

BX

9947

.S4

A5

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL  
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL  
LIBRARY



From the collection  
of the  
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL  
SOCIETY

**REVIEW**

OF THE

**SERPENT UNCOILED:**

OR OF THE

**FULL LENGTH PORTRAIT OF  
UNIVERSALISM.**

---

BY REV. J. AIKEN.

---

**INDIANAPOLIS:**

INDIANA STATE JOURNAL STEAM PRESS PRINT.

1848.

BX  
9947  
.54  
A5

## P R E F A C E .

---

The following pages are a REVIEW of a book which is small in compass, but, like most of kindred productions, it is great in pretensions, sophistry, and absurdities. Its greatness cannot be better illustrated than by the expression of an old lady when complaining of her health: "Oh!" said she, "I am *powerful* weak."

Such a blustering display of high pretensions as we find in the commencement of the *Serpent Uncoiled*, would induce one, who should put confidence in it to believe that the author had completely exploded the whole universal system. It was published by the tract society at Philadelphia, and duly revised and prepared for the press by the committee of publication; and in order that the ruin of Universalism might be complete, the editor has added his "notes" to this "standard work," against Universalism.— But this Review is designed to show that this doctrine is not yet completely used up by our anonymous author, although he is declared to be "thoroughly acquainted with the arguments" of its defenders, and that he has met and refuted them *all!* It will be seen however, that this author was not inspired by *truth alone*, when he wrote his serpentine work, which evidently was not designed to pass through the hands of any other reviewer than of the "committee," and of the prejudiced and superficial reader; ignorance and prejudice being two powerful patrons of all adcapandum writers.

The arguments of our author are given in his own lan-

guage, and at full length, so that his "portrait" of Universalism may be seen by the reader of this Review, even if he should not see the original Serpent.

Universalism is invulnerable to the serpent fangs of partialism, but the subtle poison has often penetrated the sympathetic heart of humanity. This Review is designed to show that the glad tidings of universal grace, is the sovereign balm of the great Physician—the only remedy that will *heal* the wounded spirit, and save us from the miseries of the religion of damnation.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

---

## CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SUBJECT:—Title of the work—its appropriateness—like the serpent, it prefers concealment—like its great prototype, the serpent in Eden, it appeals to woman—the opposition to universalism sustained, not by the Bible nor reason, but by slander, falsehood, and such characters as Mathew Hale Smith—the author's mistake in applying the term *serpent* to Universalism—it applies more justly to Partialism.

## CHAPTER II.

The beauty of Eden—a graphic description—the havoc made by the serpent in Eden—Universalism and Partialism contrasted—the latter shown to be the serpent's doctrine—the fall—the penalty—the doctrine of the "strongest motives" examined—something about the devil, and angels that "fell" from heaven—evil to be overruled for good.

## CHAPTER III.

SECTION 1. Partialism teaches that God will perpetuate sin and misery eternally—the Bible and Universalism teach their final destruction—difference between best and worst men in this life, will not justify an infinite and eternal difference in the future life—God our Father—cannot inflict endless misery upon his creatures—God is love—is just—

“Had not God sent his son to redeem the world, eternal death would have justly been the doom of all Adam’s race. \* \* \* \* Like Adam, we too are in a state of probation—of trial—and if found faithful, will be admitted into the celestial paradise.”

Does the Omnioient have to put man on this state of ‘probation, of trial,’ in order to *ascertain* whether or not he is worthy of the ‘celestial paradise?’ and if the ‘*trial*’ is here on earth, why not also the judgment and retribution? ‘Had not God sent his son’—what would have been the consequence? The layman answers: ‘*Eternal death would have justly been the doom of all Adam’s race!*’ But this is admitting that it depends on what *God* does, what doom justice requires for ‘Adam’s race.’

enly enjoyments now. But you, who have a knowledge of the true faith, and 'are saved' by grace, from the vices that others practice, are more highly favored and gifted than they, in a moral and intellectual point of view; and do you suppose, on this account, you are to be heaven's *eternal* favorites? And in addition to this, must you have others entirely *excluded* from his favor? Must you be the companions of angels and they the sport of cruel devils, and of such saints as Tertulian, eternally? O 'vanity of vanities!'

The wicked are deprived of the heavenly enjoyments of truth and virtue here,

'Which the men of grace *have* found;'

and, like David, may be confined in the very dungeon of the lowest hell, by the 'everlasting chains of moral darkness,' starve to death, morally, for want of the bread of life, without one drop of the sweet waters of salvation to cool their tongues ('which are set on fire of hell') while tormented in the flames of evil passions. But let us not say that they must be shut up, eternally, in the abodes of infinite horror, on this account; but remember that it is God that maketh *us* to differ from the vilest of the vile.

In speaking of the 'wicked Sodomites and Antedeluvians,' our author says: 'If all go immediately to heaven when they die, then were these criminals *rewarded*—not punished.' We admit



that it was merciful in God ; (this is his manner of dealing with sinners) and it was a blessing—not a *reward*—to those miserable creatures to be swept from the earth, as they were. Every sinner, who, by the grace of God, comes to repentance and knowledge of the truth, goes *immediately* to heaven, as we have already shown. But who would it benefit to send those poor souls to an *endless* hell, who were so unfortunately organized, or so unfavorably situated, that they lived and died such miserable sinners ? Would it do God, Christ, or the angels and saints in heaven any good to see them roast and writhe, or hear their eternal wail, or even to witness their agony one hour ? I have heard it said—and it is impious enough to make *devils* shudder—that God will laugh and mock at the calamity and infernal fear of those in hell, and such saints as Tertullian was anticipated the sport!

Which is the most reasonable to suppose that God will make ‘these vile wretches’ holy and happy, and fit for ‘heaven as soon, as the breath is out of their bodies,’ or keep them as wicked as devils and as miserable as hell can make them eternally ?

We come, now, to page 46, which commences thus : ‘But stop a moment.’ Agreed. And well might our author have paused in this place for a little sober reflection. And in order that we may keep as near together as possible, in word—not in spirit—we will also adopt the language that he

here unjustly applies to Universalism, which, by the addition of a parenthesis or two, and by exchanging a few words, of which we will leave out the quotation marks, will then apply to the author's own doctrine, where it belongs.

“Supposing that all mankind believed that every one (who repents any time before death) goes straight to heaven the moment the breath is out of his body, would conscience be very troublesome to them think you? Would it whisper to them fearful things about the worm that never dies? Would it *alarm them* by telling them of the Judgment day, and of the awful sentence, ‘Depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire?’ NOT AT ALL. Nothing of the kind would conscience whisper to those.” (For the *fear of hell* does not deter men from crime, because they expect, by means of repentance, to escape its everlasting burnings.) “On the contrary, it would tell them that they will be safe from all punishment (here and) hereafter, and will go right to heaven when they die, though they have robbed the widow and the orphan of their last crust, and steeped their hands to their elbows in innocent blood.

\* \* \* \* “Would it be intolerably agonizing to the villain to believe that after he has reveled [almost] all his life long upon gains he has procured by blood and crime, that, [if he but repents in time] he will go immediately to heaven when he dies, there to enjoy endless happiness, and not a question be asked him about his sins.”

Our author seems to think that the fear of an

endless hell is what constitutes or forms the conscience ; and professors are heard saying, 'If I believed Universalism, I would not care what I did ; I would take my fill of sin !' But I take the position, and am prepared to show, that this insensibility of a remorseless conscience is a worse condition than all the *pain* that flesh and soul can feel !

If, as our author seems to think, the more wicked a person becomes, the less remorse, and the less punishment he receives ; and if there is pleasure in sin, as hell is a place of eternal sinning, according to Orthodoxy, hell will not be such a miserable place after all ! There pleasure will be found in abundance, if orthodoxy is true.

#### SECTION IV.

Section 4th of "The Serpent Uncoiled" gives the following as proof of endless misery :

"There is not a nation, or tribe of men, however wild or savage, of which we have any account, and who have any notion of the future state, who do not believe in the endless punishment of the wicked. They differ as widely as possible as to what will constitute the happiness of the one, or the misery of the other : yet all agree that it will be endless and infinitely greater than anything that can be endured in this life."

'Endless and *infinitely* greater ?' And is this

according to the justice of that God who requires *us* to *bless* those that curse us, and do *good* for evil, that we may be like him? What a horrid idea! What a '*wild* and SAVAGE' idea, which our christian author believes in common with those '*wild and savage*' barbarians! And yet, however '*wild and savage*,' it is still taught, even in this christian land, and in this enlightened age of the world! In a *christian* land, or in the christian religion, or in the christian's mind, it is 'the abomination that maketh desolate, standing where it ought not'—in the holy place which should be dedicated to the one God and Father of all.

Well may Partialists appeal to the heathen oracles for such a cruel dogma, for the Bible offers no proof of it, and all creation cries aloud, in bold denial of such a monstrous doctrine. But our author only makes the assertion; he has not attempted to *prove* that the heathens *all* 'agreed that future punishment will be endless and infinitely greater in degree than any thing that can be experienced in this life.' Partialist christians believe in a worse than a pagan hell!

Our author inquires how we are to account for the '*fact*' (?) that all heathendom believe in the Orthodox hell, 'except by believing that God has impressed this important truth upon their consciences in some way?' If it were true, it *should* be '*impressed*' upon the conscience of every hu-

man being, in such a manner that none could doubt its reality. If true, it should have been written, 'In the beginning God created the heavens, earth,' and HELL! It should have been proclaimed at the dawn of that day, when man was first exposed to temptation, by God's forbidden fruit, and from thence recorded for the instruction and warning of all his posterity. And when the murderous Cain exclaimed, in view of being a 'fugitive and a vagabond *in the earth*,' for his crimes, 'My punishment is greater than I can bear'—what time more appropriate for him to be told of that HELL, with its EVERLASTING BURNINGS? Why was not even a hint given of such an awful penalty when that long list of *earthly* curses were enumerated in the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy? What would be said of a legislature that should make the most cruel death, by tortures the most excruciating, the penalty for a very diminutive crime, and which it knew would be committed by multitudes of the people thus subjected, and not even *publish* that penalty? ¶Infinitely *worse* does Partialism make the Grrat Supreme! for it is conceded by Partialists themselves, that the doctrine of endless misery is not taught in the Old Testament, and Peter declared that God had spoken the "restitution of all things by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Acts 3. The Great Teacher himself declared that it was "writ-

ten in the prophets that all should be taught of God:" and *this is eternal life*. See John 1:3, and 6:45.

Paul, who 'never shunned to declare the whole counsel of God,' is as silent as the voiceless tomb, in regard to such a penalty as a death of endless *torture*, for the word hell is not to be found in all of the fourteen books of the New Testament, of which he is the author. Not even once. If it had been in the counsel of God, he would not thus have shunned to mention it in some appropriate connection:—for instance where he speaks of the resurrection of the dead. He says he *hopes*—and he both desires and expects, "that there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust," Surely, the benevolent Paul could not have *desired* the resurrection of the unjust, if he had believed that resurrection would be to them an eternal curse; and he who never shunned to declare the whole counsel of God, would have surely told all he knew about it in this very place.

Again, (1 Cor. 15,) he speaks of the resurrection of all who die—in Adam, in corruption, weakness, dishonor, as an introduction into a state of incorruption, honor, glory, and spirituality IN CHRIST. ["He that is in Christ is a new creature."] He says, "as in Adam *all* die, even so IN CHRIST shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order," viz: 1st. Christ the first fruits:

and 2d. Afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming; and third and lastly: then cometh the end." No other order is mentioned by him who "never shunned to declare the whole counsel of God."

John, also, in the last book of the New Testament, points to a period, when the whole intelligent creation, without one discordant voice, shall unite in the praises of God and the Lamb. All that are in heaven and earth—all that are buried under the earth and in the briny deep, shall swell this sublime concert of thanksgiving and praise. —Rev. 5: 13.

This glorious consummation, which is so plainly indicated throughout the Bible, is also taught to the christian by what is indelibly 'impressed' upon a benevolent and feeling heart. A desire for the salvation of all is the holiest incense that arises from the altar of prayer. All the holiest sympathies and God-like desires of humanity are in favor of Universalism. And are such indications to be disregarded, and more reliance put upon a barbarian notion, on account of its prevalence among 'wild and savage' tribes of men? The author asks, 'how shall we account for this' prevalence of the notion of endless misery among those benighted tribes of earth? Account for it from the fact that they are ignorant, superstitious and degraded heathen savages. With them, doubtless, the doc-

trine originated, but we have yet to learn that *their* believing it is a good reason why a christian should believe this *monster* of *all* absurdities!

“It is true,” says our author in the conclusion of this section, “that in this christian land there are many who *profess* to disbelieve the doctrine of future punishment; but conscience could never have taught them this, [what?] for it requires a long effort before any [prejudiced] one can divest himself of the belief of future punishment; and it is doubtful whether any ever believed the doctrine so thoroughly that doubts of its truth did not frequently arise.”

Undoubtedly our author is correct in regard to ‘doubts that frequently arise’ in the minds of all who believe in future punishment, and we will give him credit for speaking the truth here, although he did it through a mistake! He is here in the predicament of Balaam, who “blessed those he aimed to curse! But we will let him apply what he says above, concerning the ‘doubts that frequently arise,’ in regard to future punishments—to Universalism as he doubtless intended. Then compare it with what he says on p. 106, and see how the Layman agrees with himself:

“The transition (to Universalism) is *easy, natural* and to the individual is imperceptible. First, speculate, then reason, then doubt, and finally disbelieve all that God has said about hell and damnation.”



Yes, the transition to Universalism, when once we lay aside prejudices, is both 'easy and natural,' if we suffer ourselves to 'reason,' or even '*speculate*;' we must 'doubt and finally disbelieve' that God has said anything about an endless 'hell and damnation.' The least that any one *can* do towards believing in Universalism, is to desire that it might prove true—this is the *first* important step, and is made even by those timid souls who dare not speculate and reason, or disbelieve in Partialism. As for *doubting* it, that must be the second step, as our author says, doubts must 'frequently arise' in the minds of all believers in 'future punishment.'

## SECTION III.—P. 59.

## CHRISTIAN FATHERS.

*"If the doctrine of Universal Salvation is true, it must have been taught by Christ and his Apostles, yet it is evident that they taught no such thing."*

All that this proposition lacks of being true is, to substitute in it, the words 'endless misery' for 'Universal Salvation.'" He attempts to sustain it as follows :

"I am aware that the advocates of that creed contend that they taught that all mankind, without

exception, are saved ; but if that be true, how has it happened that in every age of the world since that time until very latterly, all mankind have believed that they taught the endless punishment of the finally impenitent !”

[Nothing of this kind has happened, as Ecclesiastical history will abundantly show any one who will take the trouble to read “Ancient History of Universalism,” by H. Ballou.]

“ We have the writings of the Fathers who lived in the first six centuries after Christ. In the undoubted writings of these christian fathers there is not even a hint that such a doctrine as Universal Salvation had ever been thought of; but on the contrary, the eternal punishment of the wicked is again and again spoken of, as taught by Christ and his Apostles.”

Here, the author of the “Serpent Uncoiled” exhibits the most reckless want of veracity, or else the most consummate ignorance ; for a more unblushing falsehood never was uttered, as those conversant with the writings of the Christian fathers know. They sometimes use the words everlasting, eternal, in reference to punishment, and their writings abundantly show, that many of them did not give these words the signification of *endless* duration where applied to punishment, any more than the Scripture writers did, who applied the same terms to many things, which have already

come to an end. See Hab. 3: 6, Gen. 48: 3, 4 and 49: 26, Ex. 40: 15, Numb. 25: 13, Lev. 24: 8, 9 and 16: 29-34, Ps. 37: 29. Deut. 15: 16, 17, Ezra 0: 12, 1 Chron. 23: 25, Isa. 34: 11-17, Rev. 14: 10, 11, &c.

We are told that 'there is not a single hint' in the 'undoubted writings of the christian fathers that such a doctrine as Universal Salvation was ever thought of.' Read the Ancient History of Universalism, and you will find that this declaration is false—that the christian fathers, as well as "all God's holy prophets," spoke of the glorious "restitution of all things."

One reason why the doctrine does not appear to stand out in such bold relief as it does now, is, it was not *opposed*—it was then generally believed.—Universalism was not formally condemned in any Christian body of Ecclesiastics until the year 553. It was not considered a heresy until the dark ages, when the Christian religion became corrupted.—See Ballou's Ancient History of Universalism for proof of this.

#### ORIGEN:

In the early part of the third century, Origen, a man of profound learning, and teacher of the only Christian theological seminary in the world at that time, taught openly and without opposition in many of his works, the final salvation of all mankind.—As we learn from ecclesiastical history, this distin

guished individual was the author of more than five thousand volumes! His wonderful scholarship excited the admiration of his contemporaries, while his great liberality of Christian doctrine drew forth, about the middle of the third century, the bitter persecution of his own bishop, and finally his removal from the exalted station which he occupied. He afterwards succeeded, however, in establishing a similar institution at Cesarea, to which even bishops resorted as pupils for instruction! The following is from one of his works, in which Universalism is taught as a cardinal theme :

“The end and consummation of the work will take place when it shall be subjected to punishments proportioned to their several sins; and how long each one shall suffer, in order to receive his deserts, God only knows. But we suppose that the goodness of God, through Christ, will certainly restore all creatures into one final state; his very enemies being overcome and subdued. For thus saith the Scriptures: ‘The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I have made thine enemies thy footstool.’ Ps. cx, 1. To the same purport, but more clearly, the apostle Paul says that Christ ‘must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. But if there be any doubts what is meant by “putting enemies under his feet,” let us hear the apostle still further, who says ‘for all things must be subjected to him.’ 1 Cor. xv. What then is that subjection with which all things must be subdued to Christ? I think it to be that with which we ourselves desire to be subdued to him:

and with which also the apostles and all the saints who have followed Christ, have been subdued to him. For the very expression, 'subjected to Christ,' denotes the salvation of those who are subjected: as David says, 'shall not my soul be subjected to God? for from him is my salvation.' Ps. lxxiii, 1. Such, then, being the final result of things, that all enemies shall be subdued to Christ, death, the last enemy be destroyed, and the kingdom be delivered up to the Father, by Christ; let us, with this view before us, now turn and contemplate the beginning of things. Now, the beginning always resembles the end, and as there will be one common end or result to all, so we should believe that all had one common beginning. In other words, that the great variety of characters, and different order of beings which now exist, will, through the goodness of God, their subjection to Jesus Christ, and the unity of the Holy Spirit, be finally restored to one and the same state; so were they all originally created in one common condition, resembling that into which they are eventually to be recalled. All who are at last to bow the knee to Jesus Christ, in token of subjection—that is, all who are in heaven, all on earth, and all under the earth; by which three terms is comprehended the whole intelligent creation, succeeded at first from that one common state; but as virtue was not immutably fixed in them, as in God, they came to indulge different passions, and to cherish different principles. They were, therefore, assigned to the various ranks and conditions they now hold, and the reward or punishment of their respective deserts."

In a later work he observes on the same great

subject: "The sacred Scriptures do indeed call our God a consuming fire. Deut. iv, 34, and say that rivers of fire go before his face. Dan. vii, 10, and that he shall come, as a refiner's fire, and as fuller's soap, and purify the people. Mal. iii, 2." As, therefore, God is a consuming fire, what is that to be consumed by him? We say it is wickedness, and whatever proceeds from it, such as is figuratively called wood, hay, stubble, these are what God in the character of fire, consumes. And it is evidently the wicked works of man which is denoted by the terms wood, hay, and stubble. It is consequently easy to understand what is the nature of that fire by which they are to be consumed.—Says the apostle, 'the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any one's work abide which he hath built, he shall receive a reward. If any one's work be burned, he shall suffer loss.'"

Once more: "The Stoics say that when the most powerful of the elements shall prevail, then will come the universal conflagration, and all things be converted into fire; but we assert that the Word, which is the wisdom of God, shall bring together all intelligent beings, and convert them into his own perfection, through the instrumentality of their free will, and of their own exertions. For though among the disorders of the body there are, indeed, some which the medical art cannot heal, yet we deny that of all the vices of the soul, there is any which the supreme Word cannot cure. For the

Word is more powerful than all the diseases of the soul ; and he applies his remedies to every one according to the pleasure of God."

From what can be learned of Origen's writings, they are full of this theme, and his religious views may justly be considered the Orthodoxy of the third centry ; for it is known that the great body of the churches and bishops proclaimed fearlessly their high regard for him as an accomplished and profound teacher of theology.

It was not until after the death of this great man that his favorite theme was called in question to any extent, when the church of Christ became gradually divided into two parties, the friends and enemies of Origen. The truth of this cardinal doctrine, Universal Salvation, was not generally doubted, even by his enemies, till it was condemned as a heresy by the fifth general council, on the 4th of May, in the year 553. After this, all who held and continued to believe it were anathematised, for the authority of the council was aided by a general bitterness of feeling that prevailed among the people ; and but few traces of this great truth are discoverable after that down to the period of the reformation ; when the immortal spirit of it again revived, keeping pace, as it ever must, with the light and knowledge and purity of the Christian church.

Our author mentions some of the ancient christian writers, who, he thinks, taught endless misery: *Tertullian* for one! and a more heartless and inhuman wretch never disgraced the Christian name! He is said to be the *first* man that declared that the misery of the wicked would be equal in duration to the happiness of the righteous. I will give the reader a specimen of the language of this "Father" of the doctrine of endless damnation, from his work called "De Spectaculis," which will show the spirit of the man and of his doctrine:

"You are fond of your spectacles, there are other spectacles: That day, disbelieved and derided by the nations so—that last, eternal day of Judgment, [but our layman says all nations *have* believed it, 'however wild or savage,'] when all ages shall be swallowed up in conflagration—what a variety of spectacles shall then appear! How shall *I admire! how laugh! how rejoice!* HOW EXULT! when I behold so many beings, worshipped as gods in heaven, together with Jove himself, groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness."

He goes on farther in this strain, gloating over the groans and misery of his fellow creatures, writhing in eternal torments. See Ancient History of Universalism.

On p. 56 our author demands, on Universalist principles, a solution of the following problem:

"If the Apostles taught that all men go to heaven



en, how also did it happen that the unprincipled and countless portion of the community, or as the Scriptures say, 'the lewd fellows of the baser sort' were so enraged against the doctrine that they whipped, stoned, and often lay in wait to kill the Apostles? Is it so displeasing to such vile wretches to be told that they can indulge in every vile propensity to the utmost of their desires, and drink their fill of iniquity, and yet escape punishment?"

I have already shown that it is Partialism, and *not* Universalism that teaches that men can 'escape punishment.' But remember, we have been told by the layman, that this same '*countless and unprincipled* portion of community,' even all mankind, believed in the doctrine of endless punishment—not for themselves, of course—no one expects to go to hell himself—hell is for his neighbors.

Of course our friend would contend that these 'lewd fellows of the baser sort'—these 'unprincipled,' 'vile wretches'—that they were believers of endless misery: and *his* doctrine is, that such '*can* indulge in every vile propensity to the utmost of their desires, and drink their fill of iniquity, and escape all punishment' by repentance. No wonder the world, and the Penitentiaries, too, are full of this 'unprincipled' and 'baser sort' of characters, when we so often hear *professed christians* declare that, if it were not for their belief in a hell

of never-ending torments, *they* would 'indulge in every vile propensity' and take *their* fill of sin !'

Although it might be 'disagreeable to such vile wretches to be told' that all men are brethren, and all destined to the same happy home beyond death, yet I have no idea that, at those times when these crazy fellows attacked the Apostles, either the doctrine of endless misery, or universal salvation, was even dreamed of. The account itself will show that they were not influenced by doctrinal notions.

## CHAPTER IV.

*“An examination of the principal texts upon which Universalists place much reliance.”*

“They take a single sentence, detach from it all that is said before and afterwards, and make no reference to the scope or meaning of the chapter. All that is asked is to treat the Scriptures with the same fairness that other books are treated, and instead of proving from a single passage, detached from the rest, examine the scope and bearing of the writers, by reading the passage in connection with the book, or chapter, at least,”

The very course that is here recommended is what has convinced thousands of the truth of Universalism.

But, in the conclusion of this very chapter, this *honest* author, in order to disprove Universalism, quotes thirty sentences, and parts of sentences, from the Bible, precisely after the manner that he here condemns, and without one word of comment! But he first refers to some of the texts upon which he supposes ‘Universalists place much reliance,’ in a summary manner; page 60, as follows:

1. Those texts in which it is said that Christ died for all, they contend, prove that all will be

saved, but a very little reflection [the less the better] will convince any one [sufficiently prejudiced] that they prove no such thing. The death of Christ opened a way by which sinners *can* be saved."

Then Christ only died to give them a *chance* for their salvation! Query. What *chance* have those to be saved, who God knew before he created them, would be eternally damned?

2. Those texts which declare that God takes no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but wills that all men should repent and believe. They argue that what God wills must inevitably come to pass, and so he wills that all men should repent and live, all will repent and live. In reply to this, let it be observed, that man is a free agent, and God has left him at liberty to act according to his own free choice, and all these passages must be so interpreted as not to conflict with man's free agency."

No, indeed! You must not 'conflict' with the Orthodox doctrine of Free Agency, although it makes the Bible conflict with itself, and represents the will of man as conflicting with, and counter-acting the will of God, whose attributes are thus represented as conflicting with each other, besides the eternal conflict which Partialism teaches will be between God and the Devil. The following texts show that whatever God wills, or even *desires*, will certainly be accomplished; Ezek. 1; 11, Dan. 4: 35, Job 22: 13, Isa. 46: 10:

On p. 62 he says, 'because, in a very few instances, in the Old Testament, the word everlasting is applied to things of a limited duration, they contend that its meaning is always limited,' [when applied to punishment, he should have added.]—See texts referred to, p. 36, of Review. Having now paid more attention to this section than its importance requires, we pass to notice what he says of the

#### DEMORALIZING TENDENCY OF UNIVERSALISM.

He here takes the position that the restraining influence of law is in proportion to the *severity* of its penalty, and supposes, if the death penalty should be abolished: and that, if the penalty for highway robbery was only a fine of one dollar, and the penalty for other crimes in proportion, the consequence would be that crime would become far more frequent. Hence he argues that 'Universalism, by denying the infinite penalty of eternal death, is destructive of civil society and government.'" But rulers have begun to discover, from the history of the world, that the restraining influence is more in the *certainty* of *adequate* punishment, than in the cruel severity of a penalty that can be escaped. So his argument in favor of infinite torture is too late. It is better suited to the dark ages, and the days of the Spanish Inquisition.

I will now quote a sentence from p. 74, where our author himself shows the absurdity of his own position :

“In heathen lands, although the laws are almost invariably severe, cruel and sanguinary in the extreme, yet for the want of a belief in that all-pervading tribunal revealed in the Bible, and which takes cognizance of every possible offence, crimes of every grade are incomparably more frequent than in christian countries.”

See, also, what he says on pages 72 and 73, as follows :

“All human laws are seriously imperfect. \* \* \* So numerous are the offences which no law can meet, and so easy is it to evade all human (and; if Partialism is true—divine) punishment, that mankind need a system of laws that will meet every possible offence, and a tribunal that will punish every delinquent according to his demerits—a tribunal from whose verdict there is no appeal. The Bible [and Universalism] reveals to us just such a system of laws, and just such a tribunal. Its sacred pages inform us that the unsleeping eye of God is ever upon us, and that he will reward and punish us according to the deeds done in the body. (See page 6, on 2 Cor. 5; 10—Review.) From that tribunal there is no escape. It enters into the secrets of our hearts, and takes cognizance of our thoughts and motives. No degree of guilt can evade punishment. Who does not see that such laws and such a tribunal are the very things

that mankind need to protect them, and supply the defects of human legislation!"

Yes, and this is precisely what Universalism teaches, and what the doctrine of our friend denies. His reason here has broke loose from his creed.—Where *now* is his bankrupt law of repentance? *Out of sight!*

Teach mankind that this tribunal is in this world—that ‘now is the judgment of this world’—that ‘the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth—much more the wicked and the sinner;’ and that virtue and happiness are the twain which “God has joined together,’ and none can break the silver cord that makes them one : and you will thus win them from the ways of vice. But ‘ye that put far away the evil day, cause the seat of violence to come near,’ Amos 6: 3, Because you teach that the ‘sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the hearts of the sons of men are fully set in them to do evil.’ Ezek. 8: 4. Partialism ‘puts far away,’ into eternity ‘the evil day,’ and declares that ‘sentence against an evil work is not executed’ even then, if the sinner only repents ‘while the lamp holds out to burn.’ They are thus taught that their ‘damnation lingereth,’ and that ‘judgment slumbereth.’ But the unsleeping eye of Omniscience, all of whose ways are judgment, is ever upon us, and He ‘will by no means clear the guilty.’

On page 75 our author again comes in sight of his creed, and says that 'Experience and common observation teach men that they are *not* punished in this life according to their demerits, and that it is quite possible to escape punishment in this life, and men have nothing to fear, [in this-life,] nothing to deter them from crime,' &c. But this is a flat contradiction of what he has said on the preceding page. It also contradicts the Bible, as well as 'experience and common observation.' Thus it is that Partialism allures the young from the path of virtue, and thus the Serpent Uncoiled would fix its deadly fangs upon its victims while singing to them the syren song of 'pleasure in sin,' 'escape by repentance,' and the '*demoralizing tendency of Universalism.*'

On p. 76 he brings Universalism to the TEST:

"Put the Universalist to the test, and his own conduct will prove that he has far more confidence in the integrity of a man who believes in future punishment. Let him be placed in the vast, uninhabited wilderness, bordering on the Rocky mountains, a thousand miles from the reach of human laws. Let it become necessary for him to trust his life and a large amount of property in the hands of one man. Now, the question is, whom would he most readily trust under such circumstances—a man who believes that he can murder him and escape all punishment in the future world as well as in this? [This is the very picture of Par.



tialism, who knows of nothing more hateful than herself; therefore she exhibits her own despicable features again, for Universalism.] Would he not rather trust a man who believes that if he betrays his trust and escapes punishment in this, there is no possibility of escaping the most awful punishment that thought can conceive, in the life to come, and which will endure for ever and ever?"

But Partialism declares that there is a 'possibility of escaping,' very easily, this punishment 'in the *life to come*, (which punishment is generally called eternal DEATH!) and this destroys the effect of this 'most awful punishment that thought can conceive.' But this matter *has* been often '*tested*,' nearer *home* than the Rocky mountains, and not 'beyond the reach of human laws.'

I *might* mention instances where believers in endless misery have 'preferred to trust' Universalists to their own religious brethren, which would make our author's face to blush and his ears to tingle! See 'Portrait, p. 9.

Go to the *legislatures*, and you will find that Universalists are eligible to offices of 'trust,' and go to their respective districts and inquire who 'preferred' them? Then go with me to the States prisons and see who is there!

In all the examinations that have been made of the different States prisons and Penitentiaries, the inmates have uniformly been found orthodox believers in endless misery. Out of more than seven

hundred prisoners in the Sing-Sing prison, not a single Universalist was found! And this was in the State of New York, which at this time contains 252 Universalist Societies, 164 meeting houses, and 147 preachers of Universalism.

In the examinations of the prisons of Auburn, Wethersfield, Connecticut, and Charlestown, Massachusetts, where Universalism most abounds, similar facts were developed. It is also worthy of our author's notice that in Auburn prison were found, snugly and safely locked up, *fifteen orthodox preachers of endless misery*.—Men who professed that immortal souls were 'trusted' to their care!

We tell him that these are facts—facts that have been demonstrated; and they are only examples of the whole history of this doctrine! Wherever it has prevailed, it is too well known to be successfully denied, that vice, wretchedness, and profligacy have constantly followed in its train.

That Universalists are no better than they should be, we have no desire to conceal; we have no doubt some have been imprisoned for crime who have advocated that doctrine—such were not led into crime by Universalism:—but it is boldly denied that Universalist Societies will suffer, in comparison with orthodox, so called, in morals, religion, or intellectual worth. We stand ready for the 'TEST.'

One would think, from our author's remarks, that to destroy Universalism would entirely 'take away the sin of the world.'

How many martyrs have been put to death for religious opinions' sake? *Buck* declares FIFTY MILLIONS. And who put these millions to death? who bound them to the stake? who lighted the fires that curled around them? who drew them limb from limb? who poured boiling lead into their mouths? who put them to cruel tortures? Were they Universalists? No! not one of them. Who then? *Believers of endless misery to man!* Think of it, Mr. Layman, and weep! FIFTY MILLIONS of human beings have been slain in the most cruel manner, by the most orthodox believers of undying agony! And these are the *fruits* of that theory, as the whole history of the church testifies.—How, in view of all these facts, does our author appear, talking about *tests*? Let him turn his eyes towards *home*, and he will there see more crimes committed through the influence of his darling creed than Niagara could wash out in a thousand years! Had Universalism been guilty of a hundredth part of the same sins, rather than defend it, I would call on God to witness that I *renounced it forever*.\*

If the doctrine of Endless Damnation is so restraining in its influence, why are there so many

\*See *Gurley's Reply to Walker's Short and Easy Method*, p. 64.

bad people among those who believe it, and who have been most accustomed to its loudest thunders? Ah! the system has been *thoroughly* 'tested,' and it has no power to make men good or virtuous, but it has caused vice to roll in upon the world like a flood.

But we have not yet done with, or lost sight of, our author's 'test,' away there near the Rocky mountains. He asks, 'to whom, under such circumstances, we would more readily trust our lives and property?' We answer:—one who acts from principle instead of fear—who believes that 'honesty is the best policy'—that there is no advantage to be gained by doing wrong, and that 'the *way* of the transgressor *is* hard.' Trust him who follows virtue for virtue's sake, and who believe that 'the righteous shall be recompensed *in the earth*, much more the wicked and the sinner,' and that '*in keeping* the commandments there *is* great reward.'—But last of all, trust not your life, property or *reputation* in the care of [him who says if he believed in Universalism he would 'take his fill of iniquity;'] for, if he tells the truth, the fear of *hell* is the only thing that restrains him: and when our opponents declare, as they often do, that 'there is no use in religion if all are to be saved any how,' they might as well say that it is not out of any respect they have to God and his religion that they worship him, but through fear of the devil. But will God thank

any one for worshipping him out of respect to the devil!

To the praise of human nature and the God of nature, we are happy to say that there are many believers in endless misery who are virtuous, notwithstanding their faith is an obstacle.

‘What benefit,’ our author asks, ‘can possibly result to mankind from teaching them that there is no punishment in the future world? Are there not crimes enough already, even in our own country, that it is necessary to open wider the flood-gates of crime? The frequent murders, robberies, mobs, lynchings, and forgeries committed in our land and with accounts of which every newspaper we take up teems, show plainly that we have in our midst, whom the fear of God and men hardly restrain.’

And I should think this ought to teach our author the insufficiency of the fear of an angry God, a personal devil, and an eternal hell, to restrain men from crime. It is the doctrine of ‘the goodness of God that leadeth men to repentance.’—Rom. 24. *This alone can restrain this overflowing tide of corruption and stop the ‘flood-gates of crime.’* Partialism has been tried for ages, but in vain.

The following is beautiful language for one who believes men can go on in sin threescore years and more, and then escape all punishment here and

hereafter, to apply to Universalism, which teaches that 'every transgression and disobedience receives a just recompense of reward, and that God will *by no means* clear the guilty.' Ex. 34: 7. Not even by repentance. Read what follows, and see how pious he *seems* to be, while clandestinely intimating that Universalists believe and teach that people go to heaven in their sins.

Let the belief become general, that the midnight assassin will be received into Abraham's bosom—that the incendiary, who applies the torch to the sleeping family's dwelling, will be received into the abodes of eternal blessedness—that the unfeeling drunkard reels into heaven—that the ruthless murderer, who dies in the very act of murder, goes straight to heaven, and while the blood is still warm on his hands, receives from Christ the welcome salutation, 'well done! good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord,'—let this belief become general among the great mass of the people, and it needs no gift of inspiration to foresee that our country would bear no faint resemblance of hell."

What fury! How the vile reptile spits its venom! Wonder if our author expects to possess in heaven all those vile passions which he manifests here? But the *editor* has told us that our author is thoroughly acquainted with Universalism, and is a gentleman of searching acumen. He has no excuse, then, for his recklessness in applying to it

such language as the above. It is his own doctrine, and not Universalism, that teaches that man can escape punishment. Does not our author believe that the villain may spend his seventy years in crime, and then, by repentance just before death, escape the demands of insulted justice? Does he not believe that the *Penitent Thief* was 'received into the abodes of eternal blessedness,' just for saying 'Lord, remember me,' &c., even in the last agonies of death? when but a few moments before he had *reviled* at his dying Redeemer! Matt. 27: 44, Mark 15: 32,

It seems horridly unreasonable to our friend, to contend, as the Universalists do, that all shall be finally prepared for admittance 'into the abodes of eternal blessedness,' after receiving all the punishment they deserve; but he believes, of course, that a man may murder his thousands and yet go safe to heaven, while, at least *some* of those who, by him, were hurried into eternity without a moment's warning, must eternally wail in the regions of despair! Yes, but he must repent in time, says one. But who gives the *time* and *disposition* to repent? Must those who receive not these inestimable gifts here suffer eternally? while those who are more highly favored, by receiving the gifts of timely repentance, faith and remission of sins, are, on this account, to be eternally distinguished as Heaven's favorites! It is God that '*giveth* repentance to

Israel and remission of sins.' 'Who maketh thee to differ from another?' &c. It is God that 'worketh in you, both to will and to do his good pleasure,' and the *best* of christians can truly say, 'It is by the grace of God that I am what I am!'

"APPEAL TO WOMAN."

We now come to p. 81, where the Serpent, like the one in Eden, tries his diabolical and satanic arts upon woman, with this difference, however—he tries to *prevent* her from partaking of that now—*unforbidden* fruit of the tree of knowledge, of which it is now her *most exalted privilege*, to partake freely. It yields the soul appropriate nourishment—the bread of life and the waters of salvation. It is *now* the 'Tree of Life.' See John 6: 50.

"Upon no class of human beings does the blighting, withering influence of Universalism fall with more fatal effects than upon woman. Her happiness in life is greatly dependant upon the moral principles of those with whom her destiny is connected. Dare she aid, by her influence, or even by her presence, in the spread of doctrines which may shipwreck her dearest hopes?"

[But Universalism would show her that her future happy 'destiny is connected with' that of all the friends she holds dear here. Partialism, by teach-



ing that she shall be separated from them in eternity, is what 'shipwrecks her dearest hopes']

"It is her duty, as well as her interest, to give them no countenance whatever. On the purity of woman's principles is staked, not only her reputation, but everything that gives worth to her character, and renders her lovely in the eyes of man."

[He here artfully insinuates that in a belief of an endless hell, 'is staked the purity of a woman's principles, her reputation, and everything that gives worth to her character and renders her lovely in the eyes of man!']

"Who," he continues, 'but an abandoned wretch would not recoil at the bare idea of connecting his destiny with a female Atheist, or with a woman who believes in no future state of rewards and punishments?'"

[Now, fair reader, take care!—"so may you be a bride"—and never read another Universalist book, nor go to Universalist meeting, and *more especially*, never be seen to speak politely to a young man who believes in that heresy, 'nor give them any countenance whatever,' if you would appear 'lovely in the eyes of man!' Our author here joins Universalism with *Atheism!* in order to make it appear hideous, but mark! there is a difference between what our author and what 'God has joined together.']

“No:” he continues, “her form and features might be moulded into more than Grecian loveliness—she might possess every other accomplishment that ever adorned the most favored of her sex, yet the absence of moral principle, of the fear of God, would render all these qualifications of no value.”

[By ‘moral principle,’ he would have us understand a belief in endless misery and the fear of hell !]

“Who would unite his fate with hers and not have reason to fear that the day might arrive when he would be compelled to tear her from his bosom, and fling her like a loathsome weed away ?”

Hear *that*, ye jealous-hearted !—you are here informed that no woman can be trusted, as virtuous and chaste, who believes in that *licentious* doctrine of Universalism ! But suffer me to ask, in return, ‘who but an abandoned wretch would not recoil at the bare idea of connecting his destiny with a female’ to whom the *fear of hell* is necessary, in order to make her faithful and true to her nuptial vows ? The lady who has the happiness to believe in the soul-invigorating and heart-purifying doctrine of universal grace, is threatened by this serpent, as deserving no confidence, and to be ‘flung like a loathsome weed away ?’ But the ‘plea’ continues :

"The guardian angels, that are thought by some to hover unseen around the woman of pure principles, shielding her in the hour of temptation, can surely never approach the female who denies the existence of a God, or a future retribution."

[What a base insinuation is here!—that there are *no* Universalist ladies of 'pure principles,' but that they are all abandoned by the 'guardian angels in the hour of temptation!']

"Every respectable woman wields a powerful influence over other minds. Let her beware how she gives encouragement to Universalism. \* \* \* Let her avoid the places where such doctrines are preached. No professor can attend without being guilty of a crime. His example may do much injury, and may lead to the destruction of many souls."

What a "crime" to go to a Universalist meeting! which leads to the destruction of immortal souls! 'Great God! on what slender threads hang everlasting things!'

Experience teaches that truth need only to be seen in its native beauty and loveliness, in order to captivate the mind: and the opposers of truth always endeavor to conceal it from the admiring gaze of mankind. True religion, or Universalism, when adorned by its faithful advocates, with all her shining beauty and grace, is the 'chief among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely.'

The advocates of error always aim to hide its snaky head. This is the reason why the very life of Partialism depends upon concealment. Whenever it is compared with true religion, in the light of reason, it is an object of loathing and abhorrence. Hence, all this caution against attending Universalist meetings: also, the long yarn of "the death-bed scene"\* in the next chapter.

But we have mistaken the character of our western friends, in point of intelligence, if many of them can be influenced by such shallow duplicity

\* "DEATH-BED SCENE."—Hundreds of such tales as these have been fabricated for sectarian purposes, which have been proved to be falsehoods, and not the less base for being religious. This one exhibits one striking mark of falsehood at the very commencement of it. This pious story, which is by no means worth copying here, commences thus:—"In one of our Western States, which it is needless to name!" Depend upon it, reader, all of the names which should have been inserted in this book, by an honest author—from the name of the Layman himself, the committee of publication and the editor, to the name of the "State" in which that horrid death-bed scene was witnessed—are left blank for the sake of the convenience of those who wished to impose it upon a credulous community. It is difficult to bruise the head of a "snake in the grass."

But supposing that this improbable story is, as the editor says, "substantially correct," it then only proves that a young man, who it is *said* was a Universalist, renounced his faith in his dying hour, and died in despair. In the moments of dissolving nature, both body and mind become often so weak, that these haunTERS of death-bed scenes can manage

as this 'appeal to woman' displays. It is a gross insult to their virtue and intelligence.

It is too late in the day to undertake to convince any except the most grossly ignorant that a woman cannot be respected who attends the Universalist church. There are too many and accomplished of that sex, in that denomination, to give the least currency to such low and vulgar insinuations.

I might refer our author to some of their writings, which, if he would read them, would thrill even his poor soul with more heavenly emotions than he has ever yet experienced.

Why is the Layman so anxious to keep the female sex from listening to Universalism? Because, being 'a gentleman of searching acumen,' he knows that it is the religion most congenial to all the refined and holy affections of a woman's heart, and being so addressed to her nature, that the contemplation of it would make her happy, and on this account he knows that she is more easily charmed by its soothing and heavenly voice than the sterner sex. And she will, perhaps, on this account, be more willing to see its agreement also, with reason and the Bible. It is the only religion that can

to excite all those early prejudices and superstitious fears more easily than when body and mind are healthy, vigorous, and unimpaired.

Universalism is necessary, in order that we may be happy in life and in death. But it was doubtless the *state of imagination* that our author considers "needless to name."

make her truly happy in every circumstance in life. "Is she a mother?" he asks; and in addition to that is she a *mourner*? Has she lost a beloved daughter, who has died without that supernatural *new birth* deemed so essential to salvation? If so, unless she is a believer in that soul-inspiring doctrine of *universal* grace, she "mourns as those who have no hope." She supposes her daughter, not having experienced a "change from nature to grace," before death, has died out of the ark of safety. 'From *nature* to grace?' Her very nature might have been grace—her form and features might have been moulded into more than Grecian loveliness—she might have possessed every other accomplishment that ever adorned the most favored of her sex—'all these qualifications are of no value' in the sight of that God she worships; and now she awfully fears the time has arrived when that vindictive being, having 'torn from her bosom' the object of her fondest affection, has 'flung her, like a loathsome weed, away,' beyond the reach of hope or mercy, where she is doomed to wail and languish in the regions of immortal anguish—the companion and sport of furious fiends and howling demons, forever and ever! Is the belief of a partial salvation adapted to the wants of woman in such a trying hour? Can it soothe that lacerated, that wounded heart? Is it the religion that 'comforts *all* that mourn?' Is it that '*rest* of faith that *re*

*maineth* for the people of God?' Is *this* faith the 'substance of things hoped for?' My God! NO. *Universalism* alone can dry up those briny tears; the gospel of *salvation* alone can give ease and comfort to the disconsolate heart, and set the mourning captive free from the cruel bondage of tormenting fear and give rest to the troubled soul. This is the sweet water of life and salvation which alone can satisfy the thirst of the soul, although our author calls it *hell-broth!* It is the bread of life which alone can 'satisfy the longing soul.' Isa. 55: 12; and 54: 11.

Fathers, 'what man is there among you who, if his son ask bread'—the bread of knowledge—'will he give him a serpent?'—the Serpent Uncoiled?—If so, let him have this review also.

But let us look once more at the 'appeal to woman.'

"Is she a mother, and is she willing for her daughter to embrace *Universalism*, when, according to that doctrine itself, a belief of it cannot make her salvation any more secure?"

And if *Partialism* is true, will a belief of *that* doctrine make her future salvation any more secure? If she understands nature, the Bible, and reason to teach that God is too good to inflict endless pain upon feeble man, for the sins of this short life, will he be offended at this? even if she *does*

thus form too good and too exalted an opinion of his character! He has more reason to be offended at those who represent him as a being of wrath and vengeance: for anger is that dark passion that is supposed to blacken the character of hell's grim tyrant! and which 'resteth in the bosom of the fool.'

The effects of the religion of *damnation* upon woman is truly awful! Go to the insane hospitals and you will see the wretchedness of those who have looked at this hell-born monster's face!—*There* you will find those who have *felt* the blighting, withering, and *scorching* influence of Partialism. A *realizing* belief of its horrors is more than that tender plant can bear. Under its influence "the smile dies upon her lips, the rose fades upon her cheek, her sparkling eye is dim, her buoyant spirits have flown, her joints are trembling, her step is tottering—she falls! like a delicate flower—(not a 'loathsome weed,') torn by some ruthless hand and thrown to wither in the sun."

#### CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS..

The author's concluding reflections amount to about this: "The soul is of immense value, and its eternal value ought not to be staked upon the truth of Universalism unless proved beyond the shadow of a doubt." And there is not the least shadow



of a doubt' in the minds of Universalists, that the doctrine of endless hell torments is the monster of all absurdities. But he says it is more *safe* and *prudent*, to believe in this cruel dogma; and he speaks of the folly of running a fearful risk by believing Universalism, 'without any chance of gaining anything by it, even if true.' The absurdity of this has already been shown in reviewing his 'plea to woman.' He speaks of the 'folly and blindness of the Universalists,' and I suppose he considers himself as one of the enlightened, although he can see no use in believing the truth!

This position of the 'safest side' and 'two chances,' is a favorite with almost every set of Partialist fanatics in the world, and it is equally forcible for the use of any one sect against all the rest.—The Mahomedan, Catholic, or Universalist, may say to each other, 'ours is the safest side,—we have two chances of salvation to one, on any other plan.' 'He that believeth not shall be damned.'

There are about three hundred different denominations of *Christians* in the world, from which I infer: 1st. That it is impossible for all to embrace the same faith; and 2d. That our *eternal* welfare does not depend upon what we believe in time.—Faith affects our happiness only in this world,

## APPENDIX.

---

### THE INFIDELITY OF UNIVERSALISM

Has been the everlasting song of the Layman throughout his book ; yet in the Appendix, p, 99, he says, 'possibly some of our readers may feel doubts and misgivings at the nature of the charges made against Universalism, as containing marks of hypocrisy and infidelity.' Then come those 'disclosures of M. H. Smith,' by which, we are told in the commencement of the book, 'the statements of the Layman are sustained to the fullest extent.'

From Smith's text-book the author of the Serpent quotes the following false assertions :

"Not one opinion for which *Murray* contended is respected or retained. Nor does the sect hold one thing in common with Christians. They have the terms—God, Christ, inspiration, conversion, heaven, and hell ; but they mean not by them what Christians mean : and to become a Universalist is to deny all that Christianity teaches. \* \* \* \*

The practical results of Universalism are summed up in one line—it makes men bad and keeps them so."

All we ask is, that the reader will read this 'book, together with Brown's reply to it; and he w

then say that any cause that is 'sustained' only by the character and veracity of the libelous author of that book, must surely be on its last legs !

The Western Layman seldom alludes to the poets in his writings ; but whenever he does so, he shows by it that he is a man of some kind of taste, if not of refinement. See how clearly and *beautifully* he shows, by what the 'poet says,' that the Universalists are all a set of Frenchmen and Atheists. Page 430.

"The origin of American Universalism can be easily traced. Its date is too recent to be involved in the slightest shade of obscurity. It arose from the scathing caldron of the French Revolution, which threw up, during its period of ebullition, more poisonous, foul, and loathsome ingredients than the witches of Macbeth employed in concocting what the poet termed their hell-broth."

There ! how plain it is *now*, that Universal Salvation—although all good people desire it to be true—is 'more foul and loathsome' to every correct moral taste, than the very dregs of 'that HELL-BROTH,' that the poet says was concocted in the scathing caldron, by the witches of Macbeth !—There is nothing foul or loathsome in the idea of 'that *infernal* 'scathing caldron' of HELL ! during *eternal* ebullitions. Oh, no ! This is the sweet *tor* of life !—no hell-broth *here!*

Hark! again hear how this orthodox serpent hisses!

“Doubtless many Universalists will deny that modern Universalism is covered with infidelity.—Doubtless, multitudes are deceived by the specious phrases employed, and the cant terms of impartial love, and impartial God, and in attending their meetings are not aware that they are giving countenance to infidelity, and the destruction of all authority, justice, and law. They may not be aware that the PRINCIPLES of modern Universalism, and the mode of argument adopted by its teachers, tend to the subversion of all moral government.”

It comes with a very ill grace from this man to accuse *others* of cant and hypocrisy, while trying to persuade his readers to turn a deaf ear to reason and truth, by calling it *covered* infidelity, and *saying*—not proving—that it is subversive of government, justice, and law. By attending Universalist meetings, he says, you give countenance to infidelity. But the danger is, that people would thus get to see the deformity of Partialism in contrast with the beauty and excellence of true religion. It is thus the serpent error always tries to dodge and hide its guilty head from the light of truth.

We now dismiss these slanderous charges, that are made, in the entire absence of proof, and turn our attention to facts.

First, then, Universalism is the only thing the

can save many rational and reflecting people from infidelity, as it already has done in thousands of instances.

In order to prove this by showing that Partialism as 'covered infidelity,' naturally leads to *Atheism!* let us take a glance at some of its prominent features.

1. THE BIBLE teaches that GOD IS LOVE — that "He is good unto all, and that His tender mercies are over all His works;" and that this God is the FATHER of us all—that He made of one blood all nations, to dwell on all the face of the earth; that He is infinite in compassion and goodness, delighting not in the suffering of any of His creatures, but extends his tender regard and Fatherly care equally over ALL.

PARTIALISM, in the face of all this, teaches that this God of love and infinite goodness, who is the Father of us all, will utterly and irretrievably damn a very large portion of *His own children*—the people whom He has made; that He will consign them to regions of unending torment—to a Hell of burning brimstone, where they will burn, and writhe, and scream to all eternity: and that He, this God of love and compassion, will only laugh at their calamity, and mock at their cries for mercy! And all this, too, merely for the sins of this brief, mortal, and imperfect existence!

2. THE BIBLE teaches that this God of infinite

love and goodness is UNCHANGEABLE: that He is good now to His creatures, and consequently, that He will always remain so—both in time and in eternity; that He can no more cease to be good, than He can cease to be God!

But Partialism virtually declares that God changes, as doeth man; that He loves some of His creatures to-day, and will hate them to-morrow!—that so long as they obey Him, He will love them, but as soon as they disobey, and transgress His laws, He will hate them; that during the present existence, He has at least compassion enough upon all His creatures to allow them the privilege of repenting, and thereby secure heaven and happiness; but that in the future world he will become *changed*, and hard-hearted, and cruel, as to deny them, forever deny them, the privilege of repenting, reforming, or becoming any better or happier! Thus it makes God *changable*, whom the Bible declares to be the same yesterday, to-day, and forever!

3. The Bible teaches that man was originally made from the earth—a mortal being, and on this account he had to die, and return to the earth from which he was taken.

But Partialism says he was originally made immortal, but on account of sin—by eating the forbidden fruit—he became mortal, and died!

Partialism also teaches the absurdity that there

are three Gods, and yet but one God!—that one is three, and three is one! And, also, that Jesus Christ is God, and also the Son of God—consequently, that he is the son of himself! And that he died to appease the wrath of the Father—i. e. his own wrath—and satisfy the justice of an outraged law,—suffering the penalty due to sin, in the room and stead of the sinner! yet the sinner is liable to suffer this same penalty, and will, unless he repent!

These are some of the leading tenets—some of the beauties of Partialism. Here you see the Serpent—partially, at least—uncoiled. And here you may see a part of that bundle of inconsistencies and absurdities which drives hundreds and thousands into *Atheism*. Men, with certain peculiarly constituted minds, rather than have such a God as Partialism presents, will have no God at all. They take it for granted that Partialism and the Bible teach the same sentiments—not taking the trouble to examine for themselves; consequently, they reject both, and often settle down into cold and cheerless *atheism*. Thus you may see, reader, what doctrine it is that “leads to Atheism!” The inherent ugliness and absurdity of Partialism have, no doubt, been the cause of more skepticism in the world than all other causes together.

Now, as to the INFIDELITY of Universalism—let us see how that matter stands. The Bible declares

that in Christ the seed of Abraham, 'all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth shall be blessed.'—(Gen. 23: 18, and parallels.) This Universalists believe; but Partialism denies it, teaching that a large portion of mankind shall be eternally cursed and damned, world without end!

St. Paul declares (1 Cor. 15 :) that "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive"—shall be raised in "glory, honor, and immortality; bearing the image of the heavenly." Universalism admits this: while Partialism, as usual, denies it!

The Bible teaches—and Universalists believe, that the Devil and all his works shall eventually be destroyed; when there shall be no more sin, nor suffering in God's universe; when death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed, and all God's intelligent creatures be holy, happy, and immortal. But Partialism says the Devil is to exist as long as God himself; and that he will get a large portion of God's creatures to burn and torment forever!

The Bible declares that God "will not contend forever, neither will he be always wroth;" (Isa. 57: 46) and that He has "no pleasure" in the death or suffering of His wicked, rebellious children. But Partialism denies the whole of it, and says that God *will* contend forever, and that He will take "pleasure" in torturing His helpless offspring in a Hell of fire and fierce anguish, throughout eternity!



The Bible teaches that "the righteous shall be recompensed IN THE EARTH, much more the wicked and the sinner." (Prov. 11 : 21) This fact is taught in various ways throughout both the Old and New Testaments. But Partialism says that all rewards and punishments are reserved for the future state—that the wicked are not punished here for their sins, but will be in the future world, unless they repent; in which case they can escape all punishment—notwithstanding God declares that the wicked shall not go unpunished—that He will *by no means* clear the guilty !

In fine, the Bible declares that Universalism is true—that the whole human family shall eventually be made immortal, holy, and happy ;—while Partialism denies the whole of it ! Infidelity means unbelief; where now lies the charge of Infidelity ? The charge of Infidelity comes with a very ill grace from men who deny so many of the leading and fundamental doctrines of the Bible, and teach in their stead the "doctrines of devils," and the commandments of men!

We might pursue this subject to a much greater length, but enough has been said to show that Orthodoxy is that which "leads to Atheism;" and that Partialism is, in reality, but "covert Infidelity." We now submit the foregoing to the candid judgment of the reader; examine the subject well—"prove all things, and hold fast that which is good."

## A D D E N D A .

---

### EXTRACT FROM THE LIFE OF MURRAY.

The Rev. JOHN MURRAY, as is known, was the first Universalist preacher in the United States. While he resided in England, and before his conversion to Universalism, he was a member of the great Mr. Whitefield's church—at which time Mr. Relly, the Universalist, was making some stir in that country. It so happened that an intelligent and accomplished young lady, a member of the same church, had, some how or other, attended Mr. Relly's meetings, and had embraced Universalism. The following is an extract from the "Life of Murray," in which it will be seen that he, in company with a few others of the "faithful," was sent to visit this young lady, and reclaim her from the error of her way—also, the *success* of his undertaking. This circumstance, probably, was the first which set Mr. Murray to reflecting seriously on the subject, and which first as it were, "brought him up standing!"

"I had heard much of Mr. Relly; he was a conscientious and zealous preacher in the city of London. He had, through many revolving years, continued faithful to the ministry committed to him, and he was the theme of every religious sect. He appeared as he was represented to me, highly erroneous; and my indignation against him, as has

already been seen, was very strong. I had frequently been solicited to hear him, merely, that I might be an ear witness of what was termed his *blasphemies*; but, I arrogantly said, I would not be a *murderer of time*. Thus I passed on a number of years, hearing all manner of evil said of Mr. Relly, and *believing all I herd*, while every day augmented the inveterate hatred, which I bore the man, and his adherents. . . . When a worshipping brother or sister, belonging to the communion, which I considered as honored by the approbation of Diety was, by this deceiver, drawn from the paths of rectitude, the anguish of my spirit was indiscribable; and I was ready to say, the secular arm ought to interpose to prevent the perdition of souls. I recollect one instance in particular which pierced me to the soul. A young lady of irreproachable life, remarkable for piety, and highly respected by the tabernacle congregation and church, of which I was a devout member, had been ensnared; to my great astonishment, she had been induced to hear, and having heard, she had embraced the pernicious errors of this detestable babler; she was becoming a believer, a firm and unwavering believer of universal redemption! Horrible! most horrible! So high an opinion was entertained of my talents, having myself been a teacher among the Methodists, and such was my standing in Dr. Whitefield's church that I was deemed adequate to reclaiming this wanderer, and I was strongly urged to the pursuit. The poor deluded young woman was abundantly worthy our most arduous efforts. *He that converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.* Thus I thought,

thus I said; and, swelled with a high idea of my own importance, I went, accompanied by two or three of my Christian brethren, to see, to converse with, and if need were, to admonish this simple, weak, but, as we heretofore believed, meritorious female. Fully persuaded that I could easily convince her of her errors, I entertained no doubt respecting the result of my undertaking. The young lady received us with much kindness and condescension, which, as I glanced my eye upon her fine countenance, beaming with intelligence, mingling pity and contempt grew in my bosom. After the first ceremonies, we sat for some time silent; at length I drew up a heavy sigh, and uttered a pathetic sentiment relative to the deplorable condition of those, who live and die in unbelief; and I concluded a violent declamation by pronouncing with *great earnestness*, *He that believeth not, shall be damned.*

‘And pray sir,’ said the young lady with great sweetness, ‘Pray, sir, what is the unbeliever damned for not believing?’

What is he damned for not believing? *Why he is damned for not believing.*

‘But my dear sir, I asked what was that which he did not believe, for which he was damned?’

Why, for not believing in Jesus Christ, to be sure.

‘Do you mean to say that unbelievers are damned for not believing there was such a person as Jesus Christ?’

No, I do not; a man may believe there was such a person, and yet be damned.

‘What then, sir, must he believe in order to avoid damnation?’

Why, he must believe that Jesus Christ is a complete Saviour.

'Well, suppose he were to believe that Jesus Christ was a complete Saviour of others, would this belief save him?'

No, he must believe that Christ Jesus *is his* complete Saviour: every individual must believe for *himself*, that Jesus Christ is his complete Saviour.

'Why, sir, is Jesus Christ the Saviour of any *unbelievers*?

No, madam.

'Why, then, should any *unbeliever* believe that Jesus Christ is his Saviour, if he be not his Saviour?'

I say he is not the Saviour of any one, until he believes.

'Then, if Jesus be not the Saviour of the *unbeliever* until he *believes*, the *unbeliever* is called upon to believe a lie. It appears to me, sir, that Jesus is the complete Saviour of *unbelievers*, and that *unbelievers* are called upon to believe the truth; and that by *believing*, they are saved, in their own apprehension, saved from all those dreadful fears which are consequent upon a state of conscious condemnation.

No madame, you are dreadfully, I trust not fatally, misled. Jesus never was, never will be, the Saviour of any unbeliever.

'Do you think that Jesus is your Saviour, sir?'

I hope so.

'Were you *always* a believer, sir?'

No, madam.

'Then you were once an unbeliever; that is, you once believed that Jesus Christ was not your Saviour. Now, as you say he never *was*, nor never

will be, the Saviour of any *unbeliever*; as you were once an *unbeliever*, he never can be your Saviour.'

He never was my Saviour till I believed.

'Did he never die for you till you believed, sir?'

Here I was extremely embarrassed, and most devoutly wished myself out of her habitation; I sighed bitterly, expressed deep commiseration for those souls who had nothing but head-knowledge; drew out my watch, discovered it was late; and, recollecting an engagement, observed it was time to take leave.

I was extremely mortified: the young lady observed my confusion, but was too generous to pursue her triumph. I arose to depart; the company arose; she urged us to tarry; addressed each of us in the language of kindness. Her countenance seemed to wear the resemblance of the heaven which she contemplated; it was stamped by benignity; and when we bade her adieu, she enriched us by her good wishes.

I suspected that my religious brethren saw she had the advantage of me, and I *felt* that her remarks were indeed *unanswerable*. My pride was hurt, and I determined to ascertain the exact sentiments of my associates respecting this interview. Poor soul, said I, she is far gone in error. True, said they, but she is notwithstanding a very sensible woman. Ay, ay, thought I, they have assuredly discovered that she had proved too mighty for me.

Yes, said I, she has a great deal of *head* knowledge, but yet she may be a lost, damned soul. I hope not returned one of my friends, she is a very good young woman. I saw and it was with extreme chagrin, that the result of this visit had dep-

recated me in the opinion of my companions. But I could only censure and condemn, solemnly observing—It was better not to converse with any of those apostates, and it would be judicious never to associate with them upon any occasion. From this period I myself carefully avoided every Universalist, and most *cordially did I hate them*. My ear was open to the public calumniator, to the secret whisperer, and I yielded credence to every scandalous report however improbable. My informers were *good people*; I had no doubt of their veracity; and I believed it would be difficult to paint Rely and his connexions in colors too black. How severely has the law of retaliation been since exercised, in the stabs which have been aimed at my own reputation.

FINIS.









~~AUG 9 1982~~

~~JUL 10 1993~~

**OSTON, Mass. 02210**

Digitized by Google



3 2044 020 661 328

H



