

A
S. Sawyer
DISCUSSION

Nov. 1854

ON THE DOCTRINE OF

ETERNAL SALVATION:

QUESTION.

"DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES TEACH THE DOCTRINE
OF ENDLESS MISERY?"

AFFIRMATIVE.

REV. ISAAC WESCOTT.

NEGATIVE.

REV. T. J. SAWYER, D.D.

New York:
BUNCE & BROTHER, PUBLISHERS,
134 NASSAU STREET.

—
MDCCCLIV.

ENTERED according to Act of Congress, in the year 1854, by

BUNCE & BROTHER,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of New York.

**W. H. TINSON,
STEREOTYPER,
24 Beekman Street.**

**TAWS, RUSSELL & Co.,
PRINTERS,
26 Beekman Street.**

ADVERTISEMENT.

PRINTED from the report of MR. BREMAN, and published by the authority and under the supervision of the REV. MR. WESCOTT and REV. MR. SAWYER.

DISCUSSION

ON THE

DOCTRINE OF ETERNAL SALVATION.

"DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES TEACH THE DOCTRINE
OF ENDLESS MISERY?"

AFFIRMATIVE.

REV. ISAAC WESCOTT.

NEGATIVE.

REV. T. J. SAWYER, D.D.

FIRST EVENING.

Prayer having been offered by the REV. DR. NYE, of Brooklyn,

REV. MR. WESCOTT spoke as follows :—It will be remembered by those of the congregation who were in attendance last spring, that, near the close of our discussion, my brother challenged me, publicly, in this place, to discuss with him, at some suitable time, and in some suitable place, the following question: "Do the Holy Scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery?" Regard to what I deem to be truth required my acceptance of the challenge. It was, in some respects, desirable that the discussion should immediately have followed that in which we were then engaged. Then our arguments were fresh in the memories of the assembly, and would not need to have been repeated; and so far as we ourselves were concerned, it was our wish that it might have been so arranged; but this building could not be ob-

tained, having been engaged to other parties, until too late in the season. Under these circumstances, it was decided to defer our discussion until the present time.

Although many of our former arguments may now have to be repeated, in order that they may be remembered by the assembly, and their connection with the present question seen ; and although more time may be required now than would have been necessary then, yet we trust that the discussion will afford you some agreeable entertainment, as well as promote the cause of truth, and the eternal welfare of souls.

We trust that some things were demonstrated by our discussion, last April, and among them the two following, namely : That religious discussion can be conducted in a gentlemanly and Christian spirit, and without engendering personal ill-feeling ; also, that the prejudice of the community, and, among others, of some excellent men, both in the ministry and among the laity, against religious discussion, is without support, either from the Scriptures, or from the practical results of such debates. Surely, when we have for this practice the example of such men as Stephen, Peter, and Paul, it ill becomes us to cry out against it ; more especially when one of those apostles was so thoroughly impressed with the propriety of continual oral discussion on the subject of religion as to continue it for the space of two whole years, disputing daily in the school of Tyrannus.

The question to be discussed is of vast importance, and comes home to each of us, involving the highest interests of time and of eternity. It not only involves our highest interests, but it involves our brightest hopes, our deepest concerns, and the purest joys of our souls during the whole space of their entire endless existence. If there were a doubt about the title by which you held your property, how anxiously would you examine the whole question until no

doubt remained on the subject ! What an excitement has been produced in the public mind by a few frauds upon our railroad stocks ! What anxiety has been sent through the whole public breast by the pressure in the money-market !

These topics are worthy of consideration. The excitement which they have occasioned is justifiable, for the temporal welfare of thousands is involved. But, in our question the interests are eternal—the endless interests of untold millions ! In a few years it will make no difference to us whether we were rich or poor, moved in the most splendid walks of worldly glory, or dwelt among the humble shadows of obscurity ; but the time will never come when it will make no difference whether we have embraced the truth involved in this discussion, when the principle involved in it will have no bearing upon our welfare. When sun, and moon, and stars, shall have ceased to rise and set, still the salvation of the soul, and the subject of future misery, will be ever, ever, interesting to us.

I don't mean that the mere belief in the affirmative of this question will, without corresponding principles and actions, secure everlasting life. But, believing this, we shall be far more likely to embrace these principles, and this truth, and to put forth those efforts with which our salvation is connected ; while denying the doctrine of endless misery, and embracing that of the final salvation of all men, is a course calculated, in its very nature, to make us careless, inattentive to the warnings of Holy Scripture, and liable, by this neglect, to incur the doom of those "who obey not the gospel," and who are to "be punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power."

We pray you, therefore, to give the more earnest heed to this subject, listening attentively to the arguments that may

be offered, for the sake of ascertaining the truth, and reducing the truth to practice in our hearts and lives.

Do not, I beseech you, misunderstand the question. Let it be clearly defined and well fastened in your minds. It is not, Can we by our finite reason, harmonize the attributes of God with the doctrines of endless misery? But it is, "Do the *Holy Scriptures* teach the doctrine of endless misery?" If we can ascertain what the Bible teaches upon this or any other subject, we can be certain of having found the truth, and, most certainly, God's attributes will harmonize with it, whether we can, or cannot, perceive how. Nor is the question to be decided by the sympathy of our nature. The question is not, Does the sympathy of our hearts teach the doctrine of endless misery? but, Do the *Holy Scriptures* teach it? The best of men are imperfect, and their feelings must, of necessity, partake of the general imperfection of their nature. They are, therefore, liable to be wrong upon any subject which interests them. The sympathy of our nature would have shrunk from the destruction of the Old World, in which the comparatively innocent child of a few months, was destroyed with the hardened and incorrigible sinner of a hundred years old. But, did God do any wrong in sending the flood upon the earth? Who will charge Jehovah with injustice? Our sympathy would not harmonize with the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, and we should have charged any *man* with iniquity who should have set these cities on fire; but, did the Judge of all the earth do wrong in destroying the cities of the plain? Let it be remembered that the exciting of our sympathies by those judgments by no means proves that we are better than Jehovah. But it does prove that Jehovah is wiser than we are, and that he sees judgments to be just which our finite reason cannot grasp or fathom. We cannot judge God by our perverted feelings and darkened reason

Neither is the question, What must have been the design of God in the creation of man? It does not ask, Can we make the design of Jehovah consistent with the endless misery of any of his creatures? We may make a mistake with regard to his design in the creation of man; or, if we conclude that the declaration, "for his own glory he made them," is sufficiently indicative of his purpose, even this would not prove the endless happiness of the human family; for it is to be seen that the glory of Jehovah is to be promoted by the endless misery of the incorrigible contemner of his law and disturber of the peace of his universe. Let us, then, search the Scriptures, and see what they teach. Let us be careful with regard to the spirit in which we refer to the Bible. Much as to correct information, will depend on our frame of spirit. Let us not first determine what the Bible *ought* to teach, and then read it, to try and make it so speak. The prejudiced mind can make almost any book speak a very different sentiment from what its author ever intended; in this way men have wrested the Scriptures to their own destruction, once and again. Let us then come to the Bible with one faith. *This is the Word of God.* Let us come with one simple desire, namely, to know just what this Word teaches—with one single purpose—to believe just what it teaches, and do just what it requires.

Coming to the Scriptures of Divine Truth, with feelings like these, can we mistake? Then, if we speak not according to this book, it is because there is no light in us. Let us not ask what our darkest reason, embellished by sophistry, teaches—let us not ask what our perverted feelings may desire to be true—but, what do the Holy Scriptures say touching this question?

If it can be shown from the sacred oracles that sin is of so great magnitude as to *deserve* endless misery, then it will be clear that God is under no obligation to deliver man

from his impending destruction; his throne will for ever shine with spotless holiness, though the whole human family may sink into ruin. The plan of salvation being of God's free grace, he can, with perfect propriety, assign a limited time within which the sinner must avail himself of its privileges, and be received into favor, or be debarred from it for ever. And if the Scriptures reveal this day of probation, it will be clearly implied that man, being a moral agent, is capable of resisting beyond the limited time, of debarring himself of his privileges, and, thus rejecting the atonement of Christ, may perish for ever.

I am happy to say that, on the subject of moral agency, there is no difference between us: my brother declares it explicitly; and this implies not only the power of obedience, but also of disobedience—disobedience and its consequence—endless punishment. If, in searching the Scriptures, we learn that God frequently warns the sinner against eternal wrath, this certainly proves the existence of endless misery; for the infinitely just God would never warn us against what does not exist.

Further, God is consistent—he speaks what he means; the Scriptures reveal his will in plain language; he never speaks what he does not intend. He, therefore, would never, for any purpose, condescend to warn man against an evil that had no existence.

If, then, in searching the Scriptures (and you do not now understand me as beforehand, asserting anything as to their teaching), we find the doctrine of a general judgment—the description of which, together with the sentence of the Judge, gives the sinner no promise of deliverance from his awful doom—then, the subject appears to me to be settled beyond the possibility of a cavil; we are bound to believe that doom interminable. If we find that, in the day of judgment, Christ shall say to the wicked, "Depart into

everlasting punishment !” without the least gleam of hope being offered that deliverance shall ever be, ought we not to believe that that doom is interminable ? If, in the course of this discussion, it should appear that the holy Scriptures declare the continuance of future misery in the same terms or words wherein it declares the future happiness of the righteous, and the being of God himself—then are we bound either to concede the doctrine of endless misery, or to give up the endless happiness of the just—nay, to disbelieve and to deny the eternity of Jehovah ?

I am aware that my brother, in this discussion, has the wishes of the people on his side of the question ; and I am also aware that it requires but very little argument to induce a man to believe what he wishes to be true ; while, to convince a man against the desire of his heart, requires sound reasoning and conclusive argument. Well ! My brother has the wishes of the community—I have the Bible ; he will appeal to the one—I intend to appeal to the other.

I am also aware my brother will avail himself of this general desire of the human heart, and seek to convert it into an argument. He will probably call this desire the better feelings of our nature, the more Godlike emotions of our heart, which must, therefore, be founded in truth. But the fallacy will appear when we consider how frequently our brightest hopes and fondest desires have been blighted and disappointed in time past ; but if these have been based on misapprehension, so, too, may be our desires and hopes in regard to the future. Who, among all the convicts of our State prisons, but earnestly desires, and at times hopes, to be pardoned, and restored to his friends, his family, and his home ? But who would call these desires and hopes the better and more Godlike part of that man’s nature ? Who does not know that they are the aspirations of purest selfishness ? Let us remember that our desires and our hopes, in

regard to ourselves and our friends, if not founded on Scriptural evidence, are transitory and unsubstantial as the "morning cloud and the early dew." All our desires for salvation, without compliance with the requirements of the Bible, will prove to be "like the spider's web," when, at the hour of death, we are called upon to give up the ghost.

Do not, therefore, I entreat you, however ardently you may desire the consummation which this delusive hope offers you on terms too easy—do not take this desire in the place of Scriptural evidence, and thus embrace a fatal error ! Remember that the holy Scriptures, and the holy Scriptures alone, are to decide this question. Not the desire of our imperfect hearts, but What saith the Bible ? is the question under consideration.

I am earnest in this matter ; because, at the very commencement of this discussion, I wish to anchor the vessel on the true ground—the holy Scriptures of Divine Truth—that we may draw our arguments thence, and then we shall be sure that we are right ; our rock will not be as others', our enemies themselves being our witnesses. If I can persuade you to reject all arguments not based upon the Bible, and to yield your judgments to the teachings of the sacred volume, I shall have no fear with regard to the result of this discussion. My brother and myself both regard the Bible as the supreme authority upon religious questions ; and, as error can be of no lasting benefit to either, may I not hope that he will unite with me in persuading you to yield your judgments to the teachings of God's holy word ? And will not every Christian unite with me in prayer to the God of all grace, imploring him to grant to both speakers and audience the influence of his Holy Spirit, to lead us into all truth ?

REV. DR. SAWYER.—I need not spend a moment, I trust, in speaking of the importance of the subject in debate. It

is a question, as my brother has justly remarked, that touches every man's business and bosom. It affects our highest hopes and our deepest fears, as religious and immortal beings. In comparison with it, the affairs of time, our little successes and disappointments here, the rise and fall of states—even the grandest events that assume such importance on the page of history—are all as nothing. Were we discussing the fate of even one human soul for eternity, the question would be one of tremendous import. How much heightened, then, must it be, when we discuss the fate of a whole race of intelligent beings—a race that peoples our globe, and that stretches through uncounted generations! This discussion, then, I am sure, cannot fail to command your attention, and to enlist your liveliest sympathy and interest.

The doctrine which my brother volunteers to prove and maintain, I wish you to observe in the outset, is no *common* doctrine. I do not mean that it is not a doctrine commonly received and generally believed by men; but I wish you to understand, and remember, that its import is of no common character—it is simply tremendous. It asserts that a portion, at least, of the human family is, in the providence of God, to be made endlessly miserable. Have you ever thought, my friends, what endless misery means? Have you ever spent an hour in reflecting on the tremendous import of the term? There is nothing like it in the universe of God. It stands out by itself, alone, awful, sublimely awful, incomprehensible, and yet terrible beyond expression. You have suffered pain; you are familiar in some degree with anguish. Take this experience as a starting-point, and body forth to yourselves some conception of endless misery. You have felt the pain of a diseased tooth; you have suffered the restlessness of a fever; you have, it may be, undergone the torture of fire. Conceive any of these modes of

suffering continued in its intensity, not for an hour, or a day, or a week, but through months and years, day after day, week after week, year after year, century after century! Just think of the toothache thus perpetuated! How soon, under it, would life itself grow to be an intolerable curse! How soon would you wish, with the pious Job, that the shadow of death would gather over you, and this feverish existence, with all its pain, all its torture, come to an end! You have suffered mental anguish, and some of you remember, perhaps imperfectly, the intensity of the suffering. You have seen the life flickering in its socket, of some loved friend—a wife—a child; you have felt unutterable anguish, when laying the loved form in its final resting-place—when you saw the dust of the grave cover all that was so beautiful in your eyes, and so dear to your heart. Imagine that feeling continued through days, months, years—nay, perpetuated throughout eternity—nay, more, increasing in intensity until you can see no end! If you will take the trouble to think thus, you will prepare yourselves in some feeble degree to comprehend—I will not say to comprehend, but to conceive—the subject we are to discuss—endless misery. But endless misery is not the continuance of one mere pain; if the authorities on the subject are to be relied on, it is the aggregation, the accumulation, of all possible pains; all bodily and spiritual pains; all that is possible for us to suffer; all that God himself can gather around us and strengthen us to bear; and these pains are to be continued world without end! It is this circumstance of eternity that gives the last stroke to the horrors of this misery. Were it not for that, as these authorities speak, there would be some power of endurance. Could we only feel that there was an end to be reached by-and-by, then ease would come at last, quiet would settle down upon us, peace would be ours, life and joy be once more the gifts of God. But no—all pain of body, of

affections wounded, of spirits bruised, and, which is more than all, the fear and torture of a soul conscious of some harrowing guilt, are to be there borne, increased, intensified, and for ever. The terrible consciousness of sin under which your spirit quailed, takes up its constant abode in your heart, standing before you as an awful presence, which no repentance can allay, no prayer can banish! All this, I repeat, intensified, made worse and worse, awful and more awful, and continued, without hope or ray of light, through the countless ages of an inconceivable eternity! Such is endless misery!

I do not intend, this evening, to give you any description of hell, as it is called in the popular language—the place or state where this misery is to be inflicted. I may, however, be allowed to say, that if the accounts of its most learned and zealous advocates are to be relied upon, its torments will embrace every possible form of misery, and that in the intensest degree. This hell is called “a world of woe,” “an universe of death.” Watson tells us, in his “Body of Divinity,” that it is “the very accent and emphasis of misery.” I trust my brother will, at an early moment, favor you and me with his account of this tremendous suffering, give us some sketch of that world of horrors and woe into the belief of which he wishes to introduce you. I shall then take the opportunity, if an opportunity is afforded me, to show you how the old fathers, and the fathers’ fathers, have looked upon this subject, and what descriptions they have given of this tremendous misery; for I wish to remind you that the hell of modern times is a milder, more gentle, and tolerable thing than that of the olden days. It will appear in the sequel that the faith of our brother is very weak and poor compared with that of those who walked before him. “Think,” says the Rev. Austin Dickinson, formerly of this city, “think of the dread amount of

misery that must be endured by an incorrigible enemy of God, *increasing for ever in guilt and remorse!* Think of the extent of eternity! Oh! send an angel forward on the awful deep, with the speed of lightning, for millions and millions of centuries, and the dread waves of perdition are still rising and rolling beyond!" "Let the imagination stretch its wings again," says the late Dr. Griffin, "and follow the ex-cruciated soul through ages of unutterable endurance, through fire intense enough to melt down all the planets. One period after another passes by as it flies, until it looks back on the first million years as a speck in the horizon, and still it hears the tormented soul exclaim, '*My agony is just begun!*'"

These are only very mild and gentle specimens of the tone of orthodoxy, so-called, on this subject. This is the doctrine my brother is to maintain and defend! He is to make it appear to you that the Holy Scriptures, God's Revelation, teach this terrible doctrine; that God himself is its author; that it is under his wise arrangement that this misery is to transpire; that he is to be, in an especial manner, the cause of it, and is to perpetuate it world without end! He is to make it appear, too, that this misery is to be inflicted on a part of God's own creatures, made in his image, capable of happiness and misery beyond conception; that he made them for his own glory, as we are to suppose, that he sustained them through this short life, and that he is now reserving them for endless tortures!

Now, what, I ask, is such a doctrine as this to *rest upon*? Have you thought of that? There must be some broad, deep ground on which it is to be predicated. You and I cannot take it up at random, and receive it without evidence, clear and decisive evidence. Does it rest on the will of God? God is a Being of infinite goodness. Does it stand connected with God's infinite wisdom? Wisdom is

blended with mercy and love. Does it grow out of justice, that tremendous attribute, before which so many blanch and tremble? Justice itself, with all its severity, is, after all, an attribute that lays the square and the line to its work, and never, for an instant, transgresses what is infinitely right. However you and I may suffer at the hand of God, there is this consolation, that we can never suffer what is wrong, never more than we deserve. He rewards every man according to his work. There is a *proportion*, therefore, which Justice cannot transcend, and will not forget.

We agree in believing that God created man to be holy and happy. That, I believe, is one of the results, if there be any, of our late discussion. "The chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him for ever." God made man; is governing him; has never forgotten him; and I am at a loss to conjecture how he ever can. My brother may tell us that the damned in hell will "glorify God." That is no new doctrine, though it may be a strange one; but how they shall "enjoy him," is a question he will not answer. We shall be told this endless misery is the just punishment of some righteous and holy law. I trust we shall be so told, and that it will be insisted on. But where is this law? In what part of the Holy Scriptures is it laid down, and with what penalty? I have read that Book with some attention and much reverence—but I do not find it there. If my brother can enlighten me on this point, it will be a matter of great moment.

My brother has taken some pains to prepare you for a discussion of this subject. I should almost infer that we were to give up our reason—certainly our feelings and affections, and undertake our inquiry as mathematicians do theirs, viewing it as a mere problem in which we have no interest. We have had theologians enough of this kind. Calvin had an eagle eye, and a grasping mind, but a heart as cold and

hard as adamant, and talked of the endless misery of God's creatures as a mathematician would about his angles and sines. He never blenched, never hesitated, had no sympathies, or crushed them down, and was a mere creature of cold intellect. I am not inclined to think God made these affections and placed them in our bosoms to no purpose, or to be a barrier to the attainment of truth ; they may be helps to its attainment.

My brother says I have the advantage in this—that all your sympathies go with me. Did he mean this? Look out upon this city, and tell me if the sympathies of men go with the Universalist, or do they not, with a tremendous rush, run in the horrible current of orthodoxy? Where are the fashionable churches, with their hundreds and thousands of adherents? Are they guided by Universalism? I have not so learned Jesus Christ, nor so read the history of his church.

My brother tells us it is easy for men to believe what they wish to be true. The insinuation was meant that we believe Universalism because it is a pleasant thing. Would my brother stand that test? Does he believe orthodoxy, in all its consequences, in all its dreadful results, because he wishes these to be true. I would not so accuse him. He believes it, because he thinks it to be true, and finds his duty to be in it ; he preaches it for the same reason. I ask him with all his earnestness, with all his zeal, does he find any consolation in it, any bowels of mercy, anything recommending it or its tremendous awfulness.

How shall this doctrine be proved? My brother says if God threatens men with endless misery, we are to assume he means what he threatens. I grant it! Let us have the threatening. If the sacred writers speak of judgment, a general judgment, beyond which there is no promise of redemption, then it may be taken for granted that there will

be no redemption, and that the doctrine of endless torments is true. Let us have the account of that judgment. If the same words be employed, as my brother says they are, to convey the assurance of eternal misery, as are used to assure us of future life, and to designate the eternity of God, then we must take it for granted that the Scriptures teach this doctrine. Let us see those words of such indubitable import applied to this subject ; I have not yet found them. I shall ask my brother to prove this doctrine by clear passages of Divine Writ, passages that can be justly interpreted to apply to this subject, and to teach this doctrine. If this be not done, his case cannot be considered to be made out ; if this can be done, then, of course, he bears away the palm,

But it is important that we should understand upon what principles we are to interpret the Scriptures ; if, after all, this whole doctrine is to be maintained on a simple interpretative basis—that is to say, if a certain few words scattered through the Scriptures are to be picked up, on which an interpretation favorable to this doctrine can be founded. Perhaps we can be gratified by a few criticisms on Hebrew or Greek roots to make out this tremendous doctrine. It finds no support in the attributes of God, nor in the dealings of God here, in this world, with which we are acquainted, in anything that comes within the range of our knowledge or to which we can apply our reason. The doctrine is unique ; it stands out by itself alone. It rests neither on his wisdom, his goodness, nor his justice, nor on all together. It sustains no harmony with any of God's dealings in this life. It is inconsistent with every just conception of the Divine character.

But I do not believe that it can be made out even in that interpretative manner ; I believe any amount of proof of that kind must be unsatisfactory to every fair mind ; for, you will agree with me, that a doctrine must be proved by

evidence corresponding to the character of the doctrine itself. Murder in the first degree must be more clearly proved than petit larceny. Just in proportion as a doctrine rises in magnitude, the more abhorrent and tremendous it is, the more it demands increased testimony to make it apparent or even plausible. This is a point of great importance. You are not justified in receiving it on slight evidence, it is not to be taken up in the easy, careless manner of orthodox churches ; I hold there are few sins of a mental character, more serious than this. Good and serious men take up this doctrine without reflection, and so live in it, and spend their lives with men who preach it ! There are few doctrines which belong more entirely to the routine of faith, and I shall take occasion to show what influence the Catholic church has had, not only in introducing, but in perpetuating it ; and now, to this day, how Protestantism is only playing a second part to that mother of harlots.

REV. MR. WESCOTT.—My brother truly calls this a doctrine of awful importance ; but, because it is so, we are neither to believe it nor reject it ; whether it is awful in a greater or less degree is not the criterion by which truth is to be tested. We have a more sure word of prophecy than this ; we have a better rule—the word of God ! He asks if you have taken one hour to consider this so awful subject. I would that the implied exhortation would be complied with. I would that each of you would devote one hour in which you would be alone with your God, and make the subject the subject of your sole contemplation and investigation. But, let me add one word of advice, which he did not : When you go to your chamber alone, take your Bible with you, and examine the subject in the light which the Scriptures afford ; and you will rise with a more determined mind than before to shun the awful misery, and take hold

on the glorious life offered in the Gospel. 'Tis a poor argument that this doctrine must be rejected because it is awful. Suppose a man had become a subject or citizen of a country where murder was punished with death—and he then for the first time in his life heard of such a punishment for the offence ; suppose it announced to him—"Whosoever taketh the life of a man shall be suspended by the neck till dead." "What !" he cries, "put out my life so far as you can do it ; doom me to endless night ? Awful—awful ! that law cannot exist !" You would reply—"Our statute-book so declares ; we look not to the awfulness, but to the law and the testimony."

Take also the Bible in regard to the *nature* of misery. My brother, last spring, commenced with reading the orthodox ministers, the fathers. I have no religious father ; I believe no doctrine more or less because Dr. Dickinson promulgated it, or any one else. The Bible is my rule ; I believe every word which that book rightly translated teaches ; I believe nothing, for religion, that is not taught there. He adds—"that hell into which my brother wishes to introduce you, I know he did not mean what that implies, for I know the kindness of his heart. No, no ; if I wished that, I would seal my lips and let you go on. It is because I would save you, instrumentally, that I hold up the truth while the day of mercy is continued. If I told you there was no danger, I would be more likely to lead you to endless suffering than by warning you of its existence.

After some description of what this man, or father, has written, he says: "This is the tone of orthodoxy." I have nothing to do with the tone of orthodoxy, but with the declarations of the Bible, and of that only. Neither is it true, nor do we contend that God made men to be miserable ; God made man with the design that they should glorify and enjoy him for ever. He asks, "Will God lose

sight of his design?" I answer, Men carry not out God's designs in this world. When Jehovah said, "Thou shalt not take my name in vain," was it not his will and design that men should reverence instead of blaspheme his name? Jehovah has declared his will—"Love each other as yourselves." Have we done so? Is not the world notorious for selfishness, and carelessness for the interests of others? God's will is not accomplished in these regards; what assurance have we that it ever will be, in regard to the children of men, unless we can ascertain that fact from the Scriptures. The Bible is the only history, the only geography of that land which lies beyond the grave; and this Bible declares that "the wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations who forget God." The Saviour said, "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and, after that, have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom you should fear—fear him that, after he hath killed, hath power to destroy both soul and body in hell." So teach the prophets, and so teaches the Lord of the prophets. It matters little to me what the so-called orthodoxy believe (although, in the main, I think what they teach accords with the Scriptures). I believe, with my brother, that man is a moral agent, capable of sinning endlessly; and he believes, as I do, that while he sins he must be miserable. He says it would be supposed, from my arguments, that we should give up our reason and our feelings. Not so; the proper part of reason, in searching the Scriptures, is to ascertain what the Bible teaches, and then to sit down at the instructor's feet. Our feelings should nerve us up and urge us onward in protracted study. What I urge is to subject *both* to the teachings of the Bible. He says he preaches the doctrine which he believes, and I that which I believe; and he hopes God will bless me in it. I thank him for that, and I sometimes think he would rather I would

succeed—*because my doctrine is the less dangerous*. If I am wrong, there is no danger; if he, the danger is fearful. He asks me for the threatenings. I answer my brother, If Providence spare me, he shall have them to his heart's content before we are through; I cannot bring them in a single evening. This evening I only claim the Bible for the arbiter, and that judgment and feeling be submitted thereunto. He asks me to prove endless misery, and says that is my task. I admit it; I shall not shrink from it—unless I become a convert to his faith; if I do, I hope for the honesty to acknowledge my error, and join him in the promulgation of what he believes true. But I do believe I can as clearly prove the endless misery of the wicked as the endless happiness of the just—as the eternal existence of Jehovah. They are co-extensive; and, when we come to it, you will be astonished at the amount of proof the Scriptures afford. I contemplate taking the subject, step by step, through the eight evenings; and we shall have doctrine and proof as clear as mind can demand them.

My brother alludes to the Catholic purgatory—I ask the difference between it and the Restorationist's hell. Both come to have their wickedness burnt out—to rise up to heaven—bid Jesus stand aside—they have saved themselves—their say is of their own sufferings, not of the Redeemer's love and praise!

DR. SAWYER.—My brother and I agree with respect to the moral freedom of man, as we do with respect to God's design in his creation. We believe that God made man a free being, capable of moral action, responsible for his conduct, and therefore a proper subject of rewards for his good, and punishment for his evil deeds. I insist, in addition, that this original design of God, he will ultimately carry out; he will not be frustrated; having made man to "glorify

and enjoy him for ever," that end will at last be attained. But my brother denies this, and says as man is a free agent, he may continue to sin for ever. But you will bear in mind, and I ask him to bear in mind that as long as it is possible for an individual to sin, it is possible for him to repent and reform. The power of repenting is, of necessity, co-extensive with the power of sinning—for, if there be no freedom to sin or *not to sin* (that is, to repent)—then there can be no sin at all, for sin implies a *choice* of the wrong.

My brother holds that, because God's design of peace and love is not fulfilled in the world—because men murder, blaspheme, rob—the same will be the case through eternity. Is that good reasoning? Because a child disobeys its parent to-day, must we conclude it will also disobey to-morrow? It may—and, again, it may not. If I understand God's government at all, he is carrying it forward by a system of divine instruction and improvement, teaching us, by the very punishments we bring upon ourselves, as well as by other means, that sin is an evil and a bitter thing, and that, to become happy, we must first become good, and the purpose of God, carried forward in time, will be attained in eternity.

My brother has quoted some passages of Scripture : one for instance, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." I wish he had taken the trouble, which it certainly devolved on him to take, to tell us what this word, *hell*, means. He supposes, as I know, that to many of your minds it means a place of endless torments—but the words translated hell in the Bible, are *never* used there in that sense. The word in this text is never employed to signify a place of endless torment, or of any torment beyond the grave. My brother knows, or should know, that it means *the state of the dead in general*, without any regard to their goodness or badness, happiness or misery.

On this point I shall, to-morrow night, perhaps, give some authorities. I want to show you how strangely your minds have been abused ; and this I mean to show, not on Universalist authority, but on the very best orthodox authority the world possesses. By such men as, Gesenius Campbell, and Stuart, I will show that the word "*Sheol*," here translated hell, *never* means a place of endless misery. I should perhaps except Stuart, because out of sixty-one passages he selects *five*, where he thinks the word *might* mean a place of *future* misery ; but even on these he obviously places no reliance ! I say to my brother here, and to the orthodox clergy of New York, that the word "*Sheol*," translated in the Old Testament "hell," *never* means in a single instance, a place of endless punishment, and that the minds of the ignorant have been imposed on by teaching for the doctrines of God the traditions of men.

My brother has quoted another passage from the New Testament : "Fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell"—in which another word occurs—*Gehenna* ;" also translated "hell." It is a wonder he himself did not see something a little remarkable in that ; for the Saviour here speaks of a destruction of soul and body in hell ! Does my brother believe the *bodies* of the wicked go to hell ? But what was this Gehenna, in fact ? A place well known to oriental travellers ; it lay to the southeast of Jerusalem, called in the Hebrew "*Gehinnom*," in the Greek, "*Gehenna*." It was formerly defiled by idolatrous worship ; in our Saviour's day, it is said by the Rabbins, the Jews executed criminals there ; thither, the offal of the city was carried, and there burnt. Here is the origin of the often-quoted phrase—"Where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched." Such is the word perverted to signify a place of everlasting torture !

We are not here in any trifling spirit, nor, I trust, with

any desire for mastery. I want to know, as well as my brother, what is the truth. I am thoroughly satisfied the religious mind is full of errors on this subject, that have come down generation after generation, and that rest, emphatically, on nothing. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Even those who maintain that this awful doctrine is found in the New Testament, admit it is not in the Old. I shall ask how it found its way into the New, and my brother will be obliged to answer that question.

In one thing he misunderstood me. I did not allude, as he said, to the Roman Catholic purgatory, but to something far more dreadful—the doctrine of endless torments. This purgatory which he speaks of so sneeringly is only a perversion of the doctrine so general in the ancient church of a place of retribution. It is used by the Roman Catholic Church for the purpose of serving its own interests. It has an element of truth in it—just as much truth as ordinary lies have—enough to make it stand.

The Catholic Church denounces Universalism, persecutes it, and where it cannot force the belief of endless punishment, it certainly does its best in making the recusants acquainted with fire in this. That Church is the great foster-mother of torments, anathemas, and hell; and the Orthodox Protestant Church has followed as close at her heels as she well could. A man's character and usefulness in life are measured by his faith in endless misery. Let him adhere to this, and he will succeed; but if he believes God better than his neighbor thinks him to be, he is a dangerous man, to be pointed at and despised.

SECOND EVENING.

Prayer having been offered by Rev. Mr. Orchard,

MR. WESCOTT said—In the closing remarks of my brother, last night, he informed us that, because man was a moral agent, and capable of sinning continually, he was, *therefore*, capable of repenting and reforming at any time. I do not think that this conclusion follows. While we admit that man is a moral agent, and that, if left to himself, he will continue to sin, yet that does not of itself prove that he will at any time possess the power of exercising evangelical repentance and permanent reformation. A man may, in this life, disable himself from doing his duty. A continuance in a dissipated course may destroy his constitution, disable him from taking care of his family, or helping himself; yet, after all, he might continue to be a burden to all around him, and to exercise many functions of moral agency. A man may sin until every principle of his moral nature inclining him to reform shall be destroyed and eternally silenced. The apostle speaks of this class, when he says: "Having their conscience seared with a hot iron."—1 Tim., iv., 2. Again: "Who, being past feeling, have given themselves over into lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness."—Eph., iv., 19. Here all moral power is lost, because, to a man *past feeling*, it is impossible to repent. The apostle had his eye on this class.

But, another consideration, which my brother seems to

overlook entirely, but which stands out prominently in the Scriptures, is—a man, unaided by the Holy Spirit, *cannot* exercise evangelical repentance. Hear the words of Christ: “No man can come to me, except the Father who sent me draw him.”—John vi., 44. Suppose God leave the sinner, give him up, how can he repent or reform? I shall not now enter into the question in regard to the means of grace in the future world, but intend to investigate the Scriptural testimony before we are through. I can only say, if a sinner can go where God will not follow him with grace, his repentance and salvation are impossible.

My brother, in his remarks upon the texts I quoted (one in Psalms, and the other in Matthew), gives us an exegesis on the words “*Sheol*” and “*Hades*,” to show that they never mean a place of eternal misery. All admit that “*Hades*” does not necessarily mean this, but what we call, in familiar language, “the land of spirits,” “the place of the dead.” But that it *sometimes* means a place of misery, is as clear as any other truth in the Bible; it includes both the place of happiness and of misery, and which is meant we are to determine by the context. For instance, take the text I quoted, Psalms ix., 17, “The wicked shall be turned into hell, and those that forget God.” Did David mean that they would simply die? If so, where was the difference between them and the other class? The prophets, the best men, those who have walked with God, have gone there. Therefore, misery is implied in that use of “*Hades*.” No doubt the phrase was used in its common acceptance among the Jews, in the days of Christ and earlier, as the abode of souls after death; sometimes expressing eternity, as regarding place, *not* time. The text means that they who forget God will be turned into his wrath—either that, or nonsense. As to the passage from Matthew x., 28, my brother asked if I supposed the wicked would have their *bodies* cast

into hell. I do not know whether our Saviour meant that, but I answer, emphatically, Yes! I prove it from Rev. xx., near the close—"And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire, this is the second death!" Yes, in the resurrection, the body and soul were united—the wicked to be cast into hell, the righteous received to glory. The Saviour's meaning probably is, "Fear not them who can only inflict pain on the body, but him who can do that, and also follow the soul with wrath wherever it goes."

Having thus noticed my brother's remarks, I now present my first argument in proof of the doctrine of endless misery. I remark, in the first place, that *I believe the doctrine of endless misery, because sin is so great a moral evil as to deserve endless punishment.* That is, God can be just, and leave the sinner endlessly to the consequences of his sins.

How shall we ascertain whether sin is a great or a small evil? I invite your attention to the following considerations: First, the manner in which Jehovah has spoken of sin. If we can have God's opinion, we may be sure we are right. In several passages of Scripture Jehovah terms sin "*abominable.*"—Psalms xiv., 1, He calls sin "*abominable works*;" Psalms liii., 1, "They have done *abominable iniquity*;" Jeremiah xlv., 4, "Do not this *abominable thing which I hate*;" Titus i., 16, "In works they deny him, being *abominable and disobedient.*" It is not my expression, nor that of some divines (I understand we are to have the testimony of some divines); it is testimony that neither you nor I can with safety gainsay—it is the testimony of God! Mark again; in the last passage quoted, the wicked works are, denying Christ. As man may be guilty of simply denying Christ, and be guilty of all guilt! The denial need not be by words of lips, but by neglecting Christ. Such God terms *abominable*. What sinner, therefore, is there that

does not come under the condemnation of this text? Who is not abominable in the sight of God?

Again; I judge of sin from the terms in which God threatens to punish the sinner—not in the language of fatherly discipline, be it remembered, but in that of severe punishment. Deut. xxxii., 41, “I will render vengeance to mine enemies;” Isaiah i., 24, “I will avenge me of mine enemies;” Romans iii, 5, the apostle says, with great significance—“Is God unrighteous that taketh vengeance?” My brother said, last spring, if God was such a God as I believe him to be, he was unrighteous and unjust—the apostle seems to have had this class of objections in his eye. Again, Romans xii., 19, “Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord;” 1 Thes. i., 7, 8, 9, “The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power.” Here we are not only told that vengeance will be taken upon the most abandoned and outcast, but upon every one who neglects the gospel. We are also told that *one* manifestation of this vengeance is “everlasting destruction.” That is *one*! Be not deceived my friends! Though I and my brother should rise and tell you our God is not like this to take vengeance, yet, the God who sits enthroned in the heavens, who shakes creation with a nod, the God who speaks in the rolling thunder, and flashes in the vivid lightning of heaven, who shall summon every living creature to his bar; he has told us this by the pen of holy men whom he had inspired to write those things—and they shall stand till heaven and earth pass away.

Again,—Jude 7, “Sodom and Gomorrah are * * * * suffering the vengeance of eternal fire;” and this though

two thousand years had rolled by ! Oh, we may laugh at the declarations of Scripture, we may smile with contempt at the language of the Bible—but, our question, after all, is—“Do the Holy Scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery ?”

Also ; God threatens the wicked with his *fury* as well as his vengeance. Job xx., 23,” “God shall cast the fury of his wrath upon him ;” Isaiah lix., 18, “He will repay fury to his adversaries.” When Jehovah thus threatens sinners, is not sin a moral evil infinitely beyond our comprehension ?

Again ; Jehovah threatens his *wrath* against sin. Saith John in Matthew iii., 7, “Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come ?” Romans ii., 8, 9, “Indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil.” I ask again, must not sin be of infinitely great magnitude, that Jehovah should thus characterize it ? Is it not just, then, that he should leave sinners to their own destruction for ever ?

Again ; the moral evil of sin may be shown by its effects in the world. We may judge of the greatness of a principle from its effects. What has sin done ? The whole earth, as a physical body, has been cursed by it. In Genesis iii., 17, 18, Jehovah says—“Cursed be the ground for thy sake * * * thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth.” Sin was such that God could not pass by the physical world without pouring his curse on the place where sin reigned. Sin has destroyed individual peace. “There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked,” Isaiah lvii., 21. Instead of the peace, contentment and communion with God which our first parents enjoyed, man’s soul has become the abode of sorrow, discontent, ambition, gloom, terror, and despair. Oh ! we can tell that *we* cannot measure sin ; beyond that we do not know. Look at its effects upon the domestic circle. The domestic circle has all the happiness it *could*

have but for sin—but, how many are rendered wretched by its influence ! Look at that deserted hearth, beside which the widowed mother mourns her hapless child, torn from her by the master's grasp ! Behold the deserted wife, whose husband is led away by the force of sin ! Gaze upon the children of the drunkard ; behold their eyes gazing with a depth of woe they cannot, dare not utter. Sin has done it all ! Look at the ruined expectations of those aged parents, whose hopes have been blasted like a rush, whose hoary heads are brought down with sorrow to the grave 'Tis sin that has prostrated their son in the mire of degradation ! See the effects of sin on nations—but I cannot dwell on this. See them in the courts, in the prisons—thefts—murders—executions ! See them in war, and remember—all, all are the fruits of sin !

In addition to the special divisions to which I have alluded, see its effects upon the world at large ! Look especially at those two particulars—sickness, that destroys comfort ; death, that brings the body down beneath the clod of the valley, and sends the soul into a world unknown ! “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.”—Rom. v., 12. There would have been no death if there were no sin. Is sin a small thing ? Cast your eye over the world, and ask if sin be a slight thing !

[Mr. Wescott's half hour being up, he mentioned he had not enumerated all his heads, but would endeavor to compress his fourth and last within his remaining quarter hour, on the same evening.]

DR. SAWYER.—My brother, it seems to me, does not reason well in his metaphysics, when he says that the sinner can go so far in sin as to be incapable of reformation or repentance, and yet is to keep on for ever sinning. Is that

one of the arrangements of the Divine economy? He tells us, moreover, that no one of us can repent evangelically except under the influence of the Divine Spirit, which, if God pleases to withhold, of course there is no repentance for any one. But, in that case, does he not see that he makes God responsible, in a manner, for the damnation and the sin that follow? He has so organized man, and established a moral economy, that a man can sin to a certain point beyond which there is no repentance—as if God meant to extend and carry sin throughout eternity. I do not think God favors sin so far, nor does any part of his word countenance such a notion. It is very clear in metaphysics that, if I *cannot avoid* sinning, I have no responsibility. Necessity knows no morality. If it is not *possible* for me to tell truth, there is no sin in my lying. If I *cannot* be honest, who can blame me for dishonesty? If I *cannot* love God, why hold me guilty for not loving him? And so universally. The fundamental principle of moral freedom implies the possibility of acting either way, right or wrong.

I did hope my brother would take a little more pains in regard to the argument. The meaning of the word “hell,” as it occurs in the Old Testament, was adverted to last evening. It seems to me that is rather an important point. He believes the word means a place either of endless bliss or endless punishment. *I deny that.* He says it does not necessarily mean a place of misery, but that it may mean so. I want the proof that it may mean so, and that proof has not been furnished—and for the very best of all reasons, I suspect. Will you indulge me a moment while I present this subject, not on my own authority, but on that of others who are entitled to respect and confidence.

Bear in mind that the ancient Hebrews had no idea of the spherical figure of the earth. They thought it a vast plain spread out in the seas or waters; and so, when they came

to shores where they could see no land beyond, they thought that there was an end of the earth. Above the earth was heaven, and beneath the earth was "*Sheol*," or "hell," as we have rendered it. This they contemplated as a vast subterranean abode, as deep under the surface of the earth as heaven was high above it. You will find in the Old Testament several expressions, and some even in the New, in which the respective occupants of those three different regions are alluded to. We are told in a very remarkable passage, that "in the name of Jesus, every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth"—thus embracing the whole universe, according to the Hebrew idea; and so in other places. Here arises the important question—What did the inspired writers *mean* when they used this word—and, what did the ancient Hebrews understand by it? The *meaning* of the Bible is the Bible. I will, for this end, trouble you with a few authorities. The word "*Sheol*" has been rendered in the Septuagint, or Greek version, "Hades;" in ours, "*hell*." It occurs sixty-four times in the Hebrew Scriptures; thirty-one times it is translated *hell*; thirty times *grave*; three times *pit*. Whether our translators understood the matter it is difficult to say. A good many circumstances lead me to suppose that they did understand it a little better than they left their readers to understand it. They gave "*grave*" where every one saw clearly a place of endless misery could not be meant—but where this was not apparent, they put down "*hell*." Professor Stuart tells us, however, very candidly, that the word "*hell*," in the old Saxon, means "*what is covered*;" and Dr. Adam Clarke says that, in some parts of England, they still speak of "*helling*," *i. e. roofing*, houses. Unlike as these renderings are, the word "*Sheol*" itself is remarkable for the steady uniformity of its significations. Gesenius, the great Hebrew lexicographer, defines it by the

Latin word "*Orcus* ; the underworld ; a vast subterranean place, full of thick darkness (Job x., 21, 22), in which are congregated the shades of the dead, and to which are attributed valleys and gates." Jahn, the eminent Hebrew Archæologist, tells us that the belief of the Hebrews on the condition of man after death, was that "the spirits of the dead were received into *Sheol*, which is represented as a large subterranean abode. Gen. xxxvii., 35. Num. xvi., 30-33. Deut. xxxii., 22. Into this abode we are told that the wicked are driven suddenly, their days being cut short ; but the good descend into it in tranquillity, and in the fulness of their years."

My brother will from this understand what David means, in the 9th Psalm, where he says, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." He was singing a song of triumph over his enemies, whom he describes as suddenly driven into this subterranean place, while God's people were left to prosperity and joy. To continue the extract from Jahn:—

"This very spacious dwelling-place for those who have gone hence is often described as dark, as sorrowful, and inactive. Job x., 21 ; Psalms vi., 5 ; lxxxviii., 11, 12 ; cxv., 17 ; Isaiah xxxviii., 18. But in Isaiah xiv., 9, *et seq.*, it is represented as full of activity. * * * That the ancient Hebrews believed that there was a difference in their situation in *Sheol* between the good and the bad, although it might be indeed inferred from their ideas of the justice and benignity of God (Matt. xxii., 32), cannot be proved by direct testimony."—*Archæology*, § 314.

Dr. George Campbell says : "In the Old Testament the corresponding word"—corresponding to *Hades*, of which he had been speaking—"is '*Sheol*,' which signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery. * * *

The state is always represented under those figures which suggest something dreadful, dark, and silent, about which the most prying eye and listening ear can acquire no information."

Dr. Muenschcr, the distinguished author of a Dogmatic History in German, says:

"The souls or shades of the dead wander in *Sheol*, the realm or kingdom of death, an abode deep under the earth. Thither go all men, without distinction, and hope for no return. There ceases all pain and anguish; there reigns an unbroken silence; there all is powerless and still; and even the praise of God is heard no more." *Dogmengeschichte, Erster Band*, s. 393, 4.

Von Coelln says :

"*Sheol* itself is described as the house appointed for all living, which receives into its bosom all mankind, without distinction of rank, wealth, or moral character. It is only in the mode of death, and not in the condition after death, that the good are distinguished above the evil. The just, for instance, die in peace, and are gently borne away before the evil comes; while a bitter death breaks the wicked like as a tree."

Such are the testimonies of the most learned men in the theological world, respecting the meaning of this simple word. Whether they are entitled to your confidence, it is for you to say. There are no better authorities to be found—none more learned, more conversant with the subject, more completely candid. Some of them had all the prejudices of their education, all the influence of popular orthodoxy, against this view—yet they bear this united testimony! Is not this a *very* remarkable fact, well worth your attention, and that of my brother?

To all these testimonies I beg to add that of the late Professor Stuart of Andover. You all know how he stood

in literature and theology ; one of the ripest scholars in our country, and who, in Hebrew, stood above them all. In his *Essays on Future Punishment*, written expressly to sustain the popular orthodoxy on the subject, he gives the same definitions and general views which we find in Gesenius. He defines "Sheol" as meaning "the under world, the region of the dead, the grave, the sepulchre, the region of ghosts or departed spirits." He adds that—"there can be no reasonable doubt that *Sheol* does most generally mean the under world, the grave, the sepulchre, the world of the dead. It is very clear that there are many passages where no other meaning can be assigned to it." Speaking of our translators, and acquitting them of intentionally misleading their readers, he says : "In regard to most of the cases where they have rendered the word "hell," it may be doubtful whether they meant to designate *the world of future torment*. * * * I am much more inclined to believe that, in their day, the word "hell" had not acquired so exclusively as at present the meaning of *world of woe*. There is plain evidence of this in what is called the Apostle's Creed, which says that Christ after his crucifixion, *descended into hell*. Surely the Protestant English Church did not mean to aver that the soul of Christ went to the world of woe, nor that it went to Purgatory." The Bible said, before Professor Stuart, and without circumlocution : "Thou wilt not leave my soul in *hell* nor suffer thy holy one to see corruption." Calvin taught expressly that Christ went to *the world of woe*, and asserts that his death would have been utterly unavailing, had he not gone into the depths of hell, and suffered the horrors of eternal death.

But does not Professor Stuart believe that *Sheol* sometimes indicates a state or place of punishment? Yes. Having gone over all the passages in which the word occurs, he says : "The sum of the evidence from the Old Testa-

ment in regard to *Sheol*, is that the Hebrews did, probably, in some cases, connect with the use of this word the idea of misery subsequent to the death of the body. It seems to me that we can safely believe this; and to aver more than this would be somewhat hazardous, when all the examples of the word are duly considered."

Out of the sixty-four passages in the Old Testament in which the word occurs, he has selected *five* in which it may probably mean a state of misery—yet, every one who reads his words can see how little faith he himself had in this view; he saw the whole current running against him—but it was necessary to make out the word as *sometimes* meaning a place of punishment. But, after all he frankly confesses it offers *no* evidence of *endless* punishment. Surely, my brother ought to consider this. If these things be so, there is no word in the Old Testament expressing "hell;" the inspired writers had no language to present the idea—and what is more, they had no such idea, nor did it ever enter into the minds of their hearers. It is, relatively speaking, a modern idea. You would be astonished at the very first instance where *Sheol* occurs! Jacob, being informed of the death of his beloved son Joseph, says: "I will go down to *hell* to my son, mourning!"—but the translators put it down "grave." Afterwards, when it was necessary to send his beloved Benjamin into Egypt he says: "You will bring my grey hairs down with sorrow to *hell*." The Psalmist says: "Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell"—not as absolutely there, but as being in so great danger of going there.

One word more. My brother suggests that we have in this "*Sheol*" both heaven and hell. I have great doubts of this; so had as good a man as Professor Stuart. He says:

"To represent the Old Testament as determining the future state, either of the righteous or of the wicked, with the *same clearness and fulness* as the New Testament does, savors either of prejudice or an imperfect acquaintance with the Jewish sacred records. Where is the *specific* difference between the future state of the righteous and the wicked *fully* set forth in the Hebrew Scriptures? Where are the separate abodes in *Sheol* for each particularly described? I know not, nor do I believe any one can inform me."

He could not find them. My brother may, but Professor Stuart could not; and his orthodoxy is not to be called in question in America.

If the doctrine of endless misery be true, I want to see it in the Old Testament—it must be there, of right. It cannot be possible that God carried on the government of the world four thousand years, and all his prophets knew nothing of this endless misery!

I am glad to have my brother take a ground to-night on which he is about to rear such a tremendous, and, let me add, precarious, structure. He clearly assumes that sin is an infinite evil. We are familiar with that ground; it is an old position, and a good one—if it can be maintained. But when God calls sin abominable, and threatens it with punishment, he does not call it infinite. Besides, if sin is infinite, there are no great sins and no small ones, but all are of the same magnitude. He and I deserve endless misery for every sin we have ever committed—and so the Presbyterian Confession teaches. But, as each of us has committed a great many sins, each deserves a great many infinite punishments. Have we gone so far back in our theology as to say that a man, a worm of the dust, a creature of a day, can commit an infinite sin. The consequence cannot be greater than the cause. Besides, if I can commit an infinite sin, can I not also perform an infinitely good act? Then, for every

good act, I may claim heaven, infinite happiness ; as for every sin, justice must award me endless misery. What a perfect absurdity ! My brother cannot occupy this ground. He cannot, because there are several passages in the Bible which show that if we deserve endless misery, we shall surely suffer it. God is infinitely just ; he "will reward every man according to his works." I beg my brother to consider this matter seriously.

MR. WESCOTT.—I am glad the remarks of my brother leave me so little to reply to, as I shall thus be enabled to finish what I have to say. His remarks were the best the nature of the case allowed ; but a few words will dispose of them all. He says there is nothing in the Old Testament to prove any difference between the state of the good and the evil in the future world—and he quotes half a dozen men. I will quote two other men ; one a man by the name of Paul, the other a man by the name of Daniel. Paul tells us that "Moses had respect unto the recompense of reward." He suffered a good deal in this life ; all with this respect. Daniel says : "Many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

When I made the concession that "Hades" and "Sheol" meant simply the state of the dead, I made it, I supposed, to avoid discussion. My brother complains of my metaphysics ; but I did not use metaphysics—they are a thing I try to avoid. I remember the old negro's definition of metaphysics—"When a man talks of what he knows nothing about, nor nobody else knows nothing about—that's metaphysics." That the light did not shine as clear in the days of the prophets and priests as when the glorious sun of the moral world had arisen, we all admit. We all know the moonlight of the Old dispensation was far and far out-

shone by the golden splendors of the New: nevertheless it did throw a dim light upon both worlds.

He tells me my metaphysics are not good, because a man *might* throw himself into such a condition as to be *unable* to render homage to his Maker. I answer, a man, by his natural powers, may commit sin, when through total moral perversion he cannot render God spiritual worship. A wicked man can break the Sabbath—can he with his sinful heart offer spiritual service to God? But I need not dwell on this.

I proceed to my argument. In the fourth place the moral evil of sin is as great as the greatness of the law it transgresses. The greatness of the law is seen—*first*, from the character of its author; *next*, from the blessings it imparts. If you wish to see these blessings, take the Scriptures, and, through them, look into heaven, where the law is observed in its purity. There harmony prevails; peace is as constant as the shining of the throne itself. Who can conceive the greatness of the law—where its full effects are thus developed in heaven? But on earth are seen the effects of the breach of that law; contrast earth with heaven! What makes the difference? Simply sin! It has destroyed all the excellence of this world, banished its peace, made it a vale of tears, a place of sighs and anguish,—all to be closed up with death. Sin is equal in magnitude to the law it transgresses. So the apostle defines it, 1 Cor. xv., 56, "The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law." Sin, therefore, is as strong as the law it transgresses. One is an infinite, universal good; the other, being equal in its strength and magnitude, is an infinite evil. Hence, the argument, on this last point, is:—Sin equals the law in magnitude; the law equals its author; but God, the author of the law, is infinite; *therefore*, sin must be infinite. To this agrees the word of Scripture. In Job xxii., 5, we

read—"Is not thy wickedness great and thine iniquities infinite?" Dr. Adam Clarke, on this text, paraphrases "infinite" by the words "no end." Webster gives the definition, "boundless, incomprehensible." Sin, therefore, is incomprehensible to us, boundless to our vision. Who can comprehend an act aimed at the sovereignty of God, or inflicting everlasting misery on a soul? Treason against even an earthly government, cannot be pardoned in the usual manner; what of rebellion against the divine throne? Yet Jehovah terms sin treason, or rebellion, against his government! Look, then, at the scriptural view, and judge whether it be not just in God to leave sinners in endless misery. A party of rebels enter a peaceful state, and, by *continued* rebellion, create confusion,—suffering,—death. What of them? Would they deserve to be pardoned? My brother says that, if this be so, he, and I, and every one of us, *deserves* everlasting punishment. Most certainly we do; and if Christ never interposes to deliver us, we should certainly receive it. There is a difference between my brother's system and mine. I find a world ruined,—but I also find a Saviour interposing and, by his self-sacrifice, delivering it from the punishment it had justly incurred. But his system knows no such interposition. He says that for every sin we must suffer, Christ or no Christ. "We are all under condemnation," says the apostle; but the last part of that verse my brother cannot use, because he does not believe that mercy cannot come through Christ to him. From the scriptural testimony given, I venture to say you cannot escape, unless you believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. Remember what sin is; that it is aimed at the throne of Jehovah; that it transgresses a law which is infinite. Ask, would it not be just in God to leave the sinner to perish, and to perish for ever?

DR. SAWYER.—My brother has some little reverence for the authorities I quoted on the subject of "*Sheol*," but does not seem inclined to enter into argument with them over much: besides, he thinks Paul and Daniel did all that, and draws an inference from one of the expressions in Hebrews with respect to Moses, and then quotes a passage of Daniel. I wish he had been so good as to quote the *whole* passage. He has the "wrath of God," a very familiar expression, found often in the Bible, and which produces a good impression here in making persons believe what they have considered all their lives to be true. But let us look at the matter a little. In Daniel xii., is given an account of what was to transpire in this world. "At that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."

You only need to read that passage in its connection to see that the event is not at the end of the world, nor in a future state; but was to transpire here during the existence of the people of God. Our Saviour refers to this expression, Matt. xxiv. "There shall be a time of trouble such as never was," and applies it to the destruction of Jerusalem; and also, "They shall shine as the brightness of the firmament for ever," and applies it Matt. xiii. to the end of that age or dispensation. You will see my brother has taken the whole passage wrong and does not understand it at all: it

has no reference whatever to the subject-matter of which we treat. This is the misfortune of those arguments. I ask him to prove that this was to take place at the end of the world, or in the future state.

But I do not wish to dwell on this point now; I wish to look at this argument of infinities. My brother says he is not a metaphysician—I think so. He gives the old negro's definition of metaphysics—what no one understands, and what one does not understand himself; I think it suits my brother's metaphysics exactly, but one may have metaphysics without being a metaphysician. He says God is infinite—I do not dispute it, but that the law is infinite, because God is so, I doubt. I do not think, because God is infinite, that everything proceeding from God must be so too. But grant that the law is infinite, and does it follow that the transgression of the law is infinite? And so of the infinite penalty. Let him go a step further, and he must show an infinite atonement to save us from an infinite damnation.

But can there be, on such a subject, a greater piece of absurdity? Here is a child, or a man, who has sinned,—lied or cheated, committed some crime against society or against God. My brother tells you every sin is infinite, and deserves endless punishment. How many endless punishments must God, *in mere justice*, inflict? Our courts of justice say there are degrees of crime, there is murder, and several degrees of manslaughter; there is grand larceny and petit larceny;—thus crimes are graduated. This is intelligible and reasonable, and punishment can be proportioned to the aggravation of the crime. In accordance with this clear principle of justice does our Saviour speak, Luke, xii., 47, 48, where he says, "that servant which knew his Lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with *many* stripes. But he that knew

not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with *few* stripes." Now if our Saviour sees every sin to be infinite, and, therefore, equal, would not both these offences deserve equal punishment, endless misery? Besides, there is no connection in the reasoning. It does not follow, because God is infinite, that his law is so; much less that because the law is infinite, that the transgression of it must be. The whole chain is broken at every link.

It is an argument, let me add, that grew up in the dark ages; and was precisely the thing for the old scholastics;—having an air of plausibility, and only an air. But is the tremendous doctrine of endless misery to be received on such a quibble as that? Furthermore, there is a difficulty my brother has to meet, and must meet again and again. The Bible is full of declarations that God will render to every man according to his work, Coll. iii., 25. "He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done, and there is no respect of persons."

Is the atonement to do away the declaration of the apostle, who knew the atonement as well as my brother? It is one of the misfortunes of our day that the Bible, in its practical application, is nullified by certain divines, who ought, certainly, to know their true calling better. If I can sin, and yet avail myself of the atonement, and suffer no penalty, surely the apostle told us what is not true. My brother thus builds up with one hand and pulls down with the other. That doctrine has done no good in the world. The nature of the atonement is something different from this. Christ did not come to save men from the wrath of God, nor from the curse of the law, in the sense my brother takes these phrases, nor from the punishment of their sins, greater or less,—but he came to save men from their sins *themselves*. Thus the angel announced "thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." That was the

end of his coming ; not to arrest the hand of Infinite Justice, but to help forward God's purpose by bringing men to a knowledge of the truth and the practice of their duty. Now, I desire my brother to go back. He has jumped into the middle of his subject, it seems to me, and not told us the commencement of this business. I want to know when the doctrine of endless misery began ; when first it was promulgated in the world ; of what law it was the penalty ; where the law is found, and the penalty written out. "The law came by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ ;" if the penalty be of the law, it belongs to Moses, and not to Christ. My brother, and others, make a sad mistake in believing that Christ came to reveal doctrines Moses knew nothing of ; doctrines full of terror, doctrines which blast all our hopes ; doctrines which change the purpose of God, and all our views of his moral government.

I hope my brother will, to-morrow evening, take us into the Old Testament, and show endless misery threatened there as a penalty for sin. I shall insist on this. Do you not see that is the place to begin, and not in the Revelations ? I did suppose that, in an attempt to do his work clearly and in order, he would have referred us to the Old Testament at once, and have shown that Adam and Eve were subject to this awful penalty for eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge ; and thus have traced the matter down from its true source. But it is his business to lead,—it is mine to look after his work, and see how he does it. He is not doing it well. We must have a better basis to rest endless misery on ; something better than this juggle of infinities ; it would have done six centuries ago, but it will not do in 1854. I want the law and the penalty both written out plainly, as all laws and penalties are. Let us have them to-morrow evening. I want him also to look at

"Sheol," and see whether what I quoted from the most respectable authorities is true or false ; if false, let him show it, and then something will have been done towards the accomplishment of his purpose.

THIRD EVENING.

The Throne of Grace having been addressed by Rev. Mr. King of Poughkeepsie,

MR. WESCOTT said :—In the closing remarks of my brother, last evening, he alluded to the text in Daniel xii., 1, which I quoted as proof of the belief not only in a future state, but of the difference between the righteous and the wicked in that state, and seemed to imply that text had its fulfilment in time. By a careful reading of the Book of Daniel, any of you will see that we there have several visions (such as that of the great image) which bring the reader down to the close of the history of earthly events. So in regard to the vision of the beasts. It seems that, in the 12th chapter (after having brought us through these events), the prophet gives us the summing up, not only of what himself has said, but of time itself. I am the more convinced of this, from reading the last verse of this chapter : “But go thou thy way till the end be, for thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.” His death occurred a few years after this ; there has been no time since, that he stood in his place among the living ; nor probably will there be till the judgment. After careful examination, I have not changed my mind, and I would not quote a text to support any view, unless I believed it really did support it.

My brother also said that the idea of sin being infinite is

simply ridiculous ; but he offered no proof. Any law, from any source, is equal in authority and in dignity with the law-makers, and that God made many things of less dignity, does not touch the question. The apostle stated that the "the strength of sin was the law ;" if the one is infinite, the other is, in a sense. Thus we speak of infinite space or distance—what do we mean ? A distance or space that cannot be increased ? No—but that we cannot comprehend. And who can comprehend the greatness of the sin which aims at the government of God ? Who can comprehend the greatness of that word *evil*, which has turned a paradise into a hell ? In a certain sense, it is infinite, and infinitely to be punished as against God, destructive of the happiness of a world, and endangering the welfare for ever of immortal beings. Although I did not state it, I quoted a text which seemed to imply it: "Is not thy wickedness great, and thine iniquities infinite?" but I cannot help that—it is Bible.

My brother says if sin is infinite it needs an infinite atonement. Most certainly it does. We have it ; as incomprehensible to Gabriel as to him and me—an atonement no finite mind can grasp, and thus infinite. He tells us no man can escape suffering to the full extent of his guilt, and that the idea of looking to Christ is simply absurd—and then some other remarks, which I am sure my brother regrets now as much as I do, as reflecting on the majesty and dignity of the Son of God. But, does not the Bible teach that looking to Christ saves the sinner from deserved punishment ? Did not the thief on the cross, who heard the words of Jesus, escape the penalty he would have otherwise paid ? else why the Saviour's assurance that he would that day be with him in paradise ? Did not Paul intend to make the jailer at Philippi know he could be saved by faith in Christ ? Saved—from what ? not from the wrath of the Philippians

by becoming a despised Nazarene ; clearly from the punishment due to his sins. What did the apostle mean when he said (Rom. v., 9), "Much more, then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." Does not this mean being saved from deserved misery? How can it be possible that a man reads the Bible, and yet asserts that Jesus Christ never saves the believer from the wrath which else were his due? If the Bible does not teach that, by our sins in a state of nature, we deserve continual wrath, it teaches nothing. And if it does not teach deliverance from wrath through faith in Christ it teaches nothing intelligibly.

My brother is not pleased with my starting-point, and thinks I cannot sustain myself three minutes—perhaps I cannot—God can! I thank him for his sympathy, and have no doubt it was kindly meant. But my object was to establish this one point—that, without Christ, endless misery was just. He wants that at the top ; I wish to have it at the foundation, because I think that, so, the structure will stand all the better. Also—he wants to know when this doctrine of endless misery began to be believed—but that is not the question ; the question is not "When"—but "Is it so?" Suppose it were not begun to be believed till yesterday, that don't touch the question at all. If he and I found it out, for the first time, yesterday—that would make no difference. I will, however, give him my opinion : I believe the fallen angels, before the date of the earth, believed it—as also all since whom God's word has reached. That is what I believe on that point ! I now resume the train of reasoning I have laid out for myself in this discussion ;—as to my brother, I do not wish to control him.

I now ask, is it possible that any can be delivered from this curse of the law? Yes, verily! But let us first see if this curse is universal. In Rom. iii., 9, we read, "We have

before proved both Jew and Gentile that they are all under sin." Romans iii., 19, 20—"Now we know that whatsoever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." Thus, we see that from the law there is no hope; neither by observing its precepts, nor by suffering its penalties: if there were no Christ there were no escape from endless misery. Thus again, Gal. iii., 10—"Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Gal. iii.—"But that no man can be justified by the deeds of the law, is evident."

This is our natural condition; and yet we were gravely told, last night, that every man must suffer for his own sin to the extent of justice, and Jesus Christ saves no man from misery! Oh! if not, we are lost, and lost for ever; transgressors of a good, holy, and infinite law, which requires constant obedience, with every power of man; for look at the strength and spirituality of this command—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, thy soul, thy mind, and thy strength, and thy neighbor as thyself." All this a man must do, to be justified by the law. Who does it? And suppose we were to begin doing it now, what is to be done with the long catalogue of sins in the past? Can we, for the rest of our existence, do more than the law requires? Yes! Christ, in this case, would be my remedy; but my brother throws him out of the plan, or gives him a place in some dark corner where it would take a man a lifetime to ascertain in what part of the plan he has a place.

Therefore, were man left to himself, all would be lost; but God interposes—gives us Jesus Christ, and declares his purpose in words like these: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him

should not perish, but have eternal life." (John iii., 16.) And the apostle announces: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." (Acts iv., 12.) "The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son," says the apostle, "cleanseth from all sin." The salvation is not by our own works nor our own sufferings. In Acts xx., 28, we read: "Feed the church of God, which he purchased with his own blood." And again, in Galatians: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." If we are to suffer the demand of the law, how can we be said to be redeemed? Suppose a man sentenced to State's prison for ten years; he petitions once and again, in vain, and spends his full time in prison; then he comes out, and his friends gather around him, saying, "You must return thanks to the Governor;" but he would answer, "I am under no obligation to him." So were the sinner shut up in the prison-house of hell, suffered his allotment, and then came out—how could he sing songs of redeeming love in heaven? Again, 1 Peter, ii., 24: "Who, his own self, bore our sins in his own body on the tree." That, my friend, lays the foundation for the salvation of guilty men—not the observance of the law, nor the suffering of its penalty, but the blood of the Lamb."

But it was no part of my purpose to go into any lengthened inquiry into the place Jesus Christ holds in the plan of redemption. My main object, in the next place, is to inquire whether there are conditions, and if any, what, to salvation.

Chauncey, Murray, and the old Universalists, told us that the atonement was vicarious and saved from punishment; but our later Universalist friends find that each man must, himself, suffer for his own sin. In this way Christ is reduced to a mere human being—the shadow of a tale, and I do not know of what tale either he is the shadow.

However, after ascertaining what the Bible says on this plan, the question arises—Shall we be inevitably made recipients? or, are there any conditions? There are; three in number, three graces—faith, regeneration, and repentance. I quote Mark, xvi., 16—“He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.” John iii., 36—“He that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.” John iii., 5—“Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” Acts iii., 19—“Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out.” Blotted out! We are told that we shall suffer for every one of them. What Court of Justice would allow you to collect a debt after it had been blotted out? Ah! how clear the Bible is when we read it right along, without any purpose to serve!

Again: Is there any danger that man will fail of this salvation? In other words—Has God intimated a limited time within which pardon and grace *must* be accepted or not at all? I answer—Yes! Look at these texts:—Isaiah lv., 6—“Seek ye the Lord while he may be found; call ye upon him while he is near.” This implies that there is a time when he is not near. 2 Cor. vi., 2—“Behold—now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation!” Heb. iii., 7—“Therefore, as the Holy Ghost saith to-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.” Same chapter, 2d verse—“How shall we escape, if we reject so great salvation?” What do these texts mean, if not a limited time of finding salvation? What do they imply but that, beyond that time, there is danger of perishing? Again; Luke xiii., 23 to 25—“Then saith one unto him—Lord are there few that be saved? And he said unto

them—Strive to enter in at the strait gate ; for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able. When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us ; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not, whence ye are.” What an opportunity for Christ to clear up the mystery ! to declare himself an Universalist, if he were one !—for these people believed in endless misery. But what does he say—“ Strive to enter in at the strait gate ; for many will seek to enter, and shall not be able. When once the master of the house hath risen up, and shut to the door—” Shut to the door ! Oh ! what an answer to establish Universalism !

DR. SAWYER.—My brother and myself take hold of things so differently, we look at the subject from so different stand-points, that it is very difficult for us to see alike. He recognizes in the economy of God’s grace a great plan for saving men *from the punishment* of their sins ; I recognize in that plan an economy for saving men *from their sins themselves* ! Suppose a convict sentenced to the State’s prison, receives a pardon—that man is saved from the *penalty* of his crime. But suppose some good man goes to the prison-house, talks with the prisoner, teaches him the right, produces in him a better spirit, leads him to be an honest man, to recognize his duty, and to resolve faithfully to perform it. Here are two salvations ; the one saving from the *punishment*, the other saving from the *love and practice* of sin itself. My brother has the former kind of salvation—mine is the latter. You may judge which is the better.

My brother quotes many passages in which Christ is said to save us from our sins ; thus—“ He bore our sins upon the tree,” &c. Does he not see this is not the *punishment*

of sin, but sin itself? Thus the angel announced—"Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people"—not from justice, nor wrath, nor the law, but—"from their sins," that is, he was "to purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

My brother still insists that sin is an infinite evil—that is, *in a certain sense*; and what is that sense? Why, not infinite in the sense that it may not be increased very much, but in the sense of being incomprehensible, boundless. Now, that is a mere misuse of the term; and my brother ought to understand it. In a familiar and improper way, we say this or that is infinitely warm. We only mean by the term that it is "very great." Properly it means really *boundless*. So space is infinite. As Locke says, you may double and multiply your utmost conception of it, again and again, and then conceive yourself at the end, but still be able to thrust out your arm. So time is infinite; it not only passes our comprehension, but it surpasses all our conceptions. Thus, too, God is infinite. If my brother means by the word simply something very great, perhaps we would not quarrel about that; but what does he undertake to prove?—simply that *punishment is infinite*; but will he say that it is not exactly boundless, but only very great?

I said last night that the doctrine of infinite sin is absurd; I say so again; it is a sheer absurdity. Does my brother believe it in any proper sense of the term? I know he cannot. He quotes a passage of Scripture with great emphasis, and I can certainly give him this credit, that he puts on all the force that his passages can bear—"Is not thy wickedness great, and thine iniquities infinite?" Yes—that is Scripture. We are told the Devil sometimes quotes Scripture. But who says this? Eliphaz the Temanite! I do not deny—I firmly believe, as I also feel—that sin is a *great* evil. I see its effects in the world,

in society at large, and in the individual human soul—but still (God be thanked) it is not infinite. And though Eliphaz should say it is, I could not take his testimony, because at the end of the book of Job we are told that “the Lord said unto Eliphaz the Temanite, My wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends ; for ye have not spoken *the thing that is right*, as my servant Job hath.” But, even were the authority ever so good, by looking at the original my brother will see it is not of the *magnitude* of Job’s iniquities, but of their *number*, that his friend spoke. In Hebrew, the expression simply means—“without end.” Dr. Adam Clarke paraphrases it thus—“Thy sins are not only *many*, but they are *great*, and of thy continuance in them *there is no end*.”

If my brother be right, every sin is infinite, and deserves endless punishment ; there is no disparity between them. This contradicts common sense, and the Bible too ; for the Bible is, after all, rather a common-sense book. “All unrighteousness is sin” says St. John, but he adds, “There is a sin unto death,” and again “there is a sin not unto death.” The other morning a colored boy, the son of a washerwoman at my hotel, entered the room of one of the boarders, and stole a pocket-book and bosom-pin. He was arrested and is now in the Tombs ; he is about twelve years old, and has received a tolerable education for that age. What would you think if the Courts were to sentence him to imprisonment for life ? Would you not consider the punishment too severe for the crime, and a milder one more just ? But my brother says he not only deserves that, but to be condemned to burn in hell for ever for that act ! I say such a doctrine is monstrous, and reflects not on justice alone, but on the whole character of God. No ; God has given us a sense of right and wrong, and enabled us, in some measure, to judge of the magnitude of sins.

But, if every offence deserves endless misery, every good act deserves endless felicity, because God always acts in proportion. As, then, we all do both good and evil things at different times of our lives, how is God to manage. He who sinned yesterday does good to-day; he deserves both endless heaven and endless hell. How God is to recompense men under such circumstances I cannot very well see. Besides if sin be an infinite evil, it not only requires an infinite atonement, but an infinite atonement has no power over it; sin is as great as God himself, fills the universe, is as endless as God himself is endless, strong as God is strong, can stand up against God, face to face, throughout eternity, and God and Christ, and the whole Trinity cannot put it away, because it is infinite. Now that is absurd, a sheer absurdity, which my brother believes no more than I do; nor would he maintain such a doctrine unless there were a terrible necessity for it; my brother would not face all these consequences, were it not indispensable for the defence of his opinion.

In respect to one matter my brother did not understand me. He said I wanted to know when the doctrine of endless misery began to be *believed*;—that was not it, but—when it began to be *taught*? Where does he first find it in this book? He says it is here; I ask when it first began to be here? Where does it first occur? But, really, he finds it all over; everywhere; in Revelations, Daniel, Acts. But, I ask, is that the way to find and prove it? If it be in the Bible, it stands out clearly somewhere. It should be no more difficult to find it than to see the sun in the heavens at noon-day. I have read it in the Koran; it is there without any doubt. Mahomet brings it out so clearly that no criticism is necessary for its elucidation. But here—in the Bible—where is it? Begin at Genesis and tell me where first it occurs. But, indeed, my brother finds much

difficulty in it,—he dare not point to a single passage in the Old Testament. He did, indeed, quote one—"The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God;"—but, how easily he slipped away from it—how little reliance he placed on it. Nothing is more clear among the better class of theologians than that the Old Testament does not contain the doctrine at all. The Jews do not find it there; they do not believe it; or, if some of them do, it is from tradition, not Scripture. I have dwelt at length on the word "*Sheol*." Here are some additional authorities;—Dr. Campbell says, "It is plain that in the Old Testament the most profound silence is observed in regard to the deceased; their joys or sorrows, happiness or misery."—*6th Prelim. Dissert.*

Von Coelln declares that it is only in the mode of their death, and not in their condition after death, that the good are distinguished above the bad. Jahn and Muenscher assert the same thing. Dr. Paley says—"In the 28th chap. of Deuteronomy, you will find Moses, with prodigious solemnity, pronouncing the blessings and cursings which awaited the children of Israel under that dispensation to which they were called; and you will observe that those blessings and those curses consisted *altogether of worldly benefits and worldly punishments*. This dispensation dealt in temporal rewards and punishments." Bishop Burnet, Hugo Grotius, Dr. Leland, Episcopius, Bishop Bull, Bishop Warburton, and many others might be quoted to the same general purpose. If my brother can find a passage in the Old Testament containing the doctrine of endless misery, I *challenge* him to produce it;—he cannot produce one.

In the New Testament we have another word that is rendered hell, viz., *Hades*. It is a Greek word, and has the same general meaning as *Sheol* in Hebrew. Dr. Robinson defines it, in his New Testament Lexicon, "properly, what

is in darkness ; more usually in classic writers, *Orcus*, the *infernal regions*. In the Septuagint very frequently used for *Sheol*,—hence, also, in the New Testament, the abode or world of the dead.”

Dr. Campbell says:—“As to the word *Hades*, which occurs in eleven places in the New Testament, and is rendered ‘Hell’ in all except one, where it is rendered ‘grave,’ it is quite common in classical authors, and frequently used by the Seventy in the translation of the Old Testament. *In my judgment it ought never to be rendered ‘Hell,’* at least in the sense in which that word is now universally understood. In the Old Testament the corresponding word is *Sheol*, which signifies the state of the dead, in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery.”

To show you how scrupulous our translators were in the use of the word “hell,” I will quote the single passage where they render it “grave;” in all others they make it, squarely and flatly, *hell*. In Paul’s 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, Chap. xv., near the close, we read—“Then shall be brought to pass the saying which is written ; Death is swallowed up in victory ; O death, where is thy sting ! O grave, where is thy victory !” Suppose the translators had followed their own rule and rendered it “hell ;”—and why should they not, in good faith ?—how clearly would God’s benign purpose of universal salvation have appeared ! But no ! the common doctrine was to be maintained, the doctrine that hell would defy God—would get the better of heaven ; and so the apostle’s meaning was perverted ! The sting or spear of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law ; but, thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through Jesus Christ, our Lord ; both Death and Hell are to be swallowed up in victory, *i. e.*, completely destroyed, and man led to a higher and better life.

Now, I desire my brother to go to this argument a little more systematically; to lay hold of the roots of the matter, and tell us when God first revealed this terrible doctrine; where it is found; of what law it is the penalty; and all the circumstances that must attend the revelation of such an awful truth! He says I must wish him success; not at all! He himself does not; he cannot, if he has a human heart. This is one of the inconveniences of men of his class; they have to strive to make out a doctrine which they hope is not true—to labor to make others believe it, and yet pray it may be false.

REV. MR. WESCOTT.—One would think, from the argument of my brother, last evening and this, that our question read—"Do *Sheol* and *Hades* mean endless misery?" but, of a truth, that is not the question. The question is—"Do the *Holy Scriptures* teach the doctrine of endless misery?" I shall get to *Hades* as soon as my argument comes to it—he shall have his heart's full of it. I have nothing to conceal; I will now announce my whole plan for the eight evenings.

In my opening remarks, I intended to present a plea for the authority of the Scriptures (not of this man or that). Then—to prove that such was the nature of sin that endless misery was *just*, and I am more convinced to-night that I established that last evening than I was then. My next step was to present God's method of saving men from deserved punishment, and to inquire whether there were any conditions annexed, and whether there were any limited time within which we must avail ourselves of grace. My next will be to present the warnings, entreaties, and threatenings of God against such as neglect his gracious offer. My next will be a description of the judgment-day, the character of the sentence, and to ascertain whether that

sentence holds out a glimmer of hope for the condemned. My three last evenings will be given to prove endless punishment from Ionios, Hades, Gehenna, from the sense in which they stood ; not that Hades and Gehenna in themselves imply endless torture, but that, *from their connection*, Hades sometimes, and *Gehenna always*, mean so.

I do not wish to make out an error, but I do wish to make out the truth. With this frank, ingenuous statement of my plan (in which, I conceive, you will see a chain of reasoning), you will find it was necessary for me, first to show that endless misery was just ; next that, unless *all* were to be lost, a plan of redemption should be provided.

My brother says that, in his system, Christ saves from sin ; in mine, from the penalty ; and that his is right and mine wrong. In mine, Christ saves from *both*, the penalty for what is past, and the practice of what else were future. What is regeneration but the love of holiness infused into the soul ? My doctrine is that faith works by love and penetrateth the heart. Good works are the fruit, but not the meritorious cause. He alludes to a state prisoner—but I think the better way is to take away the love of sin, and then to let him out. This is what the gospel does ; it makes him a free man in Jesus Christ, our Lord. Paul declares that the blood of Jesus saves us from wrath, as regeneration saves us from sin.

In regard to the infinity of sin, I repeat that sin derives its character from the law it transgresses ; therefore it must be incomprehensibly great to us, boundlessly great—and, therefore, in the sense in which we use “infinite,” it is not a perversion of terms to call it infinite. I did not say a little negro boy ought to go to State’s prison for life and then to hell, for stealing a bosom-pin ; but I do say that Jehovah tells us that man so applieth sin to his heart and life, is such a continual transgressor, as to make his damnation just.

My brother must bring something stronger than a negro stealing a pin to overthrow my scriptural quotations. They are too strong for this case or that, real or supposed ; they are too strong for any power of ridicule.

He says I would be sorry, myself, to make out the truth of this doctrine. I ought, my friends, to have no wish in regard to God's truth ; and when we know this is God's Word, we should simply ask—What does this Word teach ? and then we should have one simple purpose—to believe just what it teaches, and to do just what it requires. If it teaches endless misery, I do wish to believe endless misery. Why ? Because it is pleasurable to my heart ? Oh no ! But that you may see your danger, flee to the city of refuge, take shelter in the grace and faith of Christ, that he may become yours and you his—that, when the storm bursts upon you, you may have him for your salvation, and be safe. While I am convinced, as I am, I would not, for my right hand, teach otherwise than as I do !

But he tells you you may neglect repentance now, and repent a thousand years hence ! I know the bitterness of the infidel's heart—I know the hardness of the heart of the skeptic—I know their chance of repentance hereafter. Oh ! I do wish to make it out—not for triumph in this argument, not for the victory, but that you may be benefited : that you, young man, who are trying to drink in the error that all is peace, may pause before it is too late, that you may hear the language of Jesus Christ and try to enter in at the strait gate—at which “many will try to enter in, but shall not be able.”

DR. SAWYER.—I did not think it worth our while to spend much time on the doctrine of the infinity of sin ; I say, however, frankly, if any man can believe it, let him believe it. Sin is either infinite or not infinite. If infinite, it is

absolutely without end, without bounds, as great as God himself, as great as the holiness of God, and just as unmanageable to God as to you or me. If it be not infinite, then it is finite; and if finite, then no augmentation, no multiplication can make it infinite; and to talk of it as infinite is merely to impose on ourselves and upon others.

God, my brother says, sees sin to be such a heinous thing, that he recognizes it as deserving of endless misery. It seems to me remarkable, if this be so, that God should have arranged matters to perpetuate it through eternity, and diffuse it finally, and for ever, through so large a portion of his intelligent and moral creation. When I am told it must be endless, it seems to me very much as if God chose to make it so. Whatever is true, good, and beautiful, is endless in its nature, because it partakes of some portion of the Divinity; but, whatever is opposed to God is finite—limited in its nature; and for the very reason that it has no connection with God, it has no share in his eternity, it cannot, and does not, endure for ever.

My brother and I differ as to the mode of getting at this subject. I must insist, and perhaps with some pertinacity, that the proper method is to begin at the beginning of the Bible. If the doctrine be there, why not point it out, and trace it through the whole word of God? This is the manner in which I attempted, last spring, to prove the doctrine of Universalism. I showed that God's character was infinitely good and wise; that he contemplated the highest happiness of his intelligent creatures, and made man with the simple design that he should glorify his Creator and enjoy him for ever. I then undertook to show that all through the Bible this doctrine runs like a golden thread. My brother has a right to follow what course he pleases—and yet, I do not see the naturalness of his method or his scheme. I believe that God abhors sin—but that does not

prove the endlessness of it—does it not rather prove that he will vanquish and annihilate it! God threatens sin—but does that prove it to be endless? He will punish it, but does that prove the endlessness of punishment? There is no sequence in this mode of arguing. I earnestly wish my brother would come to the work at once, instead of deferring it to the last evening. The words on which this doctrine rests, its great pillars, are to be shoved away to the end of the discussion. On these few words does orthodoxy rest the whole truth and proof of this doctrine, and if they do not prove it, it falls to the ground.

What is the doctrine of endless misery? Have you thought of it through this discussion? Have you formed even the faintest conception of all it implies? I have a little book made very rich by a great variety of quotations on this subject. "We are amazed," says Jeremy Taylor, "to think of the inhumanity of Phalaris, who roasted men in his brazen bull; this was joy in respect of that fire of hell. * * * Such are the torments and miseries of hell, that if all the trees in the world were put into one heap and set on fire, I would rather burn there till the day of judgment, than suffer for the space of one hour that fire of hell." So Drexelius, after describing the most horrid prisons and tortures on earth, says: "The worst of these prisons is a kind of Paradise in respect of hell." Then he adds: "If all the severest and most barbarous tortures which were ever invented by the tyrants of earth, who by anxious thoughts and hellish contrivances, improved and refined the art of cruelty, and brought it to perfection; if these, I say, were to be heaped upon the head of one man, and he was to endure them for a hundred years, yet they would not come near the pains of the damned for one day!"

And yet uncounted millions of men, the children of God, made in his image, capable of enjoying and glorifying him

for ever, are to suffer such indescribable wretchedness in such a universe of death, world without end! And this is orthodoxy! If it be not an absurdity, what is? It is the last doctrine that any moral being ought to believe. It not only destroys all hopes for our race, but it touches the very character of God himself. I tell my brother here, and you, in all candor, that if this doctrine be true, the character of God goes down in an eternal eclipse! Will you tell me, after that, that God is infinitely wise and good, and that "his mercy endureth for ever?" I point you to such a *hell*, perpetuated for men to suffer world without end! If love can create such a "world of woe," what would malice do? But, thank God, the devil himself could not do anything worse than this! And are we to charge God with what would disgrace the devil?

I have one great objection to this endless misery, aside from all want of proof. There was never a mortal living who could tell us what it was for,—what was the object in its infliction. An infinite misery produced by God, and continued alongside of his own eternity! And for what? To honor him,—glorify him,—bless any portion of his creation? God forgive the soul that could dream of such a thing! I ask my brother, and you, individually, what good could God contemplate in the infliction of such an awful destiny? You cannot answer! Men have conjectured—One good, orthodox doctor, in this city, many years ago, told us it *might* have been intended to exercise an influence over the inhabitants of the other planets! Yes—and it might *not*! Will you think, between this and to-morrow evening, what the good purpose is, or can be, of such torment? Let it be the subject of your thoughts;—What good, wise, merciful purpose God could have in dooming the greater portion of the human race to endless torments; and, if you can conjecture, please bring your answer to me

to-morrow evening. If my brother can conjecture, let him bring his conjecture here. Our desire is to know for what end, worthy of God, God can consign half the universe to endless torture.

FOURTH EVENING.

REV. MR. ORCHARD having offered prayer,

MR. WESCOTT said:—Near the close of the discussion last evening my brother read an extract from some old book—I believe, the writings of Jeremy Taylor, relating to endless misery; and, after some remarks in opposition to the view presented by that divine, and to endless misery in general as taught by any one, he closed by saying that if the doctrine be true, the glory of God will go down in eternal eclipse. I think I feel some regard for the glory of God; but, suppose the Scriptures to reveal the doctrine of endless misery, which will best glorify his name—to believe the truth as taught, or to charge his word with falsehood, and his character with injustice and cruelty. I choose to bow my faith and judgment in humble reverence and submission to the teachings of my Heavenly Father. Be assured, my friends, God will take care of his own glory; he will never give his glory to another; neither will he ask my brother nor me how he will best promote the glory of his holy name.

He asks what object can God have in inflicting endless misery, implying that this question had been asked once and again, without any answer being given. I answer briefly that I suppose the design is to shut up in perpetual imprisonment the disturbers of his government; the haters of his character, the contemners of his authority, and the

rebels against the law. Why do earthly governments sometimes inflict perpetual imprisonment? Is it to reform the criminals? Clearly not. For a sin committed in a moment, he is imprisoned during all the term of his natural life—a term that is, so far as earthly courts are concerned, endless. Why is it done? Because it is better for the state at large, more for the peace of the community, and because the offender's crimes deserve the punishment. The parallel is clear. But if he at any time reform, and break away from his sin, he may be set at large, says my brother. But he *will not* reform; from the Word of God we are authorized to say he will wax worse and worse; and if when surrounded by all the means of grace in this life, he could not be induced to reform, what probability is there that he will reform in the world of woe where no means of grace exist? But do we let the prisoner out of prison as soon as there is a little reformation? Is the thief, the robber, the forger, who when in prison ceases committing those crimes, let out again? by no means! He *must* suffer the term of his imprisonment.

In resuming, then, my argument, the chain of which I have attempted to keep up from the commencement—allow me, briefly, to review the remarks of the few previous evenings—or rather, the points which we have gained. It is established, *first*, that the Bible must decide the question. *Second*, that sin is so great a moral evil as to deserve everlasting misery, so that the whole human family is justly condemned by the law of God. *Third*, that God, in his mercy, has provided a plan of salvation; by the death of Christ, and the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit; and that its benefits are made conditional, requiring faith, repentance, and regeneration; and, also, that God has set a limit to the time in which the sinner must avail himself of it, or perish.

So far I have attempted to prove ; I leave it to you with how good argument and how much Scripture.

Last evening my brother (if I understood him), admitted sin to be a great moral evil, beyond our comprehension ; no doubt you will have observed, as well as myself, that all he has said against my position was against the simple word "infinite;" and that he played on that, without a single attempt to disprove my main argument : that sin was an incomprehensibly great moral evil. This being so, it is most evident that sinners left to the claims of justice, without the atonement of Christ, must suffer everlasting misery. Not only has endless punishment been proved in this indirect way, but we are further convinced of its truth by the solemn warnings and threatenings that are scattered, broadcast, in the Word of God. To some of these, as further evidence, we invite your attention this evening. Psalm lxxiii., 2, 3, "But as for me, my feet were almost gone ; my steps had well nigh slipped. For I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked." He was tempted to believe piety might fail of its reward. How was his error corrected ? He tells us in the 17th and 18th verses of the same Psalm ;—"Until I went into the sanctuary of God, then understood I their end. Surely thou didst set them in slippery places, thou castedst them down into destruction." This corrected his error. That the Psalmist refers to the future world as well as to this, is evident from the 24th and 25th verses of the same Psalm ; "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory. Whom have I in heaven but thee ? and there is none upon the earth that I desire beside thee." It is most evident that he takes in the whole field of religion in all its consequences, commencing here, and carrying the view to the future life, bringing the believer to glory and leaving the unbeliever to destruction. Would

the holy God utter a warning like this if there were not danger? Remember, the Bible is not a book of fancies; it treats of realities as important as the relation we sustain to God our Heavenly Father.

Again, in Mat. xi., 23., we read—"And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell; for if the mighty works which have been done in thee had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. I say unto you it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." This threat cannot relate to any temporal overthrow of the city of Capernaum, because, firstly, Capernaum never suffered temporally beyond what Sodom suffered. Bear in mind its fate, and that of the other cities of the plain—burnt in fire, and sunk beneath the Dead Sea! When did Capernaum suffer like this? Read the history of the Jewish war by Josephus, and you will find that Capernaum, while it suffered in common with other cities, yet it never was overthrown. It has existed until to-day. True, it is now an insignificant little village; but it exists. The threat, therefore, does not relate to temporal punishment. Secondly,—The judgment of Sodom, alluded to in the text, was future at the time our Saviour spoke. "*It shall be* more tolerable for Sodom," and Sodom was destroyed two thousand years before; the meaning clearly is that less strict account would be had, in the final judgment, of the people of Sodom than of the people of Capernaum, among whom Jesus stood, his miracles were wrought, the blind saw, the deaf heard, the dead arose to sing God's praises once more in life!

Again; Hebrews x., 26, 27, and to the 31st verse. "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries. He

that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses ; of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace. For we know him that hath said, vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense saith the Lord. And again ; the Lord shall judge his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." "Counteth the blood of the covenant an unholy thing !" My brother knows the meaning of these words ; it was—to call it unconsecrated, common. He that calls the blood of Jesus the common blood of man subjects himself to the fearful curse of this text. What mean these threatenings if, after a few years of suffering, we can be received into heaven, although we have rejected Christ ?

Again ; we read in John viii., 21, "I go my way and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins ; Whither I go ye cannot come ;" and in the 24th verse of the same chapter he tells us what he means by "dying in your sins." "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." Now—to lack faith in Christ is to die in our sins, and where he is we cannot come. He does not say, you cannot come for a long time, nor till you have paid the debt ; but simply—you cannot come where I am ; the sentence is final and interminable.

Again ; 1 Cor. xvi., 22, we have another threatening. "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema, maranatha ;" or, as it is rendered by almost every one, "let him be accursed when the Lord cometh." There is no difference about "*anathema* ;" it means, set apart or consecrated to death. There is some little difference about "*maranatha*," but the weight of opinion defines it as I have stated.

The time is coming when the characters of men are to be unalterably fixed. We are told of this in Revelations xxii., 11. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still ; and he which is filthy let him be filthy still ; and he that is righteous let him be righteous still ; and he that is holy let him be holy still." And then it adds—"And behold, I come quickly and my reward is with me." Yes ; at the Second coming, the character of each man is unalterably fixed ; all hope and chance of change is gone. So we read in Proverbs xi., 7, "When a wicked man dieth, his expectation shall perish," not when he is in life and prosperity, and years are left to repent, but, "when he dieth." Another text nearly allied to that—Proverbs xvi., 32, "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death."

I cannot recall to mind the explanation given by my brother of this text the night before last. If I remember aright it is that the enemies of God are suddenly cast down, his friends calmly laid to rest. Our observation does not sustain this view—the righteous seem to fall as suddenly as the wicked.

Although our great object should be to do right every day, to glorify God and obey his commandments day out and day in ; yet, we frequently reflect on death ; you, my hearers, know that we often think of the hour when we must die, and we wish to die in peace with all mankind and with God—and with a bright, unwavering hope with regard to the future. We cannot help wishing this and thinking of this. The Scriptures present to us persons who have been able to meet death thus. Some have said, "Though I walk through the valley and the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me ; thy rod and staff they comfort me." But this passage says when a wicked man dies all his hope is given up. Miserable hope, that is given up when

we need it most ! It is presented in this passage that the righteous lifts his eye upward in the hour of death, hopefully turns it to God, and meets in response the smiling and sustaining eye of his heavenly Father. But it also declares that, when the wicked tremblingly turns his eye thither, no hope avails him—he is “driven away” from the only place that he could find it. Heed these threatenings ! Understand them ! Lay them to heart ! Let no quibble on anything connected with them disturb your minds ! Be sure God trifles not in his holy Word !

DR. SAWYER :—I am very sorry that I was so unfortunate as to offend the feelings of some of my friends, believers in endless misery, last evening. In saying that the devil could do nothing worse than orthodoxy, so called, represents God as about to do, I said what greatly annoyed and displeased some. They thought I spoke wickedly, blasphemously, in such a manner as to show that I was not a Christian ; so they told me. If I spoke unadvisedly with my lips, I regret it ; if I told you only what is true, am I, therefore, become your enemy ? Let us look a moment at this subject and see whether there is ground of censure. We all profess to believe in God, as a being of infinite wisdom, goodness, and power. We regard him, as revealed to us in the Scriptures, as a Being whose name and nature are Love, who is “kind to the unthankful and the evil,” whose goodness is over all his works, and whose mercy is manifested everywhere among the creatures of his power. He created man, giving him such capacities as he possesses—and yet, in the grand sequel, a very large portion of the human race will be consigned to a place of endless misery, deprived of every conceivable enjoyment, subjected to suffering of every form and of every possible degree that the power of God can inflict, or the wisdom of God invent. I

do not misrepresent the case. I did intend to quote you a passage from old Dr. Edwards, showing that all these descriptions the clergy give of hell are only, as it were, a fire painted on paper, to the terrible reality. Such is to be the final issue, in effect, if my brother's doctrine be true, of a universe created by a Being of infinite wisdom, goodness, and power. Now, just imagine for one moment, that the devil is a personal being, possessed of infinite energy and infinite power, and animated by the most intense malignity and hate. He delights in nothing but what is evil, and finds his highest joy in practising cruelty and inflicting torture. He is just as bad as my brother and we all believe God to be good. Now imagine the devil going about to create such of our race as are ultimately to be damned, and as creating them on purpose for this infernal destiny. Yet, with all his power and all his malignity, could he make their fate worse than my brother believes it is to be under the power and government of God?

Is not that awful? It is awful, my brother; it is blasphemous—not in my utterance of it, but in your belief of such a tremendous untruth, such an utter falsehood! It is you who blaspheme God, not I. It is your creed that blackens his character, outrages his attributes, blasphemes his holy name,—not mine. It is you that make your God such a God, that you cannot distinguish him from the devil, so far as the ultimately damned are concerned. I know that this is plain speech, but plain speech is needed. When I see a city like this, given up to such an abomination, professing to be Christian, and yet making a fiend of their God—when I see the whole country, nay, all Christendom, overspread with this blasphemous, heathen notion, making it the introduction to piety, the ground on which, alone, religion can rest,—I ought not, and I will not, hold my peace. Men entertaining such opinions are held to be the

special friends of God :—but were I to speak of them, or of the government of their families, as they speak of the Almighty and the All-good, I should not sleep till to-morrow morning without being arrested for slander, and impeachment of their moral character !

My brother still insists that sinners deserve endless misery, because sin is infinite ; and sin is infinite because it is the transgression of an infinite law ; and the law is infinite because it is the law of God, and God is Infinite. Thus sin is proved infinite—but “infinite,” says my brother, “in a certain sense ;” then he accuses me of playing on that word, while he himself has it in two senses in his mind ; first, as absolutely *infinite*, secondly, as *finite* ; and performs a juggle here before your eyes, with these two different significations, thus laying a groundwork for the doctrine of endless misery on a sheer fallacy. As I said last evening, sin is either infinite, or it is not ; if not, it is finite ; and there is no clearer distinction—to say a thing is infinite in a certain sense, is to say nothing.

Will my brother say that the law is infinite in the same sense that God is ? Will he say that sin is infinite in the same sense the law is ? If he can trace it thus, his argument is sound, so far as it is an argument, while the thing itself is a mere absurdity, because I know very well, and you all know, that this child before me cannot commit an infinite sin ; cannot, because his power is finite ; and it must ever be so ; it never can become infinite ; it may become greater and greater, but infinite, never. Nothing is clearer than this. Such is the web of absurdities in whose meshes this reasoning becomes entangled.

But let us, if you please, grant for a moment that sin is infinite ; then endless punishment is the just punishment of sin ; it is no more than, and just what, sin deserves ; the proportion is exact between the offence and its punishment.

The law is holy, and just, and good, and the penalty of the law is holy, and just, and good; the penalty partakes of the same nature as the law itself. When God appointed the law, he knew it was right; when he attached the penalty, he knew that also was right. All his attributes are concerned in the law; so also are they in the penalty; his goodness, wisdom, and justice pervade both, and so does his infinite holiness. Now, then, can you conjecture what could induce God *not* to inflict the penalty, which he at first saw to be infinitely right and proper? Has he made any new discoveries to induce him to be merciful which he had not made when he enacted the law? Is not the future present to him? But it seems, when the course of events, he had himself commenced, proceeded towards its issue, that he then perceived what a predicament he had placed himself in; like Herod, after his hasty oath, he repented, cast about, and found Christ, to save men from the just law, and its just penalty, which the infinitely good, wise, and just God had enacted! That is the grand feature of salvation according to orthodoxy! Christ came to save us from the punishment we deserved—from the law of the holy and just God—to turn back the whole economy that God had been carrying on from the commencement—and to bring out an issue which was at war with his whole scheme.

I have a little difficulty with this theory—allow me to suggest it. It may be very plain to my brother and to you, but it is not so to me. We are discussing the subject on the ground of the Holy Scriptures, and I do not find my brother's doctrine there. Now, as I read the Bible, and as you will find, whether you read the Bible or not, justice is an attribute of the Divine Being, as important as any other, and which will have its way both in this world, as well as in the world to come. Let our theories be as they may, I wish we could settle this truth in our hearts—justice will have its

course as well as the other attributes, and will not be thwarted. It seems to me the Bible speaks very plainly on this subject. When the Lord laid down the law to our first parents in Eden, he stated the fact—"In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (Gen. iii., 17.) So Abraham had a deep conviction of the integrity of God when he said, as God was about to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah—"Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" (Gen. xviii., 25.) I ask the same of you now; and if it be right for him to destroy you and me endlessly, rely on it, it will be done. On Mount Sinai the Lord stood with Moses, and proclaimed the name of the Lord—"The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty." (Exodus xxxiv., 6, 7.) The Psalmist had the same conception of things;—"Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy; for thou renderest unto every man according to his work." (Psalms lxii., 12.) Is that anything? And yet the Psalmist saw mercy in this; "Justice and mercy," as the Bishop of New Jersey once beautifully remarked, "walking hand in hand through the universe;" not opposed, but operating together for the same holy end. The wise man said: "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished." (Prov. xi., 21.) They might unite and form confederacies, but Justice would still pursue her course. So Isaiah, a man of God, who saw the truth clearly, entertained a similar view, and expressed himself as clearly—"Say ye to the righteous it shall be well with him, for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked, it shall be ill with him, for the reward of his hands shall be given him." (Isaiah iii., 9-11.) Again Isaiah says: "The wicked are like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is

no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." (Isa., lvii., 20, 21.) Jeremiah says: "Wherefore doth a living man complain, a man for the punishment of his sin?" (Lam. iii., 39.) So Ezekiel, xviii., 4—"The soul that sinneth, it shall die"—that is, suffer punishment. St. Paul, Rom. ii., 2-6: "But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth against them which commit such things. And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?" That was a home-question—"Thinkest thou that judgest others * * * that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?" "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his works." Again, Col. iii., 25, Paul says: "He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done, and there is no respect of persons." And in Revelations xxii., 12, we find—a part of the passage which my brother quoted—"Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me to give to every man according to his works."

If I understand these passages of Scripture, it seems to me God is a just God, as well as a Saviour, and renders to every man according to his works. So certain is punishment. As Rev. Dr. Parker of this city says, in his Lectures on Universalism: "It is the perfection of God's legal government that its sanctions are both *adequate* and *certain*. * * * How weighty must be the influence of such a law, if perfect certainty characterizes its administration. Yet I think I shall be able to show that there is nothing in the government of God to encourage the least hope of impunity, nothing to mitigate in the smallest degree the doom of the

transgressor. The penalty of the divine law is weighty as God's eternal curse, and sure as his ability to inflict it." The conclusion would be that the entire human family would be damned endlessly. If they deserve this punishment, if their works merit it, surely it will be inflicted. If the Bible is true, that is true.

I shall now occupy your attention a moment for the purpose of showing that Christ never came into the world, never was sent, for the purpose of interfering with the proper administration of God's moral government; never to take sinners out of the hands of their heavenly father and judge, and save them from just punishment. His object was very different; and it is a little remarkable that men reading the Bible should constantly blunder on a point so clear. The angel who appeared to Joseph to announce the Saviour's birth, said—"Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." (Matt. i., 21.) Not from the punishment of their sins, but from the sins themselves.

So the forerunner of Christ, pointing him out to his disciples, said—"Behold the Lamb of God that taketh (or beareth) away the sins of the world." (John i., 29.) Not the punishment of sin, but sin itself. Again, Luke xxiv., 45-7, "Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them; "Thus it is written and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission"—that is, "putting away"—"of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Not putting away, as my brother will have it, the punishment of sin; not interfering with justice, but saving men from transgression itself, from the tempