WHAT IS THE GOSPEL?

(Ευαγγελιον) A GOOD MESSAGE.

GOOD tidings of great joy, which shall be to *all* people. This was the announcement of the angel to the shepherds, on that day of days, when that Saviour, which was Christ the Lord, was born into the world; and a multitude of the heavenly host praised God, saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men—ALL men—great joy to *all people*; not to the *elect* alone, not to those alone who do (that is, imagine they do or can do) something to save themselves, but to all—bad and good.

What follows? What is involved in this proclamation recorded by an inspired Evangelist, and therefore not to be gainsayed? Nothing more nor less than this—that all born in Adam, and through him inheriting sin and death, are by the second Adam, Christ the Lord, made to inherit righteousness and life everlasting. This is the Gospel, good news, or glad tidings.

It is not that men may be saved if they repent and do good works; not that they are saved *if* they believe in Christ as their Saviour; but that they are *already* saved, justified, ransomed, redeemed. Just as surely as they inherit sin and death from Adam so surely do they inherit righteousness and Life everlasting from Christ the Lord.

No priest, no minister, no teacher, can in any conceiveable way affect their state with regard to their ultimate Salvation or reception of Eternal Life. That is theirs as "the gift of God" although the multitude—the World, knoweth it not. All that the Minister, teacher, parent or friend can do, is to make this known as a matter of fact to those to whom the opportunity for declaring it is vouchsafed. And this is the grand mistake of the promoters of all religious societies and institutions: that they profess to have for their object "the glory of God and the salvation of souls," if they mean by this that they have the power to add any thing to the finished work of Christ Jesus (and this they must mean

if their language have any meaning at all). The idea is preposterous! But they will ask have we power to do nothing for our fellow creatures? Yes. We may proclaim to them the good news which we ourselves have heard and believed, that Christ is the Saviour of *all* men; or if there appear in any, a tendency to Socinian notions, or a too high estimate of the powers and purity of human nature, we may endeavour to convince them, from God's Word, that *all* are grievous sinners, that from birth to natural death, every imagination of the thoughts of our hearts, is only evil continually and that as the punishment of one transgression is death, none can have a right as born in Adam to inherit more than Adam's life, and none whatever to the possession of Eternal Life, which never was possessed by Adam in his own right, but which must belong exclusively to that Being to whom appertains every other *infinite* attribute.

Let us endeavour to do all that can be done (and much may be accomplished) in improving the moral and physical condition of our fellow creatures, but their final destiny let us not think to alter. It cost more to redeem their souls, so that we must let that alone for ever. Ps. xlix. 8. (Prayer book translation.) J. C.

AN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION, WHY IS NOT THE POPE THE ANTI-CHRIST.

First, because the Antichrist is spoken of in Scripture as an *individual*, and is neither a system, as Popery, nor a succession of individuals in that system as the Popes.

The Antichrist is called in Scripture "a *vile person*" Dan. xi. 21. "*The King*" Dan. xi. 36 "*The idol Shepherd*" Zech. xi. 17. "*That man of Sin, the Son of perdition*" 2. Thess. ii. 3. "*The beast*" Rev. xiii. 4. xvii. 17. "*Antichrist*" 1 John ii. 18. "*The abomination that maketh desolate*" which is, "the Man of sin sitting in the Temple of God shewing himself that he is God." If then this man of sin shall sit in the Temple of God, the Temple must be built, which it is not yet, and the Jews must be a nation, which they are not yet; but that this will be the case can be proved by various passages of Scripture, such as the following, Jer. xxx. 1. ix. 24. Ez. xxxviii. 8—16 and xxxix. 2—4 Joel ii, iii. Zech. xii, xiv. Rev. xi. 2. Matt. xxiv. 15. These chapters also prove that Jerusalem shall be besieged in the *latter day*, by the Gentiles headed by the Anti-christ, who will tread it down for 1260 days or three years and a half, and that these days are connected with the abomination, compare Matt. xxiv. 15—22. with Dan. xii. 7—11, and Rev. xi. 3, xii. 6—14. xiii. 5. Christ comes *immediately after* these days, see Matt. xxiv. 29. Compare Dan. xii. 1. 2, 13 with Matt. xxiv. 21, 31. And at the coming of Christ the Beast or Anti-christ and the false Prophet shall be cast alive into the lake of fire. See Rev. xix. 11 to end.

Secondly, because the Anti-christ will deny the Father and the Son, 1 John 2—22, which none of the Popes have ever done, for they confess both. Anti-christ will also deny that Christ came in the *flesh*, which the Popes have never done, as is shewn by their images of the Virgin and *Child*.

Thirdly, because the Anti-christ will deny every God, and set himself up above all Gods, Dan. xi. 36, 2 Thes. ii. 4. which the Popes have never done; on the contrary they say they are the *vicegerents* of Christ.

Fourthly because St. Peter's at Rome is not the Temple of God, for there was only *one* Temple, but there are *thousands* of Roman Catholic Chapels, and therefore St. Peter's cannot be *the* Temple of God.

And lastly, the inconsistency of calling the Pope the Anti-christ and the place where he is worshipped (for if he be Anti-christ he must be worshipped

Rev. xiii. 4.) the Temple of God. It ought rather to be called the Temple of Antichrist or Belial.

I think it is now fully proved from Scripture that the Pope is not the Antichrist, but at the same time I must say that he is *Anti-christian* because he subverts God's truth by the traditions of men. The *Spirit* of Anti-christ existed in the Apostles days, and we may say the same of these days, for whatever is opposed to Christ is an Anti-christ.

But it is reserved for the *latter days* of this dispensation for the personal Antichrist to appear. Satan will then put forth all his power in the person of this Anti-christ, for he will be the *seed* of the *Serpent*, see Gen ii. 15. 2 Thes. ii. 9. Rev. xiii. 2—4, and *then* will be *seen* the great *enmity* between the *seed* of the *Woman* and the *seed* of the *Serpent*, or between Christ and Anti-Christ. It will be the crisis of the world, for then will be the great battle between Christ and Anti-Christ, but we know who shall get the victory (see Rev. xix.) even Jesus the mighty one of God, who will consume the Anti-christ by the spirit of his mouth, and destroy him with the brightness of his coming, and who shall shut up the Dragon, that old Serpent which is the Devil and Satan, in the bottomless pit, that he should deceive the nations no more till the thousand years should be fulfilled. See Rev. xx. Come then, O Jesus, thou mighty Conqueror, and take unto thee thy great power and reign. Amen. MARIA MORGAN.

POETRY.

THE GRAVE OF THE SUICIDE.

I entered a village graveyard a few days since, impelled by a desire to know what epitaph had been placed upon the tombstone of a suicide, whose relatives were believers in endless misery. I found written thereon these words: "For as in Adam all die even so in Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor. xv. 22.

Oh! words of hope, how sweet ye fell
  Upon the mourning widow's heart,
When earthly voices failed to cheer,
  Nor dared one comfort to impart,
Then turning from the creeds of men
  How clung that heart to heavenly things,
Trusting that from God's holy book,
  Some dove of peace might spread her wings.

And it hath shed some rays of light
  On that green grave where *Sidney* lies,
Whose trembling hand had closed the life
  Which seemed a burden in his eyes;
Oh! weakness, born of doubting faith,
  How clouded it with gloomy fears,
The path whereon his footsteps trod,
  Through his last sad and trying years.

But ye have left him with his God,
  Prompted by that strong faith of heart
Which lack of creeds of early life
  Forms of its inmost chords a part.
Oh! may we cherish that true faith
  That leads us by our Father's hand,
That bids us trust him through all time
  And live or die at his command.

H. L.

"GOD IS LOVE."

"IF but these words that Book contained
  On which our every hope is built,
T'would be enough, though we had drain'd
  The very dregs of grief and guilt,

Love will not harm,—*Love* will not *pause*
  In doing good to aught that's dear,
Till nature doth reverse her laws,
  And thwart high Heaven in its career.

JULIA H. SCOTT.

UNIVERSALISM IN PLYMOUTH, &c.

The cause of Universalism is making considerable progress in Plymouth. Our readers were, doubtless, gratified with the Report of "The English Universalists' Reading Society, Octagon, which appeared last year in *The Universalist*. They will be still more gratified to learn that the meetings of the Society have for some time been so inconveniently crowded that a room capable of accommodating between 400 and 500 persons, is being erected in a commanding position, and there is no doubt that when opened it will be well filled.

The Library is enriched by many old and scarce books as well as modern works on the subject of Universalism,—and these are in constant circulation.

Acting under the constraining influence of the love of Christ, Mr. George Johnson and others in concert with him, have been the means of accomplishing much for the cause of truth. The Rev. William Seabrook whose consistent piety, learning, and abilities as a preacher are well known in Plymouth, is, we are happy to hear, settled among our friends.

Mr. James Whitmarsh, of Melbury, who has for nearly half a century been a public advocate of the doctrine of God's unbounded love, in the neighbourhood of Shaftesbury, Wilts, has been permitted after a severe affliction to resume his labours. May the health of this venerable defender of the faith be yet preserved! The friends associated with Mr. Whitmarsh are in possession of some of Relly's letters and MSS. one of which "The Christian Ministry" they have recently published. These documents were committed to them some few years age by a late daughter of the celebrated preacher of Universalism, and author of "*The Union*" &c. We are happy to think that they have been preserved from the flames, to which a Clergyman, with true orthodox zeal, was anxious to consign them, and offered their proprietor £10 that he might be enabled to realize his object. Query, what would this brave protestant have given to have their writer in his power?

"THE DYING UNIVERSALIST" AGAIN!

We have received from a Glasgow correspondent a tract, entitled "The Dying Universalist;" issued by a Tract Society in the City of Glasgow. It is the identical story by the Rev. Dr. Spencer which appeared in *The Christian Treasury* and was noticed in our number for March.

The greatest atrocities have been perpetrated under the mask of religion: under the plea of zeal for the Lord of Hosts have been wrought the greatest desolations,—have been committed the foulest crimes! The prison, the torture, the sword, the stake, the axe, have all been called by the valiant for the truth to minister to the interests of "our holy religion." But there is a sharper and more destructive weapon, a poison most deadly, which has sometimes been employed with effect. It is the poison of the serpent—slander. Such is the weapon with which our friends at Glasgow have been assailed. We pity the ignorance of those who have a zeal for God which is not according to knowledge! Astonishing, that they should expect to gain converts to Christianity by maligning some of their Christian brethren! Paul was intensely desirous to save sinners; and he submitted to all manner of deprivation and self sacrifice "if by any means he might gain some." But he did not slander—although he was often slandered. May those who disseminate this tract soon learn that if they would promote Christianity they must use Christian means, and that to misrepresent and cast reproach upon those who trust in the living God who is the Saviour of all men, they will eventually be put to confusion. Faith actuating the heart, and evinced in the life, is a shield which will quench all the fiery darts of the adversary. Let our friends in Glasgow, then, be of good courage. Though reviled they will not threaten; being defamed, as they have opportunity, they will entreat: not rendering evil for evil, but contrariwise blessing. If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye, for then the Spirit of glory and of God resteth on you. Be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, for as much as ye know that your labor shall not be in vain in the Lord.

ANECDOTES FOR THE SOCIAL CIRCLE.

The same Mr. L. named in page 199, was once urged by his neighbour, a Presbyterian Deacon, to accompany him to a protracted meeting held a few miles distant—assuring L. that he would be greatly edified by the exercises, as "the Spirit of the Lord was powerfully at work in their midst." "I doubt it" said L, "for I feel persuaded that what you call the Spirit of the Lord, can all be shown to be fire from hell, in a short time." However after some parleying

it, was agreed that Mr. L, should accompany the deacon next day, and should be allowed to address the meeting. There was snow on the ground, and they went together in the deacon's conveyance. The meeting was a large and a very excited one. At last, toward evening, L. reminded the deacon of his promise; the deacon with some little difficulty obtained permission of the preachers present for L. to speak; L's subject was ancient and modern Phariseeism; and so closely did he measure, cut, and fit the garment, that he was ordered to stop. But the stream flowed on. Singing was resorted to, to drown his voice. But his voice rose so as to drown the singing. With furious looks, they laid hold of him and threw him out into the snow—his neighbour, the deacon interposing and remonstrating in vain and following him out with much sympathy. L. calmly arose, and coolly brushing off the snow, turned smilingly to his friend and said—"There, what do you think of that spirit of the Lord now? Is it not turned into pretty hot hell-fire, think you?"—*Universalist Companion for* 1851.

A horseman having lost his way, made a complete circle. When the first round was finished, he saw the tracks of his horse, and said—"This, at least, shows me that I am in some track." When the second circuit was finished, he supposed he had come to a beaten path; and as the tracks increased at every round, he at last supposed he was on the highway to some populous village. It is thus that the beaten tracks of error are generally made, until they are taken for the general consent of the world, and the authority of the Church Universal!— *Ibid.*

The following conversation, in substance, took place between a Calvinistic Clergyman and a Universalist, in Hardwick—

Universalist. But can you rejoice in the decree of reprobation? Are you heartily *glad* that God will doom your fellow-creatures to endless torments? *Minister.* Ah, we have so much natural weakness here, that it is difficult to reconcile ourselves to God's will in many cases. I do not expect to be able, in this imperfect state, to contemplate the damnation of the impenitent with complacency: but heaven is a perfect state; there, I do suppose, I shall be able to say: *Amen* to every exhibition of God'srighteous judgments. *Universalist.* Do you not think that Satan has pleasure in the torments of sinful men in hell? *Minister.* Yes, certainly. *Universalist.* The amount of the matter then, is—that *now* you are *not quite as perfect as the devil;* but hope when you get to heaven *to be as good as he is!* *Ibid.*

A very celebrated divine was in the habit of preaching so as to be rather beyond the comprehension of his hearers—A lady of his parish met him one day and asked him what the duty of a shepherd was—"To feed his flock, of course," was the reply. "Ought he then, to place *the hay so high that but few of the sheep can reach it?*"— *Ibid.*

REVIEWS.

"*The Three Grand Exhibitions of Man's Enmity to God.*" By David Thom, D.D., Ph. D. Bold Street Chapel, Liverpool.—London: H. K. Lewis, 15, Gower Street, North; Liverpool, George Phillip. 1845.

Divinity is unquestionably the most lofty and sublime subject that can engage the attention of a thinking mind; at the same time, like all other high and lofty things, most difficult to handle properly, as the mass of inconsistent, incongruous, contradictory nonsense, dignified with the name of Divinity, the press daily teems with, proves. From this charge of inconsistency, &c. we must except Thom's "Three Grand Exhibitions of Man's Enmity to God."—And seldom as we take up the pen of the critic, we cannot now re-

frain from making some comments on this most masterly production, and bearing some testimony of our high estimation and admiration of it, in the hope that it may be the means of causing a work so deserving of an attentive perusal to be more generally known and read.—We have long considered Dr. Thom the most original and consistent writer on theology it has been our lot to become acquainted with; and much instruction, and great consolation, especially in the hour of affliction, have we derived from his previous works, particularly from his "Assurance of Faith" and "Divine Inversion."—Many writers on divinity, are very logical, and occasionally, or to a certain extent, scriptural, but then their arguments are based on such false and erroneous premises, i. e. on such false and erroneous views of Holy Writ, that their writings are altogether inconclusive and unconvincing; yea, little better than a heterogeneous mass of contradictions. Whereas Dr. Thom's great excellence and superiority lies in the soundness and consistency of his arguments and the deep scriptural knowledge he brings forward to prove them. Perhaps, in the work under review, a close argumentative style, is not so continuously kept up as in the "Assurance of Faith," which last work, is certainly strictly argumentative throughout.

The "Exhibitions of Human Enmity," consisting more of assertions, is the result of a deep and close study of the Scriptures, which study has evidently been carried on by a mind of no common order, and of one spiritually enlightened from above to an enviable degree. The plan of the work brings the subject before the mind of the reader, in a most lucid systematic manner, and shows the author has taken a very clear, comprehensive view of it, before, we should say, he had written a sentence.

As the title asserts, there are three grand exibitions of man's enmity to God. 1st. Violation of the Divine Prohibition. 2nd. Disobedience to the Divine Command. 3rd. Denial of Divinely revealed Fact.

The first, as every tyro in Scripture knows, was the transgression of our first parents in paradise. The state of primeval innocence, however long or short it might be, Dr. Thom considers, or rather asserts, was miraculous and *soulical*, but not in any degree spiritual; and says, page 27: "They know nothing of the distinction or rather opposition subsisting between soul and spirit. This distinction is expressly laid in 1 Cor. xv. 45. 'The first man Adam was made made a living *soul*; the last Adam a quickening *spirit*.' No matter that mankind in general, nominal Christians no less than heathens, have chosen to identify soul and spirit; it is enough for us who respect and love the divine testimony, that the Holy Ghost hath seen meet to distinguish them. Soul, we learn, from this highest of all authorities, speaking in the passage just quoted is illustrated and confirmed by the context, verses 46—49, is the mind of Adam the creature, a being of the earth, earthy; spirit is this mind of the Lord Jesus, the Creator, not as he appeared in flesh, but as glorified by being exalted to his heavenly throne. This distinction plainly as it is revealed, is generally, overlooked, if not denied. Hence pure soul, or Adam's earthly mind as it existed in paradise before the fall, is almost universally confounded with spirit or Christ's divine mind—the principles of which He became possessed or rather invested with which He was manifested subsequently to His resurrection and ascension."

By the way, this implies the Lord Jesus had not the Spirit till after His resurrection, and yet does not Scripture assert He, at his baptism, "saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him, and also that in him dwelt the Spirit without measure?"

But to return. Page 30, Dr. Thom says:—"The fact is, what soul is to Spirit, the earthly paradise was to the heavenly one. Adam the temporary possessor of soul, the passive recipient, ψυχη ζωσα, stood to Jesus the everlasting possessor and active bestower of Spirit, πνευμα ζωοποιουν, in the relation of shadow to substance. The pure soulical state of the former was in every respect a beautiful emblem of the spiritual state of the latter; but it was nothing more. Just as the earthly paradise was in every

respect the shadow of the heavenly one, but it was nothing more either All this fleshly religionists know nothing about. And hence the gross absurdity chargeable on the views of all of them, when treating of the earthly paradisaical state; they ascribe to it and to its enjoyments spiritual properties, properties, which as substantial belong, and can only belong to its heavenly antitype, the paradise of God."

Here Dr. Thom adds this clever note:—"A similar mistake is committed by vast numbers in respect to Eph. iv. 24; They ascribe to Adam in paradise the knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness of which the Apostle there speaks, supposing that the renewed ones become by grace what *he* originally was. Whereas the Apostle is there illiptically contrasting the ignorance, sinfulness, and false holiness of the old man, Adam, the *shadow*, as he existed in paradise, with the knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness of the *new man* Jesus, the *substance*, as he reigns glorified at God's right hand. Adam possessed a *shadowy* knowledge, a *shadowy* righteousness, and a *shadowy* holiness, until he transgressed; in Jesus we have conferred upon us the *substance* of all these qualities. Holiness of the truth or substance, οσιοτης της αληθειης, thus stands evidently contrasted with holiness of the shadow."

From p. 33 to 36, our author ably refutes the restorationists, or those who teach that Christ only restores, what Adam by transgression lost. And while still on the subject of Adam's miraculous, but merely soulical state in paradise, he says: "Miraculous his situation then was, but spiritual it was not, nay because it was entirely miraculous therefore it was not at all spiritual. Before spirituality could come in, and the spiritual man could be revealed, it behoved the earthly nature of Adam to shew by transgression what even in its state of purity and innocence it had been, and thereby to forfeit that state, to shew by miraculous influence alone it had been upheld, and that whenever miraculous influence was withdrawn it could not help sinking to its own level.

"This fact of the spiritual state not having been the original state of man, but having required his original state to pass away before it could be introduced, is actually the subject matter of express divine declaration. 'Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is soulical, and afterwards that which is spiritual.' 1 Cor. xv. 46."

This doctrine of the natural or soulical state of Adam and his posterity we should unhesitatingly hold, but for one passage in the Old Testament Scriptures, which as at present rendered, seems to contradict both it and the text in Corinthians just quoted. The passage we allude to is in that chapter of Ecclesiastes, where the gradual decay of man's mortal frame is so beautifully so figuratively, and so poetically described; and where, in the 7th verse, dropping all figure, we are told: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the *spirit* shall return to God who gave it." Now if there be really no spirit in man how can there be one to go to God? And moreover if that spirit have not previously been with God, (i. e. before it became an inhabitant of mortal flesh) how can it be said correctly to *return* to Him, since the plain literal meaning of the word *return* is simply *to go back again*? What would any one say to a person, who on going to a place for the first time, should tell him he was *returning* to it? Why that he was talking absolute nonsense and did not rightly understand his mother-tongue. So till this is more satisfactorily explained either by this text being proved not to be so correctly translated as it might, which we suspect is the case, but which we leave to better biblical critics than ourselves, or by some other alteration or different view of the thing, our minds must be in doubt and abeyance.

The second section is on the object, nature, and circumstances of the first experiment on man—an experiment that was rather negative than positive, and one that proved, at the very onset, the great weakness of poor human nature, and its utter inability in its own strength to abstain from evil, or "do any good thing." Page 45 our author says, "The whole experiment may be described as the application of a test to man's nature, with a view to ascertain, first, man's

capability not of doing good, but merely of abstaining from evil. And secondly, man's capability of deserving, not to rise higher in the scale of being, but of continuing even in the rank and situation in which he had been created.

The third section is on the result of the Experiment and first Exhibition of Enmity; and which is succintly and briefly told in the first six verses of the third chapter of Genesis; and commented on by Dr. Thom in a manner that must or might be edifying to every reader.

In the fourth section, which is on the comparatively low rank of the first Experiment, Exhibition of Enmity and Punishment: we are told, "Adam's criminality was not spontaneous, or self-originated on his part. He was operated upon from without.—A temptation was presented to him, and under the influence of that temptation he fell. True, the temptation was comparatively speaking a slight one. Perhaps the slightest conceivable. And the tempter himself was so contemptible, his object so transparent, and the means by which he carried his point so gross, that we are ready to think that a child might have seen through and escaped the snare laid for him.—This gives a very different view of Adam, as regards his mental and moral strength, to what the Restorationists must have or they never could wish, or think it desirable to be restored merely to what he was, however innocent he might be for even innocence, lovely and attractive as it is in itself, when allied with imbecility is in great danger of becoming contemptible.—Yet that Adam should have been more than a grown infant is very improbable so wholly destitute as he was of all experience; indeed it is a query with us, whether man is any thing more now, though he has the experience of nearly six thousand years to help him, so puerile are his thoughts, words, and actions in the main; not but there are some cheering exceptions, yet these are not to be found amongst "the many" but that "little flock" who walk not in their strength, but who take the Word of God as "a light unto their feet and a lamp unto their path." On page 60 this portion of the work thus concludes, "Adam's expulsion from paradise, and in process of time, loss of life then followed. And with his expulsion, as one consequence of the first grand exhibition of enmity to God on the part of man terminated the first or miraculous αιων, *ævum*, or age of the present world."

The second Grand Exibition of Enmity, which is "Disobedience to the Divine Command," now falls to be noticed. It is divided into two heads, and the first again into three sections with an introductory chapter, and the second head into ten sections. Under the first head and section, is shewn how the next experiment, made by God, to prove man's inability to abstain from evil, and live in obedience to the divine commands, terminates in the same result as the first, made upon a single individual.

And though this second experiment was made only upon a single nation or people it was a nation or people which was to equal in number "*the stars of heaven, and the sand upon the sea-shore;*" that surely amongst all this countless host had there been any inherent power or ability in human nature to abstain from evil, and lead a life of obedience, some few might have been found who could and would have done it. But alas! there was none, "no not one;" all, all on the contrary proved themselves to be a stiff-necked, rebellious, disobedient people; till Jesus, emphatically *the Jew*, came and triumphantly and to the very letter obediently fulfilled the whole law so that not one jot or one tittle failed. This first head succinctly relates the backslidings, &c. of the chosen people, the Israelites, from the call of their first Patriarch, Abraham, to the death and resurrection of our blessed Saviour. And the second, the condition of this chosen people during the forty years after his glorious resurrection and ascension.

Page 87, Dr. Thom most scripturally writes:

"In the whole of these cases, [viz. the transgressions of the people of Israel during their passage through the wilderness, their sins and offences on their introduction into the promised land; the revolt of the ten tribes, who gave themselves up to idol-

atry, and every other abomination; and the remaining two tribes, so provoking the Lord, that they were visited with the heavy punishment of seventy years captivity in Babylon;] yea, in the whole of these cases Israel shewed itself to be totally unable to abstain from evil. Enmity to God, in the shape of transgressing his various prohibitions, characterises every step which by that people was taken. So complete and so wide-spread, indeed, was the moral malady under which Israel laboured, as far back even as the days of Isaiah, that the Holy Ghost, speaking by that prophet, complains of the whole body politic as being one mass of corruption. *The whole head is sick and the whole heart faint: from the sole of the foot, even unto the head, there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores*, Isaiah i. 5, 6. Succeeding ages shewed that the disease was inveterate. Even amputation of entire tribes, it appeared, could not cure it. Nothing but the cutting off of the whole remained."

From page 88 to the end of this section our author dwells on the great sin the Jews committed in crucifying the "Lord of glory;" and the still greater sin of rejecting him when risen and glorified. And here the parable of a certain householder which planted a vineyard, &c. as given in Matt. xxi. 33—41, is most appositely brought in to confirm his statements. A parable, that is seen plainly and at once to refer to the rejection of the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles to the participation and enjoyment of those spiritual blessings the glorious gospel, in bringing life and immortality to light, confers upon every believer, but from a participation of which he Jews are properly debarred, as a just punishment for their hardness of heart and unbelief.

In section iii, page 101, the contrast or direct anthesis, as to the earthly state and condition, and the ability possessed of resisting the temptation to sin, betwixt "the first man Adam, and the second man the Lord from heaven," is beautifully drawn in these words:—

"The former, or earthy man, God creates and places in the most advantageous earthly circumstances: especially, creates him pure and innocent, and having done so, imposes on him but one law of prohibition, a law involving in it scarcely the shadow of a restraint: Gen. ii. 16, 17: the object of all this, as appears from the result, having been that breach of divine law committed under such circumstances, and in spite of such an accumulation of earthly motives all pointing towards abstinence from it—that transgression taking place even in man's best natural estate—might exhibit, with the greatest prominency and relief, and in the most striking manner, the inability of the mere creature, when assailed by temptation and left to itself to abstain from evil. Gen. iii. 1—6.

The second, or heavenly man, God introduces into the world under the most disadvantageous earthly circumstances: not merely born in a mean condition, and during infancy and youth surrounded by every species of physical discomfort—not merely walking through life in the vale of poverty, obnoxious to human obloquy and scorn, and the constant mark of human malice—but loaded with sins, the sins of others, not his own; Isaiah liii. 4—6; 2 Cor. v. 21; Heb. iv. 15; subjected to every conceivable species of divine law, whether prohibitory or imperative, and to the most severe and stringent exactions of that law, whether prescribing external or internal obedience; Gal. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 3; Matt. iii. 15; and obliged although guiltless to die, that is, obliged—after having obeyed every other requirement of law, and having thereby earned a right to continue on this earth for ever, John x. 18,—in obedience to law, to sacrifice the pure and holy nature by which his preceeding obedience had been rendered. Ibid; Phil. ii. 8. Such were the awfully discouraging, and, to mere flesh and blood, absolutely oppressive and overwhelming circumstances in which he who was the second man, and Son of Man, was ushered into and passed through the world. One object of all this was of course to shew, by way of contrast, that while the mere creature possessed of every earthly advantage had been unable to abstain from transgression, and thereby unable to retain what he naturally had,—the Creator manifest in flesh, on the other hand, without any earthly advantage whatever, nay in spite of every conceivable earthly disadvantage, was able not merely to abstain from transgression, but also in his own person and by means of his own righteousness to bring transgression to an end, and thereby not, to be sure, to retain his life upon earth, but to deserve and obtain, as the reward of his obedience unto death, life everlasting."

Every word of this is true, true to the letter; yet had not (with reverence be it spoken) Adam the worst it of? for what are *external* advantages to *internal*? and what was frail human nature even in its best estate, in point of

strength and ability to the divine and heavenly? Not so much as a weak fragile reed compared to the sturdy oak of the forest, which has braved the tempest of a thousand years. Then the work to be performed *required* (so stupendous and difficult was it) the strength of the divine nature, and by it was found no easy task, as the sad and bitter agony in the garden of Gethsemane painfully proved.

The second head embraces the history, or rather the state of the Jews during that remarkable period from the resurrection and ascension of our blessed Lord, to the siege and destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. A period that Divines in general are strangely silent upon, but which our Saviour thought so important as to make it an express subject of prophecy, especially the last act of it, the awful destruction of Jerusalem; see Matt. xxiv. Mark. xiii. Luke. xxi. when the daily sacrifice was taken away, the chosen people of God scattered amongst all nations, and their glorious Temple, erected by Solomon at such an enormous cost, so totally destroyed that *not one stone* (as was prophesied should be the case) *was left upon another*. Short as this period was, only forty years, it was a most eventful one; first, as another opportunity mercifully granted to the Jews of escaping the coming wrath, by obeying the command to believe on the Lord Jesus; and thus obtain an entrance to Gospel privileges, which their Jewish privileges, to which they clung so pertinaciously were only typical of. Secondly, as the time when the books now forming the New Testament Scriptures were written, for it is indisputably proved we believe, that they were all composed prior to the destruction of Jerusalem; and consequently when the foundation of that important spiritual temple, the New Testament Church was laid, or rather in the act of being laid "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." Thirdly and lastly, as the time of that most awful outpouring of the last vial of God's wrath upon that devoted city and people, Jerusalem and the Jews; when the city was besieged as never city was before and the wretched inhabitants punished by a *tribulation such as was not* since the beginning of the world to this time, no, *nor ever shall be*, Matt. xxiv. 21; and then were driven out to *become a proverb and a by-word amongst all nations*. Deut. xxviii. 37. A period, that may not inaptly be styled, to borrow a geological term, a transition state from typical and shadowy things to anti-typical and substantial; from a dispensation so limited as to bless only *one nation*, to one freely admitting "*all nations and kindreds, and people and tongues*." Dr. Thom calls this period the reconciled state of the church, when the law of prohibition was changed for one of command; a command to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and that whoever did, whether Jew or Gentile (for to both was the law addressed,) "*he and all his house should be saved*." And the punishment for not believing was the infliction of the "*second death*," or the being cast, to use the figurative language of the Apocalypse "*into the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone*;" and where the *fearful, and unbelieving, &c. have their part*. A state in which thousands upon thousands are at this very moment, and must necessarily be so as long as they are living without faith, and without God in the world; since faith in the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice and atonement that *has been made for the sins of the whole world*, can alone speak peace to the conscience, and deliver from *the worm that dieth not, and the fire that cannot be quenched*.

Page 147, &c. Dr. Thom makes some remarks on the judgment, which appear to us so much more scriptural, rational and sensible than the crude, puerile notions that are held on that subject, by the majority of religionists of every persuasion, that long as they are we cannot forbear quoting; they are these:

"Without dwelling on the fact, I may here take leave to mention, that so close was the connexion subsisting between Jesus as second Abraham and second Adam, with the Jews and with the whole human family, that as in his death both had virtually died, so in his rising again both virtually experienced a resurrection. John xi. 25. When he rose, both Jew and Gentile as it were rose in him; and both as thus

risen were summoned to judgment. It was indeed the fact of Christ's resurrection which so far brought Jews and Gentiles into a new state and condition, as to render them capable of receiving from above a new law; or they were subjected to the second law, the law of command, only in consequence of the altered circumstances into which through Christ's resurrection they had been brought. He rose from the grave; they also, in a certain sense, *came out of their graves.* Risen they appeared at his judgment-seat: the law of faith was the test or standard applied, and the reception which it met with was the ground of justification or condemnation. Jesus, both in applying the standard and in pronouncing judgment, appeared in glory; that is, appeared manifesting himself, and through himself his heavenly Father, in company with his holy angels or messengers, the prophets and apostles.

During forty years he continued issuing his new law of faith, or applying his test of character, first to the Jew then to the Greek. At last the period of probation ended, the time for judgment arrived. Then placing on his right hand, or introducing into heaven, those who had had the law of faith, which is also the law of love, carried home with power to their hearts and consciences, he placed on his left hand, or deprived of earthly and excluded from heavenly privileges, those who to his law of faith and love had proved disobedient. In other words, separating the members of his heavenly from the earthly church, with which up to this period they had been intermingled, he justified and glorified the one, while he condemned and punished the other. To the one, then, the resurrection of which we have been speaking was a resurrection of life, and to the other a resurrection of damnation or condemnation. See Daniel xii. 1—3; Matt. xxv. 31—46; John v. 21—29."

And this judgment is evidently going on now, and has been ever since the setting up of the New Testament church, and the line of demarcation is still as great betwixt the believer and unbeliever, for whilst the former is always found (to keep up the simile of Holy Writ) at the right hand, or in possession of every spiritual blessing and privilege that can speak peace to the mind; the latter is as invariably found on the left hand, or as far as regards those most desirable and peace speaking of all blessings, altogether destitute, and consequently always the victim of a condemning conscience; the *true lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.* (This is quite distinct from the moral law and the law of nature, which are never infringed upon by either the believer, or unbeliever with impunity; and still visit the sins of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation.)

How much more consistent with the scheme of salvation, is this view of the judgment the Dr. points out, than the popular one, which makes our state in the next world to depend upon our conduct here, consequently making us our own saviours. For if our future fate is to be decided by our present actions, what has our Saviour Christ the Lord done for us? No, eternal life is a gift, Rom. vi. 23, not a reward; a gift procured for every man by one Saviour, "*whose own right hand and holy arm hath gotten himself the victory;*" therefore to him alone does the reward rightly and justly appertain, and we have no part or lot in it.

But to return to a little further notice of what our author says on this head. In 9th. section he applies his beautiful and original doctrine of Divine Inversion most scripturally, as the following extract will shew:

"Jesus' first grand and peculiar act was an act of positive righteousness, performed in obedience to the *commandment which he had received of the Father.* John x. 18. Phil. ii. 8. *He, through the eternal spirit, offered himself* a sacrifice *without spot to God.* Heb. ix. 14. It was this act of our Lord, and not any preceding one, which ended creature unrighteousness, and established divine righteousness. Therefore in his case the act of obedience stands first in order, and in the second place, is the state of everlasting righteousness thereby introduced. In Adam's case the state of negative creature righteousneas came first, and the act of disobedience in which that state terminated came second; but in Christ's state the act of obedience, whereby the state of creature righteousness was brought to an end, is first, and the state of positive divine righteousness, thereby introduced and established for ever, is second." &c. P. 164.

The tenth section gives a condensed view or summary of what he had advanced on the Second Grand Exhibition. The last page of this section we should like to give, but for want of space must make a few sentences suffice.

"As, then, the Israelites in their journey from Egypt had been made to wander

forty years in the wilderness of Arabia, until a then existing generation had passed away, before they entered into Canaan; so were the true Israelites, consisting of believing Jews and Gentiles, in their journey from the mystical Egypt of the Mosaic rites and institutions. Rev. xi. 8, made to continue forty years in the wilderness of a reconciled state, subject to the law of faith, until the whole generation of unbelievers had been cut off before entering into the heavenly Canaan of a saved state, or that enjoyment of rest from subjection to law in the glorified Messiah, which, from the foundation of the world, had awaited the people of God. Heb. iv. 9. See Psalm xcv. 6—11. Rom. v. 10. Rev. xiv. 13. At the close of these forty years, the second divine experiment upon man was complete. His enmity to God, exhibited in the shape of disobedience to the law of command, was thoroughly manifested. Nothing more, with reference to this point, remained to be done. Besides, divine law, in addition to its having answered the purposes of affording mere man an opportunity to display his enmity to God, had been obeyed by Christ, and as the law of faith by his people, under the influence of his holy and heavenly spirit. Law, therefore, as fulfilled in every respect, passed away. With the ending of law closed likewise the exercise of the apostolic ministry, as having been subservient to the promulgation and enforcement of the law of faith: in connexion with this event, the church having been elevated into the heavenly and saved state, and the Jews, no longer the favourite church and people of God, having been punished with destruction of their city and temple and with deprivation of their privileges by the instrumentality of Titus. Expulsion from paradise had followed the sin of Adam: expulsion from their earthly church state and capacity, as well as coming short of a higher state and privileges, followed the sin, the second sin, of the Jews. And thus ended the second, or partly miraculous and partly non-miraculous αἰων age or æra of the world." P. 169, 170.

(To be concluded in our next.)

A Berean's Strictures on a Manuscript, entitled, The punishment of the wicked everlasting; and Dialogues between a Calvinist, Arminian, and Berean. By John Oakeshott. Second Edition. London H. K. Lewis, 15, Gower Street, North. 1850.

Our friend, Mr. Oakeshott, has long been favourably known among Evangelical Universalists, as a man of talents, education, and piety. Several tracts have, in the course of the last few years, emanated from his pen, all alike creditable to himself, and serviceable to the cause of heavenly truth and love.

The work to which we are at present directing attention, consists of "Strictures" written in answer to objections made against a former publication of Mr. Oakeshott, entitled, "Second Reply," &c. and of "Dialogues on the doctrine of endless punishment." These two tracts are preceded by a brief, but beautifully written, interesting and Christian preface.

Ever since our author's name and productions were first brought under our notice, we have been struck with his character as a man, anb his style as a writer. Simple, affectionate, Christianlike, and yet powerful is he, in both respects. Truth is his grand object; and by a sincere regard to what he conceives to be truth, is he constantly actuated. Almost as a necessary consequenc of this singleness of aim his compositions are clear and perspicuous. Through a style which may be fitly denominated transparent, sweet and spiritual ideas continually shine forth. We read his various productions with ease and pleasure. We find that we comprehend them at every step; and we lay them down with the conviction, that we have been travelling for a while in company with an humble and devoted follower of the Lord Jesus, to whose language and suggestions we have been indebted for no small degree of edification. As a logician, Mr. Oakeshott stands high. He assails the strongholds of error, and demolishes them with great ease. But his exposure of falschood, although most masterly, is couched in a style of gentleness, and breathes a spirit of affection which positively disarms controversy of all that is harsh and offensive.

Delighted have we been to renew our acquaintance with the author, through the medium of the present little volume. We find it characterised by all the excellences observable in his other productions. It is sweet, pleasing, and instructive. He has had to do with bitter, and, judging from allusions and quotations, with not particularly scrupulous adversaries. Their errors he han-

dles severely, but spares their persons. God's universal love he has vindicated from aspersions and misrepresentations; but its maligners are borne with, the kindest and justest reasons are assigned for their mistakes, and every effort is made to prevail on them to institute a new and rigorous examination of the Scriptures with reference to the subject, as well as to reconsider that sentence of condemnation to which under the influenee of ignorance and prejudice they have already come.

The "Strictures on the" Sermon or "Manuscript," occupy twelve tolerably closely printed Octavo pages. Each proposition of the author of the animadversions, is taken up and considered successively. Especially, his repetition of the common and well-known charge brought against Universalists, of concurring with the Serpent, in his delusive language to Eve and her husband: *ye shall not surely die.* Gen. iii. 4. This is admirably retorted. Partialists by ascribing immortality to man in his original,* and still more in his fallen state, —in flat contradiction to scripture which represents man, after thefall, as excluded from eating of *the tree of life* in order to prevent his becoming immortal as a sinful being, Gen. iii. 22—24, and which ascribes our possession of life and immortality to our being made partakers of the divine nature through the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, 49, &c.—are easily and satisfactorily shewn by our author to be the very parties who, however unconsciously and unintentionally, have adopted the serpent's language, and are enforcing the Serpent's falsehood.† There is, perhaps, nothing very original in our friend's "Strictures." But they are sensible, impressive, and exceedingly well-written.

Mr. Oakeshott's "Dialogues" are composed in the same simple, amiable, and Christian spirit. While their statements are in the main scriptural, and their reasonings cogent and convincing, we are not annoyed by anything like petulance, or by unseemly exhibitions of temper. Throughout we breathe an atmosphere of love. Truth is not sacrificed; nay, its claims are strenuously and rigidly enforced: but it is evidently one object of our author to afford an example of the tenderness, forbearance, and mutual affection, with which followers of the Lamb, disagreeing on certain points, should conduct their opposition to one another. Edification we experience to be the result of a perusal of these conversations.

Except in the First Dialogue, where the discussion is carried on by a Calvinist, an Arminian, and a Berean, (not in the sense of a follower of John Barclay,) these parties, with the addition of a Baxterian, constitute the interlocutors. Mr. Oakeshott's idea evidently is, to have all the leading religious parties represented in this imaginary conference. And so they are. Each expresses himself according to the notions of his sect; that is, in the statements and objections of each, the current and approved sentiments of his party are embodied. Our author's opponents propound their several objections freely. He himself, in the person of Berean, replies to them. Baxterian is ultimately convinced. And the others retire from the discussion, with an acknowledgment of deep and favourable impressions having been made upon their minds:—"Calvinus. I confess my mind is greatly shaken. I cannot refute what I have heard; and this conversation will have my serious consideration. Arminius. I am desirous to acknowledge with thanks the instruction I have received from our brother; and, like Calvinus, admit our present discussion has made a great impression on my mind, and will have my deliberate and prayerful consideration." p. 63.

* Adam's original life was not immortal or *infinite* in heaven, but merely capable of *indefinitely* prolonged continuance upon earth, in the event of transgression not intervening.

† The fate of the human race, through sin, is death or destruction: death of mind, and death of body. Human nature, as such, never lives again. Having died really and substantially in Christ's death as human beings, we live again, through the power of his resurrection, as new-creatures, or beings possessed of the divine nature. See Rom. vi. 3, 4, Gal. ii. 20, 1 Cor. xv. 49, Eph iv. 2, Cor. v. 17. We, therefore, as partakers of Adam's nature, surely die. To live for ever as human beings, would be certainly to convert Satan, the father of lies, into the prophet of truth.

Like some other brethren beloved, whose productions we have had occasion to notice, Mr. Oakeshott combines the millennial theory upon which we have more than once animadverted, with his Universalism. In the work now under review, as well as in his other able tracts, we find him contending for this particular view of the subject.

One is struck in reading the "Strictures," and "Dialogues," at our friend's manifest familiarity with some of the best and ablest writers of the Universalist School. Besides the treatises of Elhanan Winchester, he appears to have carefully studied, and to have made himself thoroughly acquainted with that master-piece of erudition, in behalf of the doctrine of God's Universal love, Stonehouse's "Restitution of all things." Earnestly do we desire to see this work republished. As a specimen of learning and scriptural criticism, on that side of the Universalist controversy which we have deliberately and conscientiously espoused, it has no equal; and to refute by means of revelation, its leading statement, we have no hesitation in pronouncing to be impossible.

D. T.

The Acts of the Elders, commonly called the Book of Abraham; containing a revelation made to him at a protracted meeting. To which is appended a chapter from the Book of religious errors. With notes of explanation and commentation from commencement to termination. Calculated for the meridian of Rhode Island, but will answer for the New England States. Written by himself. [ABRAHAM NORWOOD.] Providence, R. I. Published for the purchaser. 1842. Also same work, new and revised edition, with title page slightly altered, and second preface, Boston, Mass. 1846.

SUCH of our readers, as have completed fifty years of their earthly existence, and have been in the habit of scanning the pages of Blackwood's *Edinburgh Magazine* from its commencement, may chance to recollect the appearance in that periodical, between thirty and thirty five years ago, of a certain article eclyped, "a Chaldee manuscript." They may also remember, the mighty stir in the religious world, and especially in Scotland, of which its appearance was productive. It was written in the style of sacred scripture. This, combined with the topics of which it treated, and the manner of treating them, gave great offence. So much so, indeed, that the proprietor of the magazine sustained, in consequence of its appearance considerable pecuniary injury. Nothing of the kind, so far as we are aware, has since been attempted. And instructions, it is understood, were extensively given to binders, in the event of copies of the magazine being brought to them, to substitute for the number containing the obnoxious "Manuscript," another from which it had been withdrawn, and replaced by matter of a totally different description.*

Our Transatlantic friends are not quite so squeamish, in this respect, as we are. Books written in scripture style are not uncommon in the United States of America. We might even say, are by many regarded with a favourable eye.† If we are not greatly mistaken, at least one work, a history of the great revolutionary war, 1775—1783, composed in scripture phraseology, and divided into chapters and verses, which we remember having seen, either is, or was used in several schools as a class-book. Two or three other American books, of a similar kind, have come under our notice. Upon the propriety, or impropriety, of works so composed, we at present pronounce no opinion. We content ourselves with merely recording the above facts.

"The Acts of the Elders," which professes to be a portion of the personal history of Mr. Abraham Norwood, its author, now the Universalist minister at Salisbury, Massachusetts, thus opens:—

* "The Economy of human life," (Dodsley's,) and some other British publications of a similar kind, might be supposed to have prepared our countrymen, to look upon treatises, or articles composed in this style, if not with approbation, at all events with forbearance. What happened, however, on the occasion referred to in the text, was calculated to undeceive us.

† Who knows not Franklin's celebrated, and oft-reprinted apologue of Abraham and the Stranger who came to his tent!

CHAP. I.

1. Now it came to pass that HARRISON was dead, and Tyler was made President in his stead over all the United States of America.

2. And political dissensions ceased in some good degree for a while, that the people might manifest their grief for him who had been elected Chief Magistrate of the nation, and had been cut off by death.

3.¶ About this time there was in the town of Warwick, in the land of Roger Williams, [Rhode Island] a small number of pious people, who had renounced the vain traditions of men;

4. And they gave heed only unto the word of the Lord, and bound themselves together by a covenant to support the truth, as revealed by Jesus and his Apostles, and prophesied by all God's holy prophets, since the world began.

5. Then said they one to another, Behold we have no one to go in and out before us from Sabbath to Sabbath, and to break unto us the bread of life;

6. Let us, therefore, send for one Abraham, an Elder, whose present abode is by a certain river, even by Fall River, in the old Bay State. [Massachusetts.]

7. Peradventure he may come unto us, although we are few in number, and poor in worldly goods. for we have heard that he is of a lowly and devoted spirit, and unambitious in the things of the world.

8. So they sent a messenger unto Abraham, saying, We pray thee, come over and help us, and we will strive to do good both to thee and to thine.

9. ¶ Then Abraham when he had diligently inquired of the Lord touching this matter, said, I will go.

10. Accordingly, he arose and went, he, and his wife, and the little ones which God had given them—and they journeyed to the land whither they had been invited.

11. Howbeit, his wife, whose name was Ruth, and his kindred, and many friends were not pleased that he should depart out of the State [Massachusetts] in which he had been nourished and brought up.

We should like to have been able to insert the whole of Mr. Norwood's two prefaces. They are exceedingly characteristic. Humorous, pathetic, pungent, and straightforward. Also, redolent of genius. The second preface, which professes to be the result of the deliberations of a meeting "holden in Proprietors' Hall" composed of "Abraham himself, the Recorder of the Acts of the Elders, the Publisher of the said work, the writer of the Notes of explanation, an elder from the State of Rhode Island, a clergyman of Massachusetts, and all others personally, particularly and pecuniarily interested in the publication of the above-named Book," that is, of himself alone as sustaining all these different characters, is written in a style of humour, and has about it a point, not unworthy of the author of the "Tale of a Tub" himself. But the length of the two articles, and the extremely narrow limits to which we are obliged to restrict ourselves, forbid our copying them.

Similar reasons prevent our entering at any length on the consideration of this very amusing, no less than instructive performance itself. Such of our friends as can procure it—which may be done through our publisher—will deem themselves amply repaid by a perusal.

A few passages, however, as illustrative of the turn of mind of the author, and of the general character of the work, it may not be amiss to quote.

CHAP. VII.

7 ¶ Then arose a man of Harrisville, who professed to have done much in time past, for the cause of universal grace.

8. But he now denounced that doctrine as the veriest falsehood, and repented that he had done aught for its promotion.

9. Then said Abraham within himself, Fear not; for thou shalt surely be forgiven.

10. It requireth but a small particle of forgiveness to pardon all that thou hast done for this cause, even if it is, as thou sayest the cause of the evil one

11. For at the most thou hast done but little; and if thy other sins are of no greater magnitude, thou mayest rest in peace.

* * * *

28. Then Baker prayed vehemently about Abraham and his damnable heresy: and as he prayed, he said,

29. O Lord God! let not that man speak, who hath come in hither to night, to scatter fire-brands, arrows and death in this congregation.

36. ¶ But Baker continued his prayer, saying, O Lord, God! let him not speak! Let us have a long season of prayer.

37. Help some one to follow immediately! And help somebody else to follow him!

38. ¶ And as he prayed furiously that Abraham might be smitten down, and his mouth stopped, he occasionally unclosed an eye.

39. And looked forth to see if his prayer was answered; and thus did he watch as well as pray.

CHAP. VIII.

5. Now prayed the Elders, and then the laymen prayed; and now prayed the laymen, and then the Elders prayed;

6. And there was mingled amid the various sounds, the crying, half-smothered, drawling voice of one of the simple women, not a widow, who freely cast in her mite, to assist in this trytime.

7. And the Lord was told, that Abraham was a bad man, and a hypocrite—that he was going to hell himself, and not satisfied with this, was striving to deceive and lead others there also.

8. But the Lord believed not the words which were spoken; and even Abraham knew that they were utterly false, and instigated by the father of lies

* * * *

23. Then a new voice fell upon the ear, and new courage was inspired; and after a strange commingling of discordant sounds, which harmonized like unto the music of a saw mill and a grindstone, the hymn was finished which commenceth thus: Come, Holy Spirit, heavenly Dove!

24. This was precisely suited to the case; for as the Holy Spirit was far away, it was proper they should sing for it to come. However it came not.

25. I don't care how many spectacles, or glasses, a man may wear, to give him an appearance, if he has not the truth of God in his heart.

26. ¶ Now it was so, that the eyesight of Abraham had become dim, by reason of sickness in years past, and he therefore suffered a pair of spectacles to rest upon his nose;

27. That he might the more easily look straight before him, and ponder the paths of his feet—for he chose light and not darkness.

28 And when he saw that his adversary had become weary with denying his doctrine, and his Christian character,

29. And had fixed his attention upon the glasses that were about his eyes, he was quite amused; and taking them from their resting place, he carefully wiped the dust therefrom, saying,

30. Poor Spectacles! Thou hast indeed, though innocent, come in for a share of the bitter reproach heaped without measure upon thine owner.

31. In time past, thou hast faithfully shielded mine eyes from dust, and in time present, thou dost nobly remain in the fore-front of the hottest battle, &c.

Truly, Mr. Norwood's adversaries might well admit, that "he was a man of talents." The poor Massachusetts ex-fisherman has probably no great store of human learning. But as a man of genius, we doubt much if his equal is to be found among his Universalist brethren. How quaintly original is he! His humour is most exquisite, as well as most natural. We might almost be justified in styling him, the American Rabelais. Sweet, however, is his spirit. With a keen sense of the ridiculous in human character and conduct, he combines the greatest tenderness for human folly and frailty. Fools are perfectly safe in his hands. A good-natured smile accompanied, perhaps, with a playful pat, is the utmost that in general they provoke from him. And he is constantly on his guard against the indulgence of buffoonery. Good sense and Christian feeling, on the part of our friend, must have spared many an imbecile and many a malicious assailant the infliction of well-merited stripes which, had they been allowed to descend, would have left behind them their marks for many a long day. What a blessing is it, when humour like that of Mr. Norwood, is associated with good temper!

How happens it, that, without having been Academically trained, and without having devoted himself exclusively to literary pursuits, Mr. Norwood should compose in so pure, correct, and thoroughly-idiomatic an English style? Is it that the people of New England have had our language transmitted to them from their Puritan fathers, in a more perfect state, than we ourselves have received it? Is it that the working classes among them, are better educated than ours are, and read more than ours do? Is it that their familiar acquaintance with our excellent translation of the Scriptures, while it has been the means of disclosing to them its beauties, has served also to impart to them a relish for its Saxon phraseology? Whatever may be the cause, we have more than once been struck with the terse, quaint, and truly idiomatic turn of expression, apparent in even the ordinary and comparatively uneducated writers of the Northern States of the Union. In respect of correct and racy English composition Mr. Norwood scarcely yields to Cobbett himself. Independently altogether of the originality, genius, and shrewdness of observation which it displays, and viewed with reference to its diction alone, we have no hesitation in saying, that considerable literary reputations have been built upon slenderer foundations, than are laid in the style adopted, and the language employed throughout "The Acts of the Elders."

Abraham Norwood's story, which is in some measure the subject-matter of his work, is soon told.

He had been born, and had for many years in early life been employed as a fisherman at Cape Ann, in the State of Massachusetts. There, having been called to the knowledge of God's Universal Love, he represents himself as having, like Peter and John, "forsaken his nets and his boats—and become a fisher of men, according to the word of the Lord." Chapter i, verse 32. Great opposition he encountered. But having an undaunted spirit, and perfect confidence in the truth of what he was engaged in proclaiming, he persevered, and continues persevering, in spite of all the virulence and ill-usage, to which he has been and still is exposed, in the prosecution of his sacred calling. After having spent a considerable time at Warwick, in Rhode Island, he has

now for several years been located at Salisbury, in Massachusetts; if located be a proper term to apply to one, whose life and exertions have for a long period of time been almost entirely missionary.

Singular is the book now before us, and singular has been its fate.

Singular as we have seen, is it in style and phraseology. And not less so, in its contents. We have accounts of the prevalence of Universalist doctrine, in Rhode Island, under Abraham's ministry—of the annoyance thereby caused to the Baptists and Methodists—and of the confederacy into which these rival sects entered to wage war with Abraham and his party. We have abstracts of sermons preached, and of devotional exercises engaged in against Abraham—relations of his feelings while listening to them—and comments upon them. Also of Abraham's attempts at self-defence, and of the shoutings, prayers, exhortations, singing of hymns, and other manœvres, by which his adversaries contrived to drown his voice, and have things their own way. His own *dodge* in substituting a benevolent prayer, for an anticipated speech, is told with great beauty, and inimitable humour. Nothing indeed, can be conceived more racy and comical, as well as graphic and original, than our author's account of the scenes in which he bore a part. He lets us, in a few pages into all the *arcana* and machinery of "a protracted meeting."* However objectionable on many grounds, an imitation by human writers of the style of scripture may be, it cannot be denied, that scarcely ever has a more able and powerful production, couched in this style, issued from the press. Pity 'tis, that the local and ephemeral character of the topics of which it treats should tend to diminish its interest, and interfere with its spread and notoriety. Yet we are not altogether justified in expressing ourselves thus despondingly, for

Singular has been the fate of the book. Instead of having been like many other clever productions, consigned to oblivion, after having served its immediate purpose, it actually exhibits symptoms of something like permament vitality. So great and increasing as been the demand for it, that several years ago, Mr. Norwood had it stereotyped, and it has already, if we mistake not, been disposed of to the extent of some eight or ten thousand copies. Its quaint humour, and plain palpable manner of enunciating truth, the countrymen of its author have not been slow to appreciate. Works of far higher pretension on the subject of God's universal love will, it is probable after the lapse of a few years be forgotten. His own prose account, in another work, of the difficulties and disputes in which his profession of Universalism involved him, and the ecclesiastical discipline to which he was subjected, although very ably written, is probably now known to but few, and cared about by still fewer. But his "Acts of the Elders," from its style, its genius, its quiet pungent humour, its occasional sweet pathos, its condensed and telling statements of divine truth, its amazing power, and, above all, its Christian spirit, is likely to continue in request and to be admired, long after its author, and the generation which first saw it published, shall have been consigned to the dust. D. T.

Nine Letters between A. G. M. [ANDREW GEORGE MOLLER] *and N. B., a letter to the Rev. Hugh M'Neile, of Liverpool, and another; with appendix and notes.* Dublin: Samuel Machen, 28, Westmoreland Street, 1849.

RARE is the combination of great talents with piety, and of extensive and varied learning with evangelical views, and an experience of the humbling tendencies and influence of the gospel. When, however, it does occur, how lovely, and how captivating is it felt to be! A Cowper may stand almost alone, as at once evangelical, and a true poet. But high mental qualities may manifest themselves in other forms, besides that of poetry.

Pleased are we, through the medium of the pamphlet whose title heads this

* A species of *revivalism*, got up by the American Baptists, in imitation of their rivals, the Wesleyan Methodists.

article, to have an opportunity of drawing attention to the character, talents, and attainments of its publisher, Mr. Moller. Long have we known,* and much do we admire this gentleman. His belief in the doctrine of God's Universal love dates some years prior to our own † To his conversations on the subject, at a time when difficulties connected with it, which we found ourselves unable to surmount beset our path, we acknowledge ourselves to owe much. Honestly did he express himself. And yet, humbly and cautiously. He had read several of the best works written in favour of Universalism. One of these, Stonehouse's unanswerable treatise, he had actually been at the pains of copying, from beginning to end, with his own hand. For the gift of his manuscript, and thus, for the opportunity of becoming acquainted with this masterly production, we are indebted to Mr. Moller's kindness.‡

We take leave to mention, that the "Nine letters," is far from being, the first of Mr. Moller's publications. Above twenty years ago, he translated into English, in an able and most scholarlike manner, and brought out, Le Clerc's celebrated, *Sentimens de quelques Theologians de Hollande, sur l'histoire critique du Vieux Testament, composee par le Pere Richard Simon de l'Oratoire.* Amsterdam, 1685. This is one of the few works which we have had an opportunity of perusing both in the original, and in the translation. Mr. Moller's part, we can with truth say, is admirably executed. No one can peruse the notes with which he has enriched his version, without instruction, and without wondering at the range and maturity of the learning which they display.

The fact is our friend possesses eminent qualifications as an author, and especially as an author on Christian and Biblical topics. Endowed with superior natural abilities, he has been highly educated in the best sense of the term. As an *alumnus* of the Universities of Dublin and Edinburgh, (at the latter of which, his studies were principally medical,) he was not undistinguished. Besides other acquisitions, derived from a course of reading which has been varied and extensive, few of his contemporaries are better acquainted than he is, with the writings of those who are commonly denominated the Fathers of the Christian Church. And with many of the most eminent Continental authors, of modern times, he is familiar. To composition, he has long habituated himself. A strong savour, indicative alike of the scholar and the gentleman, is perceptible in all that has issued from his pen.

Earnestly do we wish, that we could have expressed acquiescence, in all respects, in the sentiments of our excellent and highly respected friend. But, alas! this may not be. Whether as the descendant of German ancestors, or as having been educated in the theological school of the keen, critical, and speculative John Walker, with whose body he was at one time closely connected, or on other accounts, his turn of mind, which is singularly and powerfully ratiocinative, has led him to question the canonicity of several of the books of the New Testament Scriptures.¶ Especially, of the Apocalypse. Its divine origin, and inspired authority, with Oeder, Semler, and others, he unhesitatingly and even scornfully rejects.§ To us, this opinion of Mr. Moller's has been most painful, and to our readers the occaasion of a positive loss. For it has occasioned the exclusion of some otherwise most valuable papers of that gentleman's, from the columns of the "Universalist." Honoured on the score of their scholarship, and benefited by their evangelical sentiments, we should have been in the event of their insertion; but much as we admire our friend's talents, respect his honesty, and have been edified by his piety, the editor could

* About 23 or 24 years.

† He became a Universalist about 1825.

‡ We have since, with some difficulty, procured a printed copy of the book.

¶ Those known in the early age of the Church as the *αντιλεγομενα.*

§ Mr. Moller informs us, in one of his notes in the pamphlet now under review that Oeder's "Christian Free Inquiry concerning the so-called Revelation of John," he has translated, along with Semler's notes and preface, having added to these about one hundred notes of his own With a perusal of this able work, and equally able translation, in MS, we have been honoured by the translator.

not persuade himself to open our pages to a controversy, which over and above its being aside from the purpose of our periodical, is, it appears to us, uncalled for by the circumstances of the case, as well as calculated to unsettle the minds of weak and ill-informed believers of the truth. We deeply regret, for the sake of our readers, the loss of Mr. Moller's valuable assistance, which adherence to a rule imposed on ourselves when we entered on this undertaking, has necessarily occasioned.

As to the pamphlet now lying before us, we can unhesitatingly affirm, that it well deserves, and will abundantly repay the perusal of the scholar and the Christian. It is controversial. But on the part of Mr. Moller, it is controversy conducted on the best principles, and in the best spirit. Of the "Nine Letters," five are Mr. Moller's ; and these are by far the longest, as they are also by far the most instructive and interesting, in the collection. In one of his opponent's epistles, (letter iv. p. 10,) he is complimented, and complimented most justly, on the "acuteness, learning, and research" which he has displayed. These qualities characterize and pervade everyone of our friend's compositions Whether it be to expose the trickery of the Romish priesthood—to shew the meaning of anointing with oil, and other miraculous observances in the primitive churches—to trace the history of the Canon of Scripture—or to state the glorious gospel in its simplicity—Mr. Moller is always and equally at home. Clear and impressive is he in his remarks, and felicitous in his quotations Ready to shatter to atoms the paralogisms, and erroneous criticisms of his antagonists. Careful has he been in the perusal of the various works to which he has occasion to refer—fully master of their contents and meaning does he evince himself to be—and the "sad ignorance of grammar and of Greek especially in the Latin church, as we see even in Jerome, but especially in Rufinus and the other Latin interpreters of Origen," (Letter, p. 9,) must, we suspect, have been imformation, as it could scarcely have failed to be somewhat annoying to his Popish Correspondent.

Want of time and space forbids our entering further on the consideration of the valuable and instructive letters which constitute the body of the present tract. This we deeply regret. Every letter of Mr. Moller furnishes materials for profitable reflection and comment. How admirably does he shew himself to be acquainted with the chief evils of Irish society, and with that spirit of Popery by which some of the worst of them are fostered and perpetuated. Romish priests find no favour at his hands.

The letter to Rev. Hugh, now Dr. M'Neile evincing sympathy with Luther in his views respecting the Epistle of James*—that to Edward O'Mahony, Esq, rectifying a mistake—and the Appendix, in which some remarks are made on Robert Fleming's book on the prophecies, all merit attention.

Concerning the notes, with which the pamphlet is wound up we would observe briefly that rich they are in matter, and most scholar like, although modest and unpretending in manner. Deep is our regret to see such a mass of able criticism and well digested learning, condensed and presented in a publication so little likely to be known, and so little calculated to forward the objects of its talented and benevolent author.

Would that through the medium of this periodical, we could succeed in drawing some attention to Mr. Moller, his sentiments, and his works—for notwithstanding the differences subsisting between himself and us—differences, for his view of some of which he can plead no less an authority than that of Luther himself—we sincerely respect him, and deem him, on the score of talents, learning, evangelical sentiments, purity of moral character, benevolence, and personal piety, an ornament to the cause of Universal Salvation, of which he has for a very long period been the decided and consistent supporter.† D. T.

---

* *Epistola straminea.* Luther.

† Were it not indelicate, indeed, of the nature of an outrage to a man of retiring habits, and peculiarly sensitive and modest turn of mind, it would have delighted us to draw very particular attention to the services which Mr. Moller's knowledge of the medical profession, under the promptings of benevolence and Christian feeling, has enabled him to render gratuitously to the suffering poor.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

OCTOBER, 1851.

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY

RESPECTFULLY AND HUMBLY SUBMITTED TO THE CONSIDERATION OF CHRISTIANS.

PEOPLE speak of the happiness of childhood. I never knew it. Of all the misery my life has known that if my childhood and boyhood was the most hopeless, the most withering. Whether the brain was the cause; or whether there was some mysterious process of life which drank up my spirits and darkened my soul in its progress I cannot tell; but whatever may have been the cause the effect was sad enough.

It is very lamentable that parents should have the care of children before they know *anything whatever* of their inner life. Everyone understands the disastrous consequences of ignorance in parents with regard to the physical aspect of childhood, but who thinks of them in the spiritual? Who knows, or who that has known can recal, or *would* recal, or can paint the darkness and desolation and wretchedness of the child?

For the child cannot describe and is afraid to attempt description. And if it did how many mothers can listen; how many are qualified to speak? What could our mothers say? what would ninety-nine out of every hundred be likely to say? Yet believe me, mothers, it is very necessary you *should* know how to listen so as to induce your child to try to speak. You *should* know how to encourage its tears, that the overcharged bosom might be relieved, and then to soothe them. You *should* be qualified for your awful position for you are in God's stead to your child without doubt. To whom else can a child go? And if you chide, or laugh at its sorrow as many mothers do; if you pooh pooh its perplexities, if you are impatient, you will chill and freeze the genial current which would otherwise in all probability have flowed healthily; your child's heart may swell in consequence to bursting; an early death may be and very frequently is the result; or if life goes on, its stream is poisoned; the brain in not a few instances takes the matter up and becomes confused with it; a lunatic asylum and death end the story for the present. This is not fancy. Names and places and dates can be given. And if it were better known how frequently neglect of the inner being in childhood, and religious quackery afterwards, destroy both body and soul, so far as we can see, and according to popular judgments attention would surely be directed to it, and preventive as well as improved remedial measures be adopted.

In a wild district, between mountains, rocks and streams, and the

solitude which belongs to them, on one side, and a populous manufacturing village on the other, I first became conscious of myself, and, as every child is, a student of nature. So long as I was left to nature I did very well, for she had wonderful patience and kindness, and her chidings were uniform and on principle, without caprice and without passion. I was fond of mountains and they never disappointed me of my delight. I loved solitude and its soft, low, gentle, soothing voices have lived within me to this day. I had a passion for mountain streams and their freshness, life, purity and *spirituality*, I can never since recal without an intense longing, and uncontrollable yearning after them. And the wildness, and freshness, and freedom, and boundlessness of the scenery so worked themselves into my being as to become necessities to me.

But nature has many aspects, and many lessons, and varied discipline. And men in all their wonderful variety belong to Nature, which is sometimes forgotten. Now this district was very religious and very wicked indeed; a combination which many will understand. The religion was either Calvinism, or Arminianism, or Wesleyanism, a compound of the two. There was nothing else. The good old rector was a Calvinist, the whole district was deluged with Wesleyanism; it hung on the steep mountain sides in wild nooks where shepherds had erected their huts for shelter and warmth; it followed the streams; in the farmhouse, in the hut, in the dwelling of the artizan, in the mansion of the wealthy manufacturer, everywhere was methodism. It filled the manufactory and the school; in short it filled every thing. I too of course was filled with it, for my parents after their marriage had been "converted." We sang, we read, we talked, we prayed Methodism. But I recollect as a child the distress I felt at the incongruity which I could not but perceive between Methodism and the outer world. They did not seem to me to belong to the same system. Our religion always struck me as artificial, as a made up thing, narrow, fragmentary and unnatural. I could not *say* this at that time for I did not understand my own feelings; they greatly distressed and alarmed me indeed; and I was afraid to let them be known. I thought no one was so tormented by the Devil as I was, for all this I considered to be his work.

Reader do you know anything of Class Meetings? If so you will understand my situation when I tell you that at a very early age I was taken to them and admitted a member, regularly paying my penny, and duly every quarter being examined by the appointed "travelling preacher" when he presented me with "a ticket," for which he received a shilling. This ticket then, young as I was, admitted me to the "Lovefeasts" to which I was sometimes permitted to travel several miles. Whatever at first, might be the utility of these meetings, or whatever it may be now in some respects, I am quite certain they are very injurious to children. I was introduced at the Class Meeting to a number of persons, from a dozen to twenty, of all ages and of both sexes, who met, ostensibly to speak to each other about "the common salvation" and their own individual "experience in the things of God," but really to answer a few questions put to each by a person who had been appointed to do this, and therefore styled the "Class Leader." I, a little boy, without any previous instruction

or preparation, never seeing this Class Leader but officially, apart from my parents, for they belonged to other "Classes" was asked the same questions as a rough, ignorant, middle aged man who had been just "converted," and expected to answer them in the same way. Religion was reduced to a very few points, and very narrow dimensions indeed. There was first "the awakening" "the conviction;" then "the repentance" and weeping, and misery, and praying for pardon and "liberty;" then the delivery, the being "set at liberty," justification; the progress to "sanctification" or "perfection," which some old, knotted, hardened sinners after their conversion attained by a bound, being awakened, justified and sanctified or made quite "perfect," free from all sin in thought, word, and deed in the course of a few months, perhaps, if it was the time of "a revival," in as many weeks. The older and more sober members would occasionly look incredulous, sometimes a little shocked when a savage, ignorant butcher who had been the terror of the country for his reckless profanity, and who even at the time would relate with an air of satisfaction how frightened mothers used to be lest their children should hear his languge, when such a man rose and told when and how he had been "convinced of his sin and danger," had been "pardoned" and assured, at the time, of his pardon, had joined the Methodists, (though this always happened before the pardon and assurance,) had heard of sanctification and had struggled and prayed for it all night, perhaps, and all day, and this for weeks, and had obtained it, always "in a moment," and always with some accompanying sign in feeling and emotion. When I speak of a savage ignorant butcher it is not imagination. I have a very vivid recollection of such a butcher, a tall, ungainly heavy man, whose countenance was really set in vice, whose eyes would have been sufficient to condemn him had he been on his trial. At this man's voice I had, as I well remember, a secret nervous horror; for he belched out prayers and praises and accounts of the "dealings of God with his soul" just as he used to belch out oaths. His very manner was profane; and the way in which he uttered the ever blessed name was, or seemed to me to be blasphemy. He had no modesty (how should he?) no respect, no reverence. He interrupted every one, censured without hesitation whatever he thought deserving of censure in another, no matter who. And this great monster was—poh pudor!—"sanctified," "made perfect"! Yes, he could tell you when it was done, where, and how, and all about it. He seemed to know quite as much about it as its divine author. And the process so far as you would understand it was quite a mechanical one. He had been "justified" he said; and he spent his time, when the slaughtering was done for the day, at meetings in his neighbourhood where the excitement was kept up. His Sundays in like manner were past in excitement till at length having heard of sanctification so much and so often he began to think of it for himself. Why not? He saw nothing against it; and it would have puzzled any one else to say any thing against it on the principle so popular amongst them. He set to work. The way was this. When it came into anyone's head that he ought to be sanctified—that "it was his duty to enjoy this blessing," he commenced privately, or he went to a "prayer meeting," or some sort of "meeting," the choice depending upon himself, and determined

generally by taste or temperament, sometimes by accident. Either way, he must pray till he got it. He must "wrestle" like Jacob, he must "struggle," he must "agonize." It was always, or generally very hard work. But to be successful a man must be unwearied and invincible. And when God was, like the unjust steward, "wearied" he gave way, and the "violent" and noisy applicant carried away "the blessing" "by force." This process in truth was so common as to constitute the rule, and those persons who professed "sanctification" were generally persons who had obtained it in this way. And in this way the butcher who had been notorious as "a fighter" before his conversion, fought his way to the possession of sanctification.

To be continued.

DOES THE WORD *HELL* IN THE OLD TESTAMENT MEAN A PLACE OR STATE OF ENDLESS SUFFERING?

The Rev. Theodore Clapp, D.D. of New Orleans, an eminent and faithful advocate of the world's salvation; has published the following correspondence in the "Picayune" of that City.

Gentlemen,—Will you allow me through the medium of your valuable paper, to address the religious community of New Orleans a few observations concerning some strictures on my views of the Bible from the pen of Mr. Twichell, which appeared in the "Delta" last Sunday morning. These criticisms were first published in the same paper about two years ago. Their incorrectness was then shown in an article which was inserted in the Picayune—I am desirous that those interested in this subject should not be misled by any erroneous statements about the original scriptures.

Now my statement is, that the *word Hell, in the sense of a place of endless punishment for the wicked does not occur once in all the Hebrew Old Testament.* This position Mr. Twichell would have his readers to believe, is untrue. Now, since the gentleman is familiar with oriental literature, he will oblige the sceptical by pointing out the chapter and verse of the original where the term above mentioned can be found. I have read my Hebrew Bible every day for thirty years (when at home and in health) with the help of an excellent dictionary. I cannot find therein the phrase in question. I believe any Hebrew scholar living can testify to the same experience. There are two gentlemen of the Jewish faith now in this city who are probably better acquainted with Hebrew literature than any Christian minister in the United States. Mr. Leeser, of Philadelphia, and Mr. Nathan, recently called to preside over the new synagogue in Canal Street. I am permitted to publish the following note, which they were so kind as to address to me this morning.

"Dear Sir—As far as my knowledge of our Scripture extends, I know of no term which is at all equivalent to the English word *Hell,* although I have so rendered the word "*Sheol*" in Psalm xvi. in the edition of the prayer book of our church; I did so because I could find no other word which more nearly expresses it; but it would be folly to assume that *Sheol* meant unconditional and hopeless and everlasting punishment—The term at best is indefinite, and so is the word *Hell,* as in itself it surely can have no such widespread meaning

which is merely assigned to it arbitrarily by theologians, and if we carefully scan the verse, "For thou will not abandon my soul to hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy pious servant to see corruption;" and take this as a correct rendering of the Hebrew, or as near as we can come to it, it thus means, that though for a time punished for some cause or the other, the abandoning could not be final and that the residence in *Sheol* should not be degenerated into *Shachet* "or corruption.

Respectfully yours,

"Rev. Theo. Clapp. Isaac Leeser."

"I fully concur with the explanation given above by the Rev. Mr. Leeser."

"Rev. Theo. Clapp. M. N. Nathan."

UNIVERSALISM IN LIVERPOOL.

The Chapel in which for many years the Christians believing and avowing the doctrine of God's sovereign and unlimited love in Liverpool have been wont to worship is now closed. The building in course of erection will, we believe, be completed during the present month. We understand that a sum of about £400 is still required to cover the cost of the new structure. Our friends at Liverpool love *justice* as well as *mercy*, and like all honest people are anxious to be free from debt; gratified should we be to know that their object—the opening the new chapel unencumbered by debt—is accomplished. Unable to raise the amount themselves, they have appealed to Universalists generally for their co-operation in this good work. When it is known that the present movement of our friends at Liverpool partakes literally of the character of a testimonial of their esteem for their pastor* we are persuaded that the very honest wishes of the Liverpool congregation will be realized. The appeal to Universalists generally is most fitting; and we doubt not that very many throughout the country who have been edified and benefited by the invaluable writings of Dr. Thom, will be grateful for this opportunity of testifying their respect for an individual who by his pen as well as his preaching, has for a quarter of a century, in the face of opposition, at all hazards, and at great personal sacrifice, honestly, consistently, devoutly, and laboriously maintained and defended the cause of Scriptural Universalism.

A STORY OF GRACE.

(Continued from page 87.)

CHAP. IV.

To the respect in which he was held by his employers George Richardson was indebted for many kind enquiries after his health made by them during his absence from business, and now he was able to get about again, they liberally and without solicitation granted him leave of absence that he might visit his friends in the country, and by the change of air regain that strength and vigour which his protracted confinement had impaired. The offer was gratefully accepted, and George once more found himself under the parental roof where he was received with the kindest affection by his parents and a fraternal welcome by his brother. His native air, healthy exercise and cheerful society, contributed to the speedy improvement of the convalescent. Accompanied by his brother James, he frequently enjoyed a country walk.

One day they took a stroll in the Church-yard, and their conversation naturally took a more serious turn. James pointed out many a

* The new property is to be appropriated as a provision for the Doctor's numerous family.

newly-raised mound beneath which had been deposited the earthly remains of one and another of George's old acquaintances. They grew sad at the recognition of many a stone erected to the memory of young has well as old whom "the last enemy" had consigned to earth's final resting-place.

"Here lies little Jane Maxwell," said James; "a month ago she was a very joy amidst all that was gladsome. I rather like that verse they have put upon her tomb stone, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not."

"Ah," exclaimed George, "'*forbid* them not;' and yet children generally, feel that there is something very forbidding in Him who came to reveal the *Father*. Jesus Christ may have been very attractive to little children while on earth, but they are now taught so much that is repulsive that there is not much chance I apprehend, for the administration of a similar reproof to that which the disciples erroneously gave on the occasion which drew from the Saviour those beautiful words."

"True," observed James somewhat thoughtfully, "the cup of salvation is tendered to them much as a dose of physic would be, and is generally rejected by the child as objectionable as a black draught."

"Of course," returned George, "I do not suppose that the nature and tendency of a child are really different from those of a man, and therefore the discovery of a certain amount of disinclination in the child to heavenly things would not surprise me. But when I think of the dreadfully black colours in which juvenile divinity paints the Being whom the Scriptures represent as yearning with affection even over those whose sins reach to heaven—when I think of the "dreadful hell" with which it is always found convenient and sometimes a pleasure to threaten them, and the "darkness, fire and chains" by which the Almighty is made to them "the king of terrors," I confess it makes my blood boil. Let me hope that little Janie escaped all this; indeed, she could hardly have been so merry a child had she been at all impressed with such diabolical notions. Her mother must have felt her loss exceedingly."

"Janie seemed to have no grief, and 'like a dew-drop, she sparkled, was exaled, and caught to heaven.'"

"And here lies that old miser, Tom Rich," exclaimed George, pointing to stone, "with nothing 'sacred to' his 'memory' but his name and age."

"Pity so much as that is said; to money not affection is he indebted for that. I know not what redeeming quality he had; the miserable wretch scarcely had a friend to close his eyes in death, though as rich as Crœsus. To happiness he was, I am sure, a perfect stranger."

"Doubtless he suffered the woe of those who, in their all-absorbing covetousness, join house to house; and now though he might have erected a graceful and enduring monument to his memory in the affections of those around him by a wise disposal of his wealth, he will soon be forgotten—'the name of the wicked will rot.'"

"You may recollect Mrs. Harwood, George; she is buried here. There was always something about her which people did not understand. She was upright and rigidly correct, and yet so ready to excuse

and pass by the faults of others,—so apparently indifferent about that which arouses the Christian bile of others—that she has been said to be atheistically inclined. Her pity, always practical, seemed to be boundless, and though she was known to read her bible for several hours during the day, her carelessness about Church, which she did not very often attend, confirmed the suspicion that she was not religious."

"I should hope that her unexceptionable morality—and I do not overlook her forgivingness, it is one thing to pass by a fault and another to connive at it—was the result of religious feeling. Her constant reference to the scriptures induces in my mind the persuasion that she knew and loved the truth and lived under its influence."

The brothers were now before her grave-stone and George read aloud as follows;

'SACRED TO THE MEMORY OF
MRS. HARRIET HARWOOD
WHO DEPARTED THIS LIFE, JANUARY 17th. 17—
AGED 63 YEARS'

'Christian and Christless—men of all names and creeds,
The black with crimes, the bright with virtuous deeds,
The king, the beggar, friend and foe are here,
The rich, the poor, the peasant and the peer,
All meet together in dread death's domain,
Unvarying equality doth here obtain.
We equal are as Adam's children, all
Equal—as sharers in his guilty fall;
Equal in birth, for we brought nothing in
Equal as taking nothing out again.
But (cheering thought!) death cannot hold for aye
Those for whom Christ ascended up on high:
He is death's plagues, and grave's destructions, he
Who came to loose and set the pris'ners free.
For one and all he shed his precious blood
That we, far off, might be brought nigh to God.
Equal in condemnation, all the guilty race
Alike are loved and saved by sovereign grace.
Sinful and helpless I his mercy trust
To raise the guilty from this bed of dust—
That all in Christ shall rise this glorious strain to sing,
O grave where is thy victory? O death where is thy sting?'

George was silent.

"The old lady," observed James, "desired those lines to be placed upon her stone, and Parson Brooks says they were written by her for that purpose. His reverence did not much admire them, but he engaged to see her wish carried out."

"This is very singular" at length exclaimed George; "I think I can clear up the mystery of her character, James. But we must return home; had she any books besides her bible? and who has them now?"

"I have heard that she never read any other book but the bible, although she had quite a little library. Her brother comes in for her property, a good slice of which, however, has been bequeathed to the charities of the neighbourhood."

The brothers' conversation was somewhat abruptly interrupted by the approach of an old town acquaintance who walked home with them; of whom more in the next chapter.

POETRY.

THE SPIRITUAL MINISTRY.

"Ye are a royal priesthood, a peculiar people, to shew forth the *virtues* of Him who hath called you . . . . and to offer *spiritual* sacrifices . . . . by Jesus Christ."—1 Pet. ii. 4—9.

What is the Spirit's ministry? it is
The life of God within the soul of man;
Begotten, quickened,—embryo life it is—
Christ *in* ourselves, of sin and death the ban.

It ministers in living pulses warm,
As from the heart of God to *all* mankind;
It manifests itself amid the storm
Or sunshine of man's day, and breathes God's mind.

Ours is its ministry in God's dear Son,
When to the sinner we proclaim His love,
When by *refracted* love His will is done,
All selfish, speculative, end above.

Ours is the Spirit's ministry in speech.
Which tells of Jesus to a broken heart,
Or when, with tenderness, we do beseech
The heedless ones to choose the better part.

Their's is fond ministry, "*without the word*,"
Who win a husband to the Saviour's fold;
Or who so wield the word—the Spirit's sword—
That wife or child need not to be control'd.

And ours the Spirit's ministry, whene'er
We teach our child the work of Christ for him,
For him and for *all* men, howe'er
Man's heart runs o'er with hatred to its brim.

We minister in faithfulness to them;
We urge to flee from youthful bents, which war
Against the Spirit, and their joys condemn,
That from *God's wells* they purer pleasures draw.

We minister in holy things when we
Lift up our hearts and hands to God, and pray
For loving friends, or for our enemy,
And for the weal of both select our way.

We minister in Jesu's peace to those—
We tranquillize 'mid outrages and wrongs—
Who desp'rately but aggravate their woes.
By rushing headlong to rebellion's thongs.

We minister as God's belov'd, indeed,
When we avert the shedding of man's blood;
Acting as Christ in every time of need;
Extending e'en to foes His *brotherhood*.

We minister in God's own love, when light
And truth we pour on ignorance;
Dispelling, with His Word, the mental night,
Which wraps our brother in a death-fraught trance.

In holy things we minister again,
When by the bed of dreaded death we kneel,
And banish terror from the soul in pain,
By notes of *resurrection's* joyful peal.

We minister for Christ, unto "*the world*,"
When we hold firm the Spirit's unity;
And "*shew forth*" by one loving act unfurled,
Love's banner, in the emblems of community.

We minister to love when cherished saints
Are gathered on some gladsome meeting day,
While to meet with them our own spirit faints,
And, yet, for *other's* good, we keep away!

Or when, with some beloved brother, we
Might spend a time congenial to our soul,
We yet forego the sweet fraternity,
And to some sterner calling,—self control.

We minister in true devotion blest,
When selfish care in living is denied;
In toil—in temper for *another's* best—
Following the lead of the self-sacrificed!

And so, too, they who, called *by the Church*,
Accept the Bishop's *poor, inglorious*, lot;
To oversee and *aid*, with jealous search,
The Church to *purge itself* from each foul blot.

These ministries divine us here do make
The people Jesus came to *consecrate;*
Lifting up holy hands for His loved sake,
Bearing in our own hearts th' *at-one*-ment's freight.

Making our calling and election sure;
Inborn salvation, working out its end;
In undefiled religion blameless, pure,
Proving that God and Christ,—*not men*—us send.

In Christ's anointed, and to God's heart dear;
Sav'ring of life to life, of death to death!
We consecrate or we condemn whate'er
We touch—make free or fetter by our breath!

The mart, the counter, or the servitude,
Is heavenly calling when *we* hallow it;
Each bears the impress of beatitude,
For ours the working lamp by Jesus lit!

Priests and priestesses to our God above,
And to the Lamb,—the sacred fire we keep
Ever alive in offices of love,
In vigils, and in prayers, that never sleep.

Joint-heirs of God, with Christ, God-sealed are we!
And such our ministries till all be done;
Strangers and pilgrims in our loyalty,
We live but to God's world-rejected Son.

Waiting our rightful King and kingdom here;
A race *peculiar* Jesus to fulfil:
Till He triumphant, to our joy appear,
And we remain His own "peculiar" still!

MATAAD.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ON THE SECOND DEATH.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

CHRISTIAN SIR,—I have it on my mind to send you a short paper concerning this subject. But before I send it, I am anxious to ask of your correspondents, who have written, or may be preparing to write, an answer to the following question.

What *one* distinctly worded portion of the Scrirpture can be produced which so *explicitly*, states that human beings have died, or will die, and that the very same beings will be *raised* again to die '*the second death*,' and then, after that, *again* to be raised, or *finally* destroyed by it?

Or in other words,

Is "*Resurrection*," using that word in the one pure uniform sense in which the Scriptures *always* use it, ever so applied? and *death* a *second time* distinctly spoken of, for such very bodies, which have died *once*? The language being so palpable and clear that no one can possibly *deny* it, without at once positively *disowning* the very *word* of God itself.

The importance of the subject is great and solemn, and should be most gravely weighed in every Christian's mind who touches it in preaching or writing, and for this cause I now agitate the *preliminary* enquiry. I have read all I could meet with, and feel sadly disappointed at the *lack* of any *Scriptural* evidence. I find that *that* truth, "*the second death*," like every other truth *misunderstood*, hampered with *discrepancy*, by writers *assuming* the foundation on which they build their positions, instead of simply laying such foundation in the most *unmistakeable* language of Scripture itself. Hence arising such very conflicting statements of writers on this awful point.

I wish it to be understood, that *assumptions*,—*conjectures*—or *inferences* ought not to *satisfy* a Christian searching the Word, with God fearing simplicity, on any *one* given doctrine, and most certainly not on so *fearful* a theme as *the second death*.

I am aware it is common to refer to *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, and also to what is not unfrequently (*but most unscripturally*) called "*the wicked dead*," as a proof of this statement, the "*second death*" of *bodies*, but I say, with much Christian kindness and decision, this is by no means satisfactory to *me*;—at the most, only *inferential* assertion, which clashes sadly with the *Harmony* of the word of the Lord Jesus Christ.

There can be no Resurrection, but by Christ, and therefore, He must be the Father of all human beings raised, and these said bodies raised must be either corruptible (*sinful*) or incorruptible (*sinless*) and the difficulty is *insurmountable* in maintaining the Lord Jesus to be the *author* of such a *resurrection* on either view, for "*second death*," thereby making the Saviour who died "*to condemn sin in flesh*," the *Producer* of a more *unutterably awful curse* than sin in flesh is ever revealed as *producing*!

I beg, Christian Sir, to ask permission for this paper, appearing in your next number, to give any Christian brother or sister, during the *intervening* month and prior to your receiving my paper, for the December number, an opportunity to state any, or what Scriptures explicitly mention *Resurrection*: and *after* that "*the second death*."

UN TOUT SEUL.

REVIEWS.

"*Three Grand Exhibitions of Man's Enmity to God*." BY DAVID THOM, D.D., PH. D. Bold Street Chapel, Liverpool.—London: H. K. Lewis, 15, Gower Street, North; Liverpool, George Philip. 1845.

(*Continued from page* 225)

But we must hasten to a consideration of the third and last part of this deeply interesting work, "Denial of divinely revealed Fact," as the third grand Exhibition of man's Enmity to God.— And to speak candidly we fear this part will be found more valuable than either of the others to the captious cavilling critic, and to such we gladly leave the disagreeable ill natured task, only hinting that perhaps the fifth chapter is somewhat too speculative: not but the author has good grounds or data for many of his views and inferences; yet they are for the most part so dark and gloomy, that we would fain hope he has overwrought the picture.—Towards the conclusion of this chapter he eloquently writes:—

"In Christ's own words, which is ever a pillar of cloud to the world, but of light to the church, separating the one from the other, Exodus xiv. 19, 20. will he to his people be more and more drawing near; while like lightning "heaven's red artillery" flashing from east to west, will the true consuming fire of divine revelation, (2 Thes. ii. 8, Heb. xii. 29) be gleaming fitfully from Asia's fertile plains, through cultivated Europe, to lands situated beyond the broad Atlantic wave."

The divinely revealed Fact which the "natural man" so stupidly (we will not say wilfully) denies and thus exhibits his greatest enmity to God, is set forth by Dr. Thom in a manner at once so bold, straightforward, and manly, and in a strain, that to us who can see and believe the glorious truth, is most cheering and delightful.

As an example take this.—

"The gift of everlasting life by God to man is proclaimed as what actually exists; as *a blessing already bestowed;* as what the creature enjoys certainly and indefeasibly, in Christ Jesus the Creator and second Adam, in spite of whatever as a descendant of the first Adam, and of whatever he may have personally been, may be, and is. Heavenly blessings according to the gospel, as made known since the days of the apostles, *do actually belong* to the creature, not *may belong* to him.

"How clear and unequivocal such a statement! is not this an exhibition of the very height of generosity on the part of God? The gift itself not earthly, but heavenly blessings; not temporary, but everlasting enjoyments, not improved human nature, but the divine nature. And the conditions. Conditions? There are none. Nothing is required on the part of the creature; all is graciously and gratuitously bestowed by the Creator."

Again page 291:—

"Spiritual conscience is the mind rejoicing in the knowledge of a salvation which has been *freely* bestowed upon it, in consequence of all the conditions prescribed by divine law, *having been fulfilled by the Son of God;* and as it progresses is that mind rejoicing more and more in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made it free."

This is very beautiful and delightful, and to those who "have ears to hear," experimentally felt to be indeed "glad tidings of great joy," but to all others, viz. the spiritual asleep and dead, the "dead in trespasses and sins," to all such, as to the learned and philosopical Greeks of old, of course, "*foolishness.*"

The fourth chapter of this third portion of the work is on the non miraculous but wholly spiritually nature of the third and last æra in which the greatest exhibition of human enmity is manifested.—In this part there are some very sensible remarks on war, as a directly anti-christian practice. And certainly the writer has high authority to support him in his condemnation of it, for our Saviour greatly disapproved, and in strong language condemned all war defensive as well as offensive.—And how could the Prince of Peace sanction such demoniac work? Perhaps defensive war appears (but it it only in appearance) more justifiable than offensive, yet remembering the trite adage the *second blow makes the battle*, it is quite clear if there were no defenders there could be no battle, consequently no war: so in this point of view, the defender is the most guilty, since it rests with him, whether there shall be peace or war; whether he will magnanimously forgive, or foolishly and wickedly return the blow, and thus commence a warfare that but, for his weak and sinful conduct would never have taken place.

On pages 316 &c. is described a much higher, more spiritual, and we should say, a more acceptable worship and service, seeing it must necessarily spring from the heart, than the repeating at set times, prescribed forms of prayer before men, as if in imitation of the disgusting Pharisees, who did so "*to be seen of men;*" and which called forth from our Lord such severe animadversions. Indeed both by precept and example, the blessed Lord and Saviour condemned the custom, for *he never prayed in public*, no, when he wished to enjoy this privilege he always retired *apart*: even in the garden of Gethsemane, when he had only three individuals with him, it is recorded, he *left* them to pray the Father if it were possible the cup might pass from him; yea, each separate time it is said, he went *away again and prayed*; and so should we, had we high and delicate notions of prayer.

There is not one instance given of Christ's going into the synagogue to pray, though many of his entering it "*to teach and to preach.*" And his instructions on prayer shew the same disapprobation of public worship: But thou, when thou prayest, enter *into thy closet, and when thou hast shut the door*, pray to thy Father, which is in secret, and thy Father which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly. Matt. vi. 6.

That a body of men should be set apart to make the Scriptures their exclusive study, and then give the result of that study in sermons and expositions from the pulpit "every sabbath day" is all very proper and desirable; because there are numbers, who have neither the leisure or ability to study for themselves, and also many who though they may have the ability, have not the op-

portunity, so much do secular affairs occupy them; then these secular affairs unfit the mind for the task, for, as in the days of the Apostles so now "the spirit lusteth against the flesh, and the flesh against the spirit." Gal. v. 17. But we would have men, both clergy and laity, *pray at home, in their closets*, and pray with the heart and understanding, and not with the lips merely, which last kind of prayer never has reached the throne of grace, nor never will. There would be *apparently* less devotion, and in reality far fewer prayers *said*, but we hope, indeed feel confident there would be more real true devotion, such as springs from the heart, and not the mere empty offering of *lip service* which in the sight of God, all know, or ought to know, is an *abomination*.

Pages 328—9 contain remarks on poverty and the poor which we cannot exactly pass over *sub silentio;* thus our author writes:—

"Allowances to the poor are cut down to the lowest possible degree; the usage to which they are exposed is of the harshest description; and even oppression of them when calculated to save the pockets of the wealthy, not only meets with impunity, but occasionally with approbation."

Again:

"Under the Christian dispensation they actually enjoy fewer comforts and privileges than they did under the inferior and despised dispensation of Moses."

This last assertion, that the poor have fewer privileges under the Christian than the Mosaic dispensation, we are much disposed to doubt and gainsay, for they were then as now equally subject to the "proud man's contumely," and other pains and penalties attendant upon poverty, according to the testimony of Solomon, Job, and other old Testament writers. We fear there is more truth in the former; yet it may be said in extenuation, it is almost necessary, for were the poor not treated with some degree of severity, they would soon live altogether, like drones in a hive, upon the industrious and provident part of the community, so indolent is man by nature, and so rarely is he imbued with a proper, laudible spirit of independence. Then it should be borne in mind, though poverty is not a crime in itself, it is in nineteen cases out of twenty the effect of crime, yea, the inevitable effect, and just punishment and retribution. What can the vices of extravagance, idleness, drunkenness, &c. bring their victims to but poverty? Slothfulness casteth into a deep sleep, and an *idle soul shall suffer hunger*." Prov. xix. 15. also Ibid, xx. 13, xxiv. 30—34. xxviii, 19. &c. and in the New Testament it is written:—"If any would not work, neither should he eat. 2 Thessalonians iii. 10. There are also many more passages to the same effect, both in the Old andNew Testament Scriptures, that we could point out, had we space to insert them. Yet we are far from approving of undue severity, indeed any except where it is absolutely required to check the idle from living upon the industrious; and consider it ill becomes our fellow-creature thus to treat another wantonly and that it shows a sad deficiency of Christian charity and benevolence. The poor, from their ignorance and the puerile state of their minds, like children, have a strong claim upon our indulgence and forbearance, yet there are cases in which we should do both injustice did we not treat them with severity.

The last and concluding chapter gives

1st. An explanation of the nature and extent of man's enmity and of man's punishment, as distinguished from their progressive manifestations; secondly, of the nature and extent of the divine Mercy, as distinguished from its progressive manifestations, and thirdly, of the way in which law, sin, and death are progressively destroyed.

In considering this subject, we would remark whether it were necessary or not man's nature should be manifested so progressively; it certainly was that the divine nature ("God is love") should, since from the very limited nature of man's faculties and these being at first wholly undeveloped it was utterly impossible he could receive or bear the full blaze of Deity, as "the all in all;" (conceiving the manifestation of God or the divine Mercy to be the best manifestation of his nature, i. e. of himself.) Indeed, we suspect man has but an extremely faint glimpse now of the Deity in this advanced stage of manifesta-

tion, and can only have whilst in flesh; for, to use the original and graphic language of Shakespeare, with a slight alteration:—

> "But whilst this *muddy vesture of decay*
> Doth grossly close us in, we *cannot see it*,"

that is in all its length, and breadth and height and depth. Yet the fact is, Deity and his divine attribute of mercy are, as to the letter, as much revealed or manifested, and have been now for near two thousand years, as ever they will be, the volume of inspiration being closed for ever; still man receives the manifestation progressively and in proportion as his mental faculties become developed and his mind spiritualized. And as this developement and spiritualization are now partial and limited; hence the now partial and limited glimpse of Deity and this divine attribute.

In speaking of the destruction of law, sin and death, both actually and virtually, Dr. Thom thus states it:

"In Jesus as crucified descending into hades, and in his rising again from the dead, law, sin and death, were in so far as he himself was personally concerned, actually destroyed. And in so far as the church and the world are concerned law, sin and death were, in the three events just enumerated as having happened to our blessed Lord, virtually destroyed likewise. In the conscience of every man who is born from above, law, sin and death, are so far as the knowledge and nature of Christ glorified extend, destroyed also; being swallowed up now in earnest, and hereafter in the fulness of divine love, righteousness and life. The love of God superseding law, the righteousness of God superseding sin, and the life of God superseding death by swallowing it up in victory." 1 Cor. xv. 54.

"Not so however, externally or manifestatively, and in so far as this world is concerned, are law sin and death destroyed." "These enemies of man, looked at it in the way I am about to bring them under notice, are seen to undergo a progressive destruction or annihilation."

Here reference is made to the 20th. and seven following verses of xv. chap. of 1st. Cor.

Again speaking of the epochs or periods mentioned in Scripture the Dr. says:—

"Besides the three æras epochs or periods of which I have already treated, three other epochs, æras or periods, connected with the former, and yet distinct from them, are alluded to and marked out in Scripture. The first runs from the beginning of the world till the close of the apostolic ministry, the perfecting of the volume of inspiration, and the destruction of Jerusalem. This period embraces the whole series of miraculous divine interpositions, of all kinds and for all purposes. The second runs from the close of the one just alluded to till the end of time and of this present world. During this period, no miracles exist, or can exist; every thing proceeding according to fixed general principles, whether natural or spiritual. The *third runs from the end of time till the consummation of all things.*"

Query when is to be the *locus standi* of this third and last period, if it is not to commence till *after* "time shall be no more," and the destruction of this present world shall have taken place?

Because it is clear the events of this last period cannot occur on this earth, if it is to be destroyed and swept away previously; and yet one cannot but suppose they must have some place, stage or theatre on which they may be enacted—Dr. Thom describes it, p. 487, as a period when there will be no divine law, but if we understand him right, at the *present time* there is no divine law, that, according to him, having been abolished when the Mosaic dispensation was overturned, and assuredly that is the case to the believer to whom "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness." Rom. x. 4.

Then as to the term "the consummation of all things," we see little in Scripture to lead us to expect that this world, as a planetary orb, is destined ever to be destroyed, natural as it is to infer that whatever has had a beginning must have an end. The world was said to be destroyed by the flood, yet we know it was only man and the other living creatures which were destroyed, and that we are now living on the same veritable earth Adam and all the other anti-diluvians did.—As geology informs us, there was a time when the earth was in such a

state, man could not exist upon it, so it is possible that by volcanic agency and concurrant causes it may again become so unfit a residence for him, that he must of necessity cease to be a denizen on it; but that then by the wonderful power of God (for what is too hard for Him to effect?) it may be a very suitable and delightful place of abode for a much higher order of beings than man. Yet whilst this globe retains its present position as a heavenly body and continues to revolve on its axis, so as to produce day and night, summer and winter, spring and autumn, we cannot see how time can be no more: because for that to be effected there must be one perpetual *now* knowing no change whatever; since it is only by the alternation of day and night and the variations of the seasons that the flight of time is marked, or that that flight becomes perceptible.

But much that Dr. Thom refers to this period appears to us to be going on *now*.—It is, he says, to be a "period of death;" and so is the *present* time, for the majority assuredly are dead, "dead in trespasses and sins," and none but the "little flock" who alone have part in the "first resurrection," can, in the proper sense of the word "life," be said to be alive. Then animal life, in whatever degree of vigour and strength it may be possessed, compared with spiritual and eternal life, is only death; hence the reason why our Saviour said every man, possessing only such life, is "*counted dead while he liveth.*"

On page 471—2 is drawn the delightful and enviable state of mind of the believer in such language that we should like to give the whole, but for want of space can only bring in the concluding sentence or two; as follows;—

"Being now the servant of love, he has of necessity thereby become also the *servant of righteousness*, Rom. vi. 18. viii 4,—And thus he who is made the recipient of the divine principle, through God in the Scriptures personally addressing him, Matt. vii. 9. Rev. xiii. 9, besides finding as, a matter of fact, that as one with Christ glorified he is set free from the bondage of law, Rom. viii. 4, finds also that in virtue of the same divine relation, *the bondage of sin and death has as to him passed away for* ever."—John viii. 36, 1st. John iii. 6—8: Gal. ii. 20.

Lengthened as our comments and extracts have become, we cannot conclude without again confidently recommending not only this work, but *all* Dr. Thom has written to the attention of the public, as the productions of a *master-mind*, and of one who is a full century before his age. And let none be discouraged by the labour they require; for certainly there is much real hard reading in them; but then the style is so first rate and the arguments so clear and strong that they soon, as it were, rivit the reader's mind to the subject, and so closely, that he forgets the toil in the profit and instruction he is reaping.

We have now done, as it is not our purpose to touch upon the Appendix where Dr. Thom, with his usual acuteness and ability, answers some objections raised by two reviewers against his "Divine Inversion." E.

An Analytical Arrangement of the Holy Scriptures, according to the principles developed under the name of Parallelism, in the writings of Bishop Lowth, Bishop Jebb, and the Rev. Thomas Boys. With an Appendix and Notes. By Richard Baillie Roe, B.A. In two vols. 8vo. Pp. xxi, 566, and 618. London, H. K. Lewis, Gower Street, North. 1851.

Sadly puzzled and perplexed often are Reviewers when summoned to act in their critical capacity. What course of conduct shall they pursue in regard to him, who stands for the moment at their bar? Shall he be dealt with harshly or leniently? Shall his errors and shortcomings be laid thoroughly open to public view, or shall a mantle of charity be thrown over him? Shall he be condemned without mercy, or extolled to the skies? In such a state of dubiety, it is true, a conscientious man will rarely, if ever, be involved. And should he be so, he will get out of it, by being guided in his decision by an upright and impartial consideration of the circumstances of the case. But all reviewers are not conscientious men. Hence spring their chief difficulties and their manner

of extricating themselves from them. Hence, instead of an attempt being made to untie the Gordian Knot, it is too frequently cut, and an opinion pronounced, not having reference solely to the merits of the work, but under the influence of private attachment, party spirit, the dictates of fashion, personal interest, or personal malignity. Whim and caprice, it is to be feared, in but too many instances turn the scale. "Man clothed with a little brief authority," literary as well as social, is apt to "play very fantastic tricks."

Of all the situations of difficulty, however, in which a reviewer can be placed, perhaps the most embarrassing is that in which he cannot but be aware, that his author knows vastly more about the subject treated of, than he himself does. This is no uncommon case. Nay, it is extremely common. How under such circumstances is the critic to act? Authors in general do write, or at all events should write, respecting subjects with which they have not only some acquaintance, but which they have carefully studied, and of which, under certain aspects at least, they have made themselves masters. What right, indeed, has any man, unless *au fait* in regard to some particular department of knowledge, to pretend to enlighten his fellows concerning it? Critics however are differently situated. Whatever may be the extent of their personal vanity, or however conventionally a sort of omniscience may be ascribed to them, it must be obvious to the least reflective mind, that as respects a great variety of topics, they must be either entirely, or in a great measure ignorant. They cannot know every thing. Few or none of them are "admirable Chrichtons," or can boast of the learning and memory of a Magliabeechi. To them applies emphatically, the *vita brevis, ars longa.* A smattering of knowledge is all that at the utmost, on most topics, they can possess; and well for them, if even this be properly digested and accurate. What are such parties to do when men cleverer and better informed than themselves are brought up for judgment? Critics they are, or have constituted themselves. In this capacity, a decision is expected at their hands. Shall they confess their ignorance, and consequently their inability to try the case? Alas! this is rather too much to expect from poor, frail, proud humanity. The critic fancies that he must say something authoritatively. Whatever may be the extent of his knowledge, or rather of his ignorance, the oracle must speak. Nothing must escape his lips of the nature of an acknowledgment of incapacity. And what better mode of disguising his inferiority, than by giving himself airs, and rightly or wrongly playing the part of censor? The author, therefore, is found fault with. His talents and learning are underrated. Although, it may be, the critic is totally unable to understand the author's principles, follow him in his reasonings, and appreciate the force of his conclusions, he is nevertheless incessantly cavilling, making much of petty blemishes and absolutely bursting out into an *Io, triumphe,* on occasion of the rectifying of a wrong date, or the supplying of the *exact words,* and the *exact page* of a quotation. Occasionally the inferiority of the judge is attempted to be concealed, by a different species of tactics. He affects to act the part of patron. His author is insulted, by being made the object of his pity. He, perhaps, "damns him with faint praise," or gives him the benefit of his kind and condescending suggestions. Thus by dint of sheer impudence, are ignorance and knowledge made to exchange places. The critic, whose acquaintance with a subject may not amount to one thousandth part of that which is exhibited in the able and carefully written production lying before him, is found, strange to tell, *cutting it up,* and consigning it and its author to the ridicule of his contemporaries. If he can do nothing else, Zoilus-like, he can carp. And provided that his notice be cleverly and plausibly written, ten chances to one but his ignorance and presumption are, by a discerning public crowned with the laurels which justly belong to him, whose learned labours he has been malevolently engaged in distorting and depreciating.

Feelingly have the preceeding observations been penned. As regards *Scripture Parallelism,* and in several other respects, we stand in the position of inferiors to him, whose book now lies on our table, and claims our attention. Our pride is of course grievously wounded, both by the fact, and by the necessity

of admitting it. But no practical difficulty, if any moment, is experienced by us on this account. The path of duty is abundantly plain. So far from being disposed to carp at or disparage the "Analytical Arrangement," because emanating from one who has outstripped us in his attainments, and acquaintance with the subject of which he treats—how much by lapse of time, and engagement in other pursuits, of what we once knew concerning it, have we forgotten!—and so far from deeming ourselves qualified to patronize that, which soars into a region of knowledge far beyond our ken, we are content merely to draw attention to the book, and to express our heart-felt admiration of the ability, learning, taste, discrimination, and industry, which we find every page of it to display.

Mr. Roe who on the present occasion appears before the public—formerly Richard Roe, now *distinctionis causa*, and by the addition of his mother's maiden name, Richard Baillie Roe—is no new or unknown author. A veteran in years, he is also a veteran in literature. Eighty-seven or eighty-eight summers have passed over the head of this venerable and venerated man. And in the fields of literature and science, he has long been an able, an arduous and a successful worker. The Royal Irish Academy, Grafton Street, Dublin, was for a period of seventeen years, benefited by his services as its active and painstaking officer. While connected with that influential body, he wrote, and published, under its patronage, his learned and instructive treatise on Rhythm.* This was followed up by his "Analytical Arrangement of the Apocalypse,"† and by two extremely valuable pamphlets on the doctrine of Universal Salvation.‡ Our friend, perhaps, has published more. The works named, we speak of, as having been seen and perused by us. At last, in the decline of life, with "the hoary head as a crown of righteousness," and with nearly exhausted physical energies—at a time long posterior to that at which literary men have either been *donati rude*, or have stept into their graves—Mr. Roe comes forward with a closely printed 8vo. book, comprising, in its two volumes, about 1200 pages. To say merely that it exhibits no trace of senility, is, although true, but faintly and inadequately to describe its merits; for it is characterised by a vigour of intellect, a strength of memory, and a clearness as well as soundness of judgment, eminently fitted to excite our astonishment. Blessed be God, that our dear friend has been spared to complete, and to witness the publication of this his leading work.

Our respect and love for the man, and our admiration of the author, we confess to be almost unbounded. His abandonment of the ministry, in the Established Church, for conscience' sake—his submission to, and profession of the doctrine of Universal Salvation, from the time that it commended itself to his understanding, as a truth of God's most blessed word—his modification of his views concerning it, in proportion as he was enlightened by the Scriptures—his calm, but steadfast and uniform opposition to the awful, because anti-scriptural mode of maintaining it, now so prevalent in the United States of America—his decidedly evangelical sentiments—his pure and spotless life—and the quiet, unobtrusive, influential, and sober piety by which he has ever been distinguished, have positively endeared him to our affections. Besides, who can fail to cherish respect for a mind so benevolent, so honourable, so noble as his? His great talents, we know. His attainments have long struck us, as being not more remarkable, than is the singular modesty, and aversion to display, with which they are accompanied. What the richest mental resources, and the most diversified learning could enable our friend to accomplish, we

* The Principles of Rhythm, both in speech and music. Published under the patronage of the "Royal Irish Academy." Dublin: Printed by R. Graisberry. 1823.

† An Analytical Arrangement of the Apocalypse, or Revelation recorded by St. John; according to the principles developed under the name of Parallelism, &c. By Richard Roe. Dublin: R. M. Tims. 1834.

‡ A short help and incentive to an unbiassed inquiry into the scripture truth of Universalism Dublin 1835; and "Notes in answer to certain parts of three recent pulications on future punishment, to which are added letters to the author from three beneficed clergymen." Dublin, 1836

were prepared for. Every requisite scholarlike qualification, under the guidance and control of the most exquisite taste, we were certain that he possessed and could at any time call into exercise. But, notwithstanding, his actual product has taken us agreeably by surprise. When we considered his advanced age, and the infirmities with which the decline of life is almost necessarily accompanied, we were prepared to make great allowances. Such allowances, however, we find are totally uncalled for. Mr. Roe still handles his lance with power, and hurls it at its object with unerring precision. How few literary men, even in the heyday of youth and vigour, and with all their mental faculties braced and strung to the uttermost, could have produced a work, indicative of such calm, sustained, efficacious, and successful energy?

The "Analytical Arrangement" is, indeed, in more respects than one, a most extraordinary production. When known, it can hardly fail to take its place among the standard theological works of our age and country.

Scarcely has a century elapsed, since that eminent scholar and divine, Robert Lowth, then Professor of Poetry at Oxford, and afterwards Bishop of London, announced in his prelections, *de poesi Hebræorum*, his having discovered certain peculiarities in the construction and arrangement of the Hebrew metre. These consisted, not in the fact of that species of composition being scanned by feet, as among the Greeks and Romans, or in the use of rhymes, as among the moderns. They were connected with the substance, and entered into the very essence of the poetry. They sprang from the subject-matter itself. And by it they were affected and regulated. These peculiar forms he found to be extremely varied. Sometimes a first and a third line, a second and a fourth, corresponded in their structure, as in their matter. Sometimes a first agreed with a fourth, and a second with a third. Sometimes the forms extended over, and embraced larger portions of Holy Writ: a first line holding correspondence with a tenth, a second with a ninth, a third with an eighth, a fourth with a seventh, and a fifth with a sixth. Sometimes twenty lines, and even more, were connected together in varying, but symmetrical forms. In the principal arrangements, subordinate ones he frequently found involved. And the forms in question he observed to be as often dependent on contrast, as on agreement. Nor were the immediate forms all. Forms of peculiar structure he saw after intervals recurring, and bearing a relation to those which had gone before. Larger divisions of these seemed to comprehend smaller ones. The whole assumed to his mind the aspect of a mass of ideal and verbal crystallizations. What had drawn towards it his attention, the learned Bishop has succinctly, but ably and elegantly described and delineated. To the Old Testament, and of it the poetical portions, his observations are almost entirely, we might be justified in saying are altogether confined. *

In the person of a brother-prelate, the late Bishop Jebb of Limerick, Dr. Lowth has found a talented and fitting coadjutor. That distinguished scholar had remarked, that the principle of parallelism applies to portions of the New Testament Scriptures, as well as of the Old. Upon a minute and critical investigation of this subject, he was induced to enter. Discovery after discovery rewarded his labours. And at last he published, as the fruit of them, his "Sacred Literature; comprising a review of the principles of composition laid down by the late Robert Lowth, D.D., Lord Bishop of London, in his Prelections and Isaiah: and an application of the principles so reviewed, to the illustration of the New Testament." London, 1820. This is an elegant, and truly scholarlike production, worthy to take its place along with that of his illustrious predecessor. The tendency of many portions of the New Testament writings to throw themselves into the forms and combinations, which had already caught the eye of Lowth, while prosecuting his inquiries into the nature and structure of Hebrew Poetry, Dr. Jebb has demonstrated in a manner, at once beautiful and convincing.

* His remarks on the subject in his "Prælections" are followed out in his well-known and celebrated Translation of Isaiah, with Notes.

To Mr. Boys, a London Clergyman, however, was reserved the high honour of shewing that the principle observed by the two Bishops and limited by them to compositions of a strictly poetical kind, has a far wider range and extent of application. He was enabled to see that it actually pervades the whole structure of the volume of inspiration. This reverend gentleman, besides having most admirably illustrated the principle in his "Key to the Book of Psalms," has, in his "Tactica Sacra," made "an attempt to develop and to exhibit to the eye, by tabular arrangements," this rule of composition as prevailing throughout even the prosaic portions of the divine record. If not satisfied that Mr. Boys has always succeeded—if suspicious that occasionally he has pushed matters into the regions of conjecture, subtlety, and overstrained refinement—a careful examination of his two works just alluded to, especially of the latter, which contains an analysis, on the principles of parallelism, of the "First Epistle to the Thessalonians," have served to convince us of the general correctness of his views, as well as of the great ingenuity and learning which have so eminently qualified him for the due perfomance of his self-imposed task.

Fourth on the list of "Analytic" worthies, and far surpassing them all in the extent to which his researches into the subject have been carried, and the success with which they have been crowned, is our friend, Mr. Roe. Beyond Mr. Boys, in principle, it was of course impossible for him to go. But much remained to be done in the way of examination and application. Many difficulties required to be overcome. Many objections to be met and obviated. There was a large void to be filled up. The scope for mental acumen, learned industry, and scriptural knowledge was immense. What remained to be done, Mr. Roe has accomplished. By him, the entire Scriptures, Old and New, have upon the principles of parallelism—the term be it remembered, which by common consent has been applied to this peculiar phenomenon of Divine Revelation—been analysed. Every book—every section—every verse, even, has by him been taken to pieces and examined. After having been rigidly, but reverently dissected, the whole has again been put together. Synthesis has succeeded to analysis. A comprehensive view of each book has been taken. Its relations to other books, and to the whole, have been investigated, and are exhibited. Mr. Roe having thus acted, not only in conformity to the injunctions of Holy Writ itself,* but upon the best and most approved principles of the Baconian Philosophy. The fact is, our friend is not a man to take any human theory upon trust. He must enquire and decide for himself. To foes he will listen, no less than to friends, Hence, under his hands, and in passing through his mind, Lowth's principle—indeed the whole subject—has been subjected to the test of a severe, but wholesome and most impartial ordeal. Pure gold, he well knew, could suffer nothing by being made to pass through the fire. The result we have in the work now before us. Commenced at a period, when the author was long past middle age—when the evening of life had already begun to cast its shadows over his path—it has been prosecuted by him, until very recently, under the guidance of a clear head, and a matured understanding. An arduous undertaking for any single unaided individual it was. But what may not talents, learning, perseverance, with the divine blessing effect?

His "Analytical Arrangement of the Apocalypse," published in 1834, was the pilot balloon, by which our author endeavoured to ascertain the current of public opinion, and his prospects of success in the event of embarking in a mightier undertaking. Well fitted was this work to sustain, and even increase his already well-earned fame, and to prepare for what has followed. Doomed to disappointment, no doubt in some respects, Mr. Roe was. Apathy, in quarters where he might least have expected it, met his well-meant and ably-executed attempt. Other minds would have despaired. Not his. He knew the value of his principle. Some, besides, hailed his Essay with delight. Most valuable and instructive did they find its Preface to be. Equally so, its Notes. The work itself exhibited to them the structure of the Apocalypse reduced to

* 1 Cor. ii. 13, 15. x. 15, xiv. 20. 1 Peter iii. 15.

an intelligible form. As the germ of a literary enterprise of greater magnitude, it justified the most sanguine anticipations; and these, the appearance of the present work has more than realized.

Two octavo volumes constitute the condensed form, in which this most useful assistant to the understanding of the inspired records, is brought under public notice. Had larger funds been forthcoming, a larger work, with copious explanations and illustrations, wouldhave been forthcoming also. The "Analytical Arrangement" would then have presented less of the appearance of dry bones. The plan pursued in the work on the "Apocalypse," of giving the *ipsissima verba* of the original text, with a translation, would in this case likewise have been adopted. But, alas! in aid of the publication of this most valuable theological *desideratum,* no public funds have been provided. The national purse, so often opened for trifling and unworthy purposes—so often lavish of its contents in the cause of profligacy, corruption, or wholesale murder—has been closed against him. Literary men have stood aloof. Theologians have been silent, or have indulged in a contemptuous sneer. Upon his own limited private resources, Mr. Roe has had to rely. He has been obliged to benefit others, at his own expense. He has like many other able and eminent men, contributed to render an essential service to the world, by a large pecuniary sacrifice, in addition to his previous large and long-continued sacrifice of time, labour, industry, and learning. He has produced his admirable and excellent work, in the best form which circumstances permitted—good, but destitute of the illustrations, which each reader must from the Scriptures supply for himself—not in the best form absolutely considered, for that the possession of ampler means alone could have rendered practicable.

What Mr. Roe has published is enough, and more than enough, not only to be intelligible, but to vindicate his high claims to the attention of Biblical scholars, and Christian men. In his first volume, he gives a comprehensive tabular view, as well as complete analysis of every book of the Old Testament. And this he follows up, in his second volume, by a similar mode of dealing with the books of the New. No necessary reference is omitted. Chapter and verse may in a moment be turned to. The illustrations and confirmations derivable from the Hebrew and Greek originals can, without any difficulty, be instantaneously supplied. All is clear and perspicuous. There is no confusion and no possibility of mistaking the author's meaning. Never has any work of the same size come under our notice, throughout which greater neatness correctness, and classic elegance more uniformly prevail. To the Biblical student it is indispensable. And there is no individual, capable of reading and of putting two ideas together, by whom an interest is taken in the inspired volume, who can fail to be benefited by it.

Brief is the Preface, but, like the work itself, condensed and valuable. Every necessary statement is made, and all necessary information is communicated. The principles of Parellelism are simply, beautifully, and philosophically explained. Indeed, what its amiable, excellent, and learned author had already hinted in an early No. of the "Universalist," (see Vol. i. pp. 55—58,) is here brought under public notice in a somewhat more amplified form. According to Mr. Roe, there are not only signs of our ideas, and regular ways or orders in whichthey may be presented, but these ways or orders, on the principle of parallelism or correspondence, may be easily reduced to classes. Bishop Lowth had arranged and treated of correspondences as the synonymous, the antithetic, and the synthetic. By our author they are comprised "under the four general heads of extent, form, manner, and circumstance." Preface, p. 9. Admirably simple and perspicuous illustrations of his meaning are by him subjoined. The singular modesty of this preface is not less conspicuous, than are the sound sense, logical accuracy, condensation, and learning which it displays.

The order in which Mr. Roe has seen meet to place the Sacred Books may with propriety be noticed. In the Old Testament, after the Song of Solomon, the arrangement of the prophetical writings adopted has been, Jonah, Amos,

Hosea, Isaiah, Joel, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Habukkuk, Daniel, Obadiah, Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. In this the New Testament there is no deviation from the ordinary plan, until after the Acts of the Apostles. There, however, we proceed from the Book of Revelation, as conceived to hold the next place, through Galatians, 1st Thessalonians, 2nd Thessalonians, 1st Corinthians, 2nd Corinthians, 1st Timothy, Romans, James, Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, Philippians, Hebrews, 2nd Timothy, Titus, 1st Peter, 2nd Peter, Jude, 1st John, 2nd John, and 3rd John, to some "detached arrangements," with which this portion of the work closes. In thus disposing of the Prophets and Epistles our author informs us, vol. ii. p. 337, that he has been influenced by a regard "to their chronological order." "The order of the Prophets," he further acquaints us, "is taken from Gray; and that of the Epistles, for the most part from Hales."

At the end of the "Analytical Arrangement" of the New Testament Scriptures, volume second, we meet with an Appendix of no great length, and making no pretensions to originality, of which it is impossible to speak too highly. The substance of learned and laborious volumes is condensed into it. Particularly are we delighted with the former part of it. Having hinted at the value of Kennicott and De Rossi's readings of the Old Testament, and the selection from them in Boothroyd's Hebrew Bible; and also at Griesbach and Scholz's amended texts of the New Testament, he favours us with some observations of his own as to the qualities by which the best translation of the Holy Scriptures should be characterised, furnishes us with specimens of the manner in which it should be executed, and actually epitomizes Campbell's "Preliminary Dissertations," so far as they bear on the subject of translation, and Primate Newcome's "Historical view of English Biblical translations," *within the compass of about eight octavo pages.** Truly the power of mind, and physical toil implied in making this compend are wonderful. To those who are unable, or unwilling to consult the works themselves to which we have referred, Mr. Roe's abstract must be invaluable. One circumstance, most honourable to our friend, we may notice *en passant.* Whenever quoting from an author, or ascribing to him any sentiment, *he may be trusted to.* This we could not predicate of every one. The second part of the Appendix treats most luminously of "Arrangement, topics, and references." Two specimens, by way of illustrating the author's manner of procedure—one taken from the Old, and one from the New Testament—we are furnished with.

Concerning the "Notes," we feel ourselves bound to speak in terms of the highest approbation. The extent and variety of reading, and the matured judgment which they exhibit, combined with the degree of instruction which they convey, are perfectly astonishing. To what topic, almost, in the course of his long, useful, and laborious life, has not the attention of Mr. Roe been directed? In philology—in logic—in metaphysics—in history—in poetry—in classic literature—in science—in philosophy—in Biblical criticism—and in Theology, he seems to be always and equally at home. And yet over all his faculties, and regulating the use of his richly accumulated stores, as their tutelary genii, appear presiding, a calm, sound, discriminating judgment, and fervent scriptural piety. His notes are not exclusively philological. They are not tainted with German mysticism or rationalism. They are not disfigured by the spirit of religious partisanship. They are as varied, as are the topics by which they are suggested. Frequently novel and unexpected are the views which they present. But always to the point. The first note, which is prefatory as well as explanatory, may for clearness, condensation and good sense, be taken as a fitting specimen of the literary and moral tone which pervades the

* Mr. Roe is careful to guard himself against being supposed to acquiesce indiscriminately in the Archbishop's xxi Rules or Canons. He suggests several exceedingly valuable exceptions, modifications, and additions.

whole. The generosity, controlled by discernment, by which the "Notes" are characterised, is not their least remarkable feature. Some critics and commentators write, as if it were their wish to be supposed acquainted only with authors of standard reputation, and acknowledged merit. However much they may have been indebted to other sources for valuable hints, and important discoveries, all allusions to them are carefully, and of set purpose suppressed. To be honest, not to say generous, would be, forsooth! to compromise their literary dignity. Hence, upon stolen property, to a certain degree, they live and thrive. And, "O no, we never mention them," as it denotes their practice, so might it fitly be adopted by them as their motto. Not so however, Mr. Roe. He is above such meanness. Perhaps, by some even he may be imagined to have carried matters occasionally to the opposite extreme. Intimately conversant with the works of the most approved writers on the various subjects of which he treats, he has not disdained to look into books of a religious kind which the world has generally agreed to *taboo*, or which the world passes by with contempt. And wherever in such books, or in the course of his private correspondence, he has met with a view which has sppeared to him ingenious and important as well as true, or a suggestion which he has conceived might be turned to account, he has not hesitated to quote it, stating, at the same time, honestly and honourably, the source to which he has been indebted for his information. It was this nobility of mind on the part of Mr. Roe, combined with his many other excellencies of character, which long since attracted our notice, as it has, ever since the commencement of our acquaintance, been confirming towards him our esteem. Sickened we have long been by the petty feelings, and paltry jealousies of authors, literary men, and critics. Mr. Roe is one of the very few eminent men known to us, who has succeeded in soaring into a region above the mean and the contemptible.

We can discover no drawback of the slightest consequence on the work now under review. We almost wish, for the sake of our critical reputation, that we could have found out some material defect to fasten on and carp at. But really everything is executed in the best possible fashion. The plan proposed is followed out undeviatingly to the very close; and as the end proposed is excellent, so are the means employed to reach it, the best that could have been devised and adopted. Everything by which the usefulness of his work could be promoted, he has in one way or another contrived to introduce. Where such varied, extensive, and accurate learning as Mr. Roe possesses, is found united to a judgment so sound and mature, and a taste so exquisite, what else than a work of superior value could have been the result?

True, we differ in some respects from our respected friend, the author. We are not inclined to form so high an estimate of the value of the labours of the eminently learned and talented Dr. Lee, late Arabic Professor at Cambridge, as he appears to be. Besides which, we think—perhaps, we may be wrong—that he attributes a little too much importance to the theory of the celebrated John Hutchinson.* Upon some other topics, we assert our right to dissent from Mr. Roe—the right being one which all human beings possess, with regard to the views and opinions of one another. But how few and unimportant are our points of disagreement with the dear and venerated author of the

* Since we first became acquainted with this theory, between thirty and thirty-five years ago in consequence of a perusal of the abridgment of it given by President Forbes, of Cullodon, in his well-known treatise, until now, our conviction of the learning, classical and talmudical, and of the ingenuity displayed by its inventor, have been on the increase. Nay we are ready to admit the great services which he has rendered to the student of the Scriptures, and the light which his labours have served to throw on their peculiar phraseology: Besides, we do not intend to assert, that in his ingenious exposition of the Cherubim, he, with Parkhurst and others, his followers, is altogether mistaken. All we dare say is, that he does not satisfy us He is too ingenious. Too rational, and yet to fanciful. The basis of his theory may, however be right after all. Morrison's (originally of Perth); view of the subject, we have examined and compared with Hutchinson's. Exceedingly clever, it is likewise. Still, we lack satisfaction. A thorough, complete interpretation of the Cherubim is, it seems to us, yet a *desideratum.*

"Analytical Arrangement," in comparison with those as to which we are entirely at one with him. Our mutual differences are but as "a drop in the bucket." Why almost even allude to them? We are both rejoicing in the work of truth and mercy wrought out by God our Saviour. To us, given by grace to believe in the divine testimony revealing the fact, death is the wages of Adam's one sin; and to us, crediting the same testimony, eternal life is the gift of God, through the one righteousness, of Jesus Christ our Lord. Why, then, make any thing of mere intellectual differences? We desire to forget them.

Surely, after what has been already said, any formal statement or enumeration of the qualities by which Mr. Roe's mind and writings, especially his present work, are characterised, would be superfluous. Every Christian man, of competent education, who has read the Analytical Arrangement, must see as well as we do, that it is the production of one who, to eminent ability, great learning, consummate industry, sound judgment, gentle dispositions, strict impartiality, unimpeachable veracity, and an almost quenchless desire to benefit the church of the living God, unites evangelical views of divine truth, and a deep, all pervading piety. That he is a quiet, sober, and Calvinistic, no less than decided Universalist, is to us, it will easily be credited, not one of his least recommendations.

Like ourselves, Mr. Roe has been constrained, by a sense at once of duty and of love to set himself in opposition to the awfully anti-scriptural system of Universalism, so prevalent in the United States of America. Courteously has he been treated by the leading supporters of that system. And courteously but firmly, has he rejected all religious association and fellowship with them.* What communion hath light with darkness?† The Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the putting away of sin, by the shedding of his precious blood—that sacrifice of atonement, in which *he was made a curse for us*—together with our new-creation in him, through the power of his resurrection and ascension, are seen by our friend, in the light of the divine testimony itself, as they are seen by us, to be the fundamental truths of Christianity. God revealed in Christ alone, John xiv. 9, Heb. i. 3, Christ one with God, John x. 30, and Christ God, Matt. i. 23, viii. 3, John xi. 43, (compared with Gen. i. 3.) Rom. ix. 5, Acts xx. 28, Phil. ii. 6, 1 Tim. iii. 15, 16, iv. 10, &c. are axioms of inspiration. Where denied, what but a system of deism, more or less disguised, and more or less refined, can be substituted for them? Universalism, indeed, as understood by Mr. Roe and ourselves, absolutely rests on the fact of Jesus of Nazareth being *God with us*, as its basis; and consequently, on the facts of his righteousness and life, as divine, swallowing up and superseding sin and death, as human. Remove these fundamental verities and what have we left? Mere theories. Mere human speculations and conjectures. Notions not worth contending about, one way or another. Mr. Roe, we are aware, admires, in many respects and justly, the "Enquiries"‡ of the aged and re-

* The celebrated Mrs. Sherwood, one of the most gifted female writers of the present day, and a scriptural Universalist, having, by some well-intentioned, perhaps, but injudicious American scribes, been classed with the amiable and distinguished, but Socinian Barbauld, and spoken of, in other respects, as if she countenanced *humanitarian* abominations, found herself under the necessity, several years since, of bearing her testimony, in a very marked and decided manner against being identified with those who are systematically engaged in degrading the Lord Jesus, by assigning to him a place among his own creatures. We may mention, that the pages of this magazine have more than once been graced with the productions of this lady; and, in common with all her admirers, express our ardent desire for the appearance of her long promised work on the "Types of Scripture."

† Recent personal intercourse with the talented Mr. Drew, Editor of the "Gospel Banner, Maine, and Mr. Hemphill, Massachussetts, diiposes us to hope, that as there were in Sardis, "a few names which had not defiled their garments," Rev. iii. 4, so in the United States, there are several Universalists, to whom the Deity of the Lord Jesus is dear, and who in the fact of his having put away sin by the atoning sacrifice of himself, find the sole and all sufficient basis of their hope towards God. Surely, amongst this number, must be included our excellent friend, Wm. F. Teulon, formerly of Halifax, Nova Scotia.

‡ "An Enquiry into the Scriptural import of the words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna, all translated Hell, in the common English version." Third Edition. 6s 6d.

spectable Walter Balfour, one unquestionably of the ablest in his day of the American Universalist body.* We happen to know also, that the works alluded to, he would like to see widely circulated in this country. But it is the scriptural facts insisted on by Mr. Balfour, and the clearness and energy with which he has propounded and enforced them, that our friend admires, not the sadly defective unchristian theory in support and propagation of which they are but too commonly adduced.†

The style of Mr. Roe is easy and scholarlike. It is free from all affectation. Classical neatness and correctness are its characteristics. In its luminousness and perspicuity, it is the very reflex of the mind from which it emanates. So faultless indeed is it, and so admirably adapted to the topics which it is the medium of treating, that in reading we never think about it. This, as we had occasion to remark in another case, is the highest eulogium on style which we can pronounce.

Few of our readers, we suspect, will be disposed, with the scriptures by their side, to peruse, and examine carefully and critically, the Analytical Arrangement from beginning to end. To such as do so, however, the exercise will prove to be eminently self-rewarding. The majority will keep it by them to be used occasionally as a book of reference, like a Dictionary or a Concordance. A pretty constant reference to it, we would recommend. Looked into frequently with care and attention, immense benefit will be found to be the result.

Can we wind up this notice more appropriately, than by quoting the neat and elegant language employed by the author himself, when concluding his preface?

"Order is in itself beautiful and grateful to the mind, and it also possesses a utility beyond itself as an assistance to a clear and easy comprehension of the matter concerned; so that, according to the degree in which the order of the ideas, or our perception of that order, is in any composition, clear or confused, in the same degree is the sense itself, or our perception of the sense, conveyed under it. Hence an analysis of the order becomes an analysis of the sense, and a display of the order, a display of the sense; and as the Inspired Writings exceed all others, both in their importance and their execution, the application to them of such analysis, and such display, must be proportionably useful. Mr. Boys, in the portions of Scripture which he has arranged, first exhibits the corresponding parts in such visible form as to be obvious at a glance; and then subjoins, in similar form, a summary of their respective topics. It is a common practice to write metrical compositions in this manner, for the purpose of shewing both the species of verse and the order of their recurrence; and, if this is advantageous in the case of sound only, how much more so in that of the sense! It is indeed only so far as this process is mentally performed, that a single sentence can be understood; and, though this may be sufficient on all common occassions, yet, in the case of the Bible, in which every word has weight, and in which the correspondences pervade every part, with unequalled regularity, variety, and beauty, every possible help is desirable. In short it may be justly considered as the most effective instrument that has yet been put into our hands; that it is capable of turning the scale on most doubtful questions, doctrinal or critical; that by its means the reader often obtains, from bare inspection, a clearer and more comprehensive view of a subject, than from long and elaborate Commentaries; that he is often led to inferences and reflections, which otherwise would never have occurred to him; and that, till an arrangement agreeable to it of the entire volume of Scripture is completed, we shall not make the nearest possible approach either to the best translation, or the most correct interpretation. The correspondences indeed are so much disguised in the authorized translation, by its

---

"Three Enquiries, 1, into the Scriptural Doctrine concerning the Devil and Satan; 2, The extent of duration expressed by the terms, Olim, aion, and aionios, rendered everlasting; and 3. The New Testament doctrine concerning the possession of Devils." Third Edition. 7s.

* Mr. Balfour is a native of St. Ninian's, near Stirling in Scotland; and was at one time numbered among the pupils and preachers of the late excellent and devoted Mr. Robert Haldane, formerly of Airthrey, afterwards of Auchingray.

† Sometimes we have been inclined to hope, that Mr. Balfour, although the companion and abettor of American Unitarian Universalists, is not altogether of them. Symptoms of love to the simple gospel of Christ crucified and glorified as having saved us by the shedding of his precious blood from the curse of the law, are visible in his writings, as well as in his private communications. O that he would, before quitting this earthly scene, speak out plainly his sentiments in favour of Christ's Deity! We cannot help loving the man.

want of conformity to the originals, and by its incongruous division into chapter and verses, as to contribute, with other inveterate causes, to the mistaken views which almost universally prevail. I trust, however, it will be allowed that so much progress is made towards the removal of these evils, as leaves little more to be done. All the primary divisions of the Sacred Writings are exhibited; and, though subdivision is not everywhere carried to its lowest degree, it is generally done where the importance of the subject made it desirable. Subsidiary matter is assigned to the Appendix and Notes: that of the former relating to the text, translation, topics, and system of references essential to a complete arrangement of the whole Bible; and that of the latter chiefly to the correspondences, showing their application to the solution of difficulties. I have not indeed confined myself to this line of proof; and in the case of doctrinal questions, have thought it expedient to call in additional aid. It is feelingly observed by Lowth, afterwards Bishop, that "it pleased God, in his unsearchable wisdom, to suffer the progress of the Reformation to be stopped in the *mid way;* and the effects of it to be greatly weakened by many unhappy divisions among the reformed." Sermons and other Remains of Robert Lowth, D.D. p. 78. This implies the retention of as much error as had been renounced; and it was even so. Many and great errors have not only been retained, but have been so deliberately fortified and perpetuated by creeds, articles, and confessions,—abetted, more or less, by the arrogance of self-obtruded teachers, the submission of misplaced humility, the intermeddling of human legislation, and all the multiform seductions of wordliness,—as to make their correction almost hopeless. In the midst, however, of these accumulated evils, we perceive many sources of encouragement. A house so divided cannot stand. While, on the one hand, we see, even in England, and in the chief seats of clerical education, Popery again reviving and spreading like a pestilence,—these seminaries have, on the other, produced some eminent individuals, both dead and living, by whom (though with more candour than consistency) some portions of the remaining rubbish have been removed; and of whose authority, as *argumenta ad homines*, I have availed myself as often as I could. We have also the satisfaction of knowing, that the Bible is now more intelligently read by many than at any former period; and, to crown all, we may confidently rest on the assurance of the well-known adage,—*Magna est veritas, et prevalebit.* D. T.

Le Recueil Catholique, Par L'Abbe' C. Massiot. *E fide spes. Premiere Annee. Avril.* Paris. Aux bureaux de l'Echo de la Presse, 1 et 3 Boulevart des Italiens. On s'abonne a Londres, 7, New Coventry Street.

Cases of Conscience, or Lessons in Morals; for the Use of the Laity. Extracted from the Moral Theology of the Romish Clergy. By Pascal the Younger. London: Thomas Bosworth, 215, Regent Street. 1851.

To the polite attentions of Henry Drummond, Esq., M.P. we owe the opportunity of reading, and bringing under the notice of our subscribers, the above named pamphlets.

Both we have found to be most interesting and instructive, and both make their appearance most seasonably.

The "Recueil Catholique" is, indeed, one of the characteristic phenomena of our extraordinary age. As an appeal to Roman Catholics, by one of their priesthood, it takes its place beside the "Orations" of the Barnabite Gavazzi. The Abbé Massiot, its editor, for twenty years a talented, eloquent, and impressive preacher among the Romanists in France,—who, in fact, scarcely a twelvemonth since, was in the habit of addressing numerous and delighted audiences, assembled for the purpose of hearing him in the Churches of Paris —is now, partly by force of circumstances, and partly by his own voluntary act, separated from his former communion. He has opened, at No. 36 *Rue de l'onest*, Paris, a chapel for the performance of divine worship. Two circumstances are particularly remarkable in the man, and his secession: first, that although no longer an adherent of the Church of Rome, he disclaims having become a Protestant, or intending to become one, glorying in the name of Catholic, while he repudiates the prefix Roman; and, secondly, that in the step taken by him he seems to have the sympathy, and to a certain degree, the support and cooperation of many of his clerical brethren. Who can say that this movement on the part of the Abbé Massiot, may not be the germ of most glorious results?

In this April number of the *Recueil*, we find contained: 1, *Mon premier mot*, my first word; 2. Conferences on the origin, basis, and constitution of the Catholic Church; by Mauger-Carré; 3. *Etudes Evangeliques*, and, 4. topics of meditation, addressed to the clergy. All are excellent. Under the head of *Evangelical Studies*, Massiot's observations on the *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, have particularly attracted and captivated us. Simple, beautiful, interesting, and, upon the whole, scriptural, they are. There is nothing Socinian about them. Perhaps, occasionally, rather too scholastic, (for our taste, at least,) in their statements and definitions. And yet, even in this respect, far more scriptural than the ordinary run of Protestant comments on the doctrine of Christ's Deity. Judging from an expression or two, are we mistaken in supposing, that Universalism is not exactly held by him in abhorrence? To the general tone of his remarks, as well as to particular phrases occurring towards the close of the third article, we allude, in thus speaking. Altogether, with much from which we dissent—especially as regards his Millennarian notions—there is still more in the *Recueil*, to which we can give our hearty concurrence; and the very fact of the appearance of such a work in France, positively delights us. God speed thee, Abbé Massiot.

"The Christian Ambassador," the great Universalist newspaper of New-York, has, we perceive, had Massiot and his *Recueil* brought under its notice, by A. Coquerel's "*Le Lion*." A very long and interesting account of the April number of the *Recueil*, from the pen of our friend, Balch, appears in the "C. A." of July 12. His information concerning it seems to have been derived solely from Coquerel's article. So powerfully has it impressed Mr. Balch, that he expresses a strong wish to have an opportunity of perusing the work for himself.*—When he comes to see it, he will discover in it none of the Rationalistic and Deistic tendencies, which so disfigure the works, and have proved so detrimental to the movement of Ronge and his associates in Germany. Those grand and fundamental truths in which evangelically taught men in all ages have rejoiced, and for which some of them have contended even to the death, Mr. Balch will find Massiot asserting with wonderful simplicity, power, and Christian unction.

"Cases of Conscience" is a brief, but powerfully and pungently written tract. To the Protestants of England, it makes some startling disclosures. Stinging its facts and reasonings must be to Roman Catholics, and their abettors, the Tractarian party. How awful—how debasing—the morality, which Jesuits are engaged in inculcating and propagating! There is not much, except in the facts, that is original in this work. Jesuitical morals, the same for substance now that they have all along been, were exposed to the scorn and detestation of mankind, two hundred years ago, by Blaise Pascal, in his celebrated and world-widely circulated, "Provincial Letters." With these, in point of genius or power, no man in his senses would ever for one moment dream of comparing the work now under review. But, nevertheless, "Cases of Conscience" possesses great merit. Of the truth of Pascal's statements, it furnishes a confirmation. And to his splendid book it may be added, as a fitting supplement. Clearly does this opportune, clever treatise of Pascal Jun., (is this a *nom de guerre* of Mr. Drummond?) establish it as a fact, that in whatever other respects Jesuitism may have changed, (query, has it changed?) since the middle of the seventeenth century; it is still, as from the commencement of its existence it has been, the slave of the papacy, the enslaver, as well as perverter of men's consciences, the inculcator of a nefarious morality, and the constant although insidious foe equally of God's word, and of man's real and permanent happiness. D. T.

---

* Will dear Balch take a hint? he is both an able man, and a good scholar. But he is sometimes rather careless in his style. Capable we know he is of translating French into English well; and therefore, the next time he sits down to the task, we trust to see from his pen something more accurate and idiomatic, than the English version of Coquerel and Massiot's French which appears in the number of the "Ambassador" alluded to.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

NOVEMBER, 1851.

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY

RESPECTFULLY AND HUMBLY SUBMITTED TO THE CONSIDERATION OF CHRISTIANS.

(*Continued from page* 236.)

I HAD no opportunity of knowing how this sanctification, or perfection as it was and is indifferently styled, manifested itself in daily life, for I never saw this man except on such occasions; and I have no doubt whatever, that both my parents, though they believed the man, would have had a very decided objection to my being much in his society—in it at all, indeed, except at religious gatherings.

Whether they really believed that he was a sanctified man, I have no means of knowing, but I am sure they believed he thought so.

There were many others, especially women, who were sanctified; and the number was very much increased at times called "revivals," which occurred every now and then, no one could tell how, and whose law of manifestation was as mysterious as that of cholera or potatoe-blight, or mesmeric influence. But these "revivals" did and do still frequently occur, and while the "times of this ignorance" last, *will* occur. And when they do, strange things become common—so strange that thousands of Englishmen would not believe if they were told that such things exist among us. We laugh at winking Madonnas, and the whole class of Popish miracles, and very properly so; but let us speak quietly about them, and never with forgetfulness of what is passing in the next street, or the adjoining village, in the chapel—for if we will take a little interest in what does pass in the "religious world," (a very unchristian world by the way), we shall hear and see things as odd in their way as bleeding pictures and miracle-working maidens.

There was a peculiarity about these revival sanctifications and justifications, viz. that most of them were of short duration. I was strangely puzzled often to see persons who had been "awakened" and "justified" at such times, turn out to be much the same sort of men and women as before, at the next village fair or wake. Yet this was quite common, so much so, that the quiet, staid portion of the society had little confidence in them till they saw how they passed through the temptations furnished at such seasons.

There was always however a reason for such defections; for while all allowed that some might have been deceived, yet they maintained against all opposers that the majority of the "conversions" and "justifications," and "sanctifications" were real, but that the subjects of these changes had all made a further change and "fallen away." The number of "backsliders" accordingly was always very great. Yet as any blessing could be lost, nay, as you yourself, the said sanctified-

and-made-perfect-brother might be lost, and that altogether, entirely, and for ever, what could you say? What indeed could any one say, except that the heart was very deceitful; that the devil was wonderfully subtle and ingenious; that it was really a very sad business—and made another cup of tea very refreshing? And to say the truth, that was the sort of refreshment to which *such* "times of refreshing" (as they themselves called them) generally tended, and in which they most frequently ended: when I was often struck with the fact about which there could be no mistake—that these same persons, who had been for an hour or two quite inspired, came to themselves again, and were just in all respects the very same as before. I often wondered whether the one had any influence over the other, and detected myself enquiring whether there was any affinity between the one inspiration and the other; and which was the real inspiration—that of the tea with its concomitants, or that of the converting the believer or "member"-manufacturing-inspiration which preceded it. And sometimes, child as I was, I went back to New Testament narratives in thought, and as I sat listening, was half-unconsciously comparing and wondering, with a shudder at the thought lest it should be sin, how the Apostles got on without tea, and whether the work of their revivals was as hot and thirsty as that of these.

Now let any one judge whether a boy of twelve years old was in the best school for learning the religion of Jesus Christ. Whether in fact this was the society which a thoughtful, sober-minded parent would choose for his child—nay, whether such a parent would feel quite at ease to know his child was in it at all. And yet many pious, many sober and thoughtful parents not only allowed their children to be in it, but were glad to lead them there, for though it was not exactly what they could wish it, yet they thought nothing but good could be learned, even from those who had but just left the ranks of the wicked, and could hardly be said really to have left them, since many were not long before they returned to their former place and associates. But even by those who remained among the followers of Christ, as they believed them, and of whose conversion humanly speaking, there could be no doubt, the truth was certainly not declared as it is in Jesus; nay, though there was much that was true, yet it was so blended with what was false, the light was so colored and obscured by the medium through which it passed, that a young learner was in no small danger of being quite misled, and being left to himself to ponder over what he had heard, of framing for himself a system, which nominally Christian, should in its working be as opposite to Christianity as heathenism itself.

So at least I found it. I am quite certain that many of them were sincere—that they *lived* in the system to which they had attached themselves—their whole hearts being given up to it, and their lives testifying by their purity and consistency to the singleness of their purpose and the integrity of their souls, but the circumstances under which they had become religious, the very narrow divinity of their school, made still narrower by their own partial knowledge of it, and by their misunderstanding and their misapplication of what they did know, rendered them very dangerous guides of the young under any

circumstances; but when the young happened to be of a thoughtful, contemplative cast of mind, better informed than themselves generally, and especially when they happened to be scrupulous and sensitive, over-anxious if possible to be right, and morbidly afraid of being wrong; when they were bashful, retiring, somewhat moody, and much given to musing, then, and in all such like cases, their guidance was worse than no guidance, and their teaching was actually poisonous.

I listened to all I heard attentively, and tried to act upon it. The habit of introversion and self-questioning was imperceptibly acquired where meetings were almost daily, and the business of the meetings was free, unfettered public speaking, each about what was passing within him. Like the rest I began to watch the emotions of which I was conscious, and to class them as well as I could. I soon found that I could not truthfully class them according to the method I was in the habit of hearing: with all my efforts (and they were deeply earnest) to do so, I could not "lick them into" the "standard shape." I acquired the notion which I fancy was and is common among them, that all religious feelings were inspired, and must for that reason be moulded alike and manifest themselves by the same symptoms in all. Accordingly I deemed my eternal welfare to be suspended on my being enabled to feel and to express myself just as the rest. The routine (if I may so call it) was unvaried; the awakening, the suffering, the struggling, the internal agony which many felt, and deep sorrow which all felt; the crying, the tears, the ceaseless praying; and then the being "set at liberty" at once, a conviction being at the same time granted by God, that He had at that instant pardoned and accepted them; and this succeeded by "visitations" and daily "seasons" of sometimes one and sometimes another kind, and in many instances by the "sanctification" before mentioned. Almost the same terms too were used by all in the accounts of their experiences.

This uniformity perplexed me greatly. I was young, ignorant, and a mere child. But when I tried to feel great sorrow for sin—when I wanted my heart to be so broken on account of it that I could not rest—when I wanted convictions and terrors, and sleeplessness and horrors, and prayed for these things, and waited, anxiously expecting that they would come into my heart just then as I prayed—and when I was disappointed and nothing came, and all seemed *nothing*, and my prayers were nothing, and God and my soul seemed nothing; and my shut eyes ached, and my young knees ached, ay, and my young he art too—when my prayers and my feelings, and God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit—the whole Trinity which I tried childishly to realize—and heaven and all things but my wicked heart, dull and unfeeling as I felt it, melted into an indistinct, misty bewilderment, Oh! then was agony, such as one so young ought not to have known.

(To be concluded in our next.)

THE TRUE GOD KNOWN ONLY AS HE HAS REVEALED HIS CHARACTER IN HIS WORD.

The God of the Scriptures is, in their own words, characterized as "a just God and a Saviour." It is the object of the whole of these records, in one way or other, to exhibit him as such, but more especially to reveal this, his character, as displayed in the work of Jesus Christ. From beginning to end they point more or less directly to the work of the Messiah,—his sacrifice for sin and his victory over death. Of old his prophets "testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow;" and since he ascended into heaven his apostles have proclaimed God's justice satisfied by his sufferings, and his grace or mercy now abounding unto eternal life. The death and resurrection of Christ are inseparably connected; if he had never died he never could have risen from the dead; if he had had no occasion to rise he would have had no cause to die. But he had to raise man from earth to heaven, and for this purpose he graciously was pleased to descend from heaven to earth.

In the work of Jesus Christ God is seen at once perfect in justice and unbounded in mercy. By his obedience unto death the utmost requirements of God's righteous law were fulfilled, justice was satisfied, its demands were complied with, and its highest claims exhausted. Now mercy shone forth in its glory; unfettered and unrestrained, it was now proclaimed as bestowed freely and unconditionally upon those who stood in need of it; and that Being, the manifestation of whose character had hitherto commanded man's highest approval, now claimed his warmest love.

No one of the attributes of the Almighty as revealed in the Scriptures is incompatible with another; their manifestation has been progressive, but their developement has brought to light no inconsistencies. In the course of his providence he has brought under man's notice attributes previously unknown or unobserved, or has made clear and prominent what aforetime had been hidden and obscure. At any time man knew the true God only as he had revealed himself, and thus only he knows him now. And as his attributes are all exercised in complete harmony with one another, we cannot declare his true character if we set him forth as one who exercises one attribute at the expense of another; neither can we, if even by our mode of declaring it, we suggest that he may do so.

Yet men are ever prone to do so, ever ready to improve upon God's revelation of himself by additions or glosses of their own. He has revealed his true character in those glad tidings which tell men that he hath sent his Son into the world to save sinners; that through him is proclaimed unto them the forgiveness of sins. The Scriptures constantly connect salvation with an atonement for sin; they represent this as now made and accepted,—all that was necessary to satisfy the demands of God's law finished,—salvation now his *gift* to whomsoever he will. It is God's purpose to save entirely and unconditionally—the guilty: these things are ever kept in view, that those he saves are guilty, and that this salvation is entirely his gift. Any supposed improvement in the statement of the gospel keeps one or other of these

things more or less out of view, and is in reality a perversion or corruption. No alteration or improvement is required or can be admitted: the scripture statements express all that is intended, and express it fully; they declare the greatness and completeness of God's work, and they proclaim it to those who are its proper subjects,—the guilty children of men.

The New Testament, Covenant, or Arrangement is a dispensation of mercy, a revelation of God's grace or undeserved favour to beings who stand in need of it. The Old Covenant or Arrangement was ostensibly one of justice; in it God's purposes of mercy were veiled under types and figures. Laws were given to men and violated; punishment was therefore incurred, the inevitable award of justice. From this justice could indicate no means of release. The lawgiver required obedience, but he had got only disobedience. To have by a mere act of power restored the criminals to their first position or given them a new one and perpetuated it unconditionally would have been an imputation on the wisdom of his first requirement: he had tried one plan—to bestow blessings as a reward: but it had failed, and he had now recourse to another. In this man could recognise his goodness, but it would be at the expense of his wisdom; moreover it would have been simply a new display of goodness, not a new exhibition of a n attribute, that of mercy.

But it was not so; the Son of God came, became man, and satisfied all the requirements of the lawgiver, yielding perfect obedience, loving the lawgiver and loving his law. Nay more; he took upon himself the sins of men and underwent their punishment, dying the just for the unjust; he satisfied and exhausted all the demands of the righteous judge. He obeyed his laws and deserved life; he voluntarily underwent the punishment of disobedience and sacrificed that life. No imputation now could rest upon the wisdom of the divine requirement; obedience had been demanded of and had been yielded by man,—the man Christ Jesus; but its reward was sacrificed by his taking upon himself the punishment due to disobedience.

The Son of God had accomplished the work for which he had become man, and now assumed his character as Jehovah the Saviour. Now he could bestow mercy on the guilty. It was not now one plan abandoned at the expense of an imputation on God's wisdom, and another substituted as a new display of goodness. But it was God's righteousness and wisdom indicated by the carrying out of his plan to a full and perfect consummation; and a new plan disclosed for the purpose of displaying a new attribute,—love in a higher form,—mercy, or goodness to the undeserving. God now appears, not as a benevolent and righteous ruler who gives men the blessings they deserve, but as a beneficent and compassionate Father who bestows blessings on the guilty, immortality on the dying. Only those who know him in this relation know the true God. "He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love. In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." He that loves not God in this relation or from this cause "*loveth not*"; and consequently "knoweth not" the one only living and true God.

D. W.

WHAT IS PROVIDENCE?

According to most of our English Dictionaries, Providence is said to be the government, superintendence, care, direction and disposal of all creatures, and all their actions, by a superior, intelligent Being. By the Westminster divines, in what is called the Shorter Catechism, we have it written "God's works of providence, are his most holy, wise, and powerful, preserving and governing all his creatures, and all their actions." This is nailed with the following scriptures—Psalm cxlv. 17. Isaiah xxviii. 29, Heb. i. 3, Psalm ciii. 19, Matt. x. 29. From these passages we are informed that all the works of God are Holy. That he directeth and superintendeth men in the threshing of corn, &c. &c.—That he upholdeth *all* things—*Ruleth* over *all*, and that the death of a sparrow cometh not to pass, but by the absolute determination of God, both as to the *time* and *manner* of its death.

In the face of all this, however, some deny, and many *seem* to deny, that there is providence at all.

1. Because it is so inconsistent with the rest and blessedness of the divine nature.

2. From the seemingly unjust distribution of good and evil, falling indiscriminately on the just and unjust. But were this true, then the Creator, after making the world, must have thrown up the reins and left it to itself, which could not be, unless God either *cannot* or *will* not care for, and look after the affairs of every one of his creatures. The first is set aside by its absurdity, the last by its affinity to blasphemy. To *create* was with him no difficulty. To *govern*, direct, uphold and superintend, cannot be contrary to either his *power* or his *will*.

3. There are thousands of professed believers of the Old and New Testaments, who in their words and writings *seem* to *deny* the providence of God. Many of these have sworn their adherence to the Shorter Catechism. The apostle of Christ Jesus said "In him we live and move, and have our being." Acts xvii. 28. But our modern apostles say, in him we live and have our being, but in *ourselves*, we move and shape our destiny. He hath made of one blood all nations, but left them to determine the bounds of their habitations, according to their own management. So they say.

He hath created man subject to vanity, death, and corruption, independent of the will of man—but has left him to climb to heaven, or plunge to hell according to his own free will, and as it were, independently of the will of God. Thus they seem to think, that while all things are of God as to their existence—yet the actings of creatures are of themselves; and what they call the laws of nature, allowed to move out as if God had neither the power nor the will to intervene, alter, restrain, enforce, or suspend and change these laws, by a particular providence.

The grand mistake of those wise and prudent leaders, has its origin and continuance from *ignorance* of the nature of God, and the nature of man—the will of God and the will of man. The will of man is irresistibly governed by his nature.—His nature and his will are

absolutely dependent on his Creator. The nature of God is in every sense *independent*—governed by nothing but his own will, which is the only *free* will in existence, having the nature and will of all created existence under absolute control, and His own will eternally free. Where then is the boasted free will of man? it is a mere shadow;—nay, rather, a nonentity.

Those who set aside, obscure, or deny, a providence by their absurd notions of free will and responsibility, are they who may scripturally be reckoned *Atheists*. He who does not believe in a God is a fool, but cannot be properly called an atheist.—But he who professedly believes in the living and true God, and pictures him out in a character diametrically opposite to that which is recorded in the bible is in reality an atheist.—He is living without God. Many who would be highly displeased, if they were told that they worshipped they knew not what —do really imagine that God is such an one as *themselves*. They speak of the anger, wrath, fury, vengeance, and even cruelty of God, as if he were possessed of the passions of human beings, whose thoughts are only evil continually. As well may we imagine that the invisible God has hands, arms, eyes, ears, and feet, like a child of Adam. Many things are represented in the bible, not as they really are, but as to the finite capacities and apprehensions of men, they appear. We read of the *rising* and *setting* of the sun—his circling round the earth, &c. Of the earth being founded on the seas and floods—whereas the sun is a fixed star, while the earth moves round, daily and yearly—and instead of being founded upon the waters, is *hung* upon *nothing*. Thus even at this day, we speak of the sun rising and setting, though we know that he abideth still in his place.

We cannot be rightly understanding the revelation of God, unless we see the whole of it in harmony with itself. When we read of the anger, wrath and hatred of God, we must remember that it is written—"Fury is not in me." his fury upholdeth him in bringing salvation to the human family, according to the multitude of his loving-kindnesses —Is. lxiii. 5—7. His anger endureth but for a moment, while his mercy endureth for ever. The day of God's vengeance is the acceptable year of the Lord, when all who mourn shall be comforted, Is. lxi. 2—3. God is *Light*, and in him is no darkness; God is *Love*, and in him there can be no hatred. How can it ever be that God will reprove, rebuke and punish his creatures for cruelty, hatred, wrath, vengeance, tyranny, &c. if he himself exercise like passions? It cannot be. Job said that God was cruel, because his doings were not what Job thought they should have been—he knew not that all that which came upon him was a display of the pity and tender mercy of his heavenly Father. James v. 11.

Men form their ideas of Him who is infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, from what they feel and see in beings finite, mortal, and changeable; but the thoughts and ways of God are as opposed to those of man, as the heavens are higher than the earth. By comparing spiritual things with spiritual, it may be seen that from the beginning it was never intended that men in general, to whom the word of God came, should see, hear or undersand things revealed as they really are. It was only those few to whom were given ears to hear, that could understand the mystery, which from the

beginning was hid in God. Jesus said, "unto *you* it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but *to others* in parables, that seeing, they might not see, and hearing, they might not understand." Luke viii. 10. This was the manner by Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles, till the vanishing away of the old covenant. But after the coming of Jesus Christ in his spiritual kingdom at the destruction of Jerusalem, by the expounding of the Holy Spirit through the preaching of the apostles, the mystery was made manifest and *known* to all nations for the obedience of faith. Romans xvi. 25, 26.

There is a time for every thing under the sun. The time and seasons God hath reserved in his own power. All that cometh to pass is according to the all-wise purpose and determination of God, in the dispensations of his providence. Whatever he sendeth upon the earth, whether sword, famine, pestilence, or wild beasts—whether peace, plenty, health and safety—all are manifestations of the unchangeable love of God. Offences must come, and sin will abound, while human nature exists; but though sentence be not speedily executed against evil works, yet the Lord doth not approve of them—and transgressions shall not pass unpunished, Psalm l. Whom the Lord loveth he chastteneth, and scourgeth every son that he receiveth. Whom the Lord loveth, he correcteth, as a father the son in whom he delighteth. Many of the children of God have suffered more and greater affliction, than any of the children of the wicked one—The light affliction of this life worketh an "exceeding weight of glory." All these things came forth from the Lord who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working.

The providence of God and his tender mercy are over all his works. He hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of the habitations of the children of men. All that cometh to pass under the sun, cometh to pass at the time, and in the manner, the hand and counsel of God, had before determined to be done. From the raising up of systems, kingdoms and kings, to the falling of sparrows and hairs, all happeneth according to the purpose and providence of Him, *of* whom, *through* whom, and *to* whom are *all* things. The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither bread to the wise, nor riches to men of understanding, but time and chance happeneth to them all. Eccles. ix. 11. This passage alone, might be sufficient to silence for ever all those who, while professing to believe the bible, go about to uphold the doctrine of man's free will, or to doubt, obscure, or deny the doctrine of absolute predestination, and the universal and particular providence of God.

In the interesting history of Joseph and his brethen, there is incontrovertible evidence of the superintending providence of God over the dreams, words and actions of men, from the highest to the lowest; and that all is intended for *good*, and that out of evil, good is educed, though men know not that they are doing the will of God, but walking in all the freedom of their own will; fulfilling the sinful propensities of their nature. When Joseph's brethren were afraid that he would requite the evil that they had done to him, and fell down before his face emploring forgiveness, he said unto them, ye thonght *evil* against me, but *God meant* it unto *good*, to bring to pass as this day to save much people alive. Gen. l. 18—20. Joseph had also said unto them

before, "Be not grieved nor angry with yourselves, that ye sold me hither, for God did send me before you to preserve life. God sent me before you to preserve you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance. So now it was not *you* that sent me hither *but God.*" Gen. xlv. 5—8. "Who is he that saith, and it cometh to pass when the Lord commandeth it not? Out of the mouth of the Most high, proceedeth not evil and good. Lam. iii. 37, 38. Whatever cometh to pass, whether toward a nation, a family, or an individual—whether good or evil—cometh to pass according to the will, purpose, love, goodness, and tender mercy of Jehovah. All that cometh to pass under the sun, cometh to pass according to the will of God. But many men do not know this. Many while doing their own will, are ignorant that they are doing the will of God, who hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will.

Let us look at the service of Nebuchadnezzar, whom the Lord made use of as a besom to sweep transgressors off the face of the earth. Of him it was said, "O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand, is mine indignation. I will send him against a hypocritical nation; and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets. Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so, but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few." Is. x. 5—7. Thus the king of Babylon, while doing his own will was, though unknown to himself, doing what the counsel of God had determined before to be done.

It was of the Lord that Samson took a wife of the uncircumcised Philistines. It was of the Lord to harden the hearts of the inhabitants of Palestine, that they should come against Israel to battle, that they might be utterly destroyed. Joshua xi. 20. Indeed, the disposal of *all* things is of the Lord.

Scripture, reason and common sense, seem to agree in testifying that the providence of God is over all his works.—That the thoughts, words, and actions of all men, are all disposed of according to the purpose and providence of God, in the best manner, and to the best end.—That the will of God is done in heaven above, and in the earth beneath; at all times and in all things. But those who imagine that men are possessed of *free* will cannot see these things to be so. The notion of human free will leads to a denial of the universal love of God—to a denial of universal providence, election, predestination, and many other scriptural doctrines, and tends to the establishment of conditional views of salvation, in direct opposition to the grace, mercy, justice, truth, and love of God, revealed in the bible. A great majority of those who limit the love of God to a part of his creatures, hold that faith or believing, is in some sense or other, the *condition* of salvation. "He and he only, who believeth the gospel, can be saved: and he who believeth not, shall be eternally excluded from the grace, mercy, and love of God, to never ending torments." Were this the condition of life eternal, it is such as no mere man could, can, or will be able to perform. Only those *ordained* to eternal life do in this life believe. He who believeth there is one God doeth *well*: and it is only when the Ethiopian can change his skin, and the leopard his spots, that any mere

man can do *well*. Nothing born of the will of the flesh, can believe heavenly things. It is the new creature born of God, with a hearing ear, seeing eye, and understanding heart, who can believe the gospel of the grace of God.

A creature whose will is irresistibly governed by its nature, and whose nature is absolutely dependent on its Creator, and every moment under his control, admitting the will of such a creature to be as free as it possibly can be,—is the will of such an one *free*? To the man who imagines that he has really free will, it may be said "Hast thou an arm like God?" then "Look on every one that is proud, and bring him low; and tread down the wicked in their place." "Then will I also confess unto thee that *thine own* right hand can *save* thee." Job xl. Without providence, without predestination, without free grace, without free forgiveness (*with* free will)—*without God*. The words and ways of men are to make themselves as God, or God as themselves. The word and way of God, is to manifest men, that they are beasts.

ANETAZO.

CORRESPONDENCE.

APOSTOLIC GOSPEL.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

DEAR SIR,—In the 13th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, 38th & 39th verses, we have the following simple and comprehensive declaration of the Gospel, as preached by the Apostle Paul to a people who had not before heard it, in fulfilment of the commission to "preach the gospel to every creature:" "Be it known unto you, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses."

In contrast, I beg to present to your readers a few notes of a sermon from the above words, preached to a large congregation in this town, by the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, on the 25th instant. After reading his text, and remarking upon the circumstances under which the Apostle delivered it, the speaker continued that he might address the same message to the large and mixed congregation then before him, and he would first address it to "those who were *as yet unforgiven*," "those who had not loved and served God." He went on to tell them that "they needed forgiveness," that "*God had claimed their hearts*," "had *asked them to love him*," but that "they had not surrendered their hearts to him." He said further, "God has given you a Saviour, and you have refused him; you have refused to believe him; you have neglected your own Saviour"—"God is willing to save you." "The angels who sinned never rejected an *offered* Saviour"—"God is willing to pardon you"—"He is willing to forgive you *at once*, He is ready to forgive you *instantly*; you may be forgiven *this night*"—"from that moment all will be yours—from that time God will be your father"—"you may be changed *to-night*"—"the Saviour was sent on purpose to rescue your souls, *if* you become his followers"—to any man who wishes to be saved there is an open path." After putting the question, "Who are they that shall be saved?" Mr. Noel answered, "The friends of Jesus, not his foes"—"those who come to God—those who are accepted of the Father." Mr. Noel then took up the second part of the Apostle's declaration, and stated it as a *condition of salvation*, and said: "Believe what God has revealed concerning Christ"—"Believe that you *are saved*"—"surrender yourselves, give yourselves up *to be saved*"—"if you rely on Christ *now you are saved*"—"*this night* if you have faith in Christ"—"if a man *admits the truth into his soul* he is saved"—"Believe and you will be saved, do not and you are lost"—"come to God for pardon, *because Christ is your salvation*"—"he has done all for you, and *you are saved because you rely upon him*"—"you are saved *by hanging on Christ*"—"the dying thief was saved *by a look*—look and you shall live." "One object of the type of the serpent set up in the wilderness is to show us *what we must do for ourselves*"—"*look, you may be saved to-night*—you are *saved as soon as you look*"—Christ's righteousness is *ready to be imputed to you*—you are saved the *moment you trust*—you may be saved now"—"only look"—"*that moment* you enter the family of God"—"you are saved *when* you come to God." "Look to the cross or you perish; look and you live: look *before you leave these walls;* what hinders you?" "Give yourself to the service of God, giving up all sin and looking to Christ"—"give yourself to Christ"—if you will not take this advice you will perish: relent *before it is too late*—be a disciple *from to-night*."

I leave these choice specimens of modern gospel, which I took down from the lips of Mr. Noel, to the consideration of your spiritually minded readers, who have been taught the great truth that "salvation is of the Lord," that "it is not of him that runneth nor of him that willeth, but of God who sheweth mercy. and remain,

Yours in the truth,

Liverpool, Sept. 26. A "BEREAN."

MISSION TO ENGLAND.—ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS OFFERED.

There is a great desire on the part of several gentlemen to have the *Gospel* preached in Great Britain, as it is understood by American Universalists. As yet, the views of such are scarcely known in that part of the world. We suppose there are many persons there who doubt the truth of the doctrine of endless misery; and perhaps many who have a hope of the final salvation of all men; but how few are acquainted with our views, with our manner of interpreting the sacred oracles, with our explanations of parables, and of the passages of Scripture in general which are used to support the doctrine of endless misery. If some *popular preacher* could go out to England,—whose power of speaking would draw out the people, and who is in other respects qualified,—a great good would be done.

A gentleman—a Universalist—has recently addressed us a letter, showing a very strong desire upon this point. He names Br. A. C. Thomas as a suitable person to undertake the work. Him he heard preach at the late session of the United States' Convention, and he proposes that Br. Thomas should go. Will the Lombard Street congregation assent to the proposition? The gentleman to whom we refer, (we are not permitted to give his name), offers One Thousand Dollars towards the enterprise, if Br. Thomas will go out, provided one thousand dollars or more shall be contributed for the same purpose, previously to the first day of January next. We have his letter in our possession, and are happy to be made the medium of communicating his generous offer to the public. He is abundantly able to send out a hundred missionaries to different parts of the world on the same conditions. We make this remark to give our readers the fullest confidence in his offer. There is no back out to him; he never gave an illustration of the meaning of the phrase in all his life; in fact, it cannot be found in his vocabulary. He loves the truth; he knows the value of the Gospel; he knows the state of society in England.

Now the question is, will Br. Thomas go and spend one year upon the island of Great Britain, in earnest efforts to spread the doctrines of the American Universalists?

Can there be found persons who will make up the sum to two or three thousand dollars?

Let us hear from them on this point. We wish to say, that the gentleman who makes this offer is *not* a citizen of Philadelphia, but resides in New England. He is in no way connected with Br. Thomas, but nominates him because he believes him to be peculiarly fitted for the work.

It is our intention, sometime within two years, to visit England and spend from three to six months there. But this will not in the least interfere with Br. Thomas, but may possibly aid him. We shall go as an editor; he will go as a preacher.

Communications on this subject may be made to the editor of any Universalist journal in the United States.

The following is the letter we have received:—

"1,000 dollars offered towards spreading the Gospel in Great Britain.

Rev. Thos. Whittemore,—If there is a place on earth where true Gospel preaching is needed at this moment, it is Great Britain. I know from personal observation, that the harvest is fully ripe—ready for the sickle. Thousands in England at this moment are panting for the pure waters of everlasting life, and would leap for joy and bless God if they could hear announced the glad tidings of a *world's salvation*, a doctrine which many of them do not even know is cherished by a single person on earth, and for lack of which, they follow their children and dearest friends to the grave mourning as those who have no hope.

Many of our clergymen could be named, either one of whom would be a faithful and successful husbandman, if sent across the water to labor. Those who know the Rev. Abel C. Thomas, (and who does not?) and especially those who heard his exposition of our common faith at the late U. S. Convention in Boston, must feel that the mission in his hands with the Divine blessing must prosper abundantly.

Now I have a proposition to make to our brethren and the friends of the common salvation throughout our land.

I will give One Thousand Dollars towards an outfit for Br. Thomas to go to London and spend one year in labouring in Great Britain, provided a like sum or more is contributed for the same purpose from other sources. This offer shall remain open until the first day of January next, although I trust it will be complied with within a fortnight. Depend upon it, Br. Thomas will make a shaking among the dry bones of old 'Mother Church,' whose reverberations will be heard across the Atlantic, and be felt throughout the continent of Europe.

If 3,000 dollars can be raised it will nearer the *proper* mark than 2,000. With these 'sinews of war,' Br. Thomas would be prepared to do battle with the enemy, with tracts, pamphlets, &c., as well as orally. His expenses of living, travel, hire of halls, &c. for preaching, would be considerable, and therefore he should be well provided with pecuniary means before starting.

Now, brethren, let us all put our shoulders to the wheel in starting out the first Christian Missionary to England! Send in your 100 dollars, your 50 dollars, your 25 dollars, and let us send forth a specimen of American Universalism that will prove to be an American '*Plough*,' an American '*Reaper*,' and an American '*Harrow*,' in the land of our forefathers.—September 29th, 1851."—*Boston Trumpet.*

[To the preceding we invite attention. Our American friends have a perfect right to act as they propose doing. Let them, if they can, plant American Universalist Societies in every city and town of the United Kingdom. They shall encounter no interference from us. To bid them *God speed*, is of course out of our power. Equally so, to join them in their crusade. The Unitarian body they must call in to their aid, as allies; and with their support, and that of men similarly-minded, it is not impossible that some impression may be made on the ranks of Partialists, now in a state of disorganization and panic. But Universalists who respect God's Word, and are influenced by a consideration of Isaiah liii. 1, taken along with Matt. vii. 13, 14, and the facts of Christ's and his apostles' personal history, as they decline supporting pharisaical partialism, so will they not only hesitate about, but positively decline having anything to do with men who, besides assailing the Deity of Christ and the efficacy of his death as a sacrifice of atonement, would identify the church with the world during this present time state, thereby confounding the strait gate and the narrow way of eternal life with the wide gate and the broad way that lead to destruction.—D. T.]

REVIEWS.

The Ministry of the New Testament: or the substance of a discourse on that subject. By the late James Relly. Written in the year 1756. Published and sold by James Whitmarsh, Melbury Abbas, Dorset. London: H. K. Lewis, 15, Gower Street, North. Shaftesbury: C. Bastable, High Street. 1850.

Reader, procure as soon as thou canst, the pamphlet bearing the above title. It will do thee good. Supposing thee to be a scripturally taught Christian, thou canst not rise from the perusal of it, without having had thy spiritual understanding enlarged, and many false notions regarding *the truth as it is in Jesus* removed.

To two or three gentlemen, advanced in life, who reside in the neighbourhood of Shaftesbury, we are indebted for this intellectual and spiritual treat. Somewhat more than twenty-five years ago, certain works of Relly fell into the hands of Mr. William Upjohn,—"a man of talents and piety, of extensive

reading, and deep acquaintance with the Scriptures"*—who afterwards emigrated to America, where he died. By him his discoveries were communicated privately to others; while the grand doctrine which Relly advocated, Mr. Upjohn began immediately with zeal, combined with prudence, and attended with considerable success, to proclaim in Wiltshire, and the northern parts of Dorsetshire. He also published at least one pamphlet, in support of his newly adopted views. Mr. James Whitmarsh, Melbury, Abbas, Dorsetshire, who has a chapel of his own, in which for many years, and until laid aside by the infirmities of advanced life,† he published the unlimited love of God in Christ Jesus, and Mr. James Bracher of Tisbury Cross, near Hindon, Wilts, himself also now an aged disciple, were, through the instrumentality of Mr. Upjohn, and the perusal of Relly's writings, under the divine guidance and blessing, brought to see that scriptural Calvinism was not inconsistent with Universal Salvation. Several others, by a similar enlargement of their views, were gathered to them. Eager were they to hear of Mr. Relly's congregation in London. But, alas! long before their enquiries could be instituted, the very recollection that such a congregation had ever existed, seems to have vanished from the Metropolis. No tidings of the body could they obtain. Providential circumstances, however—among others, the seeking out of a school in which to place some descendants of one of the gentlemen just alluded to—were the means of bringing to light the fact of the existence in Gloucestershire, of Mrs. Tong, a widow, the only child of Mr. Relly, who is since deceased. In her possession, were several of her father's pamphlets, and three of his manuscripts unpublished. With a view to have these destroyed, and thereby to prevent the mischief of which if brought out they might be productive, a zealous clergyman of the Church of England had offered to purchase them from Mrs. Tong. The very handsome sum offered, that lady refused. She consented, however, to sell the whole of the written and printed productions of her father to Mr. Whitmarsh and his friends.‡ Thus these valuable expositions of scripture truth came into their possession. With Mrs. Tong,§ Mr. Whitmarsh continued to maintain a pleasing and edifying epistolary correspondence as long as she lived. One of the MSS. procured in the way just mentioned, which was composed as far back as 1756, is that which, having been submitted to the public in a printed form, we are now engaged in drawing attention to.

And well deserving to be rescued from the fate which seems to have impended over it, this production of Mr. Relly's is.

Characterised it is, like all his other works, by shrewd vigorous sense, amazing perspicuity of thought and statement, and profound experimental acquaintance with the language and meaning of Holy Writ. Perhaps, not always strictly logical in its arrangement. And yet not on that account the less acceptable to the ordinary class of readers. Argumentative power, James Relly is not deficient in; and where we have the substance of dialectics, as in his writings, the absence of their exact and syllogistic forms, is not always a disadvantage.

What has particularly delighted us in this tract, is its uniform tendency, as it is its professed object, to glorify Christ Jesus. No truce is here made with self-righteousness. Nothing is allowed to interfere with, or set aside, the work of our crucified and risen Redeemer, as the all-sufficient, and the alone-sufficient ground of our hope towards God. Human inherent holiness, Relly with

* Such is the language of Mr. Whittemore, in his "Modern history of Universalism," (published early in 1830,) p. 301. Our own correspondence, and subsequent personal intercourse with Mr. Upjohn, were but brief and slight: our convictions of the truth of Universal Salvation only dating from the Spring of 1829, and that gentleman having quitted this country for America, in the Summer of 1830. But upon our mind, the interviews which, in consequence of his sailing from Liverpool, we then had with Mr. Upjohn, have left an impression fully corroborative of what we have quoted in the text.

† Mr. Whitmarsh is 76 years of age.

‡ The sum paid for them was, we believe, ten pounds.

§ A daughter of Mrs. Tong's is married to a clergyman of the Establishment.

abhorrence ignores. In Christ alone, he finds his sanctification, as he finds his justification. 1 Cor. i. 30. Sanctified or separated in him, the effects of this separation are produced in us, by our belief in the fact. We are *sanctified* or separated *by the truth, even that word* of God *which is truth.* John xvii. 17. Only thus is natural darkness superseded so far by heavenly light—is natural enmity superseded so far by heavenly love. 2 Cor. iv. 6, Eph. ii. 16, 1 John iv. 19. Superseded, we say. Not improved. For, as in Adam's nature there neither dwelleth, nor can *dwell, any good thing*, Rom. vii. 18, it is fit only to be done away with and destroyed. Malachi iii. 2, 3, Matt. iii. 12, 2 Cor. v. 17.

Union with Christ, and the effects of that union, constitute the grand themes of this, as they do of all Mr. Relly's productions.* Clearly and gloriously are these truths brought out and insisted on by our author. One with Adam, the creature, his sin is ours, his death is ours; and just so, one with Jesus, the Creator, his righteousness is ours, his life is ours. No doubt the theme is most momentous. Probably, the most so to us, of any recorded in the sacred volume. And yet, might there not have been a little less monotonousness about Mr. Relly's handling of it? And might he not have been a little more cautious in so expressing himself, as to guard against being supposed to have denied the doctrine of vicarious atonement? It is rather annoying to us, to observe the manner in which Mr. Whittemore judging from the ambiguity of his language, has given an abstract of his sentiments, in the "Modern history of Universalism," pp. 277—279. Also, to find that a similar conclusion from what he has written has been drawn by a highly respected friend, Mr. Thomas Conolly Cowan, formerly of Bristol, by whom the "Union, or a treatise of the consanguinity and affinity between Christ and his Church," was republished in England, above twenty years ago. Union and atonement, aye even vicarious atonement, so far from being inconsistent with each other, are, when rightly understood, seen to be most harmonious scriptural truths. As one with all, Jesus died along with *all*, and rose again along with *all*: 2 Cor. v. 14, 15: ending in himself, by destroying in his death, human nature, pure as his, but as ours, loaded with sin and accursed; and new-creating in himself, and made partakers in him of the divine nature, those who had formerly been human beings, through the power of his resurrection. Heb. ix. 26, 2 Cor. v. 17, Rom. iv. 25, 1 Cor. xv. 49, Gal. vi. 14, 15, Eph. iv. 23, 24, Col. ii. 11, 12. Also, Jesus died in the stead, or as the substitute of *some*, that is, of *the members of his church:* having died and risen again, before the second death was incurred by the sin against the Holy Ghost, committed by the Jewish people in their rejection of himself glorified: his exhaustion of death, and his raising directly in himself the members of his church, having made them partakers of the first resurrection, and rendered it impossible that the second death, subsequently incurred and inflicted, should hurt or have power over them. Rev. xx. 6. Also ii. 11.† In all this we have union as the basis, as well as means of atonement or reconciliation. Christ made temporarily one with us in flesh, makes us for ever one with him in spirit: atoning for us, and reconciling us to God, not by any mere arbitrary act, such, for instance, as obviating the necessity of our undergoing the first death, but, after allowing the original threatening to take full effect in the case of all of us by the termination in us of human nature, thereby preserving the justice and truth of God intact, by submitting to the execution of the same threatening and sentence himself as one with us, and as loaded with our sins, and thereby acquiring the means both of exhausting sin and death, in his own death and resurrection, and of

* "Union" is the title of one of the best known of Mr. Relly's works. It was assailed by the Rev. Mr. Mason; the attack by that able clergyman having given occasion to the master by rejoinder, entitled, "Antichrist resisted."

† Christ is *the resurrection* and *the life*. As the *former* he does not prevent his people from undergoing *the first death*, but, by means of his own death, and resurrection, delivers by raising them from it. As *the latter*, his people, raised directly in his resurrection, and made partakers of aeoniun life, do not undergo *the second death*. See John xi. 25, 26. (See Greek.)

making us partakers in him of the divine nature. And this atonement, reconcilation, or *setting at one* of the guilty creature, and the offended Creator, by the expiatory sacrifice and resurrection of the Messiah, while common to all, is specially vicarious or substitutionary, in as far as escape from the second death, and the enjoyment of peculiar heavenly blessings by the members of the election of grace are concerned. This is the scriptural view of the subject. Union implying the satisfaction of justice by adequate punishment, no less than the satisfaction of mercy by the free gift of life everlasting. Union carried into effect by atonement, and atonement the result of union. It is to be wished that Mr. Relly had so expressed himself in reference to this subject, as to have prevented mistakes. Yet let this servant of God have justice. Union with Christ on the part of man, and salvation in him accordingly, constitute most glorious divine truths. And clearly, sweetly, satisfactorily, in many respects, has Mr. Relly proclaimed them.

Christ is all. In Christ we have all. And to Christ alone belongs the undivided glory of salvation. Such are Mr. Relly's leading themes. Not in words merely, as is common with but too many, who, after saying the same or something similar, immediately contradict themselves either by assigning expressly to the creature some share in his own salvation, or by teaching him to look away from Christ to self for that comfort and hope towards God, which in Christ, and in the truth concerning him alone are to be found. James Relly, sometimes at the risk of being understood to deny the subjective indwelling and operation of the truth altogether, makes Christ, what the scriptures represent him to be, alone and exclusively all our salvation and all our desire.

His notions as to the existence of a New Testament ministry now, and as to God ever having had any ministers of the New Testament besides the apostles and their immediate coadjutors—as also his making ministers of the Gospel to be the antitypes of the Levites of old—we may be permitted to question. But the great bulk of his remarks on the typical character of the Old Testament institutions, and of his distinctions between the two Covenants, meet with our hearty and unqualified concurrence. Relly, like some more of us, had much to learn. Aye, and much to unlearn, too. He had "touched the pitch" of human theology, and how could he entirely escape being "defiled?" But enough was revealed to him, to make him suspect his own ignorance and shortcomings, as well as to prepare him for further illumination—the grand and legitimate test of scriptural teaching. In Christ, he desired more and more to see self merged; and Christ's glory, however much to his own disadvantage, and at his own expense, he desired more and more to see promoted. Such is the spirit which breathes throughout all his writings, as well as in that now before us; and which commends, and will ever commend them to our dearest affections. See Gal. ii. 20.

Mr. Whittemore, in a recent number of the "Trumpet," (Boston, U. S.) speaks disparagingly of Relly and his system. He represents the latter as having gone down; and he predicts a similar fate for every system of Universalism, having Calvinism, or rather the divine sovereignty, the deity of Jesus Christ, and the satisfaction of divine justice by atoning sacrifice, for its basis. We acquiesce in the worthy Editor's remark, with a slight qualification. Relly's system is *down*, but the fact is it was never *up*. Like Him whose character it displays, and to promote whose glory it is intended, it has from the first *been despised and rejected of men*. Isaiah liii. 3. It is part and parcel of "the strait gate and narrow way" salvation into which few ever enter, and in which few are ever found walking. Matt. vii. 14. Its rejection by *the many* is not necessarily, therefore, a proof of its falsehood. It shews that it is not adapted to fleshly minds, and fleshly likings. That is all. Systems of Universalism which embrace multitudes, and aim at being received by the majority of the human race during their time state of existence—systems which pander to human rationality, at the expense of flinging overboard the fundamental truths

of revelation, making the Lord Jesus a creature, and the efficacy of his blood as a propitiatory to divine wrath a mere fiction—Relly, and those who in the main agree with him, leave to persons who prefer entering in at the wide gate, and walking in the broad way, heedless of the awful consequences in which, as they are forewarned, such procedure on their part is sure in the long run to issue. Ibid. 13.

But the limited space which we can command, warns us to think of bringing our comments on this most interesting addition to our existing Universalist literature, to a close. Before doing so, however, our author may be permitted to say a few words for himself.

Speaking of his own mode of proclaiming the gospel, as a practical protest against what is commonly reputed orthodox, and as objected to on the score of its indulging ease, as well as of its licentious tendency, Mr. Relly says:—

"It is probable that *some* may charge my choice of such a testimony to a native indolence, as being an easy religion, for thus, the very religious people often call it: indeed, in one sense, it is an easy religion, as our Saviour's yoke is easy, and his burden light; as his ways are ways of pleasantness, and all his paths are peace; but that it is not easy to flesh and blood, is manifest enough, and that it is not natural to the world to receive it. It certainly cannot be the broad way by which the many go, for facts prove the contrary; and if it be natural to mankind, as corrupt, to choose the easiest religion, how comes it that so very few of them choose this? Almost all the orthodox and pious race of *Adam* reject it—from those who inhabit the common stews, up to the mortified hermit; yea, the most profane swearer, the drunkard, the robber, the murderer, all, to a man, complain of the true gospel, that it is licentious, that it leaves them nothing to do, and if such a doctrine be true, they may live as they list, they need not do good works; with many such pious objections. Hence it appears that ours is not the easy religion that corrupt nature makes choice of, or otherwise that this corruption, or mistake, is limited to a few, whilst the multitude is the standard of truth. But to judge of the good, the holy, the virtuous, the orthodox, by the MANY, and of the heretic, the vicious, the cast-away, that they are the FEW, is a manifest inversion of the scripture testimony concerning the matter, and can only be accounted for, from the inconsistent prejudices and enmity of man to the precious gospel of *Jesus Christ*."

"If it was such an easy religion, or calculated to gratify and soothe the lusts and passions of mankind, whence that edge of malice, that implacable enmity of Jew and Gentile towards it?" &c. p. 37, 38.

Again we find our author remarking, p. 39, 40:—

"It is difficult, from the deceitfulness of the human heart—it is very natural for men to seek honour one of another and not that honour that cometh from God only. Hence, they cannot endure to be hated, reproached, and despised for *Christ's* sake; especially, as they think it *unnecessary* to their salvation or happiness. To the same deceitful heart it is natural to be lifted up in the vanity of our own knowledge; men are not only apt to be wise above what is written, but to know so much (in their own opinion) as to need no farther instruction; which is a step towards a state of ease and peace, totally independent of *Christ* or independent of *communion* and *fellowship* with him, at least. The pride of knowledge proves very fatal to many: for though they may not *excel* in knowledge, yet to be *opinionated* of their own knowledge, is the danger; for leaving the plain and simple doctrine of *Christ*, they wander in search of novelties; the prophets and apostles growing too low for them, they pretend to infallibility themselves, and forge new revelations. Hence, they fall first into misticism," (mysticism?) "and next into deism, where they deny the Lord who bought them. Others, beguiled from the simplicity of *Christ*, as the serpent beguiled *Eve*, pine for some other good, and to be that in themselves, which God has ordained they should only be in *Christ;* whilst sundry who have rejoiced in the light for a season, are, by the love of pleasure, business, or indolence, palled in spirit, and consequently let go their profession, and grow supine and thoughtless."

Although Relly was naturally an amiable and benevolent man, he was possessed of a great talent for sarcasm. This, occasionally, but without being personal, he causes to bear with tremendous power upon those, who, affecting peculiar divine sanctity of thought and feeling, were distinguished obviously by a large measure of human desires, human self-conceit, and human hypocrisy. Listen to the following:—

"As my design is not to meddle with the clergy of the National Church, I shall

pass *them* over to observe, that even the dissenting teachers are not a little desirous of the clerical habit. As to the band, they have been in possession of that for some time, and it is now become so general, that the very *least* of them, whether regular or irregular, can do nothing without it, as if it was as truly the badge of inspiration as it is of a preacher amongst them, and the only mark of distinction between a man and his congregation. But there are some risen up of late amongst us, who, from the same principle of distinguishing their dress, instead of wearing their bands round their necks, wear them round their hand-wrists, where they put on ruffles to preach. There are some of them indeed who seem to be making advances towards the gown, which (it is not to be doubted,) they will, wear with boldness in some period, when their people are fully prepared for it and themselves have fairly got rid of those feint" (faint?) "ideas of *Christ*, which as yet makes them ashamed of being seen in a juggling dress. As to the irregular preachers, so called, who have started up in various parts of the nation, whether *originally* of the clergy or of the laity, they are all almost to a man fond of this apparel. O, how privileged! how happy are such among them who have a right to wear the priestly robes; though they condescend to call the others brethren, yet they consider themselves many degrees above them. They reserve to themselves the administration of sacraments —they sit on high in the synod—their sentences are definitive—nor from *them* is there any appeal; thus, even amongst themselves, they keep up the farce with seriousness, and permit the imagination that the habit communicates dignity, and inspires the *wearer* with wisdom and greatness of soul. The lay preachers, deeply sensible of the inconvenience which they labour under in this particular, pant for ordination in the National Church, that they also may wear the precious robes. This to obtain, they leave no means untried; they strive mightily, they beg, petition, and creep to any one who has but the least interest with the bishops; during which state of hope and solicitude, they are as ductile as a piece of clay, and in appearance ready for any impression. They patiently endure censure, and meekly receive instruction; they are free to make any promise required of them, or to subscribe to whatever articles are proposed to them. But somebody will say possibly, what becomes of their conscience all this time? Conscience! What has conscience to do in such affairs? Conscience is where it should be upon such occassions—fast asleep: lulled with the expectation of new dignities. But the stupefactive draught, or that which in a great measure prevents their distress under such conduct, is the supposition that they shall be capable of doing much more good when they have obtained their desires than they were capable of doing before. Thus the notion of doing evil that good may come, is much more general than men are aware of, and commonly sways the conduct of the greatest advocates for human holiness. But after all, there are but few that get in by this door, and these, with great difficulty." Pp. 52, 53.

Surely these quotations are quite enough to convey a fair impression of Mr. Relly's style, as well as views and habits of thinking.

Who can furnish us with a full, faithful and fitting memoir of this excellent man? Glimpses of his personal history we have, in various ways, had exhibited to us. His own writings have supplied us with some. For several, we have been indebted to John Murray's "Autobiography," to Whittemore's "Modern History of Universalism," and to communications from Messrs. Whitmarsh and Bracher. To the former of these two gentlemen, we owe our knowledge of the fact that Mr. Relly died on the 25th April, 1778. But we still desiderate much. Where was Mr. Relly born? What was his training, and what his secular profession? What were the circumstances attendant on his connexion with George Whitfield, and on its rupture? We also want to know the circumstances and issue of his controversy with Mason. With many things besides. For instance, his private character, his habits, and his associates. He preached, it seems, Mr. Whitfield's funeral Sermon. Where? And is the Sermon in existence? Mr. Whitfield died at Newbury-Port, Massachusetts, in 1770. During the eight years which intervened between the death of the great founder of Calvinistic Methodism, and his own, what was Mr. Relly engaged in? What was his procedure towards his old co-disciples in Mr. Whitfield's Congregation? What was his success in proclaiming the doctrine of Universal Salvation? We should like if, as a tail-piece to this, some one could furnish us with authentic information as to the reason of the total silence, in regard to Mr. Relly's Congregation, observed by the biographer of Elhanan Winchester, when narrating the sayings and doings of the celebrated American preacher, during his stay in the English Metropolis, from 1787 till 1794.

Reader, again we say, procure, read, and compare with the scriptures, the masterly production of James Relly, which it has been our purpose in this article to bring under thy notice. It can scarcely fail to do thee good. If it give thee some ugly and humbling views of self, and, by bringing in thy conscience as an ally, excite in thee suspicions that thou art the very man against whom his strictures are directed, be not discouraged, but bless God for the salutary application to thy conscience of the spiritual cautery. Relly's object, remember, is not to exalt thee, but Christ; or, rather, is to exalt thee only in, and as one with Christ. He wants to impress upon thy mind, the revealed fact, that it was, whilst thou wert a sinner, that Christ died for thee; and that it is in spite of thy still continuing to be a sinner of the blackest dye, without anything in thyself to recommend thee to God's favour, that the power of Christ's resurrection is put forth, in freely conferring on thee life everlasting. His book, therefore, is professedly an assault on self, while it magnifies the grace of God in thy salvation. Let the effect of its perusal on thy mind be, not to produce despair, but to cause thee to walk humbly and circumspectly with thy God, whilst thou art waiting patiently by faith for the full realization of that mercy of God, unto eternal life, which is thy certain and indefeasible privilege, through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

D. T.

Elements of Catholic Philosophy; or theory of the natural system of the human mind. Και ἡ τοιαυτη ἀρχη ανθρωπος. London: Longman, Brown and Co, 1850.
Letters on the Laws of Man's Nature and Developement. By Henry George Atkinson, F.G.S, and Harriet Martineau. London: John Chapman 142, Strand. 1851.

Phrenology, assuming to be a science, is certainly not to our taste. But phrenology content to point to facts, to suggest conclusions, and to wait until the patient investigation of contemporaries and posterity shall have furnished man with well observed and ascertained phenomena, shall have led him by cautious induction to principles, and shall have enabled him to turn the whole subject practically to account, we hail with pleasure as taking its place among those contributions to the store of man's intellectual wealth, and those aids to his advance in the pathway of civilization and improvement, of which the present age, above all that have preceded it, has such abundant reason to be proud.

Undoubtedly, Gall and Spurzheim* did much for their favourite theory. Nor do we consider the labours of those who have followed them in the same track, as altogether undeserving of notice. George Combe may not be very original or profound—Scott may have been crotchetty—the "Zoist" people may countenance materialism—Elliotson and others in this country may have mixed up their facts with many most questionable assumptions,—and several continental writers, Vimont among the rest, may have shewn themselves disposed to ride their hypothesis to death; but something, in spite of their grievous short-comings, has been achieved by all of them. Their hints, nay even their very blunders, have not been without fruit. The pearls, amidst the chaff, may not have been very numerous or very fine; but there have been pearls notwithstanding.

The things which have chiefly annoyed and disgusted us in phrenology, are its presumption, its quackery, and its efforts, either more or less insidious, to undermine the truths of revelation. At best but an attempt to find material organs for mental tendencies and phenomena, which were observed as far back at least as the days of Aristotle, it would insinuate, and would fain induce mankind to believe, (without expressly asserting it,) that it has discovered,

* This last-named individual we knew personally. His twelve able and instructive lectures we heard delivered in 1829. Seldom, if ever, have we met with more strength of intellect and accuracy of observation, combined with a more calm, philosophic, and winning deportment, than in him. He was a man powerful in his simplicity.

or at all events has been capable of discovering, from the brain alone, these tendencies and phenomena themselves. At best consisting of a set of partial observations and experiments, often ill-made, and almost always intended to establish certain foregone conclusions, it would fain pretend to the most perfect accuracy, to an exhaustion of the subject, and to the strictest impartiality. And aiming to shew that the mind of man, developing itself in connection and agreement with the organic structure of the brain, is necessarily fleshly, it glories in having cast suspicions on, if not entirely overturned the principles of A BOOK, which actually four thousand years ago described man as *made of the dust of the ground,* Gen. ii. 7, 1 Cor. xv. 47, and which nearly two thousand, years since, pronounced his mind to be *a mind of flesh.* Rom, viii. 7, Col. ii. 18. Phrenology, if men of sense, not to say Christians, are to give it the attention which it deserves, must be content to furl its canvass, if not even to strike its sails. It must acknowledge itself to be still in a state of infancy. It must relinquish the attitude of a teacher, for that of a scholar. The combined working of various faculties, (let it be supposed that all of these, and their respective cerebral seats are ascertained, which most assuredly they are not,) and the modifying influences to which the direct action of the brain is exposed by means of temperament, education, and other circumstances—the grand problems in the science of mind, and the ability to solve which, alone can confer on that science any real practical value and utility—involve as every tyro in metaphysics and mathematics knows, an amount of acquaintance with the human mind, a mastering of the complicated relations of intellect and will, and a power of conducting refined and profound calculations, to the acquirement and exercise of which, phrenology, whatever may be the boasts of its supporters, has as yet contributed but very slender assistance. It will not do to say, here the organ of destructiveness is large, and, therefore, this man is likely to turn out to be a murderer. Or, in this other person acquisitiveness is fully developed, and, therefore, when he enters our house, we must look sharply after our silver spoons. All this is not more gross, than it is silly. We ask the devoted adherents of this so-called science, to read to us each human being *as a whole.* Let any man who has studied the complicated relations of the chess-board—nay, let any man of common sense, and common observation—just whisper to the enthusiastic, and over confident phrenologist, that even supposing him to have studied and ascertained *au fond* the seat of every faculty, and every inclination of the human mind in the brain, his real task has yet to begin. He has to apply, not quackishly, but scientifically, his discoveries. *Hic labor—hoc opus.* And if, as is but too probable, he find himself baffled in his attempts, it may be that to a better acquaintance with the scriptures, and to a greater reverence for their contents, he shall be constrained after all to be indebted for the correction of his blunders, for the weapons whereby the opponents of phrenology, rightly understood, may be combatted and overcome, and for having imparted to his theory that basis of truth, as well as practical character and efficiency, of which, at the present moment, it is confessedly destitute.

Let the brain be admitted to be the organ of mind. Let its various convolutions be admitted to have to do with specific mental manifestations. Let it be admitted that the regions of thought, sentiments, and appetites, as situated respectively in the front, top, and base of the head, can be pointed out. And let us admit, even, that the seats of several of these faculties have been ascertained. To what, more than this, except empirically, and as drawing rather too largely on human credulity, can phrenology pretend?

Two works of great merit now lying on our table, and both relating to phrenology, at present claim our regard.

There are discoverable in the "Catholic Philosophy," more than *vestiges* of superior intellect, capital education, varied and valuable reading, and, upon the whole, good sound sense. Its author is not chargeable exactly with indulging in the freaks and vagaries of a Paracelsus. His style is powerful and

perspicuous. Occasionally, a little laboured. A young man he manifestly is. He comes forward fresh from the labours and acquirements of College. He has read recently, and he has read carefully; and he is determined, before forgetting what he has learned and amassed, to give us the benefit of his reading. We perceive, at a glance where he has been. We trace the good and the ripe scholar, over lawns, verdant and smiling, which he has recently trod. And the scent from his raiment shews, that in the course of his early intellectual travels, before sitting down to the business and toils of mature life, the spicy fields of "Arably the blessed," have not been in spirit unvisited or unexplored by him. We hail the accession of such a man as this, to the cause of science and literature.

A work like that which now engages our attention. argues, on the part of its author, the possession of a mind of no ordinary character and calibre. Cultured, thoughtful, powerful. Fond of speculative enquiry, and qualified to succeed in the prosecution of it. Perhaps, a little too much addicted to novelty—in another sense than that in which the words were originally employed, *avidus novarum rerum*—and, unconsciously to himself we doubt not, somewhat prone to bend facts to theory. Perhaps, also, occasionally a little too dogmatic, and exhibiting rather more than is proper or desirable in a professedly philosophic writer, of self-sufficiency, and self-conceit. To counterbalance these defects, however, he evinces himself to be endowed with a capacity for taking a view of a subject at once comprehensive, and in all its details; and satisfies us, that if not destined to advance phrenology to the rank of a science, or able to induce us to part with the teachings of a mental philosophy which is worthy of the name for his somewhat crude essay to rest it solely on a material basis, we are yet presented in his work with abundant matter for reflection, and have suggested to us a way in which many of the objections of antiphrenologists may be readily answered and obviated. If somewhat juvenile, and as regards the permament establishment of the fame of its author a decided failure, we cannot say of it, as of many other youthful productions, that it is empty and trashy. It abounds with matter—it both implies and suggests thought—and there is a manly and wholesome vigour about the intellect from which it has emanated, which, even when we dissent from our author's statements and conclusions, makes itself to be felt. Let not the author be discouraged, even though this present production of his should fall still-born from the press. He has come forward prematurely. He has been unfortunate in the choice of his subject, and has had to grapple with difficulties which probably no existing human mind is thoroughly competent to overcome. But his work is not without its value. After perusing it, and giving due weight to its contents, it will, we think, be difficult, if not even impossible, for any man of sense and candour, to evade the conclusion, that the fleshliness of man's mind, and the dependence of its operations on his organic structure, are elements which must enter essentially and indispensably into every enlarged, correct, and satisfactory system of mental philosophy. Besides, the abilities which this work displays justify us in saying to the writer, that if he will be but true to himself, he is destined yet to accomplish greater things. *Indulge genio, puer.*

The great object of our author is to establish a philosophy catholic, or of universal application, on the basis of nature. His system he considers scientific, because natural; and opposes it to all ordinary systems, which, whatever may be their merits otherwise, he apprehends to be more or less speculative, and referable mainly to opinion. Nature, as a basis of mental philosophy, is to him the brain of man; or the forms and size of the human head, as indicative generally of the forms and size of the brain. In other words, phrenology, as being supposed to have observed and ascertained the inseparable connection of certain mental phenomena with certain portions of the head, is assumed by him as alone competent to furnish us with a system of mental philosophy, in which all will ultimately acquiesce. He disclaims being a disciple of Gall,

Spurzheim, or Vimont, any more than of Lavater* or Camper. But although he does avail himself of Lavater's refined speculations and poetical reveries, and of Camper's accurate, profound, and truly scientific observations,—although he calls to his aid physiognomy and the facial angle more than the great bulk of phrenologists hitherto have been disposed to do—still it is to the great modern masters in phrenologic lore, and their works, that we must look, for the facts and principles upon which the "Catholic," or natural "Philosophy" has been founded.

No doubt its author in many respects exposes and condemns the faults of preceding phrenologists. Their catalogue of distinct primary faculties he enlarges, so as to make these amount to 42 in number. And these he has grouped into classes, orders, and genera. He has tried to be the Linnæus of this would-be science. We have according to him, mind represented as comprehending three classes, the appetites or instinctive faculties, the powers, that is, the organic or instrumental faculties, and the sentiments, implying the moral faculties or ethical virtues. These he asserts, and afterwards very ably attempts to shew, correspond to the Orectic, the Dianoetic, and the Ethical powers of the mind, agreeably to the division of Aristotle. The subdivision of each class into three orders, (of the first order of class 2, into three suborders,) and of these orders into genera, constitute the most distinguishing part of our author's theory. Great ingenuity he has displayed in this department of his work. His system he has contrived to invest with the *forms* of science, at any rate. To enter upon a minute consideration of the developements of his plan is absolutely impossible.

Probably, the most original, we wish we could have added the most satisfactory portion of his work is that in which he treats of "the Physical Vestiges of the Fall," and professes to point out in the brain, "the seat of a dark, lost mental faculty." Chap. x.

"In the centre of the side of the head, at the same distance from the central feature as that of the faculty of judgment, at the point where the three classes meet, and adjoining the indications of Hope and Concealment, of Wonder, Beauty, and Fear, is a space to which observation has hitherto failed to attribute any given function, and in which the outside of the head is frequently depressed. In the London busts the faculty conversant with Beauty, (Ideality,) is made to extend over this unknown region: in the Edinburgh bust, it is marked with a note of interrogation. * * Bereft of the only sure guidance of observation, we are yet led by a strange fascination, to linger on the mysterious limits of this unknown region." p. 120.

Our author supposes himself to find here the seat of a faculty which existed in innocent and unfallen Adam, of spiritual† perception, and of holding communion and converse with his Maker—a faculty which, having been lost by transgression, he conceives that the physical index of its previous existence may have passed away. Vestiges, however, shew where it once was. Such is briefly the substance of the chapter in which this singular idea is broached. Most readers of the Catholic Philosophy will be apt to think, that whether or not there appears here "the calm exercise of reason," we at all events encounter "the poetic play of imagination;" and will consider the author to have acted not unwisely in "distinguishing the present chapter, as one of mere hypothesis, from the inductive and analytic portions of his "work."‡ Some rather gra-

* Between twenty and thirty years ago, we perused with care and with intense interest, Lavater's celebrated work, extending over several, we think five volumes. We remember that the impression made by it on our mind at the time was pleasing. But it was evanescent. There was too much of mere theory and declamation—what Taylor, the Devil's Chaplain, used to call *skyology*—in the book. We found it scarcely possible to seize on a single principle. The author was constantly substituting the dictates of his feelings for accurate observation and ascertained facts. Beautiful, certainly, did many of his speculations appear to us to be. Perfectly, because instinctively, or rather intuitively true, in a majority of cases, his appreciation of individual character. But dreamy was the character of the work as a whole felt to be; and like ordinary dreams, faint and feeble has been its influence on the mind.

† Spiritual? No. Adam's communion with God was *soulical* or *fleshly*, at the best. *Spiritual*, or *heavenly* communion we are raised to only in Christ, and as partakers, in him, of the *spiritual* or *divine* nature. 1 Cor. xv. 45, 49. Eph. iv. 23, 24.

‡ See p. 119.

tuitously introduced theories and remarks, as to the inspiration of scripture,—far from being to our mind—characterise this part of the treatise. Notwithstanding, however, objections of various kinds to which the author has laid himself open, much natural ability is by him here evinced.

Evangelical, after an odd and yet now a somewhat general fashion, is our author in his sentiments. Certain old-fashioned doctrines he would fain be understood as holding; and yet, he would have them set in a new and Germanized key. Human nature's confinement to time, and termination in the death of Christ, he has no conception of. Human nature he sees perpetuated and carried out, in a refined form, into a higher state of existence. This *old thing* has not to him *passed away*. 2 Cor. v. 17, Rev. xxi. 4, 5. As a practical consequence, inseparably connected with this error, he cannot stop where scripture stops. He is unable to confine fleshly mind to the fleshly state, and to fleshly purposes. It must explain spiritual* phenomena likewise. He finds in the brain the principles of Abraham's faith, of David's inspiration, and of Paul's converted character and success. We think we perceive indications even of his going farther. All this is most melancholy. Especially, in a man of such promise, as the author of this work. Phrenology may map out the brain as it pleases. It may point out the particular portion of the cerebrum or cerebellum, with which this or that mental phenomenon of man, viewed merely as a descendant of Adam, stands connected. We may not dissent. Nay, it is possible that in many respects, and to a certain extent, we may coincide. At all events, investigation into the connexion between man's physical structure, and fleshly mental capacities and phenomena, will open up a field which science may legitimately and without risk of question occupy. But its range is limited to the mind of man, *viewed as a being of the earth, earthy*. Of divine faith, and spiritual* phenomena, it knows nothing, and can tell nothing. Its province is the mind of Adam, not the mind of Christ glorified. Whenever, therefore, forgetting its limits, and ignorant of the opposition between the mind of man, and the mind of God, phrenology would attempt to represent faith and love, principles and earnests of the divine nature, and dependent solely and directly on the good pleasure of Jehovah, as having to do with one form, or one convolution of the human brain, more than with another, we must be excused for turning our backs upon every such *intrusion of fleshly mind* into what it *hath not seen*, and treating it with sovereign contempt. False pretensions to faith, hope, and love, phrenology may be competent to expose. But the *manifestation of the truth as it is in Jesus*, and its effects, come from a region, and indicate the operation of principles, with which neither the brain, nor the mind of man, except as subjected to their influence in time, and finally superseded by them, has any connection.†

"Elements of Catholic Philosophy," it will be pretty obvious from what goes before, we deem to have failed from its professed object, as must be the case with every system which essays to lay what is merely human, as an adequate foundation for the Unlimited and Universal. Divine principles alone can fully and satisfactorily explain the phenomena of man's existence and character. And such principles alone can at all explain his spiritual destiny. Still let us do our author justice. As a classification of phrenological observations—as an attempt at philosophical induction in a department of knowledge where little of the kind worth noticing has hitherto appeared—as a *methode raisonnee* of what has been accomplished, up to the present time, in connecting the operations of mind with cerebral forms and convolutions—we have no hesitation whatever in assigning to this work a high, indeed, the highest place.

---

* *Spiritual*, not in the German and Unitarian sense of intellectual, but in the true and scriptural sense of heavenly and divine—that is, connected with the glorified form of Christ's mind. 1 Cor. xv. 45,—44, 48, 49, *Ib.* ii. 84, 15, Jude 19.

† To express ourselves otherwise: from observation of the scull and brain, combined with temperament, &c., we *may* discover each man's *natural* tendencies and character; but the slightest indication of one's *spiritual* character, if a believer in Christ Jesus, nothing human or external, can afford us.

We have so frequently, in this Periodical and elsewhere, had occasion to express ourselves adverse to theories which would confound the growing improvement and civilization of man, with the advance and increasing operation of the divine principles of faith and love, that it is unnecessary for us to say more, than that from a large proportion of the notions and anticipations of our author, regarding the future state of man upon earth, we positively and totally dissent. The growing faith and love of the church, we have no doubt, will to a certain degree exercise a beneficial influence on society at large; but mere human progress in knowledge and social amelioration proceeds on principles not only different from, but even antagonistic to those of the divine nature. Gal. v. 17. &c.

Despite of the sneers and disparaging remarks of the "Athenæum," (Aug. 23) we must be permitted to consider the style of this work, as, on the whole, singularly good. It no doubt has faults. Some of these we have already adverted to. But with such vigour of mind, and richness of resources, as the author evidently possesses,—with his education, his generally sound judgment, his turn for philosophical speculation, and his correct taste—all that he requires is merely to bring a little more experience, and a little more practice to bear upon a somewhat more manageable subject than that which has constituted the basis of his *coup d'essai*, to enable him to take a very respectable rank indeed among those who have enriched with their compositions the English tongue.

Turning from the writer whose work has given occasion to the preceding remarks, we find ourselves confronted by the world-famed authoress of "Tales illustrative of Political Economy," introducing to us, and acting as the *proneuse* of Mr. Henry George Atkinson, F. G. S. Their joint production we shall dismiss with as brief a commentary as possible.

That much ability is displayed by Miss Martineau and her friend, and that considerable instruction may be derived from their work, we do not dispute. Besides, its very appearance deserves to be classed among the wonderful phenomena of our otherwise wonderful age. But an inexpressibly, an insufferably painful feeling is experienced by us in the perusal of it, from first to last.

Two clever individuals, the one professionally, and the other as the result of a cure which she considers to have been effected by mesmeric agency, set themselves to the study of the human brain. Having discovered, or fancying that they have discovered in its lobes, ventricles, convolutions, and nervous matter, the origin of mind and of mental operations, their observations and inferences they first recount to each other. They then favour the public with the benefit of them. Enthusiastic both by nature, they catch fire from each other's enthusiasm. The God of nature in their eyes becomes ultimately swamped by nature itself. And, under their plastic hands, a goodly system of Atheism at last fashions itself into shape.

Glorying in their shame, in the work now before us, they proclaim it unblushingly to the world.

The high scientific character and attainments of Mr. Atkinson, and the genius of his fair correspondent, we have neither wish nor intention to detract from. In the case of the latter, her acknowledged abilities, and eminent qualifications as a writer, evinced in a long series of productions, have long placed her on a very exalted footing among England's *litterateurs*. Among living female authors, indeed, she is almost without a peer.* But, notwithstanding, the whole affair, as managed by the parties before us, is prodigiously dull. We

* Since writing the few lines which appear as a note in our review of Mr. Roe's work, in the October Number of this journal. p. 253, Mrs. Sherwood, the subject of that note, has passed away. Little did we think when we penned it. that we were so soon to be called on to deplore her loss. Being dead, however, she yet speaks. And let us express the hope that by the publication by her daughter of the work there alluded to, which she had so long in hand, and on which she had bestowed such pains, she may be enabled still further to benefit contemporaries and posterity.

absolutely slumber over some of the letters. Were it not for the startling statements in which they abound, and the equally startling inferences which from time to time they are obtruding on our notice, we question much if the patience of any reader would suffice to carry him through to the close. We cannot help thinking that, in spite of superior and even in some respects extraordinary literary merit, this work of Miss Martineau and Mr. Atkinson will speedily find its way to "the tomb of all the Capulets."

Our readers, who have not seen it, may be enabled to form some idea of the plan of the work if we tell them that it consists mainly of questions proposed by Miss Martineau, and of detailed answers to these furnished by Mr. Atkinson. Occasionally the lady contrives to introduce a little variety into her part of the correspondence, by throwing out hints as to her own personal experience regarding the matters treated of. These are not without their use in stimulating and drawing out the other party.—By the way, there are some very curious articles in the Appendix.*

Nauseating are the attempts made in this twin-product, to disparage the miracles of the Lord Jesus, and to fling doubts on the origin and nature of revealed prophecy. We may be amused with Zschokke's "divinations," and stare at Cazotte's foretelling of the fate of certain Revolutionary heroes and heroines, some years before the events spoken of actually occurred. But after all, our faith in Scripture miracles and prophecy remains unshaken. Nay, acquires strength from such attempts to overthrow it. For imitations of Scripture miracles and Scripture prophecies, the Scriptures themselves shew us to be within the compass of man's ability; as witness the cases of the Egyptian magicians, Exod. vi. vii., 2 Tim. iii. 8, the witch of Endor, 1 Sam. xxviii., the lying prophet, 1 Kings xiii. 18, and others. We cannot forget especially the soothsaying of the young woman who had the spirit of Python, and the manner in which her career was so markedly checked by the Apostle Paul. Acts xvi. 16—18. Man's mind is competent to the performance of many wondrous things. More wondrous, perhaps, than have ever yet been suspected. Far surpassing any recorded in Sir David Brewster's "Natural Magic," or in Reichenbach's "Researches on Magnetism," so cleverly translated by Dr. Gregory, of Edinburgh. It may be, nay, we conceive it to be extremely probable that exhibitions of human miracles, and human prophecies, almost surpassing belief, yet await the world. But such things have a limit. So felt Jannes and Jambres, and so felt the damsel whose case has just been referred to. "Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther," is God's restraint as effectually imposed on human power, as it is on the mighty and tempestuous ocean. Besides that many things given out as facts seem to us unproved, and therefore suspicious, even assuming them to be true, they belong to the category, not of the *spiritual*, but of the *soulical*. They belong not to the *divine*, but are mere illustrations of the hitherto unexplored depths of the *human*. Here appears one of the blunders committed by the joint authors of this work. The religious ideas of man and the religion of God—the *indefinite* and the *infinite*,—totally distinct matters, they are constantly confounding. Man's doings they would fain raise to a level with those of God. Now to this we at once and decidedly demur. Every well authenticated instance of human miracle and prophecy to which Miss Martineau and her friend can lay claim, shall be readily conceded to them; and yet so broad and marked is the line of demarkation between them and the grand miracles of Scripture, that none of them extends to the raising of the dead to the possession and enjoyment of continued earthly life, John xi. 43, 44, much less to the conferring upon those who have returned to the dust as descendants of Adam, and as involved in his sin and death, the

* We may observe that the viiith and xth letters of this collection, by Mr. Atkinson, treating chiefly of the cerebrum and cerebellum, well deserve and will amply repay a perusal. They, indeed almost all his letters, exhibit a minute accuracy of anatomical research, and an extent of physiological knowledge, extremely creditable to his professional talents and acquirements. Deeply do we wish that his language had been characterized by less arrogance and self-conceit.

possession of glorified bodies and glorified minds, the possession of incorruption and immortality through Christ Jesus, at God's right hand for ever. John xi. 25, 26, Rom. v. 12—21, 1 Cor. xv. *throughout.*

Evangelical views of religion, as a matter of course, find no favour with the talented pair. One caricature of the doctrines of Scripture in regard to man's creation and fall, and his reception of spiritual blessings through Christ, we encounter in a letter of Mr. Atkinson's, pp. 203—206. No doubt the caricature is so far justified by some things ordinarily propounded as matters of divine revelation, which not only have no foundation in the Word of God, but are diametrically opposed to it. But it is not such follies merely, that the authors of this joint production are prepared to condemn. Revealed truth itself they hate. And to discredit it altogether are their puny efforts directed.

There is, we admit cheerfully, something that is true and worth attending to in the composition before us. As the Devil, while uttering a lie, was made unintentionally to bear witness to the truth of man's immortality through Jesus Christ, Gen. iii. 4, 5, 19, 1 Cor. xv. 22—and as Caiaphas, intending merely to express his sense of the expediency of Jesus being put to death, for the purpose of screening the Jews from the vengeance of the Roman government, was made, as High Priest of that year, to prophesy concerning Jesus' dying, not only for the eternal salvation of Jews, but of Gentiles likewise, John xi. 47—52, x. 15, 16, Heb. ii. 9, ix. 26—so in endeavouring to establish the lie of Atheism, or the Divinity of Nature, have the two worthies who favour the world with their edifying correspondence, been unintentionally adding their testimony to the truth of Scripture. Not merely as belonging to a class of persons whose appearance and leading qualities are foretold in the sacred volume itself. 2 Pet. 3, 4. (See also 2 Tim. iii, 1, &c.)* But actually, by the very means to which they have recourse, in order to establish their position. "Man's mind is entirely fleshly" say they. "Its various workings we can trace to their sources in the brain." Well; be it so. What then? "Why the Scriptures must be untrue. According to them man's mind is spiritual. And they ascribe to it an immortal destiny." The Scriptures do no such thing. (Will the joint-authors have the goodness to excuse the abruptness of this denial? The truth of God is here concerned.) They assign to man a body, common to him, in its constituent principles and elements, with that of the beasts that perish. Gen. ii. 7, Eccles. iii. 18, 20. They assign to him a breath of life, common to him with that of the beasts. Compare Gen. ii. 7, *in the Hebrew and Greek*, with Gen. i. 20, 21, and 24, *in the same.* See also Eccles. iii. 19. And they represent the dissolution of his body, and the passing away of his breath, as exactly resembling theirs. Gen. iii. 19, Eccles. xii. 7 (see Hebrew): besides Eccles. iii. 21 (see Hebrew). As to man's mind, according to Scripture, it is not *spirit* but *soul;* Gen. ii. 7, 1 Cor. xv. 45, Jude 19; and as *soul*, so far from being *immortal* it *dies.* Gen. ii. 16, 17; Ezek. xviii. 4, 20; 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; Eph. ii. 1; 1 Tim. vi 16; 2 Tim. i. 10. As the ground of this capability of dying on the part of the human mind, it is, as we have already seen, expressly denominated in Holy Writ, *a fleshly mind*, or *mind of flesh.* Rom viii. 7, Coloss. ii. 18. In all this, we have THE BOOK, upon whose glorious truths Miss Martineau and Mr. Atkinson would fain pour contempt, declaring and anticipating what they and their infidel associates, with a great flourish of trumpets, declare themselves to have discovered. For this unintentional testimony to the truth of divine revelation, we tender you our acknowledgments, mighty champions of Goddess Nature! What has led our joint authors astray here, in inducing them to think that by their observations and assertions of fact they were subverting scripture, as well as the source of much blundering on the part of Deists, Unitarians, and others who are fond of manifesting their liberality of sentiments, by their *liberal* mode of dealing with

* Certain characteristics of mere professors of Christianity doubtlessly are there adverted to. But they are also characteristics of human nature in general.

God's Word, is their making their own ignorance, or the theories of the spuriously orthodox, the test of what God hath actually seen meet to reveal. They have chosen to listen to what others have represented God as saying, rather than to hear God himself speaking in His own lively and unerring oracles. Can we wonder at the common, the necessary consequence of such egregious folly? If taught by the Spirit of God, through His own word, all such parties could not have failed to discover that man's nature, mind as well as body, is fleshly; and that he, by means of sin having become subject to death, both his mind in as far as Adamic, and his body, are confined to this present world. That God was manifest in the form of man's flesh (Rom. viii. 3), and with a mind in the form of soul, or man's mind, (Phil. ii. 7, 8), both consequently having been susceptible of growth (Luke ii. 40, 52), and both capable of being in their fleshly form brought to an end. Heb. x. 10; Isai. liii. 10; 1 Peter ii. 21, iii. 18. That after having previously abstained from all evil (Psalm xxvi. 6, Heb. vii. 26; 1 Peter ii. 21), Christ as the second man in flesh, and with mind in the form of soul or fleshly mind, consummated his obedience to God's law, (Phil. ii. 8), and became the end or exhaustion of it, (Rom. x. 4), thereby restoring a righteousness in flesh which he took not away, (Psalm lxix. 4), by the sacrifice or destruction of himself, soul and body, as man, (Heb. ix. 16, Matt. xx. 28, *see Greek*), as well as the sacrifice or destruction of the human nature of believers (Gal. ii. 20) and others (John xii. 32) in himself, as spiritual Abraham, (Gal. iii. 29; 1 Peter i. 23), and spiritual Adam. 1 Cor. xv. 45, also 22.* That in thus sacrificing or destroying human nature, exhibited pure and perfect in himself, (1 Peter i. 19), he sacrificed or destroyed it, loaded with the sins of humanity; (Psalm li. 1, &c. Isaiah liii. *throughout*; 1 Peter iii. 18; 1 John ii. 2); thereby destroying sin itself in the concrete, not in the abstract (1 Peter ii. 24, iv. 1); and this in what from its essential purity and perfect righteousness was acceptable to God. Eph. i. 6, v. 23, 27; 1 John ii. 2. That he rose from the dead, no longer one with Adam the old man, but himself the new man, (Eph. ii. 15, iv. 24), with the nature of man changed in himself into the nature of God. Rom. vi. 9, Luke xxiv. 31, 36. That he rose to Heaven, the proper place for the manifestation and enjoyment of that nature. Acts i. 9, ix. 4, 5, Heb. i. 3. xii. 2. And that as the head and source of the new creation, he was also head and source of the old, (John i. 3, Colos. i. 17), and as having risen to manifest one grand purpose of his previous temporary oneness with man in flesh, to have been his shewing man everlastingly one with him in spirit, (2 Cor. v. 21, &c.) he is conforming to himself as now glorified, by giving to be partakers in him of the divine nature, those in whom as one with Adam, and as involved in his transgression and its consequences, human nature like other old things, has ended and passed away. 1 Cor. xv. 22; 2 Cor v. 17, Rev. xxi. 5. This is true scriptural orthodoxy. It constitutes a brief abstract of what revelation teaches. If not consistent in all respects with popular theology, we cannot help it. It is what God himself hath seen meet to declare. Man's *natural* and *independent* immortality, it no doubt pours contempt on; but man's immortality in Christ Jesus, and as renewed by the power of his resurrection, it proclaims and establishes. It leaves untouched all that is *true* in our two authors' FACTS. What it blows to atoms, and scatters to the four winds of heaven, after having previously laughed them to scorn, are its *infidel*, and therefore *worthless* and *impotent* CONCLUSIONS. D. T.

---

* In the death of Christ we see and recognize the antitype of the burnt sacrifice. Levit. i. *throughout*. Jesus' offering of himself was no *make-believe*. It was the entire and everlasting destruction in him of the nature of man, in subserviency to its re-appearing in him, through the power of his resurrection, as the nature of God. How else is Gal. ii. 20, intelligible? Let the truths involved in our Lord's conversation with the young man, recorded, Matt. xix. 16, —22—particularly verse 21, compared with Psalm cxii. 9, and 2 Cor ix. 9—be pondered on and prayerfully considered. Did not Christ part with his own pure human nature, (loaded with our sins), not to resume that nature again himself, or to perpetuate it in us, but to render us in him partakers of the divine nature?

THE UNIVERSALIST.

DECEMBER, 1851.

THE SYMPATHY OF JESUS.

A SERMON BY THE REV. F. M. ALVORD.

"Jesus wept."—John xi. 36.

This is the shortest verse in the Bible, but inferior to none in beauty and significance. It opens to our view the *heart* of Jesus, and speaks his tender sympathy, his unadulterated humility. Christ though exalted above every human being in power, in authority, and in name,—though he came direct from heaven on a mission the grandest and most sublime that the mind can conceive, though he was the beloved of the Father, the chief among ten thousand, and the one altogether lovely, yet he possessed the tenderest sensibilities, and was deeply moved at the sight of human suffering and woe.

This, to us, is one of the most adorable traits in the character of our Lord. The sympathy of Jesus endears him to our hearts. It awakens our gratitude—it calls out the best feelings of our natures in love to him, who was touched with a feeling of our infirmity, and who was afflicted in all our afflictions. It furnishes strong evidence of the divinity of his mission; the compassion of Christ proves that he was from heaven, for no being could love so ardently and labor so devotedly in the cause of humanity, unless his soul had been baptized in the spirit and love of God. And yet among some of the early Christians it was believed and maintained, that weeping was derogatory to the character of Christ; they regarded it as a manifestation of weakness and as an expression of folly!

Says Clarke in his commentary—"Some of the *ruthless* ancients, improperly styled *Fathers* in the Church, thought that weeping was a degradation of the character of Christ; and therefore according to the testimony of *Epiphanius*, razed out of the gospel of St. Luke the place (chap. xix. 14) where Christ is said to have wept over Jerusalem."

But we regard this subject in a far different light. Had the Saviour of sinners been indifferent to the sufferings of humanity—had he possessed a cold, stoical heart, and an unsympathizing, frigid nature, his character would have been divested of all those attractions which have power to win the soul. "Jesus wept!" He felt for our sorrows. His great soul was moved at the sight of misery and death. His tears flowed freely in the house of sorrow and bereavement.

The circumstances connected with our subject are familiar to every reader of the New Testament. Lazarus, the friend of Jesus, the brother of Mary and Martha, was dead. The Jews, as they were wont, visited the home of the sisters to comfort them concerning their brother. But they had not the words of true consolation—their message

was not calculated to bind up the heart bleeding with anguish and lacerated with sorrow. Then Martha went to Jesus, and told the story of her afflictions, and said unto him, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." She knew that his was a benevolent mission, for she had witnessed with mingled feelings of wonder and gratitude his miracles of power and mercy. She had seen his power mightier than disease in its most cruel and dreadful form, and doubted not but that he would have readily saved her brother from the dominion of hades had he been present. Jesus said unto her, "Thy brother shall rise again." He shall come forth from the power of the grave, and thou shalt mingle again in his society, and rejoice in his happiness. "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection of the last day," was the language of the unbelieving sister. The Jews entertained vague and indefinite views concerning the future state. They had an opinion, however, that when the Messiah should appear, the dead would be raised, and this period she termed the last day. "But," as Mr. Paige in his Commentary justly remarks, "as they supposed his reign on earth should be perpetual, it is not easy to determine what particular period they assigned to the resurrection. Their ideas, indeed, on the whole subject of the resurrection were vague; and nothing in relation to the Christian doctrine of the resurrection was understood, until proclaimed, brought to light, and demonstrated by Jesus himself. Thus much we may understand by the language of Martha; she believed that her brother would live again, and in this she rejoiced; but she viewed the event as far distant, and therefore her grief was not entirely assuaged."

The blessed Saviour replied, "I am the resurrection and the life." He had power to conquer death; his kingdom extended over all worlds, and at any moment he could raise the dead. "I am the way, the truth, and the life," declared the Saviour of the world. In the same sense he is the resurrection and the life. He brought life and immortality to light through his death and resurrection, and ultimately all mankind shall be made alive in him. It is worthy of remark that Jesus is never called in the scriptures the *damnation* and the *death*, though he is called the resurrection and the life, and almost every title is applied to him which can endear him to our hearts or make him precious to our souls. The reason of this is best expressed by the Apostle—"God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved."

After Jesus proclaimed himself the resurrection and the life, the sisters, and the weeping friends, gathered around the voiceless grave, where reposed the lifeless remains of a kind and an affectionate brother. The sympathies of all were touched! The fountains of compassion burst forth! Tears flowed freely. "Jesus wept." "Precious words! Like balm to the wounded spirit; like a star breathing forth amidst the loneliness of night; like the silent dew upon the opening flower." Says a writer, "How much is embraced in this single sentence; the shortest, yet the most touching in all the scriptures! No wonder the Jews said, 'Behold how he loved him!' How amiable does the Saviour appear in every trait of character, but especially in his sympathy for the afflicted and the bereaved. What a Saviour did God promise

to the world! What a moment of intense interest to the sisters; to the cause of Christianity, and to the world; what a bearing upon our ultimate destiny! Suppose a failure! How would the Infidel have scoffed and triumphed, although it would have been over the grave of his own hopes; for who needs the consolations and the pity of a Saviour more than those who have no pity for themselves? After a solemn prayer to the Being who gave him his power, he cries with a loud voice —'Lazarus come forth! and he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes, and his face was bound with a napkin. Jesus said unto them, loose him and let him go.' And the same voice will ultimately awaken all the sleeping dead, not to all the infirmities and ills of this life, but to an immortal existence."* "For as in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive."

It is not sinful for us to weep when our friends are called away. It was never the design of infinite wisdom, that man should exist on this mundane sphere in a state of unalloyed and perfect enjoyment. In the moral, as in the physical world, day and night alternate, and for aught we know, this is a benevolent and a wise arrangement of Providence—Christianity teaches this, and our hearts gladly receive her instructions. In the providence of God we are often called upon to part with our kindred, to follow our friends to the narrow house appointed for all living. The angel of death often visits our homes, and makes desolate for the time-being, the board, the hearth-stone, and the altar. He has all seasons for his own—all conditions fall before him—all ages are his victims. He turns beauty into ashes, he converts joys into sorrows, he gives us the spirit of heaviness for the garment of praise. He traverses all lands—he rides upon every sea. His going forth is from the end of the world—his dominion is from shore to shore, from the rivers to the ends of the earth; and wherever he goeth, he smiteth. He withers our hopes, blights our prospects, and bereaves our hearts.

And when we part with those to whom we were endeared, we may weep. It is our nature, and Christianity does not forbid it. Christ, our great master, wept; and his followers may do the same without wronging their own souls, or sinning against heaven.

Some of the ancient philosophers would rejoice over the sorrows and follies of humanity: such was Democrites and his disciples. Others taught that the perfection of virtue consisted in a rigid indifference to the happiness or misery of their fellow-men. He was nearest in spirit and in purity to the Gods, who was never moved by joy or grief, but who despised pain and laughed at sorrow. But how vastly superior is Christianity. That teaches us to rejoice with those that rejoice, and to weep with those that weep. It points to the Saviour of sinners, who wept at the grave of a friend, and who ever sympathized with suffering humanity. And we too may weep when our friends depart, and thus relieve the burdened heart.

Hast thou, fond mother, seen thy little one locked in the embrace of death? If so, let thy tears flow fast and freely, for Jesus, thy Saviour wept, and in tears there is relief. Hast thou, aged father, followed to the grave the child of thy love, and the hope of thy declining years? If so, refuse not the tribute of thy tears—deny not thy nature,

* Rev. C. Spear.

but weep, for Jesus wept. Brothers, sisters, has death, the relentless destroyer, entered the happy circle, and claimed a victim? If so, look at Jesus with the weeping sisters, his heart touched with sorrow, his eye wet with tears, and weep as he wept. It cannot be wrong for us to mourn the departure of friends. Why were we endowed with feeling hearts, with sympathetic natures, if grief is forbidden, if tears are sinful?

"After this example of our Lord" (says Dr. Adam Clarke) "shall we say that it is weakness, folly and sin, to weep for the loss of relatives? He who says so, and can act in a similar case to the above, according to his own doctrine is a reproach to the name of *man*. Such apathy never came from God, it is generally a bad scion, implanted in a nature miserably depraved, deriving its nourishment from a perverted spirit, or a hardened heart; though in some cases it is the effect of an erroneous æsthetic mode of discipline. It is abolishing one of the finest traits in our Lord's human character to say, that he wept and mourned him because of sin and its consequences. No. Jesus had *humanity* in its perfection, and humanity unadulterated is generous and sympathetic. A particular friend of Jesus was dead; and as his friend the affectionate and friendly soul of Christ was troubled, and he mingled his sacred tears with those of the afflicted relatives." And we may also weep at the grave of our friends, in the house of mourning, for Jesus has hallowed the tears of sorrow in his sympathy for the bereaved."

But again, while we weep that our friends must leave us, we should mourn in hope. It is wrong to give ourselves up to inconsolable grief. It is practical denial of Christianity to refuse the rich consolations of the gospel, when our day seems changed to darkest night, and sorrow is stifling our very heart-strings. Says Paul to the Thessalonians,—"But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning those which are asleep, that ye sorrow not as others which have no hope." It is right for us to sorrow, the Apostle does not forbid this, but he would not have us sorrow as others which have no hope. And if we sorrow *in hope*, we must have the assurance that the departed have gone home to dwell with Jesus—that they have entered upon the enjoyment of a higher life, a purer being. If we entertain the thought, that those whom we mourn are weltering in immortal flames—if we believe that our friends have gone beyond the reach of mercy, and the sunlight of heaven, how can we avoid giving ourselves up to disconsolate sorrow, to remidiless grief?

On funeral occasions preachers of the Gospel are wont to talk about the consolations of religion. Perhaps an unregenerate, a wicked man, is suddenly cut down in an unexpected manner and goes the way of all the earth. Yet the preacher will commend the bereaved to the rich consolations of the Gospel; while according to his creed, the departed has gone to a world of sin and demons, and the mourners are comforted with these tidings, with this religion of woe! No, here is no comfort and if we must believe that our friends, or any number of them are destined to groan and writhe in unmitigated and endless torments, there can be no meaning in the exhortation: "Sorrow not as others, which have no hope." Can we sorrow in hope, when there is *no* hope for those we mourn? Sorrow in hope, when all our hopes

for the departed are as false as the Koran, and are only given to mock and disappoint us? The thought is not admissible. When Jesus wept with the sisters, he spake to them the words of healing and consolation—that he himself was the resurrection and the life, and by that power which was given him from on high, he restored Lazarus to their embrace, and thus changed the sorrow into rejoicing. And does he not say to every weeping child of humanity, thy brother, thy friend, shall live again? Does he not say to all, I am the resurrection and and the life? I have power over death, and in me all who fall before the destroyer shall be made alive again? Are not these words of universal application? "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, *will* draw *all* men unto me."

Jesus stands before the world as the Universal Saviour and Lord. He tasted death for *every* man; he rose from the dead and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living. The grave has lost its power and death its sting, since Jesus has triumphed over the adversary, and demonstrated the truth of the world's resurrection. When we give up our friends to the destroyer let us weep, for it is befitting and proper, but at the same time let us weep in hope, and remember we have a Father in heaven who rules in love, who afflicts not willingly, nor grieves the children of men.

Another idea in this connection is suggested. Mary and Martha went to Jesus for consolation. They did not apply to the Jewish doctors of the law or doctors of divinity. The Jews indeed came to the sisters to comfort them, but they had not the words of eternal life; they did not proclaim Jesus and the resurrection. Had Lazarus been a true Pharisee and accordingly zealous in the religion of his fathers, the Jews might have then told the weeping sisters, that their brother would in some time and in some way live again, but as we may well suppose, such uncertain and indefinite theology was ill calculated to bind up the broken heart. Hence they naturally turned their attention to Jesus, and in him they found a true comforter indeed. And so it shall be with us. When the wing of the desolating angel is over our heads, and we follow to the land of silence and of gloom, our dearest friends, like Martha and Mary let us go to Jesus for comfort, and he will give us beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness. If we go to the tradition of the Elders, or to the creeds of men, for solace and peace in the time of our heavy distress, we may be disappointed: we shall find but little consolation there. True, if our friends have lived according to the fashion of the "*straitest sect*" of the most popular religion, and have died in believing in a heaven for themselves and a hell for others, we may have some hopes for their salvation; it may be well with them; but it is uncertain whether we shall ever meet them in the world of purity, of light, and of love—heaven at best is composed of fragments of broken households and severed families, and it is uncertain who will be happy and who will be lost.

Such sentiments, however sincerely believed or eloquently defended, are not calculated to comfort the bereaved. There are so many conditions connected with them, and of such terrible import, that they have no power to soothe and comfort the soul. There are *ifs* enough connected with the sectarian dogmas of the day, to peril the whole race.

Not so with Christianity. "Thy brother *shall* rise again."—"*I am* the resurrection and the life." "*I will* draw *all* men unto me." "*We know* if this earthly house, if this tabernacle were dissolved we have a building of God, a house not made with hands eternal in the heavens." Such is the gospel. It is a *positive* religion. It rises infinitely above the contingencies of doubt and uncertainty, and speaks to the soul in the language of positive assurance, of steadfast hope. And need I say, that we need a positive religion, one whose comforts are sure and certain—one of good hope and everlasting consolation when we part with our friends. What but this can answer the deep wants of the soul, and speak peace to an anguished heart? Then like Martha and Mary, let us look to Jesus the author and finisher of our faith, and cherish in our souls his precious doctrines of the resurrection and of the future life? How tender the invitation, "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." "Jesus wept."

And should we not learn from our subject that it is our duty to sympathize with the afflicted? If Jesus wept in the house of mourning and at the grave of a friend—if he was afflicted in all our afflictions, and ever sympathized with the unfortunate and sorrow-stricken, does it not even become his followers to weep with those that weep. We should entertain the tenderest feelings of compassion for the bereaved, for we know not how soon affliction may overtake us, and make us the objects of pity and commiseration. Our blessed Saviour sympathized with all classes and conditions, and had compassion upon friend and foe. As he looked upon the melancholy train bearing the remains of the only son of the widow of Nain to "the city of the dead," he stopped the bier, and in accents of mercy said, "Daughter, weep not," and by that power which he received from above, he called the departed back to life and happiness. Wherever he beheld misery he extended the hand of relief; whenever the tears of sorrow moistened the cheeks of suffering humanity, he uttered words of hope and peace. And if we are his followers, we shall be ready to visit the fatherless and the widows in their afflictions, and to comfort those who mourn.

Once more. We deduce an argument from our subject, in favour of the ultimate blessedness of our entire race. If Jesus possessed so much sympathy and love, that he could not contemplate human suffering without feeling deeply for our woes, think you that he can contemplate the endless misery of any portion of our race, and still not weep, nor shed the tears of anguish over the wreck and ruin of human happiness?

"Will he who wept over human woe on earth, though he knew the mourning would soon be changed to rejoicing—will he quietly contemplate the endless woe of those for whom he laboured and died? God forbid. The compassionate Jesus laboured for all, and died for all, and he will be satisfied with nothing short of the salvation of all, as the fruit of the travail of his soul."

Dr. Adam Clarke alluding to the sympathy of Jesus at the grave of Lazarus, very pertinently asks, "can such a Jesus refuse to comfort the distressed or save the lost? Can *he* restrain his mercies from the penitent soul, or refuse to hear the yearnings of his own bowels? Can

such a character be inattentive to the welfare of his creatures? Here is *God* manifest in the *flesh*! living in human nature, feeling for the distressed, and suffering for the lost! Reader! Ask thy soul, ask thy heart, ask the bowels of thy compassion, if thou hast any, could this Jesus unconditionally *reprobate* from eternity any soul of man? Thou answerest NO! God repeats NO! Universal matter re-echoes NO! and the tears and blood of Jesus *eternally say* NO!"

This emphatic language of the learned commentator was aimed at Calvinism, with its iron decrees, and contracted heaven, but who does not perceive that the sympathy of Jesus is equally opposed to the doctrine of endless misery in any of its forms or modifications! We may say with equal propriety "Reader, ask thy soul, ask thy heart, ask the bowels of thy compassion, if thou hast any, could this Jesus permit any soul of man to remain in suffering and pain for ever, without making a solitary effort to rescue it from a doom so terrible! Thou answerest NO! God repeats NO! Universal nature re-echoes NO! and the tears and blood of Jesus *eternally say* NO!"

"Jesus wept"—He wept, because a friend was dead, and sympathizing nature felt the blow. But if a portion of those whom the Saviour loved, and for whom he spilt his blood, are to weep for ever, on account of the endless loss of man and dear friends—or if some of the human family must welter in immortal flames, when will the blessed Saviour rest in his love, when will his great soul be satisfied? He viewed Jerusalem in her wickedness, and knew that the time was near at hand when her glory would depart, and her temple be laid in ruins—and while contemplating her temporal overthrow his tenderest feelings were called into action, his sympathetic nature was deeply moved. Ah! do not say, that the eternal ruin of that people will not cause the Saviour to weep, and for ever impair the blessedness of heaven! If human misery of short duration, called forth his tears, will not excruciating torments of endless duration, call out all the sympathies of his nature, and induce him to weep day and night for the eternally slain of his people? It cannot be otherwise—all tears must be dried, all suffering must cease, all death be banished from the universe of God, and all intelligences made endlessly holy and happy, or else the Saviour will never "see of the the travail of his soul and be satisfied."

"Jesus wept"—Precious words. Let us ponder them well. Let us study their meaning, their import. And we see Jesus sympathizing with our afflicted brethren of the human family, let us feel more deeply for the woes of our kindred race and ever be ready to extend the hand of charity to relieve the despairing, the sorrowing, and the unfortunate of the brotherhood. Let ours be the religion of mercy, of charity, of benevolence. Let us endeavour to exemplify in our conduct, those amiable virtues which were so beautifully exhibited in the life of Jesus Christ our Saviour, and the Saviour of the world. May we ever remember that—

> "We live in deeds, not years; in thought, not breath;
> In feelings, not in figures on a dial.
> We should count time by heart-throbs—He most lives
> Who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best;
> Life is but a means unto an end; that end,
> Beginning, mean and end of all things—God."

RELIGIOUS OPINIONS OF WILLIAM PITT, EARL OF CHATHAM.

The name, the brilliant talents, and the wide-spread fame of William Pitt, one of England's most eminent statesmen, are known to all readers—to every school-boy throughout the civilized world. That one with an intellect so clear and penetrating, a mind so comprehensive, and a judgment so sound, should become disgusted with the popular doctrines, creeds, and formularies, is a fact which should have great weight on the reflecting portion of those who still adhere to them. Nor was Pitt by any means alone among learned and profound scholars and statesmen, in his religious views. A large proportion of the most eminent men—men who have been distinguished for their learning, philanthropy, and patriotism—whose names shine brightest in England's history, and in the history of America, utterly repudiated the religious sentiments that form the distinguishing features of those churches which claim to be exclusively evangelical. These doctrines present views of the Deity, his works, his designs, his beneficence, so dark and limited, that those who possess enlarged minds and hearts, cannot be satisfied to receive them as correct representations of the God and Father of the spirits of all flesh.

The Earl of Chatham having received a letter from certain friends asking his opinion on religious matters, wrote the following reply. Although there are some points in which I should disagree with the writer, yet as a whole, it gives so just a description of the absurdities and evil tendencies of the fashionable religion of the present and many past ages, that its publication cannot but be of much service.

J. M. A.*

"Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep one's self unspotted from the world."

Gentlemen,—Whoever takes a view of the world will find, that what the greatest part of mankind have agreed to call religion, has been some outward exercise, esteemed sufficient to work a reconciliation with God. It has moved them to build temples, flay victims, offer up sacrifices, to fast and feast, to petition and thank, to laugh and cry, to sing and sigh, by turns; but it has not yet proved sufficient to make them break off an amour, to make restitution of ill-gotten wealth, or to bring the passions and appetites to a reasonable subjection. Differ as much as they may in opinion, concerning what they ought to believe, or after what manner they ought to serve God, as they call it, yet they all agree in satisfying their appetites. The same passions reign eternally in all countries and in all ages—Jews and Mahometan, the Christian, the Pagan, the Tartar, and the Indian—all kinds of men, who differ in almost everything else, universally agree with regard to their passions; if there be any difference among them it is this, the more superstitious the more vicious they always are, and the more they believe the less they practice. This is a melancholy consideration to a good mind; it is a truth, and certainly above all things worth our while to enquire into. We will, therefore, probe the wound, and search to the bottom; we will lay the axe at the root of the tree,

* The Rev. J. M. Austin, an eminent clergyman among the Universalists of the United States We copy the article from the *New York Christian Messenger* of Sept. 29, 1840, and, making a similar reservation to that of Mr. Austin, we commend to the consideration of *the religious world* the religious opinions of the illustrious man whose powers and opportunities of observation cannot fail to secure for him a large degree of attention and respect.

and show you the true reason why men go on in sinning and repenting, and sinning again through the whole course of their lives; and the reason is, because they have been taught, most wickedly taught, that religion and virtue are two things absolutely distinct; that the deficiency of the one might be supplied by the sufficiency of the other: and that what you want in virtue you must make up in religion.

But this religion, so dishonorable to God, and so pernicious to men, is worse than atheism; for atheism, though it takes away one great motive to support virtue in distress, yet it furnishes no man with arguments to be vicious; but superstition, or what the world means by religion, is the greatest possible encouragement to vice by setting up something which shall atone and commute for the want of virtue. This is establishing iniquity by a law, the highest law, by authority, the highest authority, that of God himself. *We complain of the vices of the world, and of the wickedness of men without searching into the true cause.* It is not because they are wicked by nature, for that is both false and impious; but because to serve the purposes of their pretended soul-savers they have been carefully taught that true religion is in the practice of virtue, in obedience to the will of God, who presides over all things, and will finally make every man happy who does his duty.

This simple opinion in religion, that all things are so well made by the Deity, that virtue is its own reward, and that happiness will ever arise from acting according to the reason of things; or that God, ever wise and good, will provide some extraordinary happiness for those who suffer for virtue's sake, is enough to support a man under all difficulties, to keep him steady to his duty, and enable him to stand as firm as a rock amidst all the charms of applause, profit, and honor.

But this religion of reason, which all men are capable of, has been neglected and condemned, and another set up the natural consequences of which have puzzled men's understandings, and debauched their morals more than all the lewd poets and atheistical philosophers that ever infested the world: for instead of being taught that religion consists in action, in obedience to the eternal law of God, we have been most gravely and venerably told, that it consists in the belief of certain opinions which we could form no idea of, or which were contrary to the clear perceptions of our minds, or which had no tendency to make us either wiser or better; or, which is much worse, had a manifest tendency to make us wicked and immoral. And this belief, this impious belief arising from imposition on one side, and from want of examination on the other, has been called by the sacred name of religion, whereas real and genuine religion consists in knowledge and obedience. We know there is a God, and know his will, which is, that we should do all the good we can; and we are assured from His perfections, that we shall find our own good in so doing.

And would we have more? Are we, after such enquiry, and in an age full of liberty, children still? And cannot we be quiet unless we have holy romances, sacred fables, and traditionary tales to amuse us in an idle hour, and to give rest to our souls, when our follies and vices will not suffer us to rest? You have been taught indeed, that right belief, or orthodoxy, will, like charity, cover a multitude of sins; but be not deceived; belief of, or mere assent to the truth of propositions upon evidence is not a virtue, nor unbelief a vice; faith is not a voluntary act, does not depend upon the will; every man must believe or disbelieve, according as the evidence appears to him. If therefore, men, however, dignified or distinguished, command us to believe they are guilty of the highest folly and absurdity, because it is out of our power; but if they command us to believe, annex rewards to belief, and severe penalties to unbelief, then they are most wicked and immoral, because they annex rewards and punishments to what is involuntary, and therefore neither rewardable or punishable.

It appears then very plainly unreasonable and unjust to command us to believe any doctrine good or bad, wise or unwise; but when they command us

to believe opinions which have no tendency to promote virtue, but which are allowed to commute or atone for the want of it, then they have arrived at the utmost pitch of impiety, then is their iniquity full, then have they finished the misery, and completed the destruction of poor mortal man: by betraying the interest of virtue, they undermined and sapped the foundation of all human happiness; and how treacherously and dreadfully have they betrayed it!

A gift well applied, the chattering of some unintelligible sounds called creeds; an unfeigned assent and consent to whatever our Church enjoins; religious worship and consecrated feasts; repenting on the death-bed; pardons rightly sued out; and absolution authoritatively given have done more towards making and continuing men vicious, then all the natural passions and infidelity put together, for infidelity can only take away the supernatural rewards of virtue; but these superstitious opinions and practices, have not only turned the scene, and made men lose sight of the natural reward of it, but have induced them to think, that were there no hereafter, vice would be preferable to virtue, and that they increase in happiness as they increase in wickedness; and this they have been taught in several religions discourses and sermons delivered by men whose authority was never doubted, particularly by a late reverend prelate, I mean Bishop Otterbury, in his sermon on these words, "If in this life only we have hope, then we are of all men most miserable," where vices and faith ride most lovingly and triumphantly together.

But these doctrines of the natural excellency of vice, the efficacy of right belief, the dignity of atonements and propitiations, have, besides depriving us of the native beauty and charms of honesty, and thus cruelly stabbing virtue to the heart, raised and diffused among men a certain unnatural passion which we shall call religious hatred; a hatred constant, deep-rooted, and immortal. All passions rise and fall, die and revive again, but this of religious and pious hatred, rises and grows every day stronger upon the mind as we grow more religious, because we hate for God's sake, and for the sake of those poor souls too, who have the misfortune not to believe as we do; and can we in so good a cause hate too much? The more thoroughly we hate, the better we are; and the more mischief we do to the bodies and states of these infidels and heretics, the more do we show our love to God.

This is religious zeal, and has been called divinity; but remember, the only divinity is humanity.

Yours' &c.

WILLIAM PITT.

CORRESPONDENCE.

WHY IS NOT UNIVERSALISM MORE GENERALLY KNOWN?

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

SIR,—Being in company with a Clergyman of the Established Church a few evenings ago, when, after a lengthened talk over passing events, our conversation turned on the goodness of God in sending his only begotten Son into the world to be, and who *is*, the Saviour of mankind, the doctrine held by Universalists and advocated by yourself and co labourers. On this subject we expatiated for some time, and in my friend's hearing I offered him a copy of Dr. Thom's "Three Questions proposed and answered," which he respectfully declined, stating at the same time, "*I do not wish to believe the doctrine even if it can be proved by the Bible; and should I read Dr. Thom's work, it may be the means of converting me to that dogma!* Is this *un*prejudiced shepherd and *seeker after truth alone?* Moreover on my friend's bidding good-bye, he added:—"*Surely, it is remarkably strange, that if God will save all men (which would be heart-rejoicing to contemplate), the doctrine should be so little known and advocated.*" This remark is not peculiar to my friend, or to this country, as the following paragraph from the "Ladies' Magazine," edited by the Rev. Henry Bacon, will show.—"The question is often asked, Why is not Universalism, as a historical idea, better understood by the general mind? Our answer is, the works to which one might reasonably look for accurate information are false to fact and candour, their authors or compilers ignoring Universalism altogether, or making but indifferent mention of it. Here, for instance, is a book of great value, to which we might rationally look for fairness on all ques-

tions—it is entitled 'The World's Progress: a Dictionary of Dates. Edited by G. P. Putnam.' In examining this work we instinctively as it were, united Universalism with the world's progress, as one element of mental and moral activity, and so we turned the leaves to see whether Universalism was recognized, and if so, what mention was made of it, we found the following in page 575:—'*Universalists.* Those who believe in the final salvation of all men—sects of Universalists existed in various countries and ages. The learned and celebrated Dr. Tillotson appears from some of his sermons to have adopted the opinion of this Universal Salvation. *Johnson.*—Certain it is, about 1691, he entertained a design for forming a new book of homilies; and a sermon which he preached before the Queen, (Mary) against the absolute eternity of hell torments, embraced this doctrine'"

'We are not aware," says the writer, "that any thing like captious criticism possesses us, and we appeal to the common intellect, if this notice does not throw Universalism entirely into the past? It says 'sects of Universalists *existed* in various countries and ages,' and Dr. Tillotson is made the best name to quote in behalf of these ever-existing Universalits, as though in the world's progress no worthy name occurs that is not more prominently and directed associated with the advocacy of the final salvation of all men! The Unitarians are justly mentioned in this work as composing in the United States, a large and influential denomination, especially in New England; but in the United States, and especially in New England, the Universalists also form a large and influential denomination, affecting the world's progress as truly as any order of Christians. How can it be expected that Universalism should be known and Universalists acknowledged a being, when only such references are made as the one considered? We were astonished at this paragraph in Mr. Putman's book. We had always supposed him really anxious, according to his professions, to convey accurate information abroad, concerning all the elements of American progress. Here in the United States, in New England, Universalism was planted. The modifications of theology to which it has undoubtedly contributed are great. The spires of its churches are continually rising with the increase of intelligence, force of thought, and philanthropy. It is operating and will operate. It has forced dogmatists to become reasoners; it has roused sleeping commanders to treason in the camp; it has driven the language of profanity from thousands of pulpits, shamed the extravagancies of enthusiasts, and made the confessions of unrest in orthodoxy, as abundant as the cries of the Hebrews in Egypt. 'Sects of Universalists *existed* in various countries and ages,' did they? Yes, Mr. Editor of the world's progress, 'and they *exist* now.'" And, Sir, that your readers may have a definite knowledge of their existence and progress, the 'Universalist Companion for 1840,' states that there were then in the United States alone, 1 general convention, 12 state conventions, 56 associations, about 853 societies, 512 ministers, and 513 meeting-houses or chapels, owned wholly or in part by Universalists; and that during the past year no less than 59 new laborers have entered into their field of labour, 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. In 1850, I find that there are in the United States "a General Convention, a General Historical Society, (the Revds. Dr. Thom of Liverpool, and Dr. Beard of Manchester, are the English Corresponding Secretaries thereof), a General Reform Association, 20 State and Territorial Conventions, 3 State Tract, 1 State Education, 5 State Missionary, and 3 State Sunday School Associations, composed of delegates from Societies, and 5 Tract, 8 Missionary, and 16 Sunday School Societies of an Associational character, making in all, 3 National, 32 State, and 112 Sectional organizations. These are sustained and kept in operation by 1,055 churches or societies, and 674 preachers, the churches owning wholly or in part 757 meeting-houses or Chapels"—having upwards of 800,000 members—the Universalists "have, also 19 periodicals, besides 3 annuals, 12 High and Academical Schools; and have published 12 volumes of new works (besides various pamphlets &c.) during the past year."—In the Canadas there are "One Association, 1 Periodical, 1 Tract Association, 18 Societies, 7 Meeting-houses, and 7 Ministers."

Nor, Sir, is the belief of the blessed doctrine of God's universal love to man confined to America, and the Universalists, and the Unitarians, together with the many scattered believers among the (so-called) orthodox of our island, but it is widely spread on the Continent.

In Germany, Universalism prevails among the evangelical or orthodox, as averred by Professor Dwight of Yale College, in his "Travels in the North of Germany," who says, "the doctrine of the *eternity* of future punishment is *universally rejected!*" The celebrated Professor Stuart, of Andover, says that "this doctrine (the salvation of all men) has become so *wide-spread* in Germany, that it *pervades* even the ranks of those who are regarded as serious and *evangelical* men in respect to most or all, of what is called *orthodox* doctrine, saving the point before us!"

I might add other authorities to the

same effect, but I deem the foregoing sufficient to establish a *status*, and that the "doctrine" is not "so little known and advocated" as my friend imagines, or the Editor of the "World's Progress" would have his readers to believe, when he said "sects of Universalists *existed* in various countries and ages."

Seeing then, that Universalists *exist now*, "in various countries," it may not be amiss to inform those persons who have read but little and thought less ot this soul-animating doctrine, and who are ever wont to say, that Universalism takes off all restraint from man's evil propensities, and that believers in such a doctrine must be depraved and unfit for the society of Christians, the characters of those who embrace this faith. To these superficial thinkers, "who understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm," and whose hearts are dead to the teachings of the gospel, it may be for their instruction that I quote (from among various *orthodox* sources) a paragraph from the Editor of the "New World," (Presbyterian), published in New York, October 1843, respecting the American Universalists who says—"It seems to us that the Universalists, in whatever light we may regard their points of doctrine, *excel other sects* in their benevolence, their philanthropy, and their respect for the law which has commanded us to render good for evil. They endeavour to entice mankind into purity of life by considerations of love and kindness; they use no threats, and cast from them the bonds of fear. And so far as our information extends, the professing members of their creed observe a strictness of conduct, and a righteousness of living which others would do well to emulate, instead of maligning a belief which certainly reposes with entire confidence on God's mercy to his creatures." To this I subjoin the testimony of Professor Dwight respecting the German Universalists. He says, "I have never seen any Christians who seemed to me to have a deeper sense of the odiousness of sin in the sight of God, or whose hearts beat with more ardent gratitude towards our Saviour, for the great redemption he has made for fallen man. I know of no examples of humility greater than those exhibited by some of these gentlemen, or more elevated views of the character of God, than you discover in their conversation. *We must look in vain for brighter examples of piety than they exhibit.* They certainly manifest a greater spirit of love for those who differ from them than is found in most of our (orthodox) sects, and they are unwilling to shut the gates of heaven against all who do not believe in every article of their creed. In this charity and love the Protestant inhabitants of most countries would do well to imitate them."—Dwight's Travels.

Apologizing for my prolixity, and wishing "The Universalist" and Universalism every success. I am, Sir,

Yours respectfully,
A CHURCHMAN.

REVIEWS.

A Gallery of Literary Portraits. By George Gilfillan. William Tait, Edinburgh: Simpkin, Marshall and Co., London. 1845.

A Second Gallery of Literary Portraits. By George Gilfillan, Dundee. Edinburgh, James Hogg: London, R. Groombridge and Sons. 1850.

The following passage occurs in Mr. Gilfillan's "Second Gallery of Literary Portraits," under the head of Phillip James Bailey, when speaking of that author's truly original and magnificent poem, *Festus*.

"We could have wished that the author of this poem had severed its masses of beauty from a moral or theological system. All such unions are dangerous to poems. Milton, indeed, has surmounted the difficulty; and while we spurn Shelley's assertion that the system of Christianity shall by and by only be remembered in Milton's poem, we grant that the 'Paradise Lost' is a subordinate evidence of its truth, as well as a rich halo around its central and solid greatness. To Pollok's work, again, his high Calvinism has proved partly a blessing and partly a bane—inwrought as it is, into the very structure of the poem, it has created either blind partizans, or bitter enemies; only a few have been able to look through the 'fire-mist' into the poetical beauties which are hid beneath it. In like manner, while Festus has been adopted and fondled by the large sect (large at least in America,) calling itself Universalists, its doctrines have repelled many of the orthodox, who otherwise would have rejoiced in the 'wilderness of sweets,' and the forest of grandeurs, which its circuit includes. Nor must Mr. Bailey imagine that he has, by his notion of a universal restoration, in any effectual way recommended religion to the sceptical of the present day. Eternal punishment, fifty years ago, was a great stumbling block to unquiet spirits. Such have generally now travelled on so far towards

Naturalism or Pantheism, that they will not return at the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely—they will laugh at the fine dream as a man would at the offer of sugar plums for food—and walk on their own ungovernable way. They will ask, must not the reason for a hell at all be an *infinite* one, and if so, is it not likely to be an *eternal* reason too? In every great house is there not a furnace for the dross, as well as a light for the drawing-room? If sin be of an expansive character, will not punishment expand along with it? or if God means to destroy sin hereafter, why does he not begin by abolishing it here? And what need, they all ask again, of any hell afterwards, when justice is done now? And, again, your theory may prove the book *human*, but does it prove it *divine?*—Thus innocuously will the milk and rose-water of Bailey's doctrine drop upon the iron scales of modern scepticism, which seeks now not so much to object to our special form of revelation, as to deny revelation altogether."—pp. 390, 391.

This is not the place, and we are not the parties, to attempt a critical disquisition on the merits and demerits of George Gilfillan. That large-minded and large-hearted man has already taken rank—high and honourable rank—among the mighty ones, the intellectual giants of his age and country. Originality, power, genius, richness, and splendour of imagination; an onward rush of thought that never stops, and seldom if ever flags; a penetration into character which nothing eludes; fondness for the picturesque; a clear appreciation, no less than intense feeling, of the sublime; a style preeminently graphic; a delight in the discovery of relations and harmonies which, disdaining and overleaping the partial, takes the universe itself for its object; in a word, acuteness united to comprehensiveness of intellect, that rarest of all mental combinations—qualities which are manifest in every one of his productions—justify his contemporaries in assigning to the author of the "Hebrew Bards," the high position which he now confessedly occupies. Thus backed and supported, thus elevated in public opinion, Mr. Gilfillan can afford to dispense with eulogies of ours. Aye, and with those of his compeers also. His is not a mind that needs to look to the suffrages of others, in order to be satisfied of its own inherent strength and resources. Its type is found, not in the ivy, but in the oak. Large, gnarled, sturdy, he gives, not asks support. To commend a man like this were somewhat of a work of supererogation. He scatters about profusely the treasures of his intellectual wealth, himself aware of their value, and regardless of the estimate which may be formed of them by others. His very faults he takes no pains to conceal. These the common herd of critics may spy, and are welcome to carp at, if they please. They may tax him with frequent exhibitions of coarseness, and may go so far even as to aver that throughout all his works, he shews himself to be exceedingly defective in point of taste. They may sneer at the shallowness of his philosophy. They may amuse themselves with detecting and shewing up his inconsistencies. At one moment, practical to the extent of almost sacrificing general principles; at another, so outrageously theoretical as to set common sense at defiance, they may charge him with being. With some appearance of candour, and yet with a view to disparage his intellectual labors, they may allege that his brain once set a-seething and his pen a-going, out pours from both a stream of thought, sometimes deep, generally full, always impetuous, and not unfrequently disquieted and turbid. Some even have not hesitated to accuse him of quackery. But what of all this? Our friend is not a man to trouble himself about such assaults. Like a rock, against his sides the fury of critics, and the envy of less successful competitors in the career of literature, expend themselves in vain. Firmly there he stands. A kind-hearted man, he can afford to smile at petty aggressors. Occasionally, on foes of a different stamp, he may be tempted to retort with interest. But his attitude in general is that of composed and dignified indifference. When he sees fit to move, he pursues his course, which is like himself straight-forward and manly, undeterred by frowns, uninfluenced by smiles. He has a fixed and definite aim—and that aim he will accomplish.

We at one time did purpose saying something as to the theological tenets of

Mr. Gilfillan. Many passages in the "Literary Portrait Galleries," first and second, and in the "Hebrew Bards," held out to us strong temptations to do so. But we abstain. The shortest abstract which we could give of his views, and the most abridged comment on them which we could submit, would occupy too much space to justify us in entering on the subject. And we are open also to the influences of other and still more powerful considerations. Somewhat contrary to our inclinations, then—for we should dearly like above all things to have a tilting match with such a giant in mind and literature, and such a master of his lance as George Gilfillan,—we drop all controversy with him on topics of general theology, and confine ourselves particularly in what follows to a brief and hasty notice of that portion of his article on Mr. Bailey, which we have just quoted.

Two things here claim our attention.—

First,—Our author's marked disapprobation of the introduction of a moral or theological system into a poem. Probably, on this point, abstractly considered, there is no material difference subsisting between him and us. In our criticism on Mr. Cock's "Infidel," which appeared in the number for March last, we have placed on record our sentiments as to this subject. Christianity and human poetry have, we conceive, little or nothing in common. To mix both is to spoil both. By being kept distinct only, do both escape the risk of being corrupted and destroyed. God's word deals in revealed facts. The province of poetry, which, if genuine, always appeals to the imagination or feelings, or both, lies properly in the realms of fiction. Consequently, true Christianity, as by its facts destructive of romance, is antagonistic to the genius of poetry. Just as poetry, whether of the Epic, the Dramatic, or the [humanly] Lyric kind, is inconsistent with the simple, unsophisticated truths and discoveries of revelation. Milton's "Paradise Lost" and "Paradise Regained," and Pollok's "Course of Time," it appears to us, just lose in respect of Christianity what they gain in respect of poetry. Fiction is the appropriate theme of the muse, herself a fiction. And fiction is trampled underfoot by God's word. Notwithstanding, if a religious system is to be alluded to in what is denominated a poem, or to form the basis of its statements and illustrations, commend us certainly to a system that is true, in preference to one that is false. Universalism may be the ground-work of Mr. Bailey's "Festus." In giving to that glorious and magnificent production a religious basis at all, he may have acted unwisely, and may have exposed himself to the risk, either of debasing his subject or of injuring his poem. But having chosen to introduce religion into it, or rather having made it to rest on religion as its foundation, it is certainly gratifying to us to think, that instead of making Satan an object of greater interest than God, as Milton has unhappily done, or clothing God with the characteristics and attributes of a demon, as is one of the consequences of weaving his theology of unending torments into the texture of his poem by Pollok, Bailey has seen and represented God as what in scripture he is revealed to be, LOVE; and has recommended him who is divine love embodied to our affections, as *the chief among ten thousand, and the altogether lovely*. Satan, according to the author of Festus, is not as the majority of his gifted predecessors in the walks of poetry have represented him to be, God's equal, and to a certain extent, God's successful competitor: but is strictly and solely God's servant and instrument; and agreeably to Mr. Bailey's views, God so far from permitting Satan to perpetuate sin and death for ever, as is orthodoxly done in poems, and in those prose romances commonly denominated sermons, is not content merely with destroying sin and death, the devil's works, (1 John iii. 8, John i. 29, Heb. ix. 26, 2 Tim. i. 10), but *destroys likewise him that has the power of the death, that is the devil.* Heb. ii. 14.

Secondly: Not satisfied to find fault with Mr. Bailey for rendering his poem subservient to the inculcation of a particular religious system, Mr. Gilfillan assails that system, the system of Universal Salvation itself. Here it appears to us, speaking with all due respect, that our friend has betrayed his ignorance of the subject, as well as missed his aim entirely.

It is not our opinion that Mr. Bailey has by his poem, as advocating "the notion of a universal restoration, in any effectual way recommended religion to the sceptical of the present day." Nor do we presume that such an opinion was ever entertained by Mr. Bailey himself. Honesty of purpose is one of the grand characteristics of "Festus." What its talented author thought and felt, he deemed himself bound to express. God's love to man, in Christ Jesus, he has found to be a scriptural truth. Titus iii. 4. (φιλανθρωπια). His subject naturally led him to, nay demanded an avowal of his belief in it. This belief he has expressed. His sentiments he has powerfully and poetically, (if not always consistently) stated, and vindicated. Under man's notice, he has thus brought the subject of man's salvation. Indeed, under the notice of many, who might never otherwise have heard of it; or who, if it had been proposed in another form, might not have felt inclined to bestow even a passing thought on the arguments which can be adduced and urged in its favour. God's blessing, he knew, might render the references and illustrations of his poem effectual to enlighten; or rather by drawing attention through their instrumentality to the divine record, might make them a means of inducing parties to quench their thirst at the fountain-head of inspiration itself. Neither Mr. Bailey, nor we, be it understood, ever preposterously imagined, that independently of the divine blessing and of illumination by God's word, any human arguments, however cogent, or any outbursts of poetry, however thrilling and captivating, could accomplish any thing for the conversion of the mind to God, or the inculcation of heavenly and divine truth. Universal salvation, as a doctrine of God, must be revealed to the conscience, through his word, by God himself, or it never will be revealed at all.

"Unquiet spirits" are often very powerful ones. Sad disturbers often are they, not only of their own peace of mind, but of that dead sea of formalism and acquiescence in human theological dogmas which overspread the world before the period of the Reformation, and on the surface of which the great majority of mankind in all ages have been disposed contentedly to float. Our Carlyles, our Newmans, our Froudes, our Sterlings, our Theodore Parkers, our Miss Martineaus, and our Atkinsons are not parties to be won from their travels on "towards Naturalism or Pantheism," by the arguments, any more than by the charms and graces of poesy. What God's word heard and read by them had failed to accomplish, man's fictions may, without any disparagement of their power or brilliancy, despair of succeeding in. And yet, neither the unquietness of the spirits, nor the excellencies of the poem, may be altogether without their use. In the stirring of the waters by the former may, as in the case of the pool of Bethesda, reside a healing influence. And the latter may be subservient to many most important ends. Infidelity may even by poets be more and more hemmed in. Strongholds within which it has entrenched itself and deemed itself secure, they may storm. False orthodoxy they may render suspicious. Religious dogmas received passively on mere human authority they may expose. To the scriptures of truth, for satisfaction on points which have hitherto been unquestioned, they may direct the attention of some. Spiritual illumination from the teachings of the inspired volume may follow. And thus ultimately the word of man, in itself utterly powerless for spiritual purposes, may in God's hands become the means of pointing to that Word, which as alone the sword of the Spirit, is emphatically THE WORD OF POWER. Heb. i. 3. Is not this something?

"Universal Restoration" or "Restitution," is not language which we are in the habit of using; nor, as commonly held, is it a doctrine to which we have ever given our assent. If by restoration is understood the replacing of matters in any respect whatever on the same footing hereafter on which they stand here, or as the setting up again of that earthly Paradise which was forfeited by Adam's one transgression, no such things are to be found intimated in God's word. Indeed, the scriptures are throughout directed point-blank against such a notion.* The earthly Paradise passed away for ever. Man's nature, as

* See particularly our Lord's answer to the Sadducees, Matt. xxii. 23—33.

accursed, ended in the cross of Christ. Nothing of earth is restored. *Old things pass away.* 2 Cor. v 17. Aye, pass away completely and for ever. So far from being restoration, the heavenly state is new creation. Isaiah lxv. 17, Rev. xxi. 5. The old heavens and old earth are superseded by the new. 2 Pet. iii.10—13. The nature of Adam is superseded by the glorified nature of Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. xv. 49, 2 Cor. v. 1, Philip. iii 21. The antitype is superinduced on the type. 1 Cor. v. 4. The Paradise of earth is found ultimately to have been merely an emblem of, as it is subservient and introductory to the Paradise of God. Rev. ii. 7.

God's purpose, as we learn from the sacred volume, never was to restore either earth or the earthly system of Judaism. Earth and man's earthly nature were in God's hands subservient, through Christ, to heaven, and the conferring of the divine nature. And the earthly church of Moses was subservient to the heavenly and glorified church of Jesus Christ. The passing away of shadows was not subservient to their restoration, but to their absorption in their glorious substances. Col. ii. 11th *downwards.* Hebws. *throughout.*

Restoration is only true in a sense of which those who commonly use the phrase have no conception. With God there is neither past nor future. He is the I AM. Exod. iii.14. In the divine nature the *eternal past* is just as much implied as the *eternal future*, that is, neither is implied; for divine nature is *eternal present* nature.* If we speak after the manner of men, however, when scaling the heights of divine truth we may, understanding that there is in the language employed a mere accommodation to human modes of thinking, say, that in a *future eternity* there is a mere restoration of what existed in a *past eternity.* That is, *past* and *future* are absorbed in *present*—there being in God no *past* and no *future*, seeing that these are mere forms of the human mind—although *to us*, as the *future in God* exactly corresponds to the *past in God*, the former appears to be a *restoration* of the latter. God suiting himself to us, is pleased to speak of himself as he *that is, and was, and is to come.* Rev. i. 4. And it was with reference to the sense of restoration just alluded to, that our blessed Lord in his intercessory prayer said, *glorify me with the glory which I had with thee, before the world was.* John xvii. 5.† Restoration thus understood implies the exact correspondency, in heavenly things, of the *eternal future* to the *eternal past;* but is a term which can never be applied to *heavenly substances* as superseding *earthly shadows.* The relation of time and man's nature, to eternity and the glorified nature of Christ, is that of progression or advancement upwards. The exact resemblance, speaking after the manner of men, of *eternity future* to *eternity past*, is that in which alone the relation of restitution can be detected.‡

Premising these observations, we call attention on the part of our readers to the three following scriptural facts, not theories :—

1st. That as all human beings were in Adam when he transgressed and died, (Rom. v. 12), so were all human beings in Jesus Christ, expressly called *the last*, or second *Adam*, (1 Cor. vv. 45), when he approved himself divinely righteous in dying, (John xii. 32), and divinely living in rising again from the dead, (Rom. v. 18, Isai. xxv. 8, Hosea xiii. 14, Cor. xv. 26, 54); as proved besides not only by Christ being styled *Adam*, 1 Cor. xv. 45, (see 1 Tim. ii. 5, where he is emphatically denominated *man*, ἀνθρωπος and Hebrews ii. 14,) that is, the man in whom all other men are contained or summed up; but by the fact of Adam, as a creature, (Acts xvii. 28), and as *the figure of him that*

---

* *He that believeth* HATH *everlasting life.* John iv. 24 The reason of which is, that in him is the earnest of a nature which equally excludes past and future, that is, the earnest of the divine nature.

† Psalm lxiii. 2, as the language of Jesus Christ in flesh, deserves in connexion with this to be looked at.

‡ "Three Questions Proposed and Answered," Question first: the fourth of the "Dialogues on Universal Salvation;" and the "Summary" of the "Three Grand Exhibitions of Man's Enmity to God," all have a bearing on the subject treated of in the text. Riccaltoun's Works also might with advantage be consulted.

was to come, (Rom. v. 14), having been in Jesus, the second Adam, as the Creator, (Colos. i. 17), and consequently by the fact of all men, as having been in Adam, (Rom. v 12), having been also through him in Christ. Ibid. 18, compared with 1 Cor. xv. 44—49, 1 Tim. ii. 4 and iv 10, and Titus iii. 4, (see Greek).

2ndly. That *immortality* is to all human beings not naturally,—for naturally *continued earthly existence* while innocent, and death through transgression were their portion, (Gen ii. 16, 17)—but supernaturally through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. (Hosea xiii. 14. 2 Tim. i. 10, Heb. ii. 14, 1 John iii. 8): as proved besides by the fact of immortality being not a human but a divine principle, (1 Tim. vi. 16), by the obvious import of our Lord's words, (John x. 10, ibid. xi. 25, 26), and by an express apostolic declaration. (1 Cor. xv. 22). And

3rdly. That all salvation involves destruction, (Gal. ii. 20, also Rom. vi. 4—11), or that in new creation through Jesus risen and glorified is involved, whether as to the whole (Rev. xxi. 4, 5), or as to individuals, (2 Cor. v. 17), the supersession,—not the perpetuation by means of improvement,—or passing away entirely of the old creation; (Isai. lxv. 17, 2 Peter iii. 10—13); also Leviticus xiv. 43—46.

Such are principles assumed by us, and implied in the following detailed answers to the objections to Universalism, which are by Mr. Gilfillan put into the mouths of Naturalists and Pantheists. These objections, it will be our aim to shew, rest upon grounds which are not only untrue, but far from being by all acquiesced in

1. Eternal life is not of the nature of "a sugar plum"* held out to reward good children, but is God's gift, freely bestowed on the vile and undeserving. Rom. v. 8, and vi. 23, Gal. iii. 6, *to the end*, 1 John v. 11. It is never known as a favour that *may be* ours, and which we are to earn by our own endeavours and virtuous actions. Rom. iii. 21, 22. Titus iii. 5. On the contrary, it is always known, where known at all, as that which as a matter of fact, *is* ours; or we know God, according to his eternal purpose, which he purposed in Christ Jesus, Eph. iii. 11. (also 1, 4, 5, and Titus i. 2, 3,) to have loved us from everlasting to everlasting in his own Son, before we are, or can be influenced by heavenly principles at all. Rom. vi. *throughout*, 2 Cor. v. 14, 15. Eph. v. 1. 1 John iv. 19. Jesus Christ, for the joy that was set before him, *endured the cross, despising the shame*. Heb. xii. 2. And his apostles who lived before the shadowy dispensation of the law, to which the fulfilment of faith as a condition was essential, came to an end, strove to *lay hold on eternal life*. 1 Tim. vi. 12; see also Heb. iii. 6, 14, iv. 14, x. 23. But Christ, the substance of that dispensation, (Colos. ii. 17), is now completely revealed. Rev. xxii. 18. By him all its conditions are declared to have been fulfilled, nay to have been exhausted. Rom. x. 4, John xix. 30. In him, and interested in his righteousness and life, we are revealed to be. Hence, eternal life is not a something which by our own righteousness of any kind we are to earn, and which we may or may not come short of; it is, through *faith of the operation of God*,—in which is *subjectively* realized to us its heavenly and divine *object*, (Heb. xi. 1, 2,—Greek)—seen by us as that of which in Christ we are even now in possession as a matter of fact, and of which we can by no possibility be despoiled.

2. There is no sense in which hell, or any other mere creature principle can be *infinite*. Rev. xx. 14. The *infinite* is the *divine*; and we think too highly of Mr. Gilfillan's sense, not to speak of his Christianity, to suppose for one moment, that to sin or to hell he would ascribe a *divine* attribute. He is led astray here by want of reflection. He is confounding, as is but too common, the *indefinite* or that which the creature cannot bound, with the *infinite* or that which is boundless. Jeremiah xvii. 9, 10. Sin and death are *indefinite*, not *infinite* principles. To assert that they are *infinite* is sheer Manichæism.

* Is not the hint, if not even the phrase, borrowed from Newman's "Soul?"

Righteousness and life as attributes of God, and as realized in the work of Jesus Christ, God manifest in flesh, are *infinite*; but sin and death, the *works of the devil*, can never, without the most arrant blasphemy, be made *infinite* likewise, and thereby raised to a level and put on a footing with them. There is neither *infinite* sin nor *infinite* death.* On the contrary sin, as *indefinite*, was cast into the *infinite* ocean of Christ's righteousness, (Micah vii. 19), and there swallowed up. John i. 29, Heb. ix. 29. Death, as *indefinite*, was cast into the *infinite* ocean of Christ's life, (2 Tim. i. 10), and there swallowed up. Isai. xxv. 8, 1 Cor. xv. 54, 2 Cor. v. 4. And yet we feel disposed to meet and satisfy our friend Mr. Gilfillan's ideas if we can. There are, undoubtedly, senses in which we may hold the consequences of sin to be *infinite*. They are in themselves merely *indefinite* principles, and through the atoning sacrifice and resurrection of Him who is the *infinite* one, shewn to be so. But through sin, creature nature dies or passes away for ever. In that destruction of man, as Adam's descendant, which took place in the sacrifice of Christ, he is, as man, everlastingly (*infinitely* if you will) punished; for, as man, he never lives, and as new-created in Jesus, never can live again. Besides, the death of death itself, which is involved in the conferring of eternal life, or the swallowing up of death in victory, is an *infinite* result. Thus in virtue of God's purpose and the work of Christ Jesus, sin and death, *indefinite* in themselves, are rendered subservient to *infinite* consequences; and man, as one with Adam, is *everlastingly*, that is *infinitely* punished by being *everlastingly* destroyed. Will this tend to satisfy Mr. Gilfillan, by shewing, that although not on popular, yet on scriptural and divine principles, we can agree with him, and meet the objections of supposed opponents by conceding the existence of *infinite*, that is *everlasting* punishment?

3. We have no hesitation in admitting, that as "in every great house, there is a furnace for the dross, as well as a light for the drawing room," so does scripture countenance the applicability of language borrowed from the action of fire upon metals, to divine and spiritual subjects. *For the Lord thy God is a consuming fire.* Deut. iv. 24. See Heb. xii. 29. *I will—purely purge away thy dross, and take away all thy tin. Is. i. 25. And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver. Mal. iii. 3.* Still, the question occurs, is the use made of such figurative language here, by Mr. Gilfillan, or those of whose objections he condescends to be the expositor, admissible? According to them while the church, or body of the redeemed is the everlasting "light in the drawing-room," the flames of hell, everlastingly consuming and tormenting the damned, constitute the "furnace for the dross." Besides the Manichæism of making sin *infinite*, and the lie given to God's express declaration that Christ *was manifested to destroy*, not confirm *the works of the Devil*, 1 John iii. 8. which are involved in Mr. Gilfillan's notions, can it claim any higher origin than the mere human brain? Suppose God to have given a different interpretation of the furnace, and of the effects of being subjected to its action. In that case, whether is human imagination, or divine revelation to prevail? Nay, even our enemies themselves being judges, which of the two, man's explanation, or God's is the more self-consistent and satisfactory? Now it so happens that in scripture, God is declared to be love, 1 John iv. 8, 16; to accomplish all that he aims at, or to do all his pleasure, Is. xlvi. 19, Dan. iv. 35; and as his object is to overcome evil with good, and to consume sin and death by righteousness and life, thereby evincing the power of his love, to succeed in this object. 1 John iii. 8, iv. 8—10. Into Christ in flesh as the furnace, and for the purpose of being consumed by the flames of his wrath, (the wrath of him who IS LOVE, and who exhibits his love to righteousness in the form of wrath towards sin,) sin and sinners, death and dying ones are thrown. As the result, they are consumed. Sin and death, sinners and dying ones, are no more. *OUR God*, be it remembered, *is a consuming fire.* Heb. xii. 29. The dross is purged—the tin is taken away. There is not, as popular divinity, backed by popular infidelity supposes, an ineffectual struggle on the part of

* Where in scripture is either said to be so?

the Creator with his own creatures—a vain although everlasting attempt made by God to consume, and thereby get rid of sin and death. (Horrid and blasphemous, although all but universal idea) No. According to the scriptures, God does consume, and thereby get rid of both. John i. 29. Heb ix. 26. ii. 14. 2 Tim. i. 10. Sin and death are cast into the furnace of Christ's death and resurrection—there they are subjected to the full and flaming action of divine love—and there they are consumed. Evil and the effects of evil are no more. Rev. xxi. 3—5. The action of the heavenly fire in this heavenly crucible, has been complete. A new creation, purged from all that is debased and disfigured by sin, makes its appearance. "Behold! I make all things new." Ibid. xxi. 5. Say, reader, by which of these two systems, are the action of the furnace, and the effects of a fire that is consuming, more fitly represented? By that one, which would make Him, in his attempts to consume sin and its consequeuces, to succeed only in confirming them for ever, that is, which would assign to his enemies, the power of everlastingly frustrating his plans and purposes? Or, by that one, which would shew him to have, agreeably to his own word, actually consumed sin and death in Christ Jesus, after having rendered their temporary existence subservient to the everlasting manifestation of his righteousness and life? Surely, dear Mr. Gilfillan, the simile of the furnace, as employed by the supposed objectors, is a singularly unhappy and inappropriate one.

4. Man's nature, although not bodily, yet mentally considered, is *indefinite*, and sin, as properly in and emanating from man's mind, is *indefinite* also. Hence, the expansive nature of sin, as *indefinite*, is at once and cheerfully granted. And punishment as following necessarily in the wake of sin, as inseparable from it, and as thereby co-extensive with it, will be of course as expansive, because as indefinite as sin itself is. But what of all this? Will the utmost expansive capacity of sin, succeed in swelling the indefinite to infinite—the creaturely to the divine? Was the frog of the fable, with all its efforts, able to enlarge itself to the dimensions of the ox? Ah! dear friend, arguments from *analogy* however plausible, even those of a Butler, will avail you and others nothing here. See how our Lord has poured contempt on all such arguments in Matt. xxii. 23—33. No human power—no angelic power—can convert the *indefinite* of the creature, into the *infinite* of the Creator, There is a gulph interposed between both which nothing creaturely can pass. Swell, enlarge, expand the *indefinite* as you will, it is the *indefinite* after all; and has not advanced one whit—one mathematical point towards the *infinite*. The highest attribute of the *indefinite* is, that it is the fitting, and the only fitting shadow, or representative of the *infinite*. The mind of man, who was made after God's image, is the figure of, not identified with the mind of God.* Accordingly, the indefinite of sin and punishment, expand them as you will, can have bounds set to them; and as the *Infinite One*, Immanuel, *God with us* hath by his incarnation, or coming in flesh, crossed the otherwise impassable gulph that separates between the indefinite and the infinite, so hath he, by his death and resurrection swallowed up the indefinite itself altogether, with all its capabilities of expansion, whether in the shape of sin or punishment, in his own infinite, because divine righteousness and life.

5. Even if God had not "begun by abolishing sin here," we cannot see how to a deeply and soundly reflecting mind, this should have presented any peculiar difficulty; seeing that ignorant as such a mind would feel itself to be of the principles of the divine administration viewed in the infinite entireness of their applicability to intelligent creatures, it might suspect the possibility of one set of principles being applied to one state of things, and another set to a state of things essentially different. It might suppose, that while sin's existence, and reign unto death so befitted earth and time, as to exclude, while

* Αβυσσος is the term applied in the Book of Revelation, chap. xx. and elsewhere. to *the mind of man*. It is an *abyss*, or *bottomless pit* to man himself; but has been gone to the bottom of, and turned inside out, by God man fest in flesh, the Lord Jesus Christ. Jerem. xvii. 9, 10, Rev. ii. 23.

they lasted, the existence and reign of what was opposite, so the existence and reign of righteousness unto eternal life, to the entire exclusion of their opposites, might equally befit heaven and eternity. Gamaliel-like,—cautious, self-distrustful, and prudent,—would such a mind evince itself to be. But as based on the consciousness of ignorance, however proper and becoming in the case supposed conduct suitable to it might be, this is not a principle upon which any one enlightened by faith can or does act; seeing that God's own express declaration of there *entering into* the heavenly state of things *nothing that defileth*, Rev. xxi, 27, and of *all things* there being *made new*, Ibid. 5, is to him sufficient and exclusive evidence of its truth. Striking, indeed, is it that what we have *imagined it possible* for a sound fleshly mind to suspect, should constitute one of the most important subject-matters of divine revelation. The state of things in time is no doubt, looked at in certain lights, shadowy or emblematic of the state of things in eternity. But it is more properly the object of scripture to make known to us, the antagonism, or opposition subsisting between the one state of things and the other. Here, we have the sphere of sin and punishment; hereafter, of righteousness and life everlasting. Rom. v. 21. But this is not all. Of His future administration of things, God has not left us at present entirely without earnests. Even here the abolition or destruction of sin has begun. In the Cross of Christ, God shews us sin destroyed, just as in the resurrection of Christ, he shews us death destroyed. And in making this discovery to the minds of the members of his church, by destroying their previous ignorance of his character, as well as thereby destroying their previous enmity to it, he commences in them the abolition or destruction, of the principles of sin and death. The body no doubt is still dead, because of sin; but the Spirit is already life because of righteousness. Sin is actually even now destroyed, by being swallowed up in the conscience, through the manifestation to it by faith of Christ as *the Lord our righteousness*. Jerem. xxiii. 6, Rom. x. 4. If the abolition of sin completely, constitutes heaven in its fulness, is not the earnest of this abolition now, through faith and love, actually the heavenly state begun? This, although a fact, and expressive of what is realized in the conscience of every believer of the truth, we propose as no direct argument in favor of the Bible, to the Sceptic and the Infidel. But it constitutes our protest against acquiescing in whatever he may think fit to assume as true. When he tells us triumphantly that the abolition of sin has not commenced upon earth, and proceeds to reason from this as it were a universally admitted fact, we quietly hint to him, that by every believer of the gospel his supposed fact is disputed. And even if he should see meet to disregard our intimation, and to make outward facts, and the opinion of the many, the grounds of persisting in his assertion, we respectfully ask to have it proved to us, that the existence of sin in an earthly or temporal state implies necessarily, or even as a matter of high probability, the existence of sin in a heavenly and everlasting one? We confess ourselves totally unable to see the *vis consequentiæ* here. Analogy may be pled. But what if we suggest, that opposition between the two states is *just as likely* as their analogy; and that the analogy cannot be rendered complete, the elements which are required to constitute the idea of *an infinite state of sin*, being absolutely heterogeneous, discordant, and incongruous? *Monstrum horrendum, informe.*

6. "And what need, they will ask, of any hell afterwards, when justice is done now?" So say we. And what is of infinitely more importance, so likewise says God's word. In the case of our Lord Jesus Christ the *infinite one* in flesh, justice satisfied here by his death on the cross as exhausting the *definite*, and his descent into Hades as exhausting the *indefinite* principles of man, supersedes the necessity and possibility of his satisfying justice hereafter. In the cases of Enoch and Elijah, justice satisfied here by the instantaneous infliction of death upon their entire Adamic natures, through the superinduction upon them entirely of that divine nature, or nature of Jesus glorified, (John xvii. 5,) of the earnest of which they had been by faith already in possession. supersedes the necessity or possibility of any hell or punishment to them hereafter-

Nay more: that earnest of the divine nature, in the forms of light and love, which is the portion and privilege of every believer of the truth here, and which as rendering mind so far spiritual or substantial, (Eph. iv. 23), is the infliction of death, by superseding it, upon soul or shadowy mind, is to him a guarantee that as already a partaker of eternal life, John iv. 24, 1 John v. 1, he cannot be hurt of the second death. Rev. ii. 11, xx. 6. Justice satisfied here by the infliction of death on the Adamic mind—death through Adam's one transgression, and death still more through the swallowing up of death in life, or in the knowledge of Christ living and glorified, Rom. viii. 10—and this followed by the infliction of death on their bodies, Ibid. leaves no necessity, or possibility for the punishment of Hell, or for suffering, to them hereafter. So far, then, our objectors and we appear to be at one. And there is no great difficulty, indeed, by means of God's word, of settling what remains. Putting out of view for the present, that highest of all representations of the subject which is brought under notice in Matt. xxii. 31, 32, Luke xx. 37, 38. and which an attempt has been made to embody in the "Summary" which winds up "Man's Three Grand Exhibitions of Enmity to God," and confining ourselves to the progressive system of divine truth, or that which carries us up from the *finite*, through the *indefinite*, to the *infinite*,—from the creation of the world, to the consummation of all things—then, as in the case of Christ, and of all upon whom the divine nature is conferred, upon earth, justice is satisfied here, only two things more require consideration—First; the application hereafter to the bodies of members of the Church of the same heavenly principle which, through faith, is on earth applied to their minds. On earth, made to know God as revealed in Christ, their souls already dead in Adam, Gen. ii. 16, 17, Eph. ii. 1, undergo the still farther death of being superseded, in the very act of being quickened or made alive by the glorified spirit of Christ; (Rom vi. 3, 4, &c. viii. 10, Gal. ii. 20, 2 Cor. v. 1—4, Rev. xiv. 13); and so, when Christ comes the second time, their bodies already dead through sin or the death of soul, undergo the still further death of being superseded for ever as Adamic bodies, by being quickened by Christ's spirit, and thereby conformed to his spiritual and glorified body. Rom. viii. 11, 1 Cor. xv. 49, Phil. iii. 21. And, secondly, there is the application of that new-creating or heavenly principle to the rest of mankind, which had already been realized in the case of the Church. Dead in soul, and consequently dead in body, through Adam's one transgression, and continuing in this state during their lifetime, the life-giving power of Christ, when he appears making *all things new*, (Rev. xxi. 5), stamps down this death upon them for ever, in the very act of his applying the power of his resurrection, John v. 28, 29, 1 Cor. xv. 22, at once to both their souls and bodies: superseding both for ever as old and Adamic, when he makes both new and divine. Thus are both the *finite* and the *indefinite* satisfied: the *finite*, in the supersession of earthly body by spiritual body; and the *indefinite*, in the supersession of soul by spirit. And here a suggestion is made to us which explains the whole and removes every difficulty. Looking at matters not *absolutely*, but *relatively* and *progressively*, as *infinitude* belongs to spirit which comes last, so the *indefinite*, as connected with the human soul, must be interposed between time, as connected with the *finite*, and the everlasting and unchangeable state as connected with the *infinite*. Here, that is, in the *indefinite*, or what is connected with soul, have we *hades*, or what is commonly translated *hell*. This like the *finite*, is gradually superseded. This gradual process, however, does not imply that the justice of God was not here satisfied by the work of Christ; but that what in himself the *infinite one*, was accomplished upon earth, is gradually manifested as accomplished also in the cases of the church and of others. It is the application and development of facts realized in Christ, according to the capacities of the creature mind. Jesus personally satisfied and exhausted the *finite*, when he died on the cross; and so likewise did he satisfy, or exhaust the *indefinite*, by his descent into Hades, its appropriate region. But as to man

and man's nature, both *finite* and *indefinite* still remain. The ending of the one, or of the finite, implying the supersession of time and earth, by the period and state of Christ's æonian reign, or of the infinite in its indefinite form. And the ending of the other, or the indefinite, implying the supersession of the indefinite itself by the infinite. The whole, however, being merely indicative of the fact, that upon earth, and in the work of Christ as dying, descending into hades, and rising again, justice has been satisfied.

7. No one acquainted with the gospel ever yet attempted to *prove* any book be it human composition, or be it the Word of God itself, to be divine. Proof implies the existence of something clearer than that which is to be proved,—of some evidence more satisfactory, than the conclusion which it is our aim to establish. In human things proof is fair and legitimate, seeing that there are some things which are clearer and more satisfactory than others; nay, it is indispensable, as must be obvious to all who know the principles of mathematical science, or have observed the proceedings in a Court of Justice. But in divine things proof is inadmissible. These carry their own evidence in themselves. They consist of divine facts; and when these facts are divinely revealed through faith in their written record, to the conscience of any one, they are seen to be divinely true, that is, to be what they are, not by proof from without, but in their own light, and by means of the conviction of which they themselves are productive. *I receive not testimony from man*, said the Son of God, while in flesh. John v. 34. "We as directly emanating from him who *is light*, and *in whom is no darkness at all*, 1 John i. 5, and as consequently essentially light in ourselves, cannot be testified to or *proved*, by the darkness of the human mind," is the import of the language of the heavenly and divine records. Hence, where faith, or the conviction produced by divine testimony exists, it is the result, not of *proof*, (that is, proof from *without*, and from what is *necessarily inferior*,) but of the facts themselves revealed, or of God himself shining into the mind through the instrumentality of these facts. In *faith* itself, that is, in the objects of faith revealed or believed in, is to be found the ἔλεγχος *or evidence of things not seen.* Heb. xi. 1.* Only therefore, where faith is, can the power and force of this heavenly evidence be felt and recognized. And thus *positively considered*, conviction of divine truth is matter, not of *proof*, but of *faith*.† Not so, however, *negatively considered.* The Scriptures, although, as the record of divine facts, themselves the clearest and most satisfactory of all evidence, and consequently incapable of being *proved*, nevertheless set *disproof* at defiance, Books falsely pretending to be divine revelations, such as the Shastras, the Koran, and the recent Mormon delusion, may be and have been *disproved.* The true revelation never can. Attack it who may, it will always come off uninjured and victorious. The viper may gnaw the file, but it will be only to his own disadvantage. Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian, in former, and Herbert, Toland, Tindal, Paine, and a host of others in more recent times, have tried their power in tilting it against the Scriptures. But, as the result, their spears have been shivered to atoms, and God's word still stands forth in all its primitive and resplendent beauty.‡ To *prove* the Bible to be divine, therefore, no intelligent and scripturally taught

* Verse 2nd shews this. *For by it*, faith, *were the Elders witnessed* to, i.e. through faith did the objective divine testimony become subjectively a testimony to them.

† See Hume's Essay on Miracles, towards the close. Hume, whose metaphysical acuteness has seldom been equalled and never surpassed, saw clearly that the *human* never could prove the *divine.* Thus, *negatively*, his writings have been of essential service to the Christian cause. His insinuated conclusion as to the non existence of divine revelation, we, who have had the facts of scripture revealed to us in their own divine light and evidence, can afford to laugh at.

‡ Here appears the true use of what have been most absurdly denominated "Evidences of Christianity," as if Christianity could have any evidence except itself. Justin Martyr in his dialogue, Grotius in his treatise De Veritate Religionis Christianæ, Campbell in his work on Miracles, and Watson in his "Apology for Christianity," and in that "for the Bible," might confute, and actually have confuted much error; bringing to light a number of most interesting facts tending to the discomfiture of infidelity. Nay, in such works as Leslie's "Short Method with the Deists," and Paley's "Horæ Paulinæ," infidels have absolutely been pushed into a corner. The truth and divine origin of scripture, however, are manifested to the mind, not by such compositions as theirs, but through the medium of scripture itself.

Christian attempts. This he leaves to its divine author as his own inalienable prerogative; and knows that he has in every age been accomplishing it, by causing its facts to appear to be what they are, or by revealing them in their own light and heavenly simplicity to the members of his Church. All that man can attempt, with any prospect of success, is availing himself of the light of scripture, and making use of its revealed facts as grounds and *media* of proof, to repel assaults made on divine revelation, and to convict of error those by whom the assaults are made. Confining himself to this line of conduct, his labours are important and may by the divine blessing be preeminently useful. He may be the means of drawing attention to many mistakes which have been committed as to the meaning of God's word, and of exposing and confuting many errors into which men following the guidance of their dark and corrupt minds have been led. In all this, however, he is doing nothing which has the slightest tendency *directly* or *positively* to establish divine truth. He is merely, as having had that truth revealed to himself, enabled *negativel* to refute *human* error. God's truth is contained in God's word alone; and God *directly* and *positively* establishes that truth in the mind of any one, not by proof or evidence, from man, and still less by disproof of human fallacies, but simply by revealing or making known its divine facts as what they are, in their own proper light, and by means of their own proper evidence.

In this plain, unpoetical, and yet scriptural way, do we reply to the objections of Mr. Gilfillan, or rather of those of whom he here comes forward in the character of spokesman. The assumptions on which they proceed are all false. Eternal life is not *a reward*, (*a sugar plum!*) but a gift freely bestowed, and presently enjoyed—*indefinite* is the highest attribute of mere creature nature, as nothing but what is divine is or can be *infinite and eternal*—God's furnace for dross, the death of Christ, does not make an attempt to consume it which is eternally frustrated, but actually does consume it—the expansive character of punishment, which is coextensive at the utmost with the indefinite nature of sin, is bounded by the infinite nature of him, by whom sin and death have both been destroyed—the abolition of sin by divine righteousness is begun upon earth—justice being satisfied in man's sufferings and death, and exhausted in the cross of Christ, there is and can be hereafter no hell, or place for the satisfaction of justice by creatures, in the popular sense of the term—and the Bible is not proved by human reasonings, but manifested in its own light and by its own evidence to be divine. In all this we do not profess to be establishing divine truth. That we leave to God himself to do, through his word. But we profess to have knocked down the assumptions of Mr. Gilfillan's objectors, as having shewn that they are inconsistent with fact; and having destroyed the assumptions, we of course overturn the conclusions which are founded on them. The alleged grounds of opposition to Universalism, founded on by our author, are inadmissible. Other arguments, therefore, must be sought for.

For Mr. Bailey's religious sentiments, as a whole, we offer neither vindication nor apology. We should feel that we insulted a man of his genius, and one so thoroughly competent to defend himself, were we to attempt to do so. His Festus stands unique in its plan, its object, and its execution—it has by the gorgeous exuberance of its imagination, drawn towards it the admiration of the civilized world—and as a poem, however profound and metaphysical it may occasionally be, it disclaims being obliged to answer queries, which might fitly enough be addressed to the author of a professedly theological disquisition. Well does Mr. Bailey know, that in so far as polemics are concerned, poetry of any kind is but "the milk and rose-water" of literature; and that it is not by "dropping these on the iron scales of scepticism," that its assaults are to be overcome, and its existence destroyed. He merely claims the ordinary privileges accorded to his art, of dealing in fiction and exaggeration as largely as he pleases—of at the utmost *sprinkling* truth (*spargere voces*), as he passes along his way—and of not being amenable to

the tribunals of strict historical fact, and dry, hard, unbending logic. But although we undertake not the defence of the poet or his poem — that *monumentum aere perennius* which the genius of Mr. Bailey has erected—we have undertaken to repel assaults on the truth of God, made through the sides of both. To repel assaults, we say, not to convince the assailants. *We believe in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe*, says an inspired Apostle. 1 Tim. iv. 10. Universal Salvation then, is a fact revealed by God, not a theory invented by man. This, with other truths of revelation, the Hydra of Scepticism assails, and would, if it were able, destroy. And with some of its modss of attack, in the form of queries addressed to Mr. Bailey, the author of the "Galleries of Literary Portraits," condescends to make us acquainted. Now it is perfectly true that the destruction of infidelity by mere human force is impossible; and that for any man, or set of men, to attempt it, would but be to throw "milk and rose-water" on the monster's iron scales. God alone, by his truth as revealed in his word, is competent to destroy error. To act the part of God then, in what precedes, has not been our object. We have merely tried to do what human beings may, namely, shew that certain assumptions of opponents are untrue, and that certain weapons of offence employed by them are illegitimate. At all events, what they suppose to be acquiesced in by all, we deny. Without destroying their opposition, which it is God's prerogative alone by his truth to accomplish, we have conceived ourselves to be able to neutralize it. As the result, we force them to prove their assumptions, at the risk of disclosing more thoroughly the weakness of their cause; or should they not chuse to do so, to have recourse to other methods of attack. The whole tending to shew, that while God's word alone is competent to bring human opposition to divine truth to an end, that opposition is nevertheless based upon principles which afford to its votaries but a treacherous footing, expose them to incessant defeats, and give them no o her prospect that that of being driven from post to post, until at last their complete overthrow shall take place.

D. T.

The Cross of Christ; the Call of God; Saving Faith; an Inquiry into the completeness and extent of the Atonement, with especial reference to the Universal Offer of the Gospel, and the Universal Obligation to believe. By Robert S. Candlish, D.D., Minister of the Gospel, Edinburgh. Second Edition. Edinburgh: John Johnstone, Hunter Square. London: R. Groombridge and Sons. 1845.

Our readers many of them at least, are, aware that amongst what are called Evangelical Christians there are disputes concerning the extent of the atonement made by the Lord Jesus Christ; that one party holds that the atonement was made for all men though only some shall receive the benefit of it, while the other maintains that it was made only for some, all of whom shall be saved by it. They are distinguished by the titles of general and particular redemptionists, both alike being partialists, or holding the doctrine of the salvation of only a part of the human race. The author of the work now before us holds a high place in the estimation of the most active and influential religionists of the day and, belongs to the class of particular redemptionists. He himself says "that an inadequate view of the nature of saving faith lies at the root of much of the crude heresy that has been vented in regard to this department of theology," and accordingly the principal or at least a great part of the object of the book is to give an exposition of what the author means by "saving faith," and to distinguish it from the views of it taken by the universal redemptionists or others.

It would be a tedious undertaking to examine in detail all the positions and arguments brought forward by the author: our object indeed is not to enter into the differences between the two parties we have referred to, but to make use of the book for the elucidation of truth; and we shall endeavour

therefore, as speedily as possible, to get at the most important and fundamental principles maintained by the writer, in order to compare them with the principles we believe to be taught by the Scriptures of truth.

The author commences by referring to three questions concerning the extent of Christ's atonement, and answers them to this effect; first, that "they for whom Christ died are infallibly saved;" secondly, that the condition of those at least to whom the knowledge of it comes is most materially affected by the event or fact in question, or rather, by the publication of it, such having their criminality greatly aggravated if they reject it; with respect to the third question regarding the exact bearing of the death of Christ on the world at large he declines to answer it categorically, but states, i. that it has procured for the world at large, and for every individual certain benefits, namely, a season of forbearance and a system of means and influences calculated to lead them to God and sufficient to leave them without excuse; ii. the death of Christ is fitted to give to all men, universally, and to every individual alike, a manifestation of the divine character and divine plan of salvation; and iii. it is the proof and measure of that infinite compassion which dwells in the bosom of God towards each and all of the lost race of Adam, and his infinite willingness, or rather longing and yearning desire, to receive each and all of them again into his favour. "To every individual, believer or not, elect or not, it is a proof or pledge of the Father's bowels of compassion yearning over him, and the Father's eye looking out for him, and the Father's arms open to embrace him freely, if he will be but moved to return; *and to no individual, before he believes, is it, or can it be, anything more;* to none does it beforehand impart any further insight into the mind and will of God, as a warrant or encouragement to believe."

On the subject of the universality of the gospel offer or call and its sincerity and good faith on the part of God, as well as its sufficiency as regards men, he says, 1, that to vindicate God in his procedure, and satisfy men, it is enough to establish his right to require and command the sinner's return to himself, and his willingness and ability, in consistency with the ends of justice, to save all such as do return; 2, that no sinner, before believing, is entitled to stipulate for any information on the subject either of the extent or sufficiency of the atonement, beyond the assurance that it will suffice for him, if he will make use of it; and 3, "that even if men had more information on the point in question, it would not help them to believe. For faith is not the belief of an express proposition defining the precise relation of Christ's death to the elect, or to men in general, or to the individual in particular; but it is "the receiving and resting upon Jesus Christ alone for salvation, as he is freely offered in the gospel."

The author then goes on to contend, in opposition to the general redemptionists, that in attempting by their system to vindicate the sincerity and good faith of God in connection with the universality of the gospel offer, they only shift the difficulty, and that "of all theories the most inconsistent is that of a universal atonement with a 'general reference' to all mankind, taken along with a purpose and provision of special grace, in regard to its application." With respect to the question which may be brought forward by those to whom the gospel offer may be made as to their standing with regard to election, he declines discussing it with them as a point not at all to the purpose, having no practical bearing on the subject, and the consideration of which is liable to do mischief by weakening the feeling of responsibility.

Having thus disposed of such considerations he goes on to consider more particularly the subject of "saving faith,"—its office, nature, warrant and origin. Its office is "to effect and secure man's falling in with what God is doing, in saving sinners;"—"to insure acquiescence, or *appropriation*"—"it is that which carries and makes sure the sinner's consent to be saved freely by grace, through the redemption that is in Christ;" its nature, a casting oneself upon Christ, directly appropriating him as our own; its warrant, the

divine testimony, and as preliminary to this, at least in the order of causation, an acquaintance with God's character as revealed in his testimony; its source and origin, the work of the Holy Spirit regenerating or new creating, imparting a new life by renewing the understanding, will, and heart, by which an individual is rendered able to believe, or capable of exercising faith.

Throughout the whole of the work we have the Gospel represented as a call or message to men to return to God,—an offer of salvation to all who will accept of it. The cross of Christ has effected a work for man, (some men exclusively,) and God commands all men to believe in the sufficiency and efficacy of that work, calls on all to accept of the benefit of that work, with an assurance or pledge that every one who is willing to do so will get the benefit of it. But the author is careful to explain that this believing is not simply a crediting of any definite proposition or assent to it as true, but involves a "closing with the offer" an appropriation of it so as to make it our own, or according to what he calls the "admirable definition" of it in the Shorter Catechism (of the Westminister Assembly), faith is "a saving grace, whereby we receive and rest upon Jesus Christ alone for salvation."

It will thus be observed that the proper understanding of the nature of the gospel and of faith are at the root of the whole matter, and it will be our business to address ourselves directly to these two points. We shall therefore state what we consider to be the plain and simple truth respecting these two points, and contrast them with the views propounded and advocated by the author.

The Gospel, as we take it from the Scriptures, means good news or glad tidings, and this good news is that God has sent his Son into the world to save sinners,—to save them to the uttermost: that by his obedience, death, and resurrection the Son of God has satisfied divine justice, made an end of sin, and brought in everlasting righteousness: that he has put away sin by the sacrifice of himself and been exalted to the right hand of God to give remission of sins to the guilty,—life to the dying. It is a testimony to a work done, a declaration of a purpose in connection with that work which shall be accomplished; that work was the perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ, that purpose the salvation of men on account of that work. It is therefore the completion of the manifestation of the character of God to man in this world, in the revelation of his *mercy* in what he has done and is doing in saving the guilty.

We have some difficulty in ascertaining what the author of the work before us would define the gospel to be,—how he would answer the question, What *is* the gospel? He speaks of a free or a universal *offer* of the gospel; so then the gospel is something which can be offered to men,—something which they may accept or reject! We have no wish to withdraw attention from the subject by verbal criticisms, but we cannot help saying that we think the language of the author and his party singularly inappropriate and even absurd; according to his own system instead of speaking of offers of the gospel it would be much more to the purpose to speak of the gospel or good news of a free or universal offer of salvation. This we presume to be his meaning, and the good news turns out to be, that all men have an opportunity of returning to God and then being saved if they choose, an assurance that they shall be saved if they are only willing and really desirous of being saved.

This constitutes in fact the popular theology. Man at first was put upon his trial; a law was imposed upon him: he violated it and fell. God gives man another chance for his life, an opportunity of retrieving his first error, with a promise of assistance, effectual for the purpose, if he will only shew his sense of his error by the slightest willingness to recover his favour with God, all impediments to this, in the necessity for maintaining the Divine truth and justice, having been removed by the substitutionary work of Jesus Christ. As the first was a case of probation so is the second.

On the contrary we hold that man was at first placed on his trial and found wanting. God was revealed then as lawgiver and judge. There was no

necessity for again subjecting man to a similar trial; the first was sufficient; it had manifested his nature. But God has now revealed himself as the merciful, the bestower of blessings on the guilty, the only being able to fulfil law, the giver of what is his own to creatures who are only the passive recipients of his favours. The gospel is the testimony which declares this; it is therefore no offer at all; it is a declaration of a matter of fact; those who believe not this testimony simply remain as they were, only that their disbelief manifests still more clearly their disposition to trust in themselves; those who believe it rejoice in the manifestation which it gives them of God's character; to them it is good news and to them alone.

Faith is simply belief or a conviction that a statement brought under our attention is true; saving faith is the belief of a testimony that tells us of a work that saves. We shall not attempt to define what belief is; it is too simple to require definition and the attempt to do so would only introduce confusion into a plain subject. But we may state what it is not. It is not understanding, as a man may understand a statement perfectly and not believe it. It is not attending to, examining, or investigating the truth of a statement, as a man may do all that and understand it too without believing it, or may even come to the conclusion that it is false. Belief of a statement, it is true, implies the existence of some degree of understanding of and attention to it, but the strength of belief is not in proportion to these: its intelligence however is, and we thus distinguish between an intelligent and a blind belief. Belief is not necessarily produced by attention to and understanding of evidence; there may be much of these without belief, and on the other hand the force of evidence may be so great as to command the attention and compel the understanding of those who are naturally most indifferent to the subject. In belief then the mind is purely and entirely passive; preliminary to and consequent upon belief the mind may be or must be active, but belief or faith itself is not an act or exercise of the mind at all, or in any sense; it is an effect produced or impression made upon the mind, which an intelligent being cannot help receiving even against his will.

This definition probably would not satisfy Dr. Candlish; indeed he does not appear to understand it clearly, judging from the definitions he gives of what he calls "the simple act of believing." Far be it from us to say that he does not give a correct statement of the view taken of it by those he is contending against; this may or may not be, but we shall not enter into that question.

He thus says (p. 66) "Faith, according to them, being an act or exercise of the understanding, weighing the evidence submitted to it and drawing the legitimate or necessary conclusions." Now, instead of this, we should say that faith was the conclusion drawn or come to from acts or exercises of the understanding weighing evidence, or it may be the effect produced by evidence with little or no exercise of the understanding at all,—a more or less intelligent faith. He otherwise expresses it as "simply the state of the mind assenting to certain truths, on the testimony of Him who cannot lie," yet it is evident that he considers this assent as something in which the mental faculties are active, as he uniformly speaks of it as an act or exercise of the mind,—the act of believing,—the exercise of faith. He does not object to the view of faith he calls the intellectual view as itself wrong but considers it defective; it is truth but not all the truth. We maintain on the other hand that the mere effect of evidence on the mind, the production of a conviction of the truth of the matter evidenced, is belief or faith; a state in which the mind is entirely passive, however much activity may have been connected with the circumstances which have brought that evidence in contact with the mind. Dr. C. might as well talk of the acts of feeling or seeing: touching and looking are acts but feeling and seeing are not acts at all; a sentient being feels and sees alike whether he directs the organs of touch and vision to an object, or the object is brought by another into relation with these organs. So it is with faith or belief; it matters not whether the person is seeking truth or indifferent to

it; in whatever way the evidence is brought to bear upon him, if it produce its effect—conviction, the person believes,—cannot but believe. He is absolutely passive in the matter, and so far from the will having anything to do with it, if the evidence be overwhelming, he is under the necessity of yielding his assent, against every desire, wish, or will to think otherwise.

This is in direct opposition to the doctrine maintained by Dr. C. He says (p. 70), that this analytical view of faith "must be understood with an express or implied qualification, recognising the moral character and moral influence of faith,—its moral character as proceeding from a renewed will, and its moral influence as determining that renewed will to embrace Christ or God in Christ, as the chief good." This statement we must unhesitatingly deny; and maintain that instead of faith proceeding from a renewed will, the new will is the result of faith, or the belief of the testimony which reveals God's character. Dr. C. asserts that "all belief is voluntary, in so far as it depends on the fixing of the mind upon the substance of the truth to be believed, and the evidence or testimony on which belief is claimed." * * "On this ground, it may be consistently maintained, that the renewal of the will is an indispensable preliminary to the believing assent which the understanding has to give to the truth of God." Drag a man from a dungeon into the the blaze of a meridian sun and tell us whether his seeing will then be voluntary or not! Place him in the midst of a storm, where the lightning plays around, the thunder rolls above, and the rain pours down upon him, and tell us whether his seeing, hearing, and feeling will then be voluntary or not! The scriptures tell us that faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. As we do not hold that faith is communicated in any externally miraculous way, so we readily admit that those capable of faith must be capable of hearing and understanding the meaning of the words in which the truth is stated to them; so neither a deaf man, nor a person ignorant of the language, nor an idiot can be affected by the gospel declared to them, but beyond these we know of no conditions necessary. Dr. C. says with respect to a willing attention,—a faculty under the control of the will,—"Hence, any perverse bias of the will must affect the kind and degree of attention which is given, and consequently, also, the result attained." It does; and in the case under consideration, when the gospel is presented to man, the result is *always* unbelief or disbelief. All unbelief of the gospel is voluntary, for "this is the condemnation, that light hath come into the world, and men have loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil." But in direct opposition to Dr. C. we maintain that all belief of the gospel is involuntary, and that the new-creating of the will is the consequence and effect of principles imparted by the knowledge of God's character which is communicated through the word, when that word is believed.

Dr. Candlish says in regard to fallen man, that "he is prejudiced, blinded, darkened; and in order that the light may get into his understanding, and bring home to it a conviction of the reality of things divine, there must be a direct work of God in the soul, restoring to it the capacity of discerning and perceiving the truth which God has to reveal." Restoring the capacity! when had man any other capacity than he has now? Had Adam when he believed the word of the serpent in preference to that of his Creator? The question is not as to capacity at all; man has now the same capacity as he had then. The question is not as to will; his desire then was to trust in himself and so is his desire now. He did not believe God's testimony in the commandment then, and he does not believe it in the gospel now.

Dr. C. goes on to contend against the intellectual view of faith, that "there seem to be individuals not a few, whose understandings are well informed in the whole of the Christian doctrine, and convinced of the truth of every portion of it, who yet give too palpable evidence of their being still unrenewed." (p. 71.) We can readily admit that a person may understand the New Testament plan, may perceive to a great extent its suitability for man, may

be able to devise no better scheme, may be unable to shew any grounds for discrediting it as a matter of fact, may think it therefore very probably true, more probably than anything else he knows of, and yet not be positively convinced of its truth. Many such men might indeed assent to it or profess to believe it, but such we cannot admit to be really believers. The faith we contend for is not the absence of disbelief or even the absence of unbelief; it is positive belief; a conviction or satisfaction in the mind that the particular proposition is true. This is by no means in proportion to the understanding of the subject, to the ability to talk of it, or to the confidence of the profession of it, and therefore we can easily understand that there are many sources of uncertainty respecting the reality of a man's faith. When therefore we find "too palpable evidence" of such men being "still unrenewed" we must conclude that in all probability their belief is not truly indicated by their profession, or that there is some mistake or misapprehension in their views—in the meaning they attach to the expressions in which they communicate their belief, or some latent incredulity in regard to some points having an influence on their conduct.

These reasons however will not satisfy Dr. Candlish: he seems to think that there may be some who may have a perfect speculative or intellectual comprehension of, and be quite convinced of the truth of the gospel, who yet will not consent to be saved, who are too proud to accept of salvation as a gift. And hence, naturally, he strengthens himself in the opinion that there is something in the state of mind which we call faith which has its seat as much in the moral as in the intellectual part of our nature, and consists "in our embracing with a fiducial reliance or trust, Him whom God reveals, as the Lord our righteousness, and the Lord our strength." Now as we disavow entirely every idea of an offer as connected with the gospel, we cannot look upon the difficulty in the same way as Dr. C. We can easily understand that there may be and are many who do not care for the salvation proclaimed in the gospel; it does not save them from death in this world nor from anything else they care to be saved from. But we hold that the desire of happiness and aversion to misery are feelings essential to humanity, and that anything which promises the accession of happiness or deliverance from misery, if believed, is necessarily productive of feelings of pleasure. But just in proportion to the strength of the belief and the nature of the thing believed will be the effect produced; and in these we have to seek for the causes of the discrepancies between profession and practice,—in misapprehension of the nature of the gospel and uncertainty as to its truth.

For an illustration of a misapprehension of the nature of the gospel we need go no further than the pages under examination. It is quite evident that in Dr. C'.s opinion, the bare statement that Christ died for sinners is of no value whatever; his gospel is that by his death Christ obtained some good thing much to be desired by men which he now offers them; and of course the great point is for men to accept of this offer. No wonder then that he considers the bare belief of the testimony respecting the work of Jesus Christ of little value, or at least quite insufficient; on this view it can only be a preliminary to the appropriation or acceptance of this offer. His view is this; salvation through Christ is an offered mercy; men must somehow or other be made willing or desirous to get this salvation, then they are in a fit state for believing the testimony that tells them how it can be got, and then it requires only a little more stimulus and ardour to induce them to seize upon it and make it their own.

These views are in fact at the bottom of the popular evangelical system. Its teachers endeavour to arouse the consciences of their hearers by the terrors of the law, the apprehension of the eternal misery of which they are in peril; or they try to stir up and excite their feelings by representations of the beauty of holiness, the blessedness of the heavenly state, and the loving kindness of God, so as to inspire them with lively fear on the one hand of something to be saved from, or of ardent desire on the other of some happy state to be attained, and

so induce them, to use Dr. Candlish's own words, "to cast themselves upon Christ." Indeed Dr. C. distinctly shews that the "mere assent or credit given to the testimony of God" is in his opinion a subsidiary thing, designed to effect a certain purpose. Thus (p. 74, 75) he speaks of "what there is in it (faith) that adapts it for the appropriation of the salvation presented to its acceptance in the gospel;"—again, "it seems difficult to explain how a sinner can get at the direct act of APPROPRIATION, which it is the very office and function of faith to secure." He states that there is no revelation or testimony of God concerning salvation "beyond the general declaration of his being able and willing to save all and any sinners who will believe," and of course, as it is only an offer it is of no use to any one till he believes that it is an offer to save him in particular, or in other words till he *appropriates* the offer. Accordingly (p. 161) he says, "For after all, the belief of a statement which is abstractly or independently true, whether I believe it or not, is a different thing from the belief of a statement which becomes true through some process of conviction or concurrence, or consent on my part." How, we would ask Dr. Candlish, can the statement of any fact be affected as to its truth by the belief or unbelief of the person to whom it is made? If it be a faet, it must be true alike whether the person to whom it is addressed believes it or not. If God be able and willing to save me, will my disbelief of the testimony render that statement untrue? Or, if the statement be that God is able and willing to save me if I believe that statement, supposing I should discredit such a testimony, will it not remain as true as ever that he is able and willing to save me if I believe that such is the case? If my salvation depend upon my consent to be saved, it is true that the carrying out of God's purpose will depend on my consent to be saved, but the truth of his ability and willingness is a thing irrespective of my consent altogether. Take the case of a man, supposed by Dr. C., too proud to accept of salvation as God's gift, that individual may still believe that God is able and willing to save him if he will consent to be so saved; the very fact of his refusing his consent implies such belief, yet here we have the case of a man believing the gospel who yet will not be saved because he will not—believe! nay, but because he will not consent to be saved;—a recusant believer.

Such is a specimen of the juggling of this so-called evangelical doctrine. It is neither more nor less than a playing upon words, a slippery use of terms at one time signifying one thing, at another time another. Why do not Dr. Candlish and his friends say plainly that the gospel is, that God is willing to save such sinners as will consent to be saved? This is *their* gospel, and why should they not express themselves so? It certainly is not the apostolic gospel. But these men have two gospels—a general and a particular, a little and a great one. The general gospel is, that God is able and willing to save all or any sinners who will believe (that such is the case, we presume), and those who believe or credit this are on the way to the particular one, namely, that he is *their* Saviour, which, as it is not testified in Scripture, they discover through finding or persuading themselves that they *believe*, that is, consent that it shall be so. And so while the one gospel is true of itself, the other they *make* true; and the latter only is of any real value or importance.

From the midst of all this confusion and mystification let us point out the simple truth, the glorious gospel of the blessed God, that God sent His Son into the world to save sinners;—not to offer them mercy, to give them an opportunity of saving themselves, or to ask them if they will consent to be saved,—but to save them to the uttermost. It is addressed to guilty men and proclaims to them the forgiveness of sins through Jesus Christ. This is a simple declaration of fact, the truth of which is entirely irrespective of the credence men give to it. But it is clear that those who do not believe it can see nothing joyful in it; those, on the other hand, who see God thus revealed, not as the righteous judge only but as the gratuitous dispenser of mercy,—rejoice in the light which the belief of this testimony imparts. They require nothing more: they find themselves sinners saved by grace,—guilty beings at peace

with God. The work of salvation is accomplished; it is God's and God's alone. If any one enquire whether it may not be that God saves only *some* sinners, whether Christ has made peace only for *some* of the guilty, we appeal to the broad statement of the gospel which warrants no such limitations; it is a declaration of God's purpose to save *sinners*, a testimony that he is at once just and the justifier of *the ungodly;* or if they point out to the occasional accompaniments of the apostolic preaching, the promise of salvation only to believers, the warning of condemnation to unbelievers, we have no hesitation in accepting the statements. He that believeth *shall* be saved was their declaration; and believing their testimony, and conscious at the same time of that belief, we rejoice in the certain salvation which that declaration announces. He that believeth not shall be condemned was their testimony, and such is the case; they that believe not remain under the condemnation in which, as descendants of Adam, they came into the world, unenlightened by the knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

We have no need to write books to explain what saving faith is, or to reconcile a universal offer of mercy and a universal obligation to believe in it, with a natural inability to receive and special grace necessary to accept of it. Saving faith is simply the belief of the testimony which tells us of the work that saves, a testimony addressed to all to whom in the course of God's providence it comes, and believed by those whom God is pleased to enlighten to discern its truth. There is no mystery, no difficulty in this doctrine; in the other, inconsistency meets us at every step. Dr. Candlish says, "the truth is, we attempt what is presumptuous and vain, when we seek to vindicate the consistency and sincerity of God in the gospel-call, by going beyond the assurance that whosever will put him to the test will find him faithful." With our views we have no consistency and sincerity to vindicate, for we do not add "a call" to the good spel or joyful testimony. The addition of the word "call" is an incongruity—the good news call! Does the joyfulness of the testimony consist in the fact that an offer of salvation is made to men? then it can be good news to none but those who recognise the value of that salvation and accept of the offer; to all others it is an idle tale: and if it be as Dr. C. and the evangelical body hold, that this salvation is intended only for those who accept of the offer, and that no others can possibly share it, then is the testimony itself not good news; it is simply an offer which is a good one to those who accept of it, but which is of no value to those who reject it, or rather which is worse than valueless, because it gives occasion to them to aggravate their condemnation. But it is not so with the simple testimony that God sent His Son into the world to save sinners; this it is true is recognized as good news only by those who credit the declaration, but in its own nature it is glad tidings entirely irrespective of its reception by men; though it be discredited, rejected, perverted, and corrupted by all but a chosen few, still the testimony as to the matter-of-fact remains unaltered—still it is itself "good news."

Dr. C. in speaking of the office or function of faith, (page 61), says, that in determining this "much will depend on what it is that God is doing in saving sinners, especially in the extent to which, and the manner in which, he makes use of the sinner's own co-operation or instrumentality in saving him." This he illustrates by the case of Noah, the office or function of his faith being to set him to prepare the ark. We should say that it was the express command of God which set him to prepare the ark, and that faith was the principle which led him to yield obedience to that command. Had the Almighty simply declared his purpose to Noah to destroy the world and save him and his family, Noah's faith would have led him to rest in peace, in the full assurance that God would keep his promise, though in what manner he knew not. In such a case the building of an ark would only have indicated a doubtfulness on the part of Noah respecting one part of God's promise. But according to Dr. Candlish, it is somewhat different with the subject under consideration; for, as according to his statement the work of God is complete, the office of faith is

simply to insure acquiescence or appropriation, there being the same necessity for appropriation here, as in Noah's case, for performance—that the saving work of God may be effectual. He tries to persuade the reader that this is *no work* to be done by man, but his own illustration manifests his inconsistency; he says "it is like the closing of the hand upon that which is brought into contact with it." Is it so? then this closing of the hand is as much a work or act done by man in order to complete the work of salvation as was the building of the ark by Noah; it is only a smaller work occupying a much shorter time.

Dr. C. says, that in such cases as Noah's, "the office or function of faith, is properly that of a motive prompting to action; but when, on the other hand, as in the justifying of the ungodly, all is done by God, and the act of justification proceeds upon no work of man, but on the finished and perfect righteousness of Christ, instead of a motive to any act, faith rather takes the character of an act in itself final," and hence he concludes "we cannot fail to perceive the fitness of such expressions as—receiving, embracing, closing with Christ, all describing the office or function which belongs to faith as that which carries and makes sure the sinner's consent to be saved freely by grace, through the redemption that is in Christ." So according to this the finished work of Christ is all of no avail, unless the sinner's consent to take the benefit of it be obtained: in fact, the work of Christ is incomplete for its purpose until the sinner complete it, and the gospel is that God sent His Son into the world to give sinners an opportunity of being saved if they choose.

We recognize no such distinction as Dr. C. makes between the faith of Noah and that of the Christian now. In both cases faith operates in the same way; it imparts peace to the mind in which it dwells and inspires it with principles of action; in both alike it robs death of its sting, destruction of its terrors; to both alike it imparts principles on which to act, whether they be commanded to build an ark, or called upon to attend to the precepts given them for their guidance, and by walking worthy of the calling whereby they are called, glorify Him who hath bought them with a price. And if Dr. C. or others urge that there seem to be many "whose understandings are well informed in the whole of the Christian doctrine, and convinced of the truth of every portion of it, who yet give too palpable evidence of their being still unrenewed," we have only to say such *seems* to be the state of their minds; and though probably we should not look exactly for the same kind of evidence of the new mind as Dr. C. does, yet in proportion to the inconsistency between their principles and practice, should we doubt the sincerity of their profession, or deplore the ignorance and error displayed in the misapplication of their principles. When principles are only propounded through doctrinal statements, there will ever be a risk of producing a merely speculative profession, an ability to talk about a system; and it is only when principles and precepts are taught concurrently,—principles elucidated as the means of regulating practice, and precepts enforced as calculated to suggest and strengthen principles, that there can be any true teaching at all. This is the scriptural method of teaching; anything else is merely talking about a system and leads only to a barren profession. This is the only way in which truth can be taught by human agency, so far as it can be so taught; and any attempt to improve or supplement it by proclaiming faith as an act of the mind, making offers of mercy, urging gospel calls, or thundering warnings of condemnation, only manifests dissatisfaction with the way in which God reveals his character, and exhibits men as attempting to improve upon this by perverting his testimony, substituting appeals to the hopes and fears, desires and dispositions of men, instead of trusting to the power of God, whose word, notwithstanding all that men may do against it, or falsely for it, will not return unto him void, but shall accomplish that which he pleases, and prosper in the thing whereto he hath sent it.

EKDIKALETHES.

Maranatha. In connexion with the Future History of the Jewish Nation. Inscribed with much affection and respect to the Writers on Prophecy of the present day. By JANE USSHER HOBBS. Dublin: John Robertson, 3, Grafton Street. Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. London. 1839.

The True Church: shewing what is the True Church; the Ingathering of the Jews to the Church; in what manner and when; the course of the Church; the past, the present, and the future. By JAMES BIDEN. London: Arthur Hall, Virtue and Co. 25, Paternoster Row. 1851.

"AGAIN—again—again," is a line which, strong in its very repetition, occurs in that noble and spirit-stirring ode of Thomas Campbell, "The Battle of the Baltic." Prodigiously simple the words are; and on that very account prodigiously wide is the range of their application.

To the never-ceasing multiplication of books, they apply with painful exactness. Day not more certainly succeeds day, wave not more certainly succeeds wave, than do the productions of the teeming brain of man constantly and regularly succeed one another—the one which now makes its appearance being almost instantly swept aside by the next, which again in its turn as speedily gives place to its successor. Truly says Solomon, *of the making of books there is no end.*

Surging up incessantly from that *troubled sea** the human mind, and thrown like so many *waifs* on the shore of literature, are treatises on the subject of prophecy. So numerous for the last fifty years have they been, that *legion* is their only appropriate name. Nor at the present moment is there the slightest prospect of the stream of writings on this subject ceasing to flow. *Labitur et labetur.* English gold is ready to purchase; and where there is the demand, there will of course be the supply.

Perfectly marvellous, and even amusing were not the subject too serious for ridicule, is the enthusiasm of writers on the subject of prophecy—is the earnestness with which they bespeak attention—and is the confidence evidently cherished by them, that the theory which each one of them has to propound will ere long become the acknowledged creed of all. To say that such persons are content to act as the interpreters of prophecy—great as is the presumption implied in a pretence even to this—would be to pay a higher compliment to their humility than they deserve. They actually in almost every case speak as if *the mantle of Elijah* had descended on their own shoulders. Disclaim this in words, perhaps, they may. But that the *furor Delphicus*—the insane feeling of a capacity to unrol the records and unveil the face of futurity,—has seized on them, every page, every line nearly, of their absurd, self-contradictory, and but too often blasphemous productions, bears testimony.

All this, melancholy as it is, looked at merely in a literary point of view might be tolerated, were any thing like genius, or even variety, apparent in such compositions. To every fault, in the Republic of Letters, pardon may be conceded, except to sheer dulness and stupidity. We could bear with Elliott's learned laboriousness and industry, and Cumming's eloquent and solemn quackery, if they would only set before us something novel—some new, even if it should not be a scriptural principle of interpretation, or some combination on a large and comprehensive scale of alleged historical facts, which had escaped the notice, or had surpassed the ingenuity of their predecessors. They might have tried at least to tickle our intellectual palates with some splendid exercise of the inventive faculty. But it is rather too bad to have "changes" on "the bells" of effete systems perpetually "rung," and dinning our ears, to the annoyance, if not even damage of our sense of hearing. To have nothing but our old acquaintances the Romans, pagan and papal—the forms of Roman government by kings, consuls, dictators, decemvirs, tribunes of the people, and emperors—Huns, Alans, Goths, and Vandals—Alarics,

* Isaiah lvii. 20.

Theodosius', and Theodorics—usurping Phocas', intriguing Stephens, and domineering Hildebrands—reformation thunders and revolutionary earthquakes—together with all the rest of the hacknied prophetical *materiel*, constantly reproduced on the stage, made to pass before us for the hundredth time in "most admired confusion," or at the utmost only slightly altering their places like queens, rooks, bishops, knights, and pawns, on a chess-board. Is there no one capable of striking out a really new path amid the tangled forest of prophetical enquiry? Mere human novelty we are well aware, does not of itself constitute truth, any more than the want of it necessarily indicates falsehood. But it is not with truth that we have now to do. It is with human compositions, fundamentally erroneous both in principle and detail—human compositions dealing in the romance of religion. Such, we contend, are generally as dull as they are false; and to them novelty is essential, as their sole redeeming quality. Where, however, in works on the subject of prophecy do we find it? Mede we know. Sir Isaac Newton we know. Fleming and Faber we have studied. With Durham we are not unacquainted. Elhanan Winchester and Pirie of Newburgh, we have made tt a point to master. Other eminent men in ancient and modern times, Roman Catholic and Protestant, Bishops Bossuet and Walmsley, (Pastorini), no less than Bishop Newton, men whose prophetical notions are supposed to carry weight, we have paid all due attention to. Even minor lights, such as Cooper, Bicheno, Keith, Cunningham, &c. &c. we have not altogether neglected. In all of these, with some variety certainly, we encounter systems essentially the same. As the result, we are sick of them. Nor have we found still more recent works calculated to remove the nausea. On the contrary, rather to increase it. The newest works merely repeat what has been said a thousand times already with but little variety of method and phraseology, and with still less of matter. We are getting now to homœopathic, or rather infinitesimal doses, on the subject of prophecy: almost the only variety on which we can now count, being the extremely diluted nature of the potions of error, that is, of the very substance of their works, which it is now the good pleasure of authors to mete out to us.

Absence of novely—want of variety, however, on the part of writers who treat of the subject of prophecy, although censurable at the bar of letters, is not the ground on which they are objected to by the scripturally taught Christian. Their principles, perhaps rather principle of interpretation is false, because antagonistic to that which God himself has revealed. They are trying to explain the divine by the human, instead of having the human explained to them by God himself, in the light of the divine. Setting out from such unsound premises, no wonder if they land themselves in unsound conclusions. On a foundation of sand, what stable superstructure can be built? From the charge of having adopted for their respective starting points, principles that are unsound, because unscriptural, sorry are we to say, that neither of the esteemed authors, whose works now claim our critical notice, great as is the ability which they both display, is exempt. Hence the necessity under which we feel ourselves most reluctantly to utter, in regard to both, the language of condemnation.

Twice have we carefully perused Miss Hobbs' book. On both occasions with feelings of the greatest kindness to herself personally, and the first time strongly prepossessed in her favour. Her open and honest avowal of Universalism had excited towards her our warmest and liveliest sympathies. Her strength of mind—her earnestness of purpose—her power of encountering and mastering difficulties—her condensed and masculine style of expression—her genius even, were too manifest to be overlooked. But what of all this? She has in her work proceeded on false principles, and the result of necessity has been a failure.

Miss Hobbs, it may be mentioned *en passant*, is, through her maternal grandmother, whose maiden name was Ussher, a lineal descendant of that great statesman and divine, as well as man of letters, Primate James Ussher,

("Usserius noster," as he is proudly and fondly spoken of by his British and Irish contemporaries), Archbishop of Armagh, in the days of Charles I. Like many others, she is a living proof that the axiom as to the talents not being hereditary, is one that requires to be received with caution, and many qualifications. In her case it is clear, that "the remainder of the patent" of nature's "nobility" has not yet been "exhausted." But at the same time, in her work abundant evidence is afforded that no descent however honourable, and no abilities however great, can by any possibility convert the essentially false into the true.

Her grand principle that scripture is its own interpreter, scripturally understood, is a glorious and fundamental truth. Understood however, as she understands it, it is erroneous, and the fruitful parent of errors innumerable.

Several writers, such as "Ben-Ezra, Bickersteth, Begg, Burgh, and though last, not least, McNeile," (!) to all of whom the fair authoress pays the somewhat ambiguous compliment of being "wise scribes who are not far from the kingdom of God," p. 7, and none of whom, except perhaps on the score of character, will be known fifty years hence,* have it seems, adopted and proceeded on her principles. No matter. The fact of men of far greater abilities and of far superior theological standing—nay, on the supposition of all the men of genius in the land—having lent their sanction to such a system, would not contribute the weight of a feather towards the establishment of its validity. The system and the principles on which it rests, being unsound, what is the worth of names, authorities, character, and so on? Why, obviously,—

Nought but leather and prunello.

Our friend's principle as expressed by herself is, that "prophecy must of necessity be understood by us in its plain and literal sense." p. 13. As to her meaning in these words, she has left us in no doubt, for she had said previously "That Zion and Jerusalem mean these *places*, and not the church; that Babylon means Babylon, and neither Rome nor Popery; that Edom means Edom, and not the enemies of the Church; that earth means earth, and heaven means heaven." p. 11. Figurative meaning she thus expressly and of set purpose, (with certain exceptions, for which see her work), completely excludes.

According to the above principle, the Old Testament scriptures both can and do explain themselves, their language being always understood literally, except in the few cases where the context furnishes either a key or an explanation, or where we are plainly told in the New Testament, what was intended under the figures of the Old. p. 12.

Now, so far from the principle being true, *the very opposite of it is the fact.* No PROPHECY *of the scripture*, that is, of the Old Testament scriptures, *is of any private*, that is *of self* (ἰδίας) *interpretation.* 2 Peter i. 20. One portion of the Old Testament scriptures may, and frequently does explain another, as regards temporal things, and the inferior and secular meaning of types and figurative language. But *no portion of the Old Testament scriptures is capable of explaining itself spiritually.* Over the face of Moses a veil was thrown. Exod. xxxiv. 33—35. So likewise was the dispensation of Moses a veiled dispensation. 2 Cor. iii. 13—15. Accordingly every fact and circumstance recorded in the Old Testament scriptures, besides its literal signification, involves also a mystery, that is, a secret or spiritual sense; see Rom. v. 14, 2 Cor. iv. 6, Gal. iv. 22—31, Eph. v. 32; and thus the topics treated of in them constituted, as a whole, *a mystery hid from ages and from generations.* Eph. iii. 1—11. The prophets, and holy men of God who composed these writings, so far from having been actuated by their own will, or enlightened by their own sagacity, were impelled to their pious task by the direct *stimulus* and *afflatus*

* The Rev. William Burgh, *may be* excepted. How painful his eccentric and inexplicable career! Perhaps Ben-Ezra may be remembered in connexion with Edward Irving.

of the Holy Ghost; 2 Peter i. 21; also Psalm xlv. 1;* and so far, after having completed their work, were they from understanding the true and spiritual import of what they had written, that they were exactly upon the same footing as those into whose hands their inspired compositions came, compelled to *search what, and what manner of time, the spirit of Christ that was in them did signify.* 1 Pet. i. 10, 11. And this, with the express additional revelation, that until Christ himself came, their researches were destined to be baffled. They wrote for the instruction of a future age, not of their own. Ibid. 12. Now could this have happened, had they possessed that power of explaining themselves, which Miss Hobbs and her friends are pleased to abscribe to them? Undoubtedly, the Old Testament scriptures are divinely inspired;† but they have no power of self-illustration or explanation, spiritually considered. This power, God saw meet for ages to reserve in his own hand. At last he exercised it, first, in the person, character, and work of his own Son, and in the preaching of the gospel by the Apostles; and then in his inspiring persons to commit to writing the Gospels, Epistles, and other portions of the New Testament. Thus *was the veil done away in Christ.* 2 Cor. iii. 14, 16, 17. Thus by the facts revealed concerning Christ, *had life and incorruption light thrown on them*; 2 Tim. i. 10;‡ and were the previously dark sayings of Moses and the prophets, shewn to have been in exact accordance with actual occurrences. Luke xxiv. 25—27, 44—46. The Old Testament scriptures, heretofore a series of enigmas, now began to be made plain; (Eph. ii. 13—22); and facts to which merely a literal import had been attached, now began to assume the spiritual aspect of metaphors and allegories. 2 Cor. iv. 6, Acts x. 9—16, Gal. iv. 22, &c. A sealed book throughout, the Old Testament was now shewn to have been; although in the light of the writings of Evangelists and Apostles, a sealed book no longer. Incapable it was, in any respect, of interpreting itself spiritually; (Matt. xvi. 21, 22, John xx. 9); but capable it was of being so interpreted, by the appearance, history, death, resurrection, and ascension to glory, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by means of the teaching of that spirit which, as glorified§, he was pleased to shed forth on his Apostles and Disciples. What, under such circumstances, becomes of the plain literal sense of the Old Testament scriptures, as the true means of spiritual interpretation?

Miss Hobbs' false principle then is, that all the language of the Old Testament is to be taken literally, except in cases where the New Testament gives an explanation inconsistent with the literal sense;‖ the true principle is, that in no case whatever has the language of the Old Testament, spiritually considered, a power of self-interpretation—that in every case it is governed by the language and discoveries of the New, however incompetent we may be in our present state of spiritual advancement, to apply these—and that even in some cases, such as the future belief in Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah by the Jews as a nation, and the destruction of this present world, where the *spiritual* is under certain aspects involved in and connected with the *literal*, our authority for thus interpreting, is not the language of the Old, but solely the language of the New Testament. Rom. xi. 11—26, Hebrews i. 10—12, 2 Peter iii. 10—13. The *literal* sense of the Old Testament, Miss Hobbs would erroneously, with certain exceptions, elevate to the level of the *spiritual*, or divinely explanatory sense of the New; whereas the New asserts to itself, as opened up to the conscience by the Holy Spirit, the exclusive power of explaining the Old—thereby reversing Miss Hobbs' favorite axiom; and shewing

* "And what marvel? The original thereof being from heaven, not from earth; the author being God, not man; the inditer the Holy Spirit, not the wit of the Apostles or Prophets;" &c. "The Translators" (of King James' version) "to the reader." 1611.

† Πᾶσα γραφὴ Θεόπνευστος. 2 Tim. iii. 16.

‡ Φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν

§ John vii. 39, with Acts ii *throughout.*

‖ "Except, therefore, where it would exhibit a manifest absurdity, as that all the trees of the field should *clap* their *hands*, and the mountains *leap* for *joy*,—or where, as St. Augustine expresses it, the passage would seem to command a heinous wickedness." *Maranatha*, p. 13.

that to interpret the Old Testament *literally* is in every case, looking at its spiritual sense, to interpret it falsely.*

The Jews of our Lord's time acted upon the principle of interpreting the Old Testament scriptures literally; and, as the natural consequence, after frequently exposing themselves to the rebukes of him of whom these scriptures spoke, see particularly Matt. xx. and xxi., they rejected, condemned, and crucified him. Acts xiii. 27. Pursuing the same course, and guided by the same false spirit of interpretation, the Jews poured contempt on the preaching of the Apostles, put some of their number to death, stirred up against them the fury of the Gentile populace, and at last drew down upon themselves to the uttermost the divine vengeance, manifested in the destruction of their city and temple, in the captivity and scattering of their people, and in the termination of their polity. And having acted for eighteen hundred years on the principle of preferring the *literal* sense of the Old Testament to the *spiritual* sense of the New, and, therefore, continuing to reject the claims of Jesus of Nazareth, it cannot but be to their own surprise, that they now find themselves aided and abetted by parties styling themselves Christians, in the maintainance of that grand principle upon which their own stubborn infidelity is founded.

The Apostles were not so fortunate as our friend Miss Hobbs has been, in finding the Old Testament scriptures to be plain and self-explanatory. Taking them in their literal sense, they were always blundering. Matt. xvi. 22, xx. 20—23, Luke ix. 51—56, Acts i. 6. Express instructions from our Lord were required to correct and remove the notions which a literal understanding of scripture had given rise to. John xvi. 12. *Indeed* John xvi. *throughout.* Agreeably to our Lord's promise, after his resurrection and ascension, special revelations were from time to time vouchsafed to the Apostles, as absolutely necessary to correct the mistakes into which a literal interpretation of the Old Testament scriptures was continually betraying them. x. 9—16, xv. 1—20. And only in proportion as in their minds, and in those of other converts, the *letter* was superseded by the *spirit*, did they advance, or were they capable of advancing in the genius and spirit of Christianity. See Gal. ii., indeed, *throughout.* 2 Cor. iii. 6. The poor Ethiopian Eunuch found the literal sense of Isaiah liii. so thoroughly incapable of self-interpretation and self-illustration, and thereby so puzzling and unsatisfactory, that right glad was he to avail himself of the offer of the spiritually, because New Testamently enlightened Philip, to afford him the true view of its meaning. Acts viii. 26—39. The fact is, attention to the literal sense of the Old Testament, has in every age since the introduction of the gospel, led professing Gentile believers no less than Jews astray. Its evils constitute the chief bane—lie at the very root—of what is falsely called Christianity. Only as the veil of Moses is done away, by the shining into our hearts of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ—only as letter is superseded by spirit,—have we a right and true understanding of the Old Testament scriptures.

Nearly connected with, indeed necessarily involved in the false principle upon which we have just been animadverting, is another which pervades Miss Hobbs' theory, and shines conspicuous in her publication. This new principle is, that Old Testament prophecy has principally a reference to, and is principally fulfilled in the external history, progress, and ultimate triumphs of Judaism, as well as of Gentile nations as subservient to those results in New Testament times; and that the blessings of Christ's heavenly and everlasting kingdom can only be reached, through the previous re-establishment of Jews and Judaism, in their own land and in the enjoyment of their ancient privileges. Literally, according to her, and in fulfilment of the literal sense of the prophets there is to be a restoration of Jews to Palestine, a re-building of the Temple, a resumption of their offices by the Aaronic priesthood, the performance again

* Any case *may be* excepted in which the *literal* sense receives the sanction of the New Testament. But, query, without the authority of the Holy Ghost in the New, could we be justified in resting on the literal sense of the Old Testament, *in any case*, as having a *spiritual* import?

of sacrifice and of other Old Testament rites and ceremonies, the revival o obsolete institutions, and the conferring upon Israel according to the flesh of the monarchy of the whole earth. Also Babylon, literally understood, is the subject matter of prophecy yet to be fulfilled, And Edom. In a word, prophecy, whether in the Old or New Testament scriptures, except where we have a special assurance otherwise, respects the present punishment and future triumphs of the fleshly Israel, and the subjugation under her feet externally of all her enemies.

Building upon this principle, events as related in profane history, are looked at and classified, and scripture prophecy is interpreted by means of them; and by means of external events which shall emerge at future periods of the world, is it anticipated that all that is now dark and mysterious in prophetical phraseology shall finally be understood.

Painful and heart-sickening, as manifestative of a spirit the very opposite of that of the Holy Scriptures, is all this.

It is admitted, that in Old Testament times, external events, in certain respects, and especially under the teaching of God himself, interpreted prophecy. And it is admitted further, that as respects the appearance of our Lord in flesh, his death and resurrection, and the state of things which for forty years succeeded his ascension to glory, we have external events brought under our notice by the Holy Ghost, in which a great deal of ancient prophecy, indeed, some of its most important predictions, were accomplished.

Here let the hint just thrown out be borne in mind, that for the external fulfilment of these prophecies, no less than for the previous utterance and recording of them, we have not been left to human observation and inference, but have the express authority of the Holy Ghost himself, speaking in the Scriptures.

Not so circumstanced, however, are the facts, or supposed facts, observed and reasoned from, since the completion of the volume of inspiration, and the ending of the Jewish system and polity.

At or about the period of the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 69, all miracles ended. 1 Cor. xiii. 8—10. Likewise all prophecy then ended. Rev. xxii. 18, 19. And, as necessarily involved in these two facts, all miraculous, inspired, or divinely infallible interpretation of prophecy then ended.*

As the result, to no external historical events, since Jerusalem's destruction, can men now point, and say certainly and authoritatively to others, in these have ancient prophecies been fulfilled. For we can never be thoroughly satisfied as to the truth and accuracy, as well as comprehensiveness and applicability of the human and humanly observed facts which are alleged; and no power have men to satisfy us, by the working of miracles, that their interpretation is divine. Short, however, of such miraculous proof on the part of expounders of prophecy, what is the worth of their expositions?

Besides, how curious the procedure of almost all writers on the subject of the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, in New Testament times. The facts adduced are human—the beings by whom they have been observed or collected are human—and the conclusions drawn from them are human. Now can any thing *human* constitute a fit basis on which, for mere man, to rear a superstructure of the *divine*? John v. 34, Matt. vii, 26, 27, Acts ii. 22, 23, xiii. 27, 1 Cor. ii. 7, 8. The New Testament Dispensation is, as distinguished from the Old, essentially spiritual and divine in its *form*, while agreeing with the Old in being spiritual and divine in its *origin* and *matter*. It is distin-

* To this fact, our dear friend Miss Hobbs seems not only to give her assent, but upon it to found one of her principles of the interpretation of Scripture.—"Prophecy must of necessity be understood by us in its plain and literal sense, as we have no pretensions to any thing more than a reasonable judgment and a sound mind, comparing scripture with scripture" Marantha, p. 13. Setting aside, for the present, other objections which we have to our friend's statement, may we be permitted respectfully to enquire, if the more fallible guesses of the human mind, such as she contends for, can ever for one moment be put upon a level with inspired prophecy, divinely revealed to the mind, through the word, by the Spirit?

guished from the Old, as being *antitypical* and *substantial*, while the Old was merely *typical* and shadowy. Col. ii. 16. &c. Heb. viii, ix, x, &c. If so, then under the New Testament Dispensation, the *shadowy* must be explained by the *substantial*, not the *substantial* by the *shadowy*, The Old consists of dead forms; the New, of living realities. John vi. 63. Gal. iv. 9, 10, indeed, *throughout*. Col. ii. 8, 20. Why, under such circumstances, waste our time, and lose our labour, in seeking the *living* among the *dead?* Luke xxiv. 5. Who would listen for one moment to the human interpretations of the dead forms of the Old Testament, when the Spirit of God, speaking in the New, hath been pleased to breathe into these forms, and by the facts concerning Jesus and the resurrection which he hath seen meet to reveal and record, hath imparted to them a true and spiritual vitality? See Ezek. xxxvii. 1—11, Heb. i, 1, 2, indeed *throughout*.

And yet, alas! by Miss Hobbs, and her party, this wondrous perversion of the import and use of the Old Testament prophecies is exhibited.

She conceives that the plain and literal sense of the Old Testament is the true one, and that human and humanly observed facts explain its meaning: in this, led astray by her ignorance of the revealed principle, that under the reign, and during the dispensation of the Messiah, that is, in New Testament times, the spiritual or the divine, made known through the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, is the sole cause and medium of all true understanding of the Old Testament Scriptures; John vi. 63; Acts xxviii. 23—28; and that so far from human principles and human events throwing light on God's word, it is only in the light of spiritual illumination through that word —the new portion of it explaining the old—that human principles and human events can be at all rightly conceived of and understood—that their operations can be detected, that they can be classified, that their tendencies can be apprehended, and that their grand workings and final issues can be seen to have been anticipated in ancient prophecy. It is not human facts that explain or can explain divine prophecies;* it is only the mind spiritually enlightened by God's word, and in proportion to the degree in which it is so enlightened, that, in the light of the divine, is enabled to see the fulfilment of God's purposes in the human.

Hence, clever as Miss Hobbs' book confessedly is—indeed, perfectly masculine in its ideas and structure—it is, spiritually considered, crotchetty and worthless. It exhibits a human mind, setting out from certain false premises—and, under the guidance of these, stumbling at the very threshold, on the prophecies of Daniel, dreaming of the restoration of the Jews to the earthly land of their fathers, floundering in the quagmire of Satan's biography, indulging fancy as to the signs of our Lord's coming, unsealing the contents of that sealed book after a human fashion, which God himself alone to the consciences of his people unseals after a divine one, and bringing us at last to an antiquated and abolished† system of things restored on earth, in direct opposition to that New Creation state of things, through the death and resurrection of Christ, to the earnest of which by faith God himself is introducing us on earth, and to the fulness of which he is bringing us in heaven. The whole is a fearful specimen of the nature and results of false Theology, even when treated of by a person of no ordinary abilities and attainments.

Thus, the one false principle necessarily leads to and lands in the other. "The plain and literal sense of the Old Testament Scriptures, is their true sense." Ergo: "in the return of the fleshly Jews to their own land, in the restoration of their temple, service and priesthood, and in their future ascendency over Gentiles upon earth, we witness the fulfilment of those scriptures." The two principles certainly agree. "The cover," as Luther says, "is worthy of the dish."

Our friend, in spite of her determination to make every thing bend to the literal sense of the Old Testament, finds herself constrained, whilst prosecu-

* Unless God himself be the interpreter.

† Hebrews viii. 13.

ting her work, in five or six instances to admit the necessity of a totally different mode of interpretation. This, for her own sake, is distressing. A true principle of any kind, will admit of no exceptions, (except such as are apparent merely), and much less a principle that is *divine*. We wonder that her own experience and acknowledged difficulties—that the stubborn resistance made to her by several scripture facts—did not tend to shake her confidence in her assumed theory.

Not that she stands alone in her blundering. The highest names in theology (!)—names far higher than those she has quoted, not excepting "the great McNeile" himself—are ranged on her side. The Potters, the Medes, the Sir Isaac Newtons of a former, and the Bishop Newtons, the Fabers, and the Elliotts of a more recent period, all proceed on certain fundamental principles common to her with themselves. To external events they both agree in looking, as at once the fulfilment and the interpretation of prophecy. Human facts, either of a past or of the present age, are by them observed and classified; and so appropriate are they—so exactly do they, as Miss Hobbs and her predecessors fancy, coincide with the language of Daniel and John—that to them these sacred writers *must have referred*. Or, apart from the facts, human principles are laid down, and human theories, are concocted (as "that the Old Testament *must be* understood in its plain and literal sense," that "Jerusalem *must signify* Jerusalem; Babylon, Babylon," &c. and that "the Jews and Jewish institutions *must be* externally restored," &c.) and by these, scripture language *must be* explained. At all such things—all such vain attempts to bind down his meaning—the God of Heaven laughs. The Babel-builders left to themselves begin to speak with diverse tongues. System conflicts with system. Confusion is the result. Until at last all attempts of men to explain divine prophecy incur not only the suspicion of the church, but the contempt and ridicule of the world. Thorough quacks are they in process of time seen to be. Mere experimenters on divine subjects. And however loud the trump which they blow, and the success with which they contrive for a while to vend their nostrums, the fate of all empirics is ultimately their own.

"Divine inversion," a New Testament doctrine, (Matt. xx. 16, xxii. 41—45, &c.); also, although veiled, an Old Testament one, (Gen. lv. 1, 2, Hebrews xi. 4, Gen. xxv. 24—26, Malachi i. 2, 3, Rom. ix. 10—13, &c), and one of the two grand principles on which divine revelation rests, alone explains the opposition between the use of the Old Testament before Christ came, and its use since. External things and events, at the utmost presignifying and foreshadowing internal principles, constitute the substance of the Old Testament record, and were God's method, for the time being, of teaching his character and purposes; now, however, in the light of the New Testament alone, revealing internal principles as embodied in certain leading facts, is God's character and are his purposes to man directly taught and revealed, and in the light of those principles and facts alone, are the Old Testament Scriptures capable of being apprehended. Understanding to a certain degree the New, we are astonished and delighted to find the light which is thereby thrown back on the Old. That is, it is from the inverting of the mode of divine teaching, in New Testament times, that all our spiritual light proceeds. And not to the Old Testament merely is this New Testament light confined. It sheds a bright and glorious lustre on human society and human events. It illuminates them, not they it. We obtain from time to time, through the medium of its spiritual statements understood, more than glimpses of the progress of events, and of the tendencies to results, which have by the Holy Ghost been foretold in ancient prophecy. This, human events do not qualify us to comprehend; but divine principles, realized in the conscience by faith, when brought to bear upon such events, contribute to do so. We begin to comprehend the human, in the light of the divine; not the divine, in the light of the human. We say, begin to comprehend. For slender, indeed, is the advance which up to the present moment, those taught of God have been enabled to make in that

divine science, the interpretation of prophecy. Enough, however, has been made known to us, to indicate what is the true path. And while conscious, that in the present state of our spiritual attainments, our views of the fulfilment of prophecy are extremely shallow and meagre, and that the spiritual and divine advancement of a future stage of the church shall alone qualify its members thoroughly and satisfactorily to comprehend the whole scheme, we have seen enough of the truth and value of New Testament and *divine* principles, to justify us in setting aside and dispensing with mere *human* ones, even although they may plead in their behalf the plain and literal phraseology of the Old Testament Scriptures.

"Please you, my Lord will you read a pasquil," is said to have been the contemptuous language, with which Mary of Guise, Regent of Scotland, drew the attention of the then Archbishop of St. Andrew's, to a remonstrance which had been presented to her by Knox and the other Scottish Reformers. Now, although Miss Hobbs' religious views, as developed in her "Maranatha," appear to us to do more, spiritually considered, than merely to *border on* the romantic, yet there are no contemptuous feelings in our mind, regarding either her or them. We have no wish to hold them up to ridicule. The reverse. We are writing in sober earnest. Her treatise is a clear, terse, powerful, masterly piece of composition. Truly almost may we apply to her advocacy of the cause which she has undertaken to defend, *mutatis mutandis*, the hacknied quotation, *Si Troja hac dextra defendi &c.* Still, however, her work, like the vastly more learned and elaborate one of Mede, is, divinely considered, baseless. It is an attempt to establish the false. It is a mere tissue of mistakes, (with certain exceptions immaterial to our present purpose,) from first to last. Beginning with erroneous premises, it goes on o'er hill and dale, through swamps, and quagmires, and quicksands, to erroneous conclusions. The restoration of the earthly Israel, to a high earthly state of prosperity, in the earthly Canaan, is her dream. The elevation of the earthly Israel, to be members of the spiritual Israel—their introduction thereby into the spiritual Canaan upon a footing of equality with Gentile believers—and the great *spiritual,* not *earthly* prosperity of the church, with which this new and enlarged state of things is to be accompanied, constitute leading topics of God's word. See Romans xi. especially. Notwithstanding this decided discrepancy between her views, and those of the New Testament explaining the Old, our female friend is not without her consolation. With her, as with other parties proceeding on the same principle of explaining the divine by the human, are probably 999 out of every 1000 nominal professors of Christianity. As for us, finding that God hath spoken after a certain fashion, and hath in New Testament times established spiritual, not literal principles of Old Testament interpretation, when God is contradicted, and principles of exposition opposed to his are set up and contended for, we are, like Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, *not careful to answer in this matter.* Dan. iii. 16. Our opponents we leave to the word of God, and their own consciences.

The work of Mr. Biden, to which we would, in as few words as possible, invite attention, along with some points of agreement with that of Miss Hobbs, presents features, in some important respects, totally at variance with hers.

Mr. Biden's professed subject is "The True Church," or that assemblage of individuals whom, according to His eternal purpose in Christ Jesus, God is in every age separating from the world, through faith in His revealed heavenly testimony, and thereby introducing into His kingdom and glory. Particularly, by the true Church, in New Testament times, Mr. Biden understands the whole body of believers in Jesus of Nazareth as the long promised Messiah, whether previously Jews or Gentiles.

Concerning this Church, and the blessings destined for it in virtue of its connexion with its divine and glorified head, he understands the Old Testament scriptures to be speaking continually. In the teeth of views entertained by

Miss Hobbs, and the parties with whom she is associated, he considers the prophecies of the Old Testament which foretold Jerusalem and Judea's flourishing condition in the age of the Messiah, to have received, or to be receiving their accomplishment, not in the earthly prosperity of the typical, but in the spiritual blessedness of the antitypical church. Notions of an opposite kind he decidedly, and on many occasions, most ably repudiates. Admirably, indeed, has he in the earlier portion of his work by a *comparison of spiritual things with spiritual*, shewn the true import and bearing of several precious Old Testament passages,—passages sometimes fearfully mangled because misunderstood, by the parties to whom Miss Hobbs has attached herself, and mangled particularly by Universalists of the Elhanan Winchester and Pirie School of Divinity. Still it behoves us to speak of his attainments with caution. Mr. Biden, notwithstanding the clearness of his views in some respects, has not been able to get over the idea of God's restoring a previous state of things.

Language to this effect, he is but too frequently found employing. Earnestly, however, do we wish to think, in spite of this phraseology, and in spite of expressions accompanying it which seem to indicate that he means what he says, that in reality his intention is to represent the blessings of the New Testament Church, not as restoring or perpetuating those of the Old, but as, in consequence of being their *substance*, superseding the *shadowy* blessings of the Old Testament Church.

Two things Mr. Biden is careful to impress on the minds of his readers:—

1. That it is not of the true or spiritual Church as exalted to heaven, but of that Church during its time state, under the reign of the Messiah, that the Old Testament Scriptures are full. Understood qualifiedly, that is, without going to the extreme of excluding references to the Church in its heavenly and glorified state on the part of the prophets, and always bearing in mind that the state of the Church while on earth is the earnest of its state in heaven, we are very much disposed to acquiesce in this view of the writer.

2. That to a spiritual restoration of the Jews to their own land, or, in other words, to their conversion in due time to the faith of Jesus as the Messiah, as being the import of that restoration, Old Testament prophecy is full—connecting with this conversion of theirs, great increase of spiritual blessings to the true Church in its time state. In this view of Mr. Biden's, taken as a whole, we are inclined to acquiesce likewise. This "restoration" is manifested in the thorough amalgamation of believers, whether previously Jews or Gentiles, and in the thorough extinction of all previous differences, not in the elevation of Jew over Gentile, as is but too prevalent an idea with many. Besides, the conferring of superior heavenly blessings, in connexion with the conversion of the Jews, is not inconsistent with the Church of Christ taking a far lower position in the estimation of the world, than it had previously done. "I will yet be more vile than thus." With these explanations, the grand outline of Mr. Biden's views in reference to the future conversion of the Jews, we take to be scriptural. At the same time, to many, perhaps to a great number of his details, we are obliged reluctantly to demur.

This work of Mr. Biden's will, we trust, do good. It comes out at the right time. As the protest of a professing member of the Church of England against many current popular errors regarding prophecy, it may be the means of drawing an amount of attention to the Scriptures, which nothing proceeding from a dissenting quarter, however cogent, could have succeeded in. So far well.

Sorry are we, that much as we have been refreshed and edified with many of Mr. Biden's statements—decidedly as we are at one with him in his leading sentiment as to what constitutes the true Church of God—and admiring as we do his great natural ability,* we find it to be utterly impossible for us to bestow

* He would be probably much gratified were we to shew him the great number of pages of his book which we have turned down, in consequence of the sweet, glorious, and ably-expressed truths which, in the course of our careful perusal of it, have from time to time attracted our notice.

on his work unqualified approbation. It is in many respects sadly defective.

By his own admission, the respected author, a clever, honourably-minded, and successful man of business, is, comparatively speaking, but new to literary pursuits. The subject of prophecy, too, has particularly engaged his attention —dare we venture to say that he has studied it?—for a very inconsiderable period. Under such circumstances, need we wonder at failure in certain respects? At repetitions—at want of due arrangement—at seemingly partial alteration of views, while composing and publishing—at a readiness to embrace gaudy but unsubstantial novelties—at superficiality—and so on? Truly, taking all things into account, the book now before us is a wonderful production. We have already spoken of those naturally superior abilities on the part of its author, to which it bears ample testimony. To what we have previously said we may add, that its conception and execution are alike remarkable; that it displays great comprehensiveness of intellect; and that an energy of character is stamped on it, and a perspicuity of language runs throughout, which perfectly justify Mr. Biden in directing his attention to literary pursuits, and only inspire us with regret that he had not entered on his present career earlier, and had not had his mind subjected to a regular and thorough course of training and discipline. To the causes just hinted at, we trace his principal defects. Enough appears on the face of his work to indicate scantiness of education,—a taste but imperfectly developed and cultivated,—inability but too frequently to use, when most wanted, his own excellent natural powers of discrimination—and general unpreparedness for dealing in its entirety with a subject of such magnitude and importance as that of prophecy.

Again: no man, if he is new to literature, whatever may be his natural talents and acquirements, listening to the dictates of prudence and experience, will venture to bring his first and hurried thoughts under public notice. To rush into print, with one's lucubrations in their crudest form, is not properly to consult one's reputation, besides being disrespectful to those for whom one professes to write. All thinking that is really profound, and worth being attended to, implies labour in the acquisition of its materials; and, generally also, labour in its concoction, digestion, and preparation for the press. We say, generally also. For some daily writers, and some even of those who bring out works of higher pretension, and of a more permanent kind than newspaper articles, do certainly by practice acquire great facility in the art of composition. They can supply their printers, whenever wanted, with what is technically called *copy*, accurately and even elegantly written. Their manuscripts, like that of the late Mr. Cobbett for instance, shall present no erasures, shall require no corrections, and shall be perfect even to their very punctuation. Persons gifted with this power, it is to be suspected, are not very numerous. And they are rather unsafe guides to be imitated by a young author. By any author, indeed, who aims at permanent fame and abiding usefulness. Horace among the ancients, and Rousseau and Roscoe among the moderns, (to whom may be added even George Canning, orator as he was), who elaborated their compositions, and thereby recommended them to the notice not only of their contemporaries, but of posterity, are somewhat better and safer models to work after. If they have not always Cobbett's power, they at all events avoid his repetitions, and eternal quotation of himself. These remarks were suggested to us originally by observation of the looseness and desultoriness of Mr. Biden's style, but were of course confirmed by the following passage, on which we stumbled at p. 335:—"At present I am more than usually debarred from obtaining the needful knowledge, being confined to my bed by a broken limb. *As I print as fast as I get a few pages of MS. ready, I do not like to stop the publication for the want of this knowledge.*" (The italics are ours). Many of the defects of his book, Mr. Biden has in these words sufficiently and satisfactorily accounted for. In many parts of Australia, having no occasion for the carcase, they are said to boil down a whole sheep for the sake of the fat alone. A large MS. treated after the same fashion—examined and re-examined

—written and rewritten—until condensed into the *residuum* of its marrow or substance, is often really no bad thing. Could our respected friend have been prevailed on to adopt some such process in regard to his "True Church," even retaining his three grand divisions of, 1st. "Preliminary Remarks;" 2ndly. "The Jews' return;" and 3rdly. "The Course of the Church," we fancy that he might have produced, if a much smaller and shorter, at all events a decidedly superior article.

But the last and worst feature—the most grievous defect—of the worthy author's book, is the extreme superficiality of his notions concerning prophecy and its fulfilment. The elements of the subject, even, he has scarcely mastered. As to deep, comprehensive, and truly spiritual views, although some appear to have begun to enter into and take possession of his mind, they exist there, for the most part, in a state almost chaotic. They are, indeed, *without form and void.* When he attempts to reduce them to order he flounders awfully; and the result but too often is "confusion worse confounded." Pleasing, as well as interesting, however, is it to mention that his best thoughts by far on the subject of prophecy, are those which appear to have entered into his mind directly from the scriptures. Would that he had stopped at these. Dissatisfied, however, with them—and no reason had he to be thoroughly satisfied with what existed in his mind in a disorderly form, and in flat contradiction to mere human ideas on the subject which, nevertheless, he was desirous and determined to retain—he has quitted that divine authority, which, had he been less impatient might in due time have cleared up all difficulties, and betaken himself to the instructions of ignorant and erring men. Unfortunately for himself, he has fallen into the hands of nearly the worst class of these. (We say *nearly the worst class,* for it is matter of doubt with us, whether Miss Hobbs' friends and coadjutors, or these whom Mr. Biden has had recourse to, be the more ignorant and incompetent in such matters). Men of learning and research like Elliott, and men of eloquence like Cumming, but as regards the true and scriptural meaning of prophecy, the veriest quacks in existence. Men in whom has been realised, although in a sense somewhat different from that in which he wrote it, the poet's adage:—

A little learning is a dangerous thing.

By such men, Mr. Biden has been captivated. Should we not rather say, fascinated? While occasionally differing from them, and doing so once or twice with an evident approximation to the truth, he in general unhesitatingly adopts their views, and is some times even found assenting, as if to an oracle, to the merest fancies and most puerile conceits that ever entered into the human brain.* The two witnesses (Rev. xi. 3—13), although so clearly the Old and New Testaments, the two portions of the divine word, through which God reveals and bears testimony to His own character, as that there seems to be no possibility of mistaking them, he yet, with Dr. Cumming, supposes to be the members of Christ's Church. *The time, times, and half a time,* he perseveres in interpreting by the specific chronological period of 1260 years, instead of perceiving that 1260 years constitute the symbol of three spiritual periods and a half. We are positively grieved and annoyed at all this. Dear Mr. Biden, the Lord conduct you to the knowledge of His own word, and thereby enable you to throw overboard at once the human idols whose worship has, to a painful extent, led you so decidedly astray. Enlightened by God himself, you will discover, that it is not human historical facts, or supposed facts, humanly observed, humanly arranged, and humanly reasoned from, that constitute the basis of a divine interpretation of prophecy. Had they been fitted to do so, then human talents and human education would have clothed men with something like the miraculous and infallible character of the

* See, for instance, the readiness with which Mr. Biden seizes on and adopts as his own, Dr. Cumming's wild, fanciful, and most absurd interpretation of the words, "Write them not." Pp. 380—386.

Apostles. Such a notion, however, is as inconsistent with fact, as it is absurd and blasphemous. When divinely taught somewhat further than he now is, Mr. Biden will discover that as *the testimony of Jesus is* alone *the spirit of prophecy*, (Rev. xix. 10, Luke xxiv. 25—27, 44, 45), so only in proportion as the glorified mind of Jesus is opened up to us, and made ours by faith in God's recorded testimony, does it become in us the basis and cause of true prophetical interpretation. The divine alone can interpret the divine. Human ideas and human things can no more explain divine prophecy, than they can conduct to the understanding of any divine truth. But conversely, the truths of God's word, in proportion as they are manifested to us in their own divine light, are found by us to throw light upon human ideas and human things, and particularly on these as connected with the origin, history, experience, present sufferings, and ultimate triumph of the Church of God, during its time state. To try to interpret scripture by man's historical notices and conclusions, any more than by man's philosophy, never yet has been, and never will be successful. Such attempts begin and end in darkness, uncertainty, and confusion. They have given rise to that Babel of prophetical expositions by which the religious world is now distracted. God's word increasingly understood, as the glorified mind of Jesus is increasingly bestowed on the members of his Church, will lead necessarily to the increased understanding of prophecy; and when God's word is understood completely, by means of the perfect bestowment of Christ's mind on his believing ones, then, but not till then, will the veil that previously overhangs prophecy more or less, be completely and for ever drawn aside.

Let not Mr. Biden think that in what precedes we have dealt with him harshly and groundlessly. So far from our feelings towards him being unkind, we love him dearly for the measure of divine truth which appears to be in him. And almost certain we are, that should he live for ten years more, and continue during the interim to grow in the knowledge of the scriptures, no man will then more sincerely concur with us in censuring his own errors than he himself will. In the meshes of an unscriptural system he is at present entangled. Out of it, our desire and fervent prayer are that he may, as soon as possible, make his escape.

D. T.

POETRY.

"GO AND SIN NO MORE."

Deal gently with the erring!
  Ye know not of the pow'r
With which the dark temptation came
  In some unguarded hour.
Ye may know not how earnestly,
  He struggled, or how well,
Until the hour of weakness came,
  And sadly thus he fell.

Think kindly of the erring!
  O do not thou forget,
However darkly stain'd by sin,
  He is thy brother yet.
Heir of the self-same heritage,
  Child of the self-same God,
He hath but stumbled in the path
  Thou hast in weakness trod.

Speak mildly to the erring!
  For is it not enough,
That innocence and peace have gone
  Without thy censure rough?
It sure must be a weary lot,
  That sin-crush'd heart to bear,
And they who share a happier fate
  Their chidings well may spare.

O, kindly help the erring!
  Thou yet may'st lead him back,
With gracious words and tones of love
  From misery's thorny track,
Forget not THOU hast often sinn'd,
  And sinful yet must be,—
Deal gently with the erring,
  As God hath dealt with thee!

MISS H. J. WOODMAN.

THE SECOND DEATH.

[We received the following communication in reply to *Un tout Seul*, too late for insertion in the November number. We now insert it with the paper referred to by *Un tout Seul* in the *Universalist*, Oct.]

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Dear Sir,—In reply to the letter of "Un tout Seul" in your number for the present month, I would observe that though, as he says, neither *assumptions* nor *conjectures* ought to satisfy a Christian in his search after truth, yet there are *inferences* from what is said, which are so *obviously necessary* and *unavoidable*, as properly to have the force of *direct statements*, unless they are *contradicted by direct statements*. That the following inferences are *not* contradicted by direct statement, I think he will perceive at once; whether, or not, they are *obviously necessary* and *unavoidable* ones, may be a questionable point. The subject of your correspondent's doubt is, that any who shall have *previously died* and *risen again* shall die the *second death*. Certainly, we are no where told this in *express terms*, but I submit the following inferences to his consideration. In Rev. xx. 4, 5, 6, two resurrections are spoken of—the first and the second—and their respective participants; and it is said that on him who *hath* part in the *first* resurrection, the *second death* hath *no* power. Does not this clearly imply that on those, or at all events, on some of those, who have *not* part in the *first* resurrection, but only in the *second*, the second death *hath* power?

Again, in verse 14, we are told that the lake of fire, or being cast into the lake of fire, is the second death; in verses 12 and 13, we are told that the dead—of course the risen dead—were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works; and in verse 15, that whosoever (whosoever, I presume, of the risen dead mentioned in verses 12 and 13) was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire which, according to verse 14, is the second death.

To state this argument more concisely. The raised dead were judged out of the books:—*all of them* who were not found in the book of life, suffered the second death, by being cast into the lake of fire—therefore *some of the risen dead* suffered the *second death*.

In this argument I am (it is true) *assuming* that by whosoever, in verse 15, is meant *whosoever* of the *risen dead* spoken of in verses 12 and 13. Should I be wrong in this, my argument fails; but otherwise, I submit, it must stand.

I remain, dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

Bath, Oct. 27, 1851. I. N. B.

First. The book of Revelation, I view as *entirely* distinct in every respect from all the sacred scriptures beside. I have *no* evidence that it was *circulated*, or even *known* to any of the churches of Christ *when* Paul wrote, nor indeed to any but the *seven* churches in "*the Asia*," by *name* addressed.

Second. It is the only book which contains the term *second death*, and I do not admit that *any* evidence has appeared that a *single* prediction has *commenced*,—of course, not any one *completed*, neither can be till this Gentile day is fully closed. All the popular comments I have read, more and more confirm my mind in this view of the subject. The idiom of the book is purely *Hebraic*. John speaks of *synagogue*, *temple*, *altar*, *tabernacle*, *tribes named*, *Mount Zion*, *Armageddon*, *Baby-*

lon, &c. Things and places which did *not* exist in their distinctive Old Testament *prominence* and *position* when *John* wrote, and which Paul does not name in his Epistles to the churches of Christ. Neither can I find a SINGLE fulfilled prediction in the *previous* scriptures that has not left its LUMINOUS, DIVINE FOOT-PRINT behind, so as not to be *mistaken*. Not so with this book however. Scarcely two *Gentile* expositors *agree* in their *conjectures*. In a word, it seems to *me*, they have brought too much of "*man's wisdom*" with which to look at this *deeply interesting record*.

Third. The term, "second death," occurs *four* times in this book—Rev. ii. 11—"*the death of the second* (*Greek*), with *no* explanation in *this* verse, what it is. Rev. xx. 6, "*the death—the second*," again *no* explanation. Rev. xxi. 8, "*second death*," *no* articles here. Rev. xx. 14, "*and the death and the hades were cast into the lake of fire*, THIS *is the second death*. Here is the *only* explanation given of the *second death*, and this most explicit phrase is applied to the ACT of *casting* "the death and the hades into the lake of fire." By which I am taught the *entire death*, i.e. the *destruction* of these two states *personated*, which came by *sin* and must be *destroyed* by *Christ*.

Fourth. For I find the scriptures are very *fertile* in the practice of *personation*, but I never find that *real* persons or beings are *personated* or mixed up together with *things* or *states* so personated. Real beings require not *personation*. There is a most splendid personation of the two states—"*the death and the hades*," in Rev. vi. 8; and I also read the Lord Jesus has "*the keys of the hades and the death*." Also God speaks prophetically to *these* two states of *death and hades*, and uniformly declares their *destruction*, wherever named, from Hosea xiii. 14 downwards throughout the New Testament. I understand, therefore, *the second death* to be the complete extinction of *the death and hades*, (*not* of any one human being), but of *these two separate states*; and thus AFTERWARDS, we read "*the death shall be no more*." Rev. xxi. 4, &c.—"*and every curse shall be no more*," Rev. xxii. 3, "*for the former things are passed away, and all things are become new*."

These simple thoughts cause me to be very diffident as to making *general* assertions, having no *specific* reference to any other part of *revealed* truth to illustrate the subject. *Generalizing* scripture does not enable *me* to *understand a single particular fact* God has stated, with any degree of *sacred harmony*.

In glancing at I. N. B's Christian remarks, you have sent me, I beg leave to say, I do not know of any "*inference*" in Scripture on any one given point that is not *based* on the *most explicit* direct statements of Scripture *first*. And I cannot admit any *inferences*, for any one point of divine truth were ever *anticipated* by the *holy writers*, the doctrine not having been *first* expressly and clearly *worded*. It is, I am fully convinced, the painful source of the countless, confused opinions which so abound among all sections of *partialist* Christians, and opens a *dangerous* door for every kind of anti-scriptural fancy. Let this practice of *inferences* be once *abandoned* and *the truth* would appear in her divine, beautiful robes of *harmony* and *distinctness* on all points, in a way she is not allowed to appear, in these modern times of *soi disant* orthodoxy.

Respecting the "*risen dead*" my esteemed brother J. N. B's argument goes on the principle of a very unhappy translation of Rev. xx. 15, as though it stated a *positive* certain doctrine of the dead being raised to be cast *alive into the lake of fire*, for he says—"*all of them*," &c. as if there were a *number*, not to say a *multitude*. Whereas neither the English nor Greek text will allow of this: the *English* version *bad* as it is *confines* itself to the grammatical, unit, *singular* number—but the *Greek* makes it quite an *uncertainty* that even *one* was so found. This fact demands distinct regard; especially as that part of my important question in the October number, as to whether the Lord Jesus is to be regarded the author of such resurrection bodies, and whether "*corruptible*," or "*incorruptible*" has been passed over with *perfect silence*.

I can write no more now, and as there can be no further replies, enough has been said to occupy a sanctified, reflective mind.

To a *private* Christian, through your medium, I shall feel pleasure in answering any question I am able.

UN TOUT SEUL.

OPINIONS OF THE FATHERS.

Extracted from Tomline's "Refutation of Calvinism."

Cyril of Jerusalem. A.D. 348. Benedictine Edit.

"Since death came by one man, life also came by one man. By one man, namely, the Saviour, who voluntarily submitted to death. For remember what he said, 'I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it again.' But he endured these things, having come for the salvation of all men." p. 196.

Ambrose. A.D. 374. Benedictine Edition.

"The Lord Jesus came to save all sinners; it was right that he should show his will, even with respect to the ungodly, and therefore it was right that he should not pass over even him who was to betray him, that all might *observe that in the choice of his traitor, he displayed a sign that all were to be saved.* Nor had either Adam reason to complain that he received the command, or Judas that he was chosen. For God did not impose upon one the necessity of transgression, or upon the other that of treason, because both might have abstained from sin if they had preserved that which they had received. Finally he knew that all the Jews would not believe, and yet he said, I am not come except to the lost sheep of Israel. Therefore there is no fault in him who commands, but there is sin in him who transgresses. And as far as was in God, he shewed to all that he desired to deliver all. I do not however say that he did not know that there would be transgression, nay I assert that he did know it." Vol. I. p. 161.

Jerome A.D. 392. Benedictine Edit.

"JOHN THE BAPTIST UTTERS A FALSEHOOD WHEN HE POINTS TO CHRIST AND SAYS, BEHOLD THE LAMB OF GOD WHICH TAKETH AWAY THE SIN OF THE WORLD, IF THERE BE STILL PERSONS IN THE WORLD WHOSE SINS CHRIST HAS NOT TAKEN AWAY." Vol. 4. part 2, p. 646.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

SUPPLEMENTARY NUMBER.—DECEMBER, 1851.

MARY MARTHA SHERWOOD.

BY DAVID THOM, D.D. PH.D.

To permit our Magazine to close, or even to undergo a temporary suspension of existence, without taking some notice of the eminent and excellent lady whose name appears at the head of this article, would be to shew that we were not less wanting in a sense of what is due to ourselves, than in respect for the deceased.

Brief, it is true, must our memoir be. Unsatisfactory, for this reason, to ourselves, no less than to others. But limited space imposes upon us a necessity from which we cannot escape. And the prospect of soon seeing a longer, and thoroughly authenticated biography from the pen of Mrs. Sherwood's youngest daughter, Mrs. Kelly, while it reconciles us to the necessity, also induces on our part a wish in no respect whatever to interfere with or anticipate that lady's design. We therefore, as well as for the reason previously hinted at, abstain from making the fullest use of our materials; but in writing briefly, we do not on that account write the less sincerely and affectionately, or with the less appreciation of Mrs. Sherwood's extraordinary merits.

The "Lady's Newspaper" of October 11th, after remarking truly enough, that "although her," Mrs. Sherwood's "works do not belong to the highest class of literature, they assuredly appertain to the most *useful*," proceeds to furnish us with a few details of her personal and domestic history, which, with some additions of our own, we may rapidly run over, partly, to place them on record, and partly with a view to gratify a common and not unlaudable feeling of curiosity.

Mrs. Sherwood's maiden name was Butt. Her father, Dr. George Butt, a man rather distinguished in his day, was chaplain to George III., Vicar of Kidderminster, and rector of Stanford, in the County of Worcester. A work on Isaiah written, we believe, by this gentleman, was some time since in our possession. He was an excellent man. His abilities and learning are said to have been of a superior order. Her mother was highly and deservedly esteemed; but was of a nervous temperament, and had the misfortune, during a great part of her life, to labour under delicate health. She survived her husband.

The subject of our narrative first saw the light at Stanford, Worcestershire, on the 6th day of May, 1775. In 1803, she was married to her cousin, Henry Sherwood, Esq. of H.M. 53rd Regiment of Foot. "In 1805," we are informed, "she accompanied her husband to India, where, in consequence of her zealous labours in the cause of religion

amongst the soldiers and natives dwelling around her, Henry Martyn and the Right Rev. Daniel Corrie, D.D. late Bishop of Madras, became acquainted with her; and the intimacy that then commenced remained unbroken till death." While in the East, her life appears to have been prosperous and happy, and, by the divine blessing, singularly useful. After an absence of ten or eleven years, she returned to England.

She was the mother of several children. Her eldest child, a daughter, did not accompany her on her voyage, but was left behind for education in her native country. Two infants died in India. Two daughters, Emily, the third one, wife of Dr. Streeten, an able and respected physician of Worcester; and Lucy, the second, who was married to a gentleman residing at West Bromwich, near Birmingham, died respectively in 1833 and 1835. Mrs. Dawes, Mrs. Kelly, (Sophia, the lady to whom her mother's papers have been entrusted), and the Rev. Henry Martyn Sherwood, Rector of Roughton-Hacket, and Vicar of White Ladies Aston, Worcestershire, constitute the surviving members of her family.

Mrs. Sherwood, for some years subsequently to her return from India, was engaged ably and successfully, in the work of tuition. Towards her memory, her pupils cherish a warm, we might almost say, an enthusiastic attachment.

It pleased God, in rapid succession, to remove from her by death, first, her son-in law, Dr. Streeten, and afterwards her beloved husband, Captain Sherwood. The latter gentleman expired, after a most trying illness, at Twickenham, on the 6th December, 1849. "The fatigue she went through," says her biographer, whose language we have already quoted, "in devoted attention to him, and the bereavement she experienced at the severance by fate of a union of nearly half-a-century, were the ultimate causes of her own demise." She herself, after having been only for a few days to appearance slightly unwell, and with no premonitory symptoms of approaching dissolution, except rapidly increasing prostration of strength, expired at Twickenham, on the morning of Monday the 22nd of September last. "Though she was of advanced age," in her 77th year, "her mental faculties never failed her, and she preserved a religious cheerfulness of mind to the last." "I am going," uttered calmly and peacefully, were her last words.

For between 40 and 50 years, Mrs. Sherwood has been before the public as an authoress. Need we add, a remarkably and justly successful one? To enumerate the whole of her works would be tedious. The principal are "Henry and his Bearer," "The Lady of the Manor," "The Church Catechism," "The Nun," "Henry Milner," in 4 parts, "The Fairchild Family," "The Monk of Cimiés," and more recently "The Golden Garland of Inestimable Delights." Well has she earned her high literary reputation.

Having in what precedes endeavoured to meet the views, and satisfy the curiosity of ordinary enquirers, we now proceed to touch on topics, which, as supremely important, are far more interesting to our own mind as well as far more likely to interest the readers of the "Universalist."

Our deceased friend was brought up in the Communion of the Established Church of England; and externally in connexion with it she

continued to the last.* Under the influence of parental teaching and example, followed up by her own personal researches, she became in early life what is commonly expressed by the term Evangelical. Her associates while in India, some of whom have been already named, furnish us with a very good key, to find out what her religious sentiments then were.† Views of a still more decidedly Calvinistic complexion seem, in process of time, to have taken possession of her mind. In other words, she *grew in the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ*, and thereby *in grace also*. 2 Peter iii. 18.

Between 1825 and 1831, she seems to have been able to see clearly, and to rejoice believingly in the doctrine of the Divine Sovereignty. Kindred scriptural topics excited in her the liveliest interest. And, having once entered her mind, they, by divine grace, kept possession of it. 1 Peter i. 5. God's unchangeableness, manifested especially in his unchangeable love to the church in Christ Jesus, she seems for years to have had a strong and irresistible tendency to dwell on. How sweetly this appears in the earlier portions of her "Henry Milner." Her religion having been introduced into her conscience by the Holy Ghost himself, through the Scriptures, was not, like the dreams of fanaticism, or the conclusions of mere human intellect, baseless and evanescent. On the contrary, as *the truth* of God it *dwelt in* her, *and* was *mith* her *for ever*. 2 John 2.

It was towards the close of the year 1838, that our correspondence —a correspondence which we must always regard as one of our highest privileges—with this dear and respected lady began. We had in the month of May preceding, published the first edition of our "Dialogues on Universal Salvation." A copy had been purchased by Mrs. Sherwood. She had felt interested in its contents. Anxious to obtain two other copies, one for herself, and another for a clergyman of the Established Church whom she highly esteemed, she had made application for them pressingly, but unsuccessfully in London. Owing to the smallness of the edition published (500) the work had gone off rapidly. Baffled in her applications to booksellers, she was induced at last to make an application for what she wanted, in the shape of a letter addressed to ourself.

Never can we forget the sensations with which we perused this letter. Never can we forget the letter itself. But for its length, we should have gratified ourselves, as well as our readers, by inserting it entire. The import of it we shall state.

After informing us of her immediate object, she took occasion to speak of a great change, or rather enlargement, which her religious views had recently undergone. She had become a Scriptural Universalist. Having resided for some time at Geneva in 1831, she had there become an attendant on the ministry of the celebrated Dr. Malan. On one occasion, it seems, she had heard him preach from the text,

* There is nothing in the Articles of the Church of England to prevent this. King Edward's condemnation of the doctrine of Universal Salvation had been removed by Queen Elizabeth. And many bright ornaments of the English Establishment, Archbishop Tillotson, Bishop Newton, Dr. Thomas Burnet, and others, had, without challenge, professed to believe that God was ultimately "the Saviour of all men."

† Between 1805 and 1815.

As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. 1 Cor. xv. 22. Proceeding on the principles of Calvinistic Theology, the Dr. represented these words as a declaration, that while *all human beings* had died in Adam, *all those only who are given to believe in Christ* shall hereafter be made alive. The attempt on the part of the Doctor to satisfy all his hearers of the truth of his position proved to be a signal failure. Mrs. Sherwood, it would appear, felt the weakness of his proofs. Rather was led to suspect, that the plain, unforced language of the text proved something exactly the reverse of that for which the learned divine had adduced it. Feelings similar to her own, as she wrote to us, had entered into her daughter, Mrs. Streeten's mind, and into Captain Sherwood's, agreeably to the information which we have received from a most respected correspondent. The Captain, it seems, analysed the sermon, shewing its thorough discrepancy with the express language of the Holy Ghost. This shook the minds of the members of the family. It led to farther investigation. Scripture was searched, and one portion of it compared with another. To the volume of inspiration the appeal was made; and, in the meantime, no human composition on the subject of Universal Salvation was looked into, except Elhanan Winchester's "Dialogues." The hints contained in this work turned out to be serviceable. Prosecuting their enquiries, the proofs of the universality of God's love thickened upon them, whilst they also had brought under their notice unceasingly passages of Holy Writ exposing and condemning, the doctrine of never ending torments. Mrs. Sherwood's part was now taken. She again appeared before the world, in the capacity of an authoress, 1837. Her "Monk of Cimiés," and the fourth part of her "Henry Milner," came out that year. Both works, the former more guardedly, and the latter more openly, exhibit her convictions of the truth of God's unbounded love, through Christ Jesus. Next year, 1838, our "Dialogues" fell into her hands.

Such is a short, but accurate account of the circumstances in which our correspondence with Mrs. Sherwood, and opportunities of studying her character, had their origin.

As a writer, we had always admired this lady. But henceforth our admiration began to assume the form of strong Christian respect and attachment. This was owing to her principles and motives of action gradually, and yet unmistakeably, unfolding themselves. She was pleased to write to us with openness and confidence. Ardent love to God as revealed in Christ Jesus, and consequent love to her brethren in Christ, breathes throughout every communication. There were no Socinian or Arminian dregs tainting her language, and detracting from the purity and simplicity of divine truth. She was a guilty creature, saved by grace, and she knew and rejoiced in the fact. Jesus, *God with us*, was to her *the author and finisher of faith;* Heb. xii. 2; and the work which he consummated on Calvary, when he *died the just for the unjust*, was that by which alone all her hopes of salvation and life everlasting were inspired. Gal. vi. 14, Rom. iii. 21—26, Phil. ii. 8, 9, 1 Peter ii. 24, iii. 18. She *loved God*, as *having first loved* her. 1 John iv. 19. Evangelism, in her case, instead of having been shaken

or impaired by the enlargement of her views,—as, it is slanderously said by their opponents, happens to all Universalists,—had evidently taken a stronger hold upon her mind, and was exercising a more powerful influence over her affections.

Above all things, in love to Jesus, as *God the Saviour of all men*, (1 Tim. iv. 10), she evidenly continued to grow. Discriminating, however, incessantly. Led astray by no novelties of American Universalism, and rejecting with abhorrence the attempts of Transatlantic professors of belief in the dogma of God's being *the Saviour of the world*, to deluge the Church with Pelagian and Socinian abominations. The awful mistakes of such parties, however, she saw clearly could not *make void the truth of God*. While it is as spiritual Abraham, or head and Saviour of his Church, that Jesus is now revealed by the Spirit to the members of the election of grace, (2 Cor. v. 17, Gal. iii. 29, 1 Pet. i. 23), she saw it stated likewise with perfect explicitness by the same Spirit, in the word, that ultimately as spiritual Adam, or head and Saviour of all, Jesus shall be revealed to all. 1 Cor. xv. 22—28, Rom. v. 18, Eph. i. 10, 1 Tim. ii. 6, (Μαρτυριον ἰδιοις καιροις), iv. 10, Hebrews ii. 8, 9, James i. 18, 1 John ii. 2, iii. 8, Rev. xxi. 5. New-creation, through the power of Christ's resurrection, implying not the perpetuation or restoration, but the destruction of Adam's nature in them, was she saw the privilege of *the bride, the Lamb's wife*, and of every member of that glorious mystical body, in time, and throughout the whole duration of the æonian kingdom; (Isaiah lxv. 17, Matt. xxv. 46, John iii. 3, 5, 2 Cor. v. 17, Gal. ii. 20, Eph. iv. 23, 24, Rom. vi. 3—11, 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12); and new-creation, through the power of Christ's resurrection, implying not the perpetuation or restoration, but destruction of Adam's nature completely, was she saw ultimately the realization of the divine purpose, as being the complete supersession of sin and death, by divine righteousness and life, in the case of all. *Behold! I make all things new.* Rev. xxi. 5, Rom. v. 18, ix. 5, 1 Cor. xv. 28, Phil. iii. 21, Hebrews ii. 8, 9, 1 John iii. 8, John i. 29, xii. 32, 1 Cor. xv. 54.

The divine sovereignty, in the whole of this procedure, Mrs. Sherwood saw magnified. Dan. iv. 35, Eph. i. 10. God's purposes partially frustrated by the transgression of Adam,—God obliged to tolerate the existence of sin and death for ever,—and God sharing throughout eternity, his supremacy with his most inveterate and malignant creature, were, although popular and long-established dogmas, yet as opposed to scripture, objects to her of intense abhorrence. So far from these caricatures of Christianity being true, she saw, in the light of scripture itself, the entrance of sin and death, subservient to the entrance and everlasting reign of righteousnes and life. Gen. ii. 16, 17, iii. 1—6, 15, Rom. v. 12—21, xi. 31—36. Sin and death, after having served their purposes, she saw destroyed. 1 John iii. 8, Rev. xx. 14. The reign of him, by whose death and resurrection the destruction of sin and death had been effected, she saw thereby established for ever. Phil. ii. 8—11, Hebrews ii. 8, 9, Rev. i. 18. Thus instead of taking a morbid delight in the prospect of the perpetuation of shadows, it was to her matter of supreme gratification to see them absorbed in their

glorious substance. Song of Solomon ii. 17, Colos. ii. 17, Hebrews ix. 1—15. Instead of taking a morbid delight in the prospect of the everlasting perpetuation of sin, by means of the everlasting perpetuation of sinners and their torments, it was to her matter of extreme gratification, that Jesus, her God and Saviour, had succeeded in exterpating sin from the universe, with all its effects and consequences. John i. 29, Heb. ix. 26, Rev. xxi. 1—5. Nothing could satisfy her but the scriptural view of the work of Christ as complete, and the perfect and everlasting destruction of all his and our enemies. John xix. 30, Rom. x. 4, 1 Cor. xv. 26, 2 Tim. i. 10, Heb. ii. 14, 1 John iii. 8.

Manichaeism, with all its attempts to make sin and death *infinite*, thereby, not only putting them upon a level with divine righteousness and life which are *infinite*, but insidiously also doing away with the possibility of atonement, she was enabled, in the light of Christ's *infinite* sacrifice, and the destruction thereby of sin and death as *indefinite*, to see through and trample underfoot.

Seeing that all men were naturally in Adam and that Adam, and consequently all men in him were supernaturally in Christ as second Adam—as at once man and God—she was enabled not only to get rid of the awfully unscriptural idea of Adam and Christ constituting two independent beings, but to understand how all Adam's posterity being in him, and Adam and all his posterity being in Christ, the scriptures represent to us, not the opposite fates of two distinct classes of individuals, but the same fate progressively, in two distinct states or forms of existence, of one and the same class of individuals: their shadowy and earthly form of existence being brought to end in the creature by sin, that an opportunity might thereby be afforded, through the appearance, death, and resurrection of Christ, for the bestowing on them, as partakers of divine righteousness, of a substantial and heavenly form of existence in the glorious and everlasting Creator. 1 Cor. xv. 47—49.

In a word, to our dear friend, Jesus, the mighty God, did not appear necessitated to share his power with his grand enemy, the creature of his own hands; but as the glorified man, as well as God, she saw *all enemies put under his feet*, Psalm cx. 1, and himself, no longer mediator, but God, reigning as *all in all*. 1 Cor. xv. 28.

Sweet and exceedingly precious to us were the numerous letters, amounting at the least, we should think, to between twenty and thirty, in which these all important truths are either announced or acquiesced in. We regard them as among the most valuable literary treasures in our possession.

Mrs. Sherwood's last to us, written in the course of this summer, was long, affectionate, sensible, and breathing the spirit of genuine piety. Decided marks did it afford of the truth of the observation made by her biographer in the "Lady's Newspaper," that in whatever respects the finger of time might be visible in the decay of her bodily frame, her mental powers continued bright, unimpaired, active, and vigorous.

To say that we enjoyed the confidence, no less than esteem, of this excellent and highly-gifted female, might appear to many to be an arrogant assumption on our part. We abstain, therefore, from preferring such a claim. All we shall remark is, that in many of her com-

munications she was pleased to open up her mind to us, on a great variety of topics, in a way that is only customary, and to be looked for, among intimate and trusted friends. We felt deeply the honour thus done to us. Reciprocated, we can aver, was the esteem cherished by us towards our eminent correspondent, and strong the confidence which we reposed in her judgment and Christian affection. She was good enough more than once to speak of us as sustaining towards her something like the double relation of son in point of years, and of father, as having been the means of bringing truths under her notice to which she attached unspeakable importance.

Mrs. Sherwood continued her literary labours almost to the last.

Several times did she honour us, by writing concerning her book on "The Types of Scripture." Important is the subject, and admirably fitted was she, in various respects, to treat of it. Often were we struck with the extracts which she sent to us. It seemed as if she possessed. by God's grace, a peculiar and heavenly knack at unfolding this, one of the most difficult of all divine subjects. Let us hope that the work is in a state of sufficient forwardness, to be soon presented to the public.*

We merely, and this because it was matter of notoriety at the time, touch on a fact which was painful to ourselves, as well as to others. We mean the alterations made in "Henry Milner," part iv. in 1844. Mrs. Sherwood's own authority we have for saying, "that no retractation of her views on the subject of Universal Salvation was thereby meant—her sole purpose having been to render her expressions more agreeable to scripture." The change we certainly regretted. Nothing, we conceive, could be more consonant with God's word, than the passage as it originally issued from her pen. We cannot see how it could be improved. As the whole first appeared, it will be found on the back of the dedication, to "The Three Grand Exhibitions of Man's Enmity to God."† How important often to "let well alone." The world was ill-natured enough, to assign a reason for the change, differing from that avowed to us by herself. By us there is a strong wish entertained to regard her explanation as satisfactory.

With Mrs. Sherwood, we never had more than one personal interview; and that, five or six years ago. To us, it was a most interesting, instructive, and refreshing one. The impression made by it upon our mind can never be effaced.

There was something peculiarly majestic and dignified in Mrs. Sherwood's look and bearing. You felt, in a moment, that you had to do with no trifling character—that self-respect was one of her leading features—and that, but for the crucifying influences of the truth, pride, in her, might have gone out even to offensive lengths. But the same truth which had made her free, had likewise subdued her. With amazing, indeed, with an intuitive penetration into the minds of those with whom she was brought into contact, we saw that she combined mild-

* None of your readers can have failed to peruse and be edified by the "M.M.S." of the "Universalist."

† The copy of "Henry Milner" part iv. from which the passage was extracted, as well as a copy of the "Monk of Cimies," was a present from Mrs. Sherwood herself.

ness, and much Christian meekness of feeling. Whenever she chose, however, it must have cost her but a very slender effort, to expose folly, or to brand crime with infamy.

Here we find ourselves tempted to enter on a most fertile and interesting theme, the character personal and literary of the deceased. Excellent was she in both respects. Abounding in what was pure and praiseworthy as a woman, and exhibiting many high qualifications as an author. But want of room warns us to forbear. Besides, in her life and writings, her various excellencies are embodied: with the former of which, we shall soon be made fully acquainted by her daughter; and the latter of which speak for themselves. Astonishing in her was the combination of the rarest industry, with genius and mental resources so rich and ample, as almost to seem, at first sight to have enabled her to dispense with it. Not thus, however, did she judge. And not thus did she act. Life profitably employed, she saw to consist in labour—and labour to her, therefore, was her duty, as it never ceased to be her delight. "The battle of life," to borrow the title of a well-known poem of Longfellow's, she fought. But more: as having been *separated from the world by the truth*, as having acquired the spirit of *a pilgrim and a stranger here*, and as *strengthened* from above *with might inwardly in the inner man*, she *fought the good fight of faith, finished her course, and kept the faith.* Literature constituted in a great measure her employment. In her case, however, literary pursuits were subordinate to the divine glory. Certain talents had been entrusted to her, and these she desired to *occupy till* her *Lord came.*

Mrs. Sherwood is gone. Her place upon earth is now vacant. But her memory and her works both survive. An odour they send forth, which we trust will be ever fragrant. Labourers in the same intellectual field may come after her. Views of heavenly truth far more scriptural than either hers or ours will, it is hoped, in future ages of the Church be attained to and cherished. Nevertheless, her exertions for the good of her fellow creatures, and her constant wish to draw attention to those inspired records which proclaim God's love in Christ to guilty men, will not have been in vain. She has filled up a niche in the temple of humanity. And she has striven to magnify the riches of His grace, *who sent his Son into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved.* John iii. 17. God by her instrumentality has been, and will no doubt yet continue to be glorified. And she, in the mean time, having put off the garments of mortality and been ushered into the immediate divine presence, has had addressed to her the gracious and cheering language: *Well done, thou good and faithful servant! Thou hast been faithful over a few things.—Enter, thou, into the joy of thy Lord.* Matt. xxv. 23.

BIOGRAPHY OF THE REV. NEIL DOUGLAS, PREACHER OF UNIVERSALISM, GLASGOW.

By John Fraser.

The subject of this Memoir, the Rev. Neil Douglas, was born in Glendaruel, Argyleshire, North Britain, in the year 1750. His father's name was Daniel Douglas, and his mother's, Mackinlay. His father was both a farmer and miller. His ancestors lived in easy circumstances from time immemorial. His great grandmother was a woman of deep piety, and though she could not read (for reading was then generally taught to the male sex only), she possessed great knowledge of the Bible. The parents of Neil Douglas were also pious people and much respected. His mother was related to some noble Scottish families. She was grand-daughter or great grand-daughter to one of the Northern Dukes of a former time; but was disowned in consequence of her marrying Daniel Douglas. He died in the prime of life, while his son Neil was but a boy, without having made any adequate provision for his family. The widow struggled for a time to support herself, her son, and a daughter; but finding the task a hard one, she resolved to remove to Greenock, where some of her husband's relatives resided, in the hope that they might be useful to her in her widowed state.

Shortly after her removal to this town, she placed her son under the care of a master shoemaker to learn that trade. After he had made some progress in the art, the family removed to Glasgow, that he might in this more renowned city acquire a better knowledge of his trade, and have more favourable opportunities of gratifying that thirst for knowledge which was early awakened in his young ardent bosom. In this city he laboured assiduously at his daily calling, supporting both himself, his mother, and sister; devoting all his leisure hours to the cultivation of his mind, and in preparing himself for the University. It appears that from his boyish days the paramount feeling of his mind was to become, in future years, a preacher of the gospel—a feeling that originated, no doubt, in the piety of his own disposition.

Having made the necessary arrangements to enter College, he did so under Professor Muirhead in the session of 1772, when he was 22 years of age. He continued his attendance at Glasgow University for a period of eight years, during which time he supported himself and his relatives by his assiduous, and unremitting application to public and private teaching. As a student he was highly distinguished for his excellent conduct, talents, and attainments. His fellow-students cherished towards him very great regard. They used to say, he could learn more in one week than they could in a month. Some of these students were relatives of the noble family with whom his mother was connected. They sought his acquaintance; and assured him that the patronage of the best parishes of Scotland would be at his command as soon as he should be licensed. During his studies, however, and in the course of his extensive reading, he imbibed not only Anti-State Church but liberal political principles. He, therefore, refused the proffered support—an instance of that unswerving integrity which characterised all his subsequent conduct. He had

previously connected himself with the Relief body*—was a member of their church, and promptly obtained license as a Probationer in this connexion. Speedily afterwards he received a call from the Relief Church at Cupar-Angus, Forfarshire, which he accepted, and became extremely popular as a most able and successful preacher of the gospel in that locality. As was to be expected from his previous success as a student, and the eminence he had acquired during his academical career, he speedily became the leading member of the Relief synod, and was distinguished as a singularly pious, able, and eloquent preacher.

Whilst residing in Cupar-Angus he formed his first matrimonial connexion, becoming united to Miss Mary Ann Miller,† a lady distinguished for great attainments and piety. The causes and circumstances connected with their acquaintance and marriage are at once romantic and extraordinary, and at the same time, reflect the very highest credit and honour on both parties. The union was to him a superlatively blessed and hallowed one; and to his partner to whom he was devotedly attached not less so. During the few years (for they were but few) she was spared to bless her husband, their lives were spent in the enjoyment of unalloyed bliss, arising from the amiability of their dispositions, the refined affection they cherished for each other, their mutual glorying in the cross, and faith in Jesus, *the Saviour of all men, especially of those who believe.* But for the present we drop this almost superhuman subject.

The popularity of Mr. Douglas gradually increased. The charm of his private manner, the fire, the earnestness, the fluency, the scriptural tone, and the eloquence of his public addresses, captivated all hearts, and won for him universal admiration.

He remained some years in Cupar-Angus, (we are not sure how many), during which he had several children, three of whom died in infancy, and three (a son and two daughters) grew up to man and womanhood. They survived their father. Their mother, great and good woman as she was, died when they were young. The eldest daughter died some years ago, leaving a numerous family. The second daughter is married, and resides with her husband in England. The son is understood to have died recently in a foreign land.

The wide-spread fame of Mr. Douglas brought a call to him from a Relief Church, Dundee, which was accepted; the prospect of a wider sphere of usefulness being the inducing cause of his removal. Here he laboured for some years in the same acceptable manner as at Cupar-Angus. It was a new church, and he was its first minister. The debts incurred by the building were very heavy, and burdensome on the congregation. The parties from whom the money had been borrowed instituted a law-suit to recover it; and when the church was to be sold, Mr. Douglas, with that benevolence and disinterestedness which were preeminent features of his character, advanced the money to pay the debt, on promises made by the congregation and local presbytery, that united exertions would be made by them to repay him. The promises were

* A body originating in the deposition of Mr. Gillespie, of Carnock, in 1752; and now merged in the United Presbyterian Church.

† She was daughter, by his second marriage, of Mr. Miller of Starr, was half sister of Sir H. Miller, and was related to the family of Lord Melville, as well as to some other noble families.

broken: he never received in return one farthing for an outlay of about £1,100. This money belonged to Mrs. Douglas, who consented to the loan. When no efforts were made to repay the sum, Mr. D. complained, and dissension arose among the members. During these disputes Mr. Douglas, partly prompted by the yearnings of his own heart to revisit the scenes of his youth, and in deference to the wishes of the Relief Synod, undertook a mission to the Highlands to preach the gospel to the poor, perishing, as he found them to be, for the want of spiritual instruction by the deplorable neglect of the local clergy. He shortly afterwards published a journal of his mission. On his return, finding that no steps had been taken to do him justice, shocked with the unchristian conduct of the church, and of his co-presbyters, and some dissent having arisen among the members of the congregation regarding the dispensation of the ordinances and church government, he gave up all connection with his church and the Relief body.* The cause of his sensitiveness on the question of repayment was the fact that the money was not his but the property of his much-loved partner. She had descended from her high position as a lady of rank to marry him, and from this cause alone he ever treated her with the most refined and delicate respect, and was on this account excessively pained at having been the means of depriving her of her patrimony, and by this deprivation robbing her children of that which he regarded as belonging to them through or by her. Never, however, did this Christian lady, chide her cherished partner for the loss hereby sustained.

Mr. Douglas having now commenced to preach the Gospel wherever he could find admission, in connexion with no party whatever, was doomed to another trial of his faith, resignation, and trust in God. His beloved wife was seized with a fever which in fourteen days terminated in death. Her christian conduct during her illness was a happy illustration of heavenly principle. It was tender, affecting, instructive, sublime; a magnificent instance of what the grace of God can do in the prospect of death,—making life the most beautiful when it expires amid the radiance of heavenly hope, and the prospect of a future immortality! She died in the thirty-ninth year of her age, eleven years and a half after her union with the subject of this memoir. She was universally beloved. The streets of Dundee were crowded by those who were anxious to witness her funeral and the common remark was, "she has not left her like in the place." The feelings of her bereaved husband, with a heart so tender, and a devotion so ardent to such an angelic being as God had blessed him with cannot be described; and yet the supporting power of God's spirit in this his hour of darkness and of sore trial as manifested in his conduct, was as beautiful in his life, as the same power was beautiful in her death.

He thus writes of her "Though not old in years, yet mature in piety and grace she dropt into her grave, like fruit into a mother's lap in Autumn."

"How pleasing to form an idea of the joy and triumph of her pure and gentle spirit, when disengaged from the burden and confinement of mortality, and

* He says himself, "He spent many weeks travelling some hundreds of miles on his own cost, in unavailing efforts to get his brethren to aid him, till he gave up the cause as desperate, and resigned his charge entangled with the whole burden of the debt."

and flying with seraphic wings into the immediate presence of her God, and to the very throne of her once crucified, but now exalted and glorified Saviour! On earth, she has left a pattern to survivors worthy of imitation. Angels beheld her exit with joy, and hailed her entrance into their pure and blissful mansions with rapturous songs of praise! May the Lord remove every film from our eyes, and give us daily to look towards him, who is the everlasting fountain of light and life, and whom to know is life eternal,—that living the life of the righteous, we may die their death and have our latter end like theirs."

Mr. Douglas' revered and aged mother constituted one of his household during the life time of Mrs. Douglas, as did also, for a portion of that time, a daughter of his sister, whom he rescued from misery and took under his own roof; and Mrs. Douglas so far from cherishing any antipathy to these expressions of kindness on the part of her husband, regarded both his relatives with the tederest affection—evidence of her singular goodness of heart.

Sometime after this painful event, in the year 1798, Mr. Douglas repaired with his family to Edinburgh, his object being to print books, and by that means, as well as by his preaching to propagate a knowledge of gospel truth. At the same time he took a very active interest in the question of political reform which was much agitated at that period. His acquaintance on political grounds was sought by many influential reformers residing in Edinburgh and elsewhere. The British Convention then existed, of which Mr. D. was a member. He had the acquaintance of Skirving and Gerald, the latter of whom Mr. D. designated the brightest genius of the age. Although many had been tried and banished at that time for political offences, there would have been many more had it not been for Mr. D.'s great caution in advising the reformers how to keep within the law. He printed at this time a number of tracts on public questions such as "Strictures on the high prices of provisions, and the causes thereof;" on "Washington, the American President's death," &c. These tracts arrested the attention of the authorities, who sent six officers to seize on the materials of his printing office, and the stock of his published works, which they dragged through the streets, vociferating to the populace as they went along, and exposing scornfully their illegally obtained booty. They attempted to force his aged parent with his infant in her arms to give evidence before the Sheriff against her son. All this was done because he pleaded the cause of the distressed! By these rude and wicked acts he lost more than £100. No warrant had the parties so to act. Mr. D. called on the Sheriff to remonstrate with him on the unwarrantable nature of such conduct. He was civil, and told him his pamphlets were sent to the Privy Council, and that he was to send his defence there.

Mr. D. wrote to Lord Melville, his relative, complaining of the usage he had received. His Lordship wrote to the Lord Advocate, and the consequence was, that Mr. D. was speedily informed that his articles would be returned to him. He soon received them, but in a state of mutilation. Mr. D. was extremely grateful for this interference on the part of his Lordship.

Mr. D. at this period performed the compositor's work of a very instructive poem, entitled "Lavinia," with a Memoir of his deceased wife—a singular

instance of his activity and industry. The latter work to a religious mind is one of touching and transcendant interest. He also published at this time a small volume, "Journal of a Mission to the Highlands, in summer and harvest, 1797, by appointment of the Relief Synod," in which he graphically depicts the deplorable condition of the Highlanders for want of religious instruction, through the lamentable neglect of the parish clergy. Mr. D. was an excellent Gaelic scholar, and could preach fluently in this language.

Whilst residing in Edinburgh, Mr. D. formed an acquaintance with a Mr. Mathieson, an eminent type-founder; a highly intellectual man, and a leading member of the Universalists in that city. Through this intimacy, and whilst trying to defend his own orthodox opinions from what he deemed the heresy of that body, he discovered the weakness of his own arguments; and was thus lead to study the Scriptures with more care on this point. The result of his researches was the conviction of the truth of the doctrine of Universalism.

At this period the eternity of Hell torments blazed in every pulpit throughout Scotland. Every sermon terminated with the most vivid and appalling pictures of future punishment. The public mind was quite in love with this doctrine, because it was thought to be a great biblical fact; and the clergyman who was the most graphic describer of it was generally thought to be the ablest preacher.

Mr. Douglas was too honest to conceal his new convictions. He gloried in his expanded views of the divine love, in reference to the whole human family. It was in harmony with his refined and disinterested feelings aa a man, a patriot, and a Christian. He now saw an untrodden field of Christian labour lying before him; and with that indomitable energy by which he was characterised, he determined to enter it. His mind having now received an influx of scriptural knowledge regarding the ultimate fate of man, he nobly determined to make it known. This new and divine discovery, infinitely surpassing every discovery in art and science, was peculiarly refreshing and seasonable to his God-taught mind. The loss of his deceased partner, intensely painful as it was to him, was made bearable by reason of his firm belief that her departed spirit rested in the bosom of her God; but he had three children who died in infancy. What their future state should be was to him a matter of extreme concern, even of frequent, prolonged, and distressing agony. The gloomy Calvinistic dogma of children a span long subjected to endless misery preyed most painfully on his sensitive and affectionate nature. He indulged this feeling so far, a feeling that was but the legitimate result of such a doctrine acting on such a mind and heart as he possessed, as to have exposed himself to the charge of insanity. He more than once retated to the writer of this Memoir, with tears in his eyes, the distressing state of mind he then experienced, and that but for his becoming acquainted with the doctrine of God's universal love, he feared himself that his mind would have been destroyed by the anxieties of his lacerated heart. Oh! how many excellent Christians have suffered in like manner!

Mr. D's mind now enlarged, strengthened, and irradiated with the gladsome tidings, longed for action in this new and interesting field of labour. He resolved to begin his extraordinary career in Greenock, probably owing to the

influence of his youthful associations with that town. It was there his mind was nurtured to some extent for the work of the ministry; and there he resolved to recommence his ministry, by proclaiming the fulness of the Gospel and the saving mercy of God through the second Adam, as including all who had died in the first Adam. He went to Greenock in the year 1800. He met a few friends to whom he communicated his new views; but before speaking publicly in the town, he resolved to visit his birth-place, and make known the glorious gospel to its inhabitants. Thither he repaired, and among his friends he met with a very warm reception; and such was his love of the people, and the scenes amid which his young being first dawned, that for twenty-two years subsequently to this period he annually visited the same place. How often have we heard him exulting with rapture at the prospect of these visits, so dear and hallowed to him, and recounting the hosts of interesting circumstances with which they were associated. He was passionately attached to the simple, honest, warm-hearted Highlanders of his glens, who would travel to hear him preach to the congregated hundreds in the open air, amid the charms of summer; for he delighted in the free expanse of such beautiful temple worship: and when by reason of age and infirmity he became unable to visit any more scenes so dear to his soul, he yearned over the bereavement continually with a pathos and feeling I have no language to describe. "Oh my poor highland brethren! my highland brethren have no faithful preachers of the gospel!" See his Journal of this Mission.

After his return from the highlands to Greenock he engaged a public hall, and commenced preaching the new doctrine, which threw the inhabitants into a state of intense excitement and rage. He was hunted, hooted, and pelted with abominable missiles in the public streets. Abomination was introduced into the little pulpit of the hall on the Sunday mornings; and every kind of insult and annoyance was thrown in his way for a considerable time. The pulpits were as debased in their anathemas as the ignorant multitude, whose conduct was in keeping with the denunciations of their dark-minded teachers. One clergyman in particular, Mr. Bain, took the lead in denouncing Mr. Douglas, and holding him and his doctrine up to the scorn and reprobation of his people, overleaping most unscrupulously all the charitable and polite barriers within which he should, as a minister, have confined his discussion. Mr. Douglas, nothing daunted, held on his glorious course, proclaiming continually the love of God to all men, and assailing the errors of the common system with his well-marshalled and logically conducted arguments. As a rejoinder to the Rev. Mr. Bain's fulminations, he published a satirical poem addressed to him, entitled "Slander Retorted; or, Lucifer's Thanks to those who plead for the Endless Duration of his Regal Character and Dominion," date 1803. The madness of the Greenock feeling gradually became tamed. The influence of a powerful and fearless mind, guided and sublimed by scripture truth, scripture consistency, and that boundless charity which he ever exhibited, commanded ultimately for him the homage of virtue; and the character of being a scholar, a man, and a Christian who was not to be trifled with, and controversy with whom was dangerous to popular dogmas, came ultimately to be established.

A small band of friends now rallied around him. A church was formed—the Greenock Universalist church. Mr. William Scott, Merchant, Greenock, who had many years previously been a hearer of his in Dundee, in passing by the Hall heard a preacher's voice. Said he, "Can that be the voice of my old Minister?" He entered the Hall, and behold it was the veritable voice and man! Old acquaintance was renewed. Mr. Scott was thereby induced to examine and embrace Universalism; and a friendship of the most hallowed kind was formed between them which was never broken. Mr. D. laboured in Greenock for four years, preaching three times every Sunday, and two or three evenings during the week, both in English and Gaelic. Indeed, he was untiring in the preaching of the Gospel—not mere Universalism but gospel truth generally.

This church increased in members to the number of about fifty; and the Hall which held about 200 was always filled. Many who kept up their connexion with other churches became believers in the doctrine of Universalism. The members of this church were as a whole most exemplary. Highly respectable were they as individuals. None of them ever recanted; and when Mr. D. at the end of four years' labors among them, left for Glasgow to enter upon a larger sphere of usefulness he paid monthly visits to this interesting church, to which he stood as long as he lived in the relation of Pastor. In Mr. D's absence the brethren edified each other, and ever ready were the services of Mr. Marquis and Mr. Scott; individuals who were extensively skilled in the knowledge of the bible. Mr. D. in removing to Glasgow had also an eye to the education of his two daughters and son, cherished by him for the mother's sake with great tenderness and with intense affection. Greenock could not then afford a liberal education.

The greatest unanimity prevailed in the Greenock Church during the period of its existence, about half a century. The ordinances were despensed every first day of the week, and the writer believes that during that long period there was never a vacant Sunday. They gloried in the redemption and the sufficiency of Christ's work in putting away sin by the sacrifice of himself; and in the restoration of all fallen intelligences. Well does the writer remember the many old worthy men and women who were members of that church, admirers of their pastor, warm and devoted lovers of the truth. It was indeed, refreshing, to mingle with them in worship. They grew old in the connexion. One after another died, giving glory to God for the glad tidings. Long was the church kept up after Mr. D's demise; and when by death and removals the society became too small to meet in a public Hall, they met in Mr. Scott's house, and worshipped together, bowing themselves before that God whom they had so long served. For some years this private worship was kept up till death again and again summoned these devoted ones hence. The meeting was finally dissolved only by death. Mr. William Scott—honoured name in connection with this church from its origin till its termination—alone survives to mourn his isolated condition. Even his moral and religious character alone gave an influence and respectability to the church and the cause in Greenock. He prayed with it and for it, and taught with all meekness and simplicity the great Christian doctrines during the long period now named. May God

grant him in his declining years the sweet fruition of his labours of love—for *that* they emphatically were—a constant foretaste of heaven's bliss, and heaven itself at last. Nor can we omit to mention Mrs. Scott, the gifted, the pious, the public-spirited, the intelligent lady to whom he was first married. She was a warm-hearted Universalist, and one whose personal history is associated with that of this church, and whose conduct reflected on it and on herself the highest honor. She, too, has many years ago passed away in faith and hope, leaving yet a few to mourn her loss; in whose rememberance she is cherished with hallowed affection. Mr. Scott was married a second time, and with his excellent wife, lives somewhat retiredly, in easy circumstances, still rejoicing in God the Saviour of all men, especially of those who believe. To him the writer is indebted for some of the information now communicated in this article, and which he respectfully acknowledges.

We have said Mr. Douglas removed to Glasgow; and here it was his character became more amply tested and known. He was in the vigour of life and health, and devoted all his energies to the duties of his calling. His removal to Glasgow caused great public excitement. It was felt that a great man had come to reside in the city. The clergy were terrified at his influence, and afraid to meet him in argument. They tilted at him occasionally in their pulpits, but none dared to commit themselves to the press against him. The popularity of Mr. D. whilst in Glasgow was increased, and his influence extended rapidly, not only by preaching thrice every Sunday, but by itinerating during the week among the surrounding villages—indeed, wherever a door could be opened for him. A school-room, a hall, or inn-hall, a room in a private house, or the open fields, were all alike to him. He would preach to a dozen or a thousand—the one as readily as the other. He speedily took advantage of the press to aid him in the good work. He printed tracts and pamphlets in great numbers, and whenever he went in the country he took a supply of them with him, and had a great many friendly agents who assisted in their circulation. Whenever his sermons were over, there were his tracts and works to be had, sometimes gratis, and always at a small price. To give him more power of this kind, he established a printing office of his own. Often he did the labor of a compositor himself, and printed his works sometimes on very coarse paper that he might afford to give them at a nominal place.

Neil Douglass was now a person universally talked about. In all the private circles of the clergy, he was the frequent theme of conversation: sometimes they affected to despise him; but, for all that, fear of him was the predominating feeling. His Rev. brethren of the Relief body were especially annoyed at his doctrine. They knew he was a man of superior learning, ability, and piety; and to lessen the power of his influence, they propagated a report that he was deranged; and it is astonishing how long and how extensively it prevailed. The origin of this report has reference to the time we have already noted, in regard to his grief concerning the future state of his three children who died in infancy. His own influence, the influence of a thoroughly sound mind, ultimately strangled that report. Those who heard him preach felt how much their reasoning powers were exercised, and how luminous and coherent was his every sentence, and could not be persuaded

that the speaker was other than a thoroughly sane and good man. No preacher in Scotland was ever heard by a greater number of persons. The Andersonian Institution, John Street, in which he preached, held many perhaps eight hundred persons: it was always filled and generally crowded at the evening service. Members of all churches constantly attended his meetings as well as individuals who were unconnected with any church. He never failed to be a source of great popular attraction even to the very last of his public appearances. Every thing about him was somewhat original. In stature he was much beneath an average height, but very portly in body. His limbs were extremely handsome. and his walk agile, graceful, and gentlemanly; his attitude was erect and his bearing was dignified. In these respects no one could look upon him, without feeling that he was an extraordinary man. His countenance was exceedingly bland and benevolent, suffused with a silken expression of sweet graceful piety that readily spoke to the heart and won it. His eye was rather dark, and exceedingly sharp, but its penetrating glance could be easily borne, because of the kind feeling with which it gleamed. He had a powerful voice. It was in his days of health, vocal thunder, but mellow and musical, reminding us very much of Daniel O'Connell's. His rapidity of utterance was extraordinary. The active operation of his mind in conceiving thoughts could have given fair and free expression to half a dozen tongues. Truly may it be said in his case, "out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh." The deep feeling and sincerity of that heart glistened like summer radiance in his every tone, and speedily set at defiance all possible scepticism as to his sterling honesty. Thousands of times had that poetic expression its realization in his case—"they came to scoff but remained to pray." His mind was quick in action, vigorous, acute, logical. No easy task was it to foil him in argument. He had a large amount of homely wit, with which he could speedily silence all opposition to his enlarged views. His knowledge of scripture was extraordinary. The great charm of his preaching, lay in the constant, instructive, appropriate and beautiful use he made of it. His quotations from the sacred record were ever and anon sparkling like golden jewels in the midst of his own flaming language. His every hearer was always struck with the gigantic power he so readily and constantly wielded. Under his living, burning, intensely earnest oratory, there never could be sleeping auditors; and though he could not be called highly eloquent, in his use of language, never very imaginative and poetic, yet there were ever falling on your ears, the eloquence of facts, of powerful arguments, of scripture quotation, delivered with a fervour, a pathos, and a piety of spirit that made you irresistibly feel that after all his eloquence was divine, and his influence all-commanding and irresistible.

When the infidel listened to him, he felt how the citadel of his unbelief was assailed and prostrated, by representing God as he was revealed in the word of truth. When his hearers came from other churches, they too were made to feel that to their Calvinism must be superadded the ultimate restoration of all things, in order to make it consistent, scriptural and Godlike. When the Arminian came, his objections to the predestination of an elect few to bliss, were rendered powerless; because this was but one link in the grand work of

redemption—a mean to an end—the first fruits of the coming harvest, and the type and assurance of the in-gathering of all to God's ample temple, and the ultimate consummation of the mediatorial work when God will be all in all. When the patriotic Christian came he found a preacher whose heart throbbed with interest in the welfare of his country, of human kind the wide world o'er: the hater of tyranny and oppression—of slavery in its every form be it black or white: the denouncer of crime as pertaining to every class, kings, lords, and commoners—he found one whose sympathies beat in warm and glowing unison with the whole human race, simply because they were of one blood, one family, the children of one God, and the redeemed of one Saviour. When the students came, for they did so numerously whilst attending the classes in the Glasgow College, they felt how difficult it was to keep up the assurance of their orthodox faith, when subjected to the searching scrutiny of this powerful preacher. To *our* knowledge shipwreck of this faith was very common, and the persuasive agent of such a change, was revered and adored. The young unsophisticated bosoms yielded to the demonstration of the glad tidings they heard with so much delight. Their studies went on all the while; but as they neared the pulpit, they trembled for the result of their new convictions: they in fact trembled for themselves; and worldly prudence triumphing over their fresh and youthful convictions they, in numerous cases, put their broken faith again into dock, to be remodelled in genuine, popular, Calvinistic style. They could not afford to be honest, to keep a good conscience. What makes all doctrines plain and clear, is two, three hundred pounds a year, of which there was no prospect as preachers of Universalism!

But what then? As the result of Mr. D.'s preaching, in Glasgow, and throughout a large district of Scotland—as the result of his numerous publications, of his triumphant replies to all his assailants,—as the result of impressions produce upon the thousands who heard him, scattering themselves over the country, and the numerous students who did the same, ultimately becoming ministers, the doctrine of endless torments became less taught, less proclaimed, less relished, till at this moment, hundreds of discourses begin and end without allusion to it at all; or if alluded to in occasional instances, how the fiery accents are changed! *In fact, the preaching of Hell torments is not now popular!* A secret, quietly-cherished incredulity regarding its truth extensively pervades the Scottish mind. Old *repulsive* Calvinism is dying out!

And what, then, we again ask? Why as the growing result of Mr. D's labours, the gospel is now being addressed to all, more or less scripturally, *because it has been provided for all.* This doctrine is now extensively taught by the united Presbyterians of Scotland, as well as by the Kirk of Scotland It is not confined to the mere Morisonians. It is extensively taught, and the doctrine of an endless hell cast into the shade: the clergy and people being ready to admit that it is a dark question, the solving of which they are willing to leave to God in his own good time and way.

No one who has watched the changing state of religious feeling in Scotland during the last forty years, and who is acquainted with the labours and influence of one great and pious mind, the subject of this memoir, can doubt of his having been greatly instrumental in producing that change. We must say, however, that

whilst Arminian views are now very much taught in Scotland, Mr. D. was himself a decided believer in the doctrine of *the election of grace*, and in the absolute communication of that grace to the soul by the spirit of God irrespective of creature will. He was a believer in the trinity,—in the deity and atonement of Jesus. In church government he was an independent, and favourable to pastoral appointments over congregations. The ordinances were periodically dispensed in his church. He devoted one sabbath monthly to visiting his Greenock brethren. For many years he thus laboured with great energy of body and mind in the work of the ministry, diffusing correct views of the Fatherly character of God; and his ultimate design of mercy towards all men. We should state that he took a warm and special interest in maintaining the Deity of Jesus; and when efforts were made to propagate Unitarianism in Scotland, no clergyman presented so much and so powerful opposition to it as himself. On this subject he has written some most valuable works.

Though as a clergyman he was quite aggressive on what he regarded as error in points of faith, he ever conducted his opposition in a most charitable and Christian manner. In private he was extremely affable, courteous and winning. The fear of God was with him an ever-abiding and operating feeling, and gave a charm and a hallowedness to his conversation that can only be understood by those whose high privilege it was to enjoy it. And, oh! how humble he was and how accommodating to all! The kitchen of the poor man he enjoyed as pleasantly as the parlours of the wealthy. Never was his conversation other than extremely interesting and instructive. He was full of anecdote, wit, pleasantry, and an inexhaustible store of information. His memory was most retentive; he has said to the writer, that though the Bible were lost he could nearly supply the whole of it, chapter and verse. There was a charm about his private manner surpassing nearly every thing of the kind we ever met, He made you feel instantly at ease in his presence; and discoursed with such affectionate kindness to all around him on the great subjects that interested his mind, that one felt as if breathing the very atmosphere of heaven: so holy, so pure, so sweet, so instructive, so noble was his conversation, without the slightest ministerial pedantry or assumption of personal consequence. The parents of the writer were extremely hostile to Universalism. His mother, a remarkably pious and excellent woman, often grieved herself most bitterly and painfully at her son's departure from the common faith. She habitually engaged in prayer that he might be brought back again from the errors into which he had fallen. Unknown to her, and when his father was on his death-bed, he introduced Mr. D. to the family. He spent two hours in precious conversation with both; and what a change! Bigotry and opposition were broken down. He won their respect, and even affection. When he left the house the mother shed tears, and often afterwards went and heard him preach—wishing that the gospel which he taught were true!

We come now to speak of an extraordinary event in his life. His sermons were sometimes called political, because in lecturing very often from the prophets, he took occasion to contrast the state and government of ancient kingdoms with the state and governments of Europe, the British government included. He was an avowed and decided reformer, and he took frequent

occasions to denounce the misgovernment of our country. Such preaching and feeling commanded great attention, and, in times of distress, great audiences. In the years 1816 and 1817, very great distress existed in the west of Scotland, among the working population. He sympathised intensely with the people, and denounced and exposed the causes of their misery, part of which he attributed to the government. The authorities regarded him as a disaffected seditious preacher. Crowds went to hear him, and at length steps were taken to prosecute him. Police were sent to his church to note his words, and he was apprehended, examined, and committed for trial on a charge of sedition, before the High Court of Justiciary, Edinburgh. The whole country was thrown into great excitement by this act. Mr. D., now growing old and feeble, had to prepare himself for trial. He would then be about sixty-seven years of age. His examination before the Sheriff of Glasgow lasted three days. Every thing was done to make him commit himself to the fangs of the law. He made his declaration with the honesty and frankness of a Christian; and such was the advantage taken of that honesty that he regretted that he had not followed his Lord's example by remaining silent, and leaving his accusers to substantiate their charges as they best could. The Crown brought all its weight and concentrated power against him, with the evident purpose of crushing and imprisoning this patriot and Christian: but behold! the Scottish bar, ever characterised for philanthropy and a high sense of justice, was not unobservant of this matter, and individuals of no less eminence that J. P. Grant, Esq. M.P. the late Lord Jeffrey, Lord Cockburn, and J. A. Murray, Esq., all advocates then flew to the rescue and defence of the venerable man of God, and offered to plead his cause gratuitously. All that was necessary to be done, they did. The evidence of town-criers and paltry-minded policemen—men who proved their inadequacy as witnesses in such solemn matters,—completely failed even in the hands of the Crown, and thus rendered any great exertions on the part of his counsel unnecessary. The Lord-Advocate, in addressing the jury, admitted that the evidence had broken down. The result was, that after a short speech from Francis Jeffrey, the jury instantly returned a verdict of *not guilty*. At this verdict, the whole audience and the bar testified their approbation.

This trial made some wondrous revelations of character to Mr. D. Some of his professed clerical friends proved traitors, and would not even testify to his character; and many individuals unknown to him showed him great kindness. By the merciless rigour of a landlord, to whom he owed nothing, he was forced to leave the house he occupied at the very time of his trial, and to sell his printing office for whatever it would bring. The legal persecutors, however, were signally foiled; and God be praised that so it was. Had Mr. D., in his great weakness, been sent to jail, he would, in all probability, have died in it. Mr. D. had prepared his defence, but did not need to deliver it. He however published an account of his trial with that defence, and a most interesting work it is.

Mr. D, now acquitted in the face of the country, returned to his congregation in Glasgow, and continued to preach as usual, regardless of either danger or persecution. His bodily weakness, which had been gradually increasing, now rendered preaching painful and laborious; but nothing could break his

spirit. When unable to walk to his place of worship, he requested his friends to carry him to it; and this was done in a great many instances—such was his anxiety to proclaim the truths taught him by God; and such too was his weakness, that his friends often said he would die in the pulpit. On one occasion, through excessive weakness and over-exertion, he fainted in the pulpit. His head fell on the book-board. He shortly afterwards so far recovered as to be able to express a wish that he might recover sufficient strength to say to his flock, that he died believing in the doctrine he had so long taught them. He was, however, spared to them a short time longer. To save his voice, which was now entirely broken, and which he could use only in whispers, some of the brethren engaged in the preliminary exercises of praise and prayer. Long before this time he had become very deaf, and it required great exertions of voice on the part of others to make him hear. Increasing weakness and disease put their veto at last on his public appearances; and often as he lay on a sick bed, did he mourn that he no longer could mingle with his brethren in public worship, and in reading and preaching the Word of Life so dear to his soul. For some months during his confinement to bed, he was, by reason of his great deafness, almost incapable of hearing the voices of his visiting friends, and thereby deprived of the intercourse which he so much loved. His voice, too, had also become so weak, husky, and shattered, that it was difficult to know what he said; and in this state had he to wait for many months, till the days of his appointed time should be fulfilled. He retained, however, his consciousness to the last. During his long confinement, his mind was constantly exercised with divine things; his lips expressing in broken accents the thoughts and feelings of his soul. During the earlier part of his illness, some of the members of his church occasionally went to see him, and engaged with him in private worship, Mr. D. himself taking part as long as he was able in this exercise. The writer never enjoyed this holy communion of Christian hearts, but often has he heard from the lips of those who did, how painfully sweet and how religiously solemn such meetings were. Towards the very end of his existence, only one or two of his Christian brethren were permitted to see him. Nature, after long suffering, at length yielded, and he died as he had lived, the adopted, the saved child of God, on January 9, 1823, in the seventy-third year of his age, and the fortieth of his ministry.

Long before his death, he obtained the promise of his beloved deacon, Mr. John Harvey, to see that his remains should be interred in his, Mr. H.'s burying ground, Calton. This was done. His remains were carried on the shoulders of Christian friends—members of his church—to the grave, attended by an exceedingly large number of persons whose minds were all pervaded by a strong solemn feeling, and whose demeanour was in impressive keeping with that feeling. Thousands gazed on this mournful spectacle with great and thoughtful interest, and a sentiment of universal respect towards the deceased was all-pervading and freely expressed. The company assembled at the funeral was so large as to require a number of apartments to hold them. Members of his own church were asked to join in prayer in each apartment. The following inscription is on the tombstone of his grave:—

With permission of JOHN HARVEY, Proprietor of this lair.
In Memory of
NEIL DOUGLAS, A.M.
Minister of the Gospel,
Who died on the IX. of January, MDCCCXXIII. in the Seventy-third year of his Age, and the Fortieth of his Ministry.

Also, of his Spouse,
MARY M'MORREN.
Who died on the XXIII. of August, MDCCCXXIV. in the Sixth-sixth year of her Age.

We should have mentioned, that about the time he left Edinburgh, he married a very religious woman, Mary M'Morren, by whom he had no children. She survived him only about twenty months. She was a Methodist, and always kept connexion with the Wesleyans. It is believed that Mr. D. in maintaining his own views had to bear up against much opposition of a very annoying kind constantly received from her; but he bore all this with singular patience and spirit, and yielded her, notwithstanding, the most kindly attention. This circumstance, however, prevented many of his friends from calling on him during his illness, and those who did, went on the faith of their character and religious relationship, determined not to be refused an audience with their loved, their dying pastor.

During the latter part of this illness, Mr. M'Dermid, Relief Minister, Paisley, to whom Mr. Douglas had done many valuable services, and who, notwithstanding, turned his back upon him, because of his doctrine, came to see him. But for what purpose? Serpent-like, to beguile him. What the precise nature of his conversation was we cannot tell; only he very shortly afterwards proclaimed in his pulpit that Mr. Douglas had recanted his belief in Universalism! The news spread throughout the country most rapidly. Another Relief Minister, Mr. Jamieson, Bell's Hill, Lanarkshire, proclaimed the same in his pulpit, on the authority of Mr. M'Dermid. It is quite astounding how much this circumstance became the theme of universal conversation—delightful to his foes and the foes of God's love, and most painful to his church and friends. They knew, nevertheless, that the report was false, and trumped up traitorously to extinguish the doctrine associated so much with Mr. D.'s name. It was his own brethren who had so often met and worshipped with him in private during his illness, and they all could bear testimony to the fact that so long as his tongue and voice could utter an audible syllable, he gloried in the doctrines which he had so long taught. When the slander was proclaimed, Mr. John Harvey, deacon of his church from its commencement, an old, a most upright, and singularly pious man, ever beloved most dearly by Mr. D., went along with another member and saw Mr. D., to whom they managed to communicate a knowledge of the report, which Mr. D. instantly resented with all the feeble means he then possessed of expressing his feelings. His health recovered a little afterwards, and he expressed a hope he might again be able to appear in public to refute the calumny. Meanwhile, Mr. William Worrall, a student, and member of the church, and who often filled the vacant pulpit of Mr. D., published, with the approbation of the church, two letters addressed to the two Ministers named, in which he gave them a well-merited chastisement for their unfounded slander. To this no reply was made; and, in point of fact, the false report speedily died away. It was never again echoed in any

other pulpit. The force of Mr. D.'s own character, morally, intellectually, and religiously, was sufficient of itself to belie the slanderers, and extinguish their vile intention; and it did so. Such an imputation on the fair fame of Mr. D. for many, many years has never found the faintest echo in Great Britain; though we learn that its expiring moan has lately been uttered in the United States to an excellent friend of ours, Mr. John Morrison, New York, by a clergyman once in the Relief connexion in this country, of whom better things might have been expected.

We cannot conclude this narrative without expressing our own feelings for a moment in reference to the great departed. Blessed were we in having the precious opportunity of hearing this servant of God preach in our own locality in the open air. It was at a time when Calvinism was seen and felt by us to be a most tremendous and appalling doctrine; but the new view of it propounded by Mr. D. gave it an entirely new and beautiful colouring. In process of time, we believed the gospel as taught by him, and rejoiced with gladness of heart.

Some years afterwards, a church was formed in our locality, Johnstone, Renfrewshire, which he often visited; and there are many who will never forget the religious importance of these visitations. When in this locality, the writer's house was his home; and sweet and precious indeed were the hours he spent in private with our family. Mr. D. used to lament most bitterly the faithlessness of the Clergy. Many of them he knew to be believers in his views; but they would not proclaim them from fear of worldly ruin to themselves; and some from a belief that it was not essential to proclaim the doctrine to the world. One instance of this we may give. A cousin of ours, a religious man, happened to call at our house when Mr. D. was present. This friend alluded to his having been a former member of Dr. Balfour's congregation, Glasgow, and said that the Doctor habitually dwelt on the great love of God to the human family; and that on this subject he was peculiarly interesting and grand. Mr. D. replied, that the Doctor himself was a believer in Universalism, and that hence it was he knew and felt how great was the love of God to man; but that he did not think his duty lay in preaching the doctrine of limited punishment to the people, fearing that such preaching might lead to evil. The Doctor himself admitted this to Mr. D., and hence it was that this celebrated preacher was well-known as one who never dwelt on future punishment, but had rather made himself remarkable for dwelling with singular power and interest on the love of God in Christ Jesus. Some of our Glasgow friends are aware of another meeting which took place between Mr. D. and Dr. Balfour, when the same subject was spoken of; and when, though the worthy Dr. was not then so explicit, he bowed to the force of Mr. D.'s arguments, but expressed his fear as to the licentious tendency of preaching the restoration.

Mr. Douglas knew that many clergymen sympathised with his views, and quietly wished him God speed. The writer of this can testify to the same fact; and in closing his narrative, he deeply regrets that from many causes, it is not satisfactory to himself, though truthfully told; nor indeed worthy at all of the great and remarkable Christian Minister, whose life is but too feebly and most

imperfectly pourtrayed. We here subjoin a list of some of his publications, all now out of the book market, and only found in the possession of private individuals.

Titles of the Works of Neil Douglas. A.M.

Sermons on important subjects, with some Essays in Poetry. By N. Douglas, minister of the gospel, at Cupar-Fife. Edinburgh: 1789.

A few Essays in poetry, published for the benefit of a poor family.—Edinburgh: 1790.

Strictures on the high price of provisions, the probable causes, and the most effectual remedies. In a series of letters. By a friend to the poor. Edinburgh: (without date, but apparently 1798.)

Journal of a mission to part of the Highlands of Scotland, in summer and harvest, 1797, by appointment of the Relief Synod. In a series of letters to a friend. Designed to shew the state of religion in that country. By N. Douglas, preacher of the gospel. Edinburgh. 1799.

Lavinia: a poem. And an Asiatic petition. Followed by a memoir of the author's lately deceased Spouse; with some short practical pieces. By a friend. (N. D) Edinburgh; 1799.

An antidote against Deism: in a series of letters. With an introductory letter to Mr. Vidler. By N. Douglas, minister of the gospel, at Greenock.—Edinburgh: 1802.

Slander retorted: or Lucifer's thanks to those who plead for the endless duration of his character and dominion. To which some other articles are subjoined.—Greenock: printed by and for N. Douglas. 1803.

The threatened invasion improved, with a view to the final judgment. Printed and sold by the author, N. Douglas.—Greenock. 1804.

Two Lectures delivered in Paisley, Dec. 11th. and 25th. 1805, by N. Douglas, preacher of the everlasting gospel. To which is subjoined, Strictures upon an Essay on Eternal punishment, which appeared lately in the Missionary Magazine.—Glasgow; 1806.

Messiah's proper Deity argued from Scripture: also, his atonement, and the divinity of the Holy Spirit: with a few strictures on the way of a sinner's acceptance with God, and on some Unitarian publications. By N. Douglas, preacher of the everlasting gospel, Glasgow.—Glasgow: 1807.

A reply to Mr. R. Wright's letter, addressed to the author, animadverting on his essay in behalf of Messiah's proper Deity. By N. Douglas, preacher of the gospel, Glasgow.—Greenock: printed by Scott, Abercromby and Co. 1810.

Messiah's titles, husband—redeemer, proofs of his proper Deity: three Sermons, by Neil Douglas, minister of the gospel, Glasgow.—Glasgow, 1811.

The Royal Penitent; or true repentance, exemplified in David, king of Israel. A poem: in two parts By N. Douglas, minister of the word of God.—Greenock: printed by William Scott, 1811.

The outcasts comforted A sermon by Elhanan Winchester. With a short account prefixed, of what the author [editor] hath suffered for his principles. A new edition. By N. Douglas. Glasgow: date uncertain, supposed, 1814.

King David's Psalms, in common use, with notes, critical and explanatory. By N. Douglas, minister of the gospel. Glasgow: 1815. With portrait of the author.

Strictures on the author's trial, declaration before the Sheriff, remarks on the crown evidence, and some important information, respecting the cause of Reform. By N. Douglas, minister of the gospel. Glasgow, 1818.

Tracts.

The African's Lamentation. (Poem. Without date. Supposed to be 1794 or 1795.)

Britain admonished: an extract from poems by W. Cowper, Esq., of the Inner Temple; to which is subjoined, an elegiac poem, to the memory of a deceased friend. Edinburgh. 1799.

Summary view of the evidence of Universal restoration. Glasgow: 1806.

Seasonable warning to parties who are inclining to the Unitarian system, or have already embraced it.—Price 4d.

A critical examination of 1 Cor. xv. 24—28, shewing that the Unitarian view of that passage hath no countenance from the text.—Price 3d.

The two preceding published at Glasgow, 1809, or 1810.

Extracts from a late selection from the sacred books, with some remarks, &c. No date.

The reconciliation and restoration of all things, by Jesus Christ. Extracts from sundries. Glasgow. 1814.

Thoughts on time and eternity, (a poem,) and some other articles.—Glasgow, no date. Supposed, 1817, or 1818.

Anonymous, but uniformly ascribed to Mr. Douglas.

A peep at the true telegraph; or brief thoughts on Daniel, chapter second. By a student of divinity.—Edinburgh: 1797.

A defence of Restoration; or an answer to a letter which has appeared in the Liverpool Theological Repository, September, 1807, under the signature, M. By Philanthropicos Filalethes.—1807.

Edited by Mr. Do glas:

The Vehicle of Free Inquiry, or the monthly medium of impartial discussion: intended as an antidote against the prevailing errors of the present day; with accounts of the progress of the gospel, by means of Missionary and Bible Societies, &c. Vol. i. Glasgow: 1813.

The Glasgow Universalist's Miscellany. Vol. ii. Glasgow: 1814.

Connected with Mr. Douglas:

Two letters: the one addressed to Mr. M'Dermid, minister, Paisley; and the other to Mr. Jamieson, minister at Bell's Hill, on the reported recantation of Mr. N. Douglas. [By William Worrall.] Glasgow: 1822.

Sermon delivered at the Universalist Church, Glasgow, January 19th, 1823, in consequence of the demise of Neil Douglas, V. D. M. By William Worrall. Glasgow: 1823.

NOTE.

Mr. Fraser having been obliged to embark for the United States of America, without leaving his intended list of Mr. Douglas' publications, the task of drawing it up has devolved on Dr. Thom. That gentleman has endeavoured to make the catalogue as complete as possible, from the materials which were put into his hands.

Dr. Thom begs to suggest the two following alterations in the preceding narrrative:—

1. Instead of Cupar-Angus, read Cupar-Fife.
2. Instead of "Sir H. Miller," &c., read "William Millar, Esq., of Starr." The name of Mrs. Douglas' half-brother was William, he having borne the same name as his father. See Mr. Douglas' dedication, prefixed to the "Glasgow Universalist's Miscellany," Vol. ii. 1814.

Dr. Thom also suggests, in order to render one of the preceding paragraphs thoroughly intelligible, that the "British Convention" which was broken up by Provost Elder, sat at Edinburgh, in December, 1793; and that the trials of Messrs. Muir, Fysche Palmer, Skirving, Margarot and Gerrald, for sedition, occurred at Edinburgh, in 1793, and 1794. Mr. Mealmaker's took place some years afterwards.

A list of the leading reformers of 1793, 4, including Mr. Douglas, will be found in the parody on the well-known Scotch song, "Fy, let us a' to the weddin'," generally ascribed to Dr. Drennan.

REVIEW.

The Christian doctrine of future punishments; By Andrew George Moller, A. B. *To which are subjoined two letters addressed to the author, with observations on the Apocalypse:* By the late Dr. Joseph Stopford, Ex. S.F.—T.C.D.; *and notes in the margin of a tract entitled, "The Doctrine of Universal Restoration examined and refuted."* By Daniel Isaac. Published for the author by Rowe and Norman, Examiner Office, Clarence Street, Cheltenham. May be had of all booksellers. Price 1s. 1848.

Another specimen of that clear, pointed, and scholarlike mode of writing, which is so characteristic of Mr. Moller.

He says in his preface, which was composed in 1848:—

"The following little work has been written about twenty-two years, and though never printed, occasionally communicated in MS. copies. When I began the inquiry, I did not know that any thing worth reading had been written on the subject, since the days of the Apostles; and as I could only be satisfied by testimonies from Holy Writ, I did not inquire for the opinions of others. Yet I afterwards incidentally read

the tedious but interesting work of Stonehouse, whose mind, held down in the chains and darkness of the Apocalypse, had vainly endeavoured to vindicate the attributes and character of the Almighty."

We have so recently drawn attention to the high qualifications and character of Mr. Moller, as exhibited especially in certain publications of his, that it is scarcely necessary for us to do much more than express our conviction, in reference to the present pamphlet, that it fully sustains his previously well-earned literary reputation. Its exposure of the popular dogma of never-ending torments, is simple, searching, and scriptural. Its notes learned and most valuable. And its whole tone calm, candid, moderate, and dignified. No competently educated individual can fail to rise from the perusal of it, without having experienced feelings of the most pleasing description.

Respecting the alleged inconsistencies, falsehood, and mere human origin of the Apocalypse, we claim the right to differ from the learned author, and his German coadjutors. The Book of Revelation appears to us to be both genuine and authentic. To our mind it approves itself as a portion of the inspired Canon of Scripture. With such a man as Mr Moller, however, we can afford, although decidedly, yet most affectionately, as to a matter of this kind, to disagree.

How refreshing the thorough honesty and truthfulness which pervade a production like this! D. T.

MR WILLIAM UPJOHN.

The following passage contained in a letter recently addressed to the writer of this, by Mr. Whitmarsh, of Melbury Abbas, Dorset, is so creditable, at once to our venerable correspondent, and to the deceased subjectof it, that we cannot resist the inclination to transfer it to our columns:—

"Nov. 30, 1851.

"I see in one of the Reviews in "The Universalist" for this month, that you have referred to that most valuable servant of God, the late Mr. Wm. Upjohn. What is said of him there is strictly true. I hope it will not be considered out of place, if I make a few remarks respecting my connexion with that dear man of God, for about twenty years. In the thirtieth year of my age,* a separation took place between the Old Wesleyans and myself, for preaching the righteousness of Christ, or what they called Calvinist doctrine: and about the same time, Mr. Upjohn was rejected by the Dissenters; so that he had no place to preach in. I then invited him to speak in my small chapel at Cam. After a time, Mr. Upjohn rented a house in Shaftesbury, and we all joined together, and fitted it up for a chapel. Our united efforts continued, till just before Mr. Upjohn saw Relly's letters,† when some unpleasant circumstances took place, which occasioned a final separation between us. Had not this occurred, we should have accompanied him to America. Several of our valued friends, who are now in heaven, laboured to heal the breach. But without effect. And this useful servant of God left England quite suddenly—we never having had an opportunity of seeing each other again. This I deeply regret. Mr. Upjohn died on the 26th of August, 1847, just one month before I lost my beloved partner in life."

Let us hope, that, like the kindred dispute between Paul and Barnabas, the misunderstanding in question was rendered subservient to the making known of the glad tidings of God's universal love, on scripture principles, in two places, instead of its being confined to one.

D. T.

REV. DR. THOM, OF LIVERPOOL.

The Rev. Mr. Drew, Editor of the "Gospel Banner," United States, who, during his recent visit to our shores, had an opportunity of meeting and conversing with Dr. Thom, of Liverpool, thus records his impressions:—

It was our pleasure, while in Liverpool, to pass a Sabbath's service with Dr. Thom—the pastor of the only Universalist Church in that city—the only one,

* About 1806 † Somewhere about 1825.

we believe, in the United Kingdom. By this we do not mean that Universalism is not preached elsewhere in England, indeed, it is in many churches. Not a few even of the Church of England ministers themselves hold to this doctrine and advance it in their discourses. Many of the best men of that Church in all time, have been believers in the ultimate triumphs of divine grace in the salvation of the entire family of man. So of preachers of other denominations. But Universalism as a *distinctive* sentiment, is hardly known in England; it is not thought that it is necessary for it to take this distinctive form. Men and women, and even ministers all over the kingdom, may believe in, enjoy, and avow it, and yet lose no cast, or forfeit religious fellowship. This is one reason, no doubt, why there are few or no Dissenting Societies in England which erect the standard of Universalism as the central principle of their religious system, and admit none in their communions but such as hold to it as the first and leading matter of faith.

Dr. Thom is a Universalist. No man rejoices in or urges with more fervour the doctrine of the final salvation of the whole intelligent family of man, *through the grace given us in Christ Jesus our Lord*, than that great and good man. He may have his peculiarities of faith—who has them not?—but he is as learned a man as our denomination can boast of; and as good a Christian man as there is in the world. Such is his reputation in Liverpool, and all over Great Britain and Scotland where he is known. His views are more evangelical than those of many of the American Universalists. He does not admit man's natural right to salvation, by the immortality of his nature; but he affirms that salvation is a matter, exclusively, of divine mercy and grace —wholly undeserved, unmerited,—and that for it we are entirely indebted to the grace of God as it shines gloriously in the wonderful plan of redemption, whereby it became necessary for Jesus Christ to die an offering for sin. With mere Socinianism he has no fellowship. The Rationalism of Germany and the United States he repudiates with a Scotch abhorrence.

The Sabbath on which we worshipped the God of all Nations and the Father of all Flesh with him, was August 21. It proved to be a rainy day, and the congregation was not large—but appeared devout, and highly respectable. His Chapel is in Bold Street. It is an old edifice, with galleries on three sides, and a high old fashioned oaken pulpit. The Society are building him a new and a large house of worship in another part of the city. We should like to be present at its dedication. Evidently his congregation are not gathered together to have their ears tickled, but to have their understandings enlightened, and their hearts baptized into the spirit of Christ.

As out of the pulpit he is respected and beloved, so in it he is revered. He is about sixty years old, of commanding form, and dignified bearing, and has a decided look of Scotch honesty and earnestness. He is a Scotchman by birth and education. His learning is various and profound. We were pleased with the manner of his conducting the services from the pulpit. First, he opened an old Scotch Psalm (not Hymn) Book, which contained a most literal versification of David's Psalms in rhyme and metre, but utterly without any sectarian sentiments other than appears in the original text itself. He gave out the number to a small choir that surrounded the organ, and as he read line by line he made a running commentary as he proceeded. Indeed, he expounded the *versified* Psalm, comparing Scripture as he went along, with the same readiness and freedom that he would elucidate the original Psalm itself, were he reading it from the Bible. And in this exposition he brought out vast funds of learned criticism and improvement, which made mere reading of the Psalm a most instructive and interesting service. This taught the people *what were the sentiments of praise* which they would be called upon to sing; and so they were prepared to "sing [it] with the *spirit* and the understanding *also*." The choir struck, assisted by the organ, and one volume of praise went up from the whole congregation. It was congregational singing. The people participating in the worship. It was solemn

and affecting. He then offered as an earnest and comprehensive extempore prayer—the congregation *rising*—the new American fashion of *sitting* in the pews as listeners and spectators, not having yet crossed the water and reached Liverpool. After prayer he read a few verses from Isaiah, 49th chapter, which were compared with a portion of Romans 8th, and constituted another running commentary from the Scriptures of great interest and beauty. Then he read another Psalm, much as he read the first, and it was sung congregationally. His sermon which followed was on the subject of Regeneration. It was extemporaneous—able and earnest. We saw nothing in the doctrine to object to. It was all true and useful. He is certainly a ready speaker, very fluent in the use of the purest language, and speaks with an earnestness that impresses you. Above all, he discharges his duty in the spirit of his Master. We wish he were better acquainted with the American brethren, and they with him.

After the service, he invited Br. Hemphill and ourself, with several leading members of his Society into his Pastoral room in rear of the pulpit, where we found a beautiful study, warmed by a coal fire, carpeted and having a Library. Here we enjoyed an interview of an hour or two. His second service was not to be till 7 o'clock; he urged us to preach for him, at that time, and after service accompany him to his residence at Edge Hill and take dinner with him at 8 1-2 o'clock. Having designed, however, to hear Mr. Martineau in the P. M., and having to write a communication for the Banner in the evening it was impossible for us to accept of his kind invitations—either to preach or to dine. We arranged however to see him the next day.

While in Br. Thom's vestry room, he endeavoured to explain to us the peculiarity of his doctrinal views,—lamented that he had not been better understood in America—especially that Br. Whittemore should have spoken of him as he has done—"not indeed," said he, "that Br. W.'s reviews had given him (Br. T.) any uneasiness, or created the least unkindness towards him." All he asked was, that if his views were wrong, they should be examined in a brotherly spirit, and their error pointed out and exposed. No one would be more pleased or thankful than he. He spoke respectfully of some of Br. T. Sawyer's reviews of his Works. He also expressed high respect and affection for Brs. Ballou, Balfour, Balch, and other American brethren. He said he is not strictly a Trinitarian, but, as near as we can recollect, affirmed it as his belief that Jehovah is the *self-existent;* that God is the manifestation of Jehovah, in the flesh, which is Christ; and the Holy Spirit is the operation of both upon the soul of man to sanctify and save it. He seemed to us like one of the good, learned, old-fashioned, Calvinistic Universalists—like Winchester, Murray, Chauncey, Huntington, &c., and that he *ought not to* be neglected or disfellowshipped by his American brethren, because, in modern times the Unitarians of this country had succeeded in impressing their American likeness upon our denominational body. At least, *we* have always held that Universalists should fellowship all Christian believers in the common salvation, whether they held to Calvinistic or Arminian views, whether they believed in the trinity or unity, whether they held to the doctrine of future or no future punishment.

If they affirm and preach the final triumphs of God and of Christ in the salvation of all men, we would receive and defend them as brethren. But we think Br. W. has not spoken of Dr. Thom with that sympathy and fellowship which he ought to have from America, standing as he does alone, as the *only* Universalist in England, without one denominational brother in the ministry to encourage and sustain him. We felt it our duty to say to Br. Thom, that whatever his views were—and we could not say they were not right till we understood them better—he had *our* love and fellowship; and we felt as good a right as any other American Editor to say to him that he *has* the affectionate regards and the religious fellowship of a vast majority of the Universaalists of this country.

It happened that on Monday we missed seeing Dr. Thom, he having been called out of town to attend professionally the sick bed of a friend. The next day our ship hauled out of Dock into the river Mersey. It rained violently and the wind blew a gale. Br. Thom came down to see us in the storm, but could not reach the ship, consequently we could not see him again, but he forthwith wrote us a very brotherly letter and deposited it in the Liverpool Post Office, which reached Augusta before we did, so that a salutation from him was amongst our first greetings at home.—*Gospel Banner, Oct.* 25, 1851.

Dr. Thom begs us to say, that there is a slight, but perfectly unintentional mistake, in what Mr. Drew has said regarding his, Dr. T.'s views of the Trinity. Dr. T., in his services that forenoon, discoursing from John iii. 1—6, had spoken most decidedly of the Deity of the Lord Jesus, and of regeneration as consisting in the communication by him, through faith, of the earnes, of the divine nature. *Born of water, and of the Spirit*, he had defined to meant having the conscience washed from guilt by Christ's blood as by water, and having the first fruits of new-creation imparted by the power of the Spirit of Christ risen and glorified. When Messrs. Drew and Hemphill entered his vestry, announced themselves as American Universalists, and yet expressed decided acquiesence in what he had been saying, he both felt and looked astonished. He entered at once into conversation with the two gentlemen. Their talk was long, open, and friendly. To Dr. Thom's increased astonishment, the more they conversed, Messrs. Drew and Hemphill expressed themselves in a way of acquiesence in evangelical doctrines, which he was not prepared for. This delighted him. It induced him to urge Mr. Drew to officiate for him in the evening. It induced him to urge the two gentlemen's coming to his house the following day to talk over matters more at large. And it induced him to declare that he was far from being an out-and-out supporter of scholastic notions of the Trinity. He certainly drew attention to Jehovah-Aleim—the one glorious being,—viewed as both the *self-existent*, and the *self-manifest one.* To God as Jehovah-manifest, not in flesh merely, but throughout everlasting ages.—Not exactly as reported, then, but nearly so, did Dr. Thom express himself on this subject. Mr. Drew has evidently been most truthful, so far as his memory served him, in stating what he heard. But some things have been forgotten. The interview for the following day was solicited, specially with a view to their becoming better acquainted with each other's sentiments as to this all-important subject of the Deity of the Lord Jesus, as well as the Deity of the Holy Ghost.

POETRY.

EMMAUS,

OR THE REMEMBRANCE OF HOURS BLESSED BY COMMUNION WITH JESUS.

O blessed Lord! when we recall
  Hours brightened by thy gracious smile,
We long to live them o'er again,
  And feel a holy joy the while.

We feel like those disciples, Lord,
  Who saw Thee vanish from their sight,
And knowing who their guest had been,
  Said to each other in delight:—

"Did not our hearts within us burn
  "The while his holy voice we heard?
"While he talked with us by the way,
  "And opened God's all-blessed word?"

To them, Lord Jesus, it was sweet
  To think of hours so blessed by Thee:
'T was a bright break in sorrow's cloud,
  A sun-gleam on *their* stormy sea.

Emmaus to their souls was dear,
  And dear the way which thither led,
And dear the lowly dwelling, where
  They saw Thee bless and break the bread.

And we have our Emmaus, Lord,
  To which our thoughts with rapture turn:
And oh! while memory tracks the road
  How do our hearts within us burn!

We have some hours divinely sweet,
  Hours blessed O Lamb of God! by Thee:
Bright breaks they are in sorrows cloud,
  Glad sun-gleams on *our* stormy sea!

Glad—for their brightness is the truth
  That Thou art ours, and we are thine.
Thou, ours in death,—we, thine in life,
  The endless life of bliss divine!

Glad—for we have thy special love:
  Glad—for a love-saved world we see;
For as in Adam *all* have died,
  All shall be made alive in Thee!

THE GULF FILLED UP!

The Rev. George Bates gives in the "Gospel Banner" the following reminiscence of a sermon delivered by an aged Calvinist minister, who contrasted the doctrine of Calvinism with Universalism in no measured terms of zeal. This ardent preacher stated he "did not profess to know the effect of Universalism upon his own heart and life; for he had never believed it. He was kind enough to say, there were many plausible arguments in favour of the doctrine, and if true, it would afford him great satisfaction and delight to believe it. He deemed it altogether preferable to Calvinism. But said he, 'there is one insuperable objection to Universalism which must for ever prevent me from embracing it, and that is the great gulf between the rich man and Lazarus. Build me a bridge over this gulf, and I will be a Universalist at once.' This was uttered with an air of triumph, as though he had presented an unanswerable argument against the doctrine he was opposing, and he closed his discourse."

In the afternoon of the same day, it was Mr. Bates' duty to speak to the people, and knowing that they were holding fast the remark about "the bridge over the gulf," "At the close of my sermon, I observed that I was not architect enough to plan a bridge of any considerable dimensions, or mechanic enough to build one after it was planned. But I would endeavour to present that venerable father a substitute which would be vastly better and much more safe than a bridge. I would show him from the divine testimony, that the gulf *would be filled up*! I then quoted from the prophet, "Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain; the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.' If the gentleman contended for a *literal* gulf, I had as good a right to consider the prophecy alluded to as strictly *literal*; and if so, then the gulf would exist no longer. In fact it was annihilated. And now that I had made the whole distance *terra firma*, affording him a plain and easy way, would he accept it instead of a bridge and yield the point? In other words, would he become a Universalist, and walk upon the king's highway without danger?

THE SAFE SIDE.

"Truly," said Doubting, "you Universalists seem to be very happy. Your doctrine is very pleasing; and, to tell the truth, I should like to believe in it, and be a happy Universalist. But I reckon, it's always best to be on the safe side. If you are right, I am safe enough; but if you are wrong, our system makes your case desperate indeed. So I think I will keep my faith, and be safe"

Once on a time, as tales usually begin, two men went a fishing. A. had a good substantial boat, that admitted no water, and B. was in a leaky old canoe which would hardly sustain its own weight. A. caught fish in abundance, and had before him the prospect of a rich repast; but B. had no time for fishing. It took all his time to bail his crazy boat, and keep it above water.

"Truly, said he, "neighbour A. you are very happy there. You have got a good boat, and are taking fish finely. To tell the truth, I should like right well to be in your boat, but I reckon it's best to be on the safe side. If my boat sinks I can get into yours, and I know you have caught enough for us both. So I will stay where I am. If this boat goes down, yours will save me, but if yours sink your case will be desperate Your fish and boat are gone, my boat will not hold you, and as for fish I have none for myself."

The last we saw of poor B. he was bailing the old boat, and enduring the pangs of hunger, for the purpose of being safe. "Whoso readeth let him understand."

L. D. W.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Dear Sir.—Your correspondent, "Un tout seul," in replying in your present Number, to my argument in favour of the affirmative of the question—whether or not any who shall have previously died and risen again shall die the second death, makes the following remark:—"Respecting the 'risen dead,' my esteemed brother J. N. B.'s argument goes on the principle of a very unhappy translation of Rev. xx. 15, as though it stated a *positive* certain doctrine of the dead being raised to be cast alive into the lake of fire, for he says—'*all of them*, &c. as if there were a *number*, not to say a *multitude*. Whereas neither the English nor Greek text will allow of this: the *English* version, bad as it is, *confines* itself to the grammatical unit, *singular* number—but the *Greek* makes it quite an *uncertainty* that even *one* was so found."

In reply to this, I beg to observe, that though in declaring what would take place under such and such circumstances, should they occur, *hypothesis* is right and proper: not only would there be *no propriety in it*, but there would be *no opportunity for it*, in the Apostle's narration in Rev. xx. 15, of what he saw in vision. Now he could not in vision, any more than in his waking moments, see *hypothetical persons or acts;* nor was he *speculating* as to what *would* take place in this or that case, but simply *observing* what *did* take place. Supposing your correspondent to have been in Paris during the recent outbreak, and in writing an account of what he saw, to have expressed himself thus:—"If any one was found with arms in his hands, he was arrested immediately;"—of course he would have been understood as meaning, that *some were* so found, and that *every one* so found, was so treated; and not as merely *speculating* as to *probable* or even *certain consequences* of being so found, should it occur. So that I submit that your correspondent's critique upon the words "εὑρίς," by no means affects my argument, which I repeat—The risen dead were judged out of the books: *all of them* who were not found in the book of life, suffered the *second death*, by being cast into the lake of fire—therefore, *some of the risen dead* suffered the *second death*.

I remain, dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
I. N. B.

Weston-super-Mare, 12th Dec. 1851.

To the Editor of "The Universalist."

Sir,—Will your readers accept the following as the beginning of truth. See Psalm. lxxviii. 2.

The parables or fables of our Lord teach us, that this world is as a stage on which the actions of men are for signs of the ways of God—they teaching us "what the kingdom of heaven is like." For Man was created to image God, as a son images the father. Hence Adam was the son of God, of whom came Eve, who is for a figure, or sign, or image, a symbol of the Church, the mother of us all. From her sprang Abel; who teaches us that the life given to carnal man, נכש, is but as a shadow or vapour that passeth away. Cain, we are expressly told, Gen. iv. 1, is for a sign or representation of the spirit of that law by which the carnal life of Man is taken away for he is איש את הזה; which is to say, the man is for a sign or image of Jehovah, the giver of the law; he being, as to the Spirit, the very Jehovah—the jealous God, or *brother*; as in the parable of the prodigal son; and as is figured by Jonah. After these it is written Adam begat a son in his own likeness, and after his own image, (who is the image of the Father,) and called his name Seth—which was to signify, God hath appointed another Son, (even Christ, a spiritual Son, whose blood should atone for the sin of Cain—for his blood speaketh better things than the blood of Abel,) and he shall be in the place of Abel. And Seth begat Enos, or Enoch, who walked in all things according to the perfect law of God. This marks the time when the Sons of men shall worship God in spirit and in truth. Gen. iv. 25: and v. 3.

Behold, then, how "the world is a stage, and every man and woman a player," teaching us what the kingdom of heaven is like. For saith the Spirit which begat man, The children thou hast given me are for signs and wonders.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
J Wapshare.

WILL YOU ANSWER?

1. As we are required to love our enemies, may we not safely infer that God loves *His* enemies? If God loves his enemies, will He punish them more than will be for their good? Would endless punishment be for the good of any being?

2. If God hates his enemies, why should we love our enemies? Are we required to be better than our God? If God loves those only who love Him, in what respect is he better than the sinner? Luke vi. 32, 33.

3. As we are forbidden to be overcome of evil, can we safely suppose that God will ever be overcome of evil? Would not the infliction of endless punishment prove that God had been overcome of evil?

4. If man does wrong in returning evil for evil, would not God do wrong were He to return evil for evil? Would not the infliction of endless punishment be proof positive that God was returning evil for evil?

5. Will not an infinitely good God do the best He possibly can for the whole human family? Would not the infliction of endless punishment be the very worst that God can do for any being in the universe?

6. As we are commanded to overcome evil with good, may we not safely infer that God will do the same? Would the infliction of never-ending punishment be overcoming evil with good?

7. Is God "without variableness or even the shadow of turning?" If God loves His enemies *now*, will he not *always* love them? If God will always love his enemies, will he not always seek their good?

8. Is it just for God to love His enemies, and be "kind to the unthankful and the evil," in the present life? Would it be unjust for Him to exercise the same love and kindness toward them in the future state?

9. Would it be merciful in God to inflict endless punishment? That is, would it be merciful to the sufferer? Can that be just which is not merciful? Can that be merciful which is not just? Do not cruelty and injustice go hand in hand?

10. Does divine justice demand the infliction of pain from which mercy recoils? Does the mercy of God require anything which His justice refuses to grant?

11. Does not mercy plead for the salvation of all mankind? If any other attribute of Deity pleads for a different result, why should the pleadings of mercy be set aside?

12. If the demands of the justice of God are opposed to the requirements of His mercy, is he not divided against Himself? If the requirements of His *mercy* are opposed to the demands of His justice, how can His kingdom stand? Mark iii. 24.

A. C. T.

ERRATA.

Page 6, (Index) 14th line from bottom, for "Sir John Stonehouse," read "Sir George Stonehouse."

Page 292, line 8th of Correspondence, instead of "in my friend's hearing," read "On my friend's having."

Page 293, line 31st from top, for "ever-existing," read "once-existing."

Page 342, line 12th from bottom, for "confidence," read "affection."

Page 358, 13th line from top, for "Sheriff of Glasgow," read "Sheriff of Lanarkshire."

Additions to the list of Neil Douglas' works, page 363: "The Duty of Pastors, particularly respecting the Lord's Supper: a Synod Sermon. To which is added Dialogues on the Duty of Frequent Communicating, &c. with Answers to Objections made to that Primitive Practice. 1797." Also, "Britain's Guilt, Danger, and Duty: several Sermons from Isaiah xxvi. 8. A Monitory Address to Britain, &c. 1795."

Page 365, 10th line from top, for "cast," read "caste."

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01029 3746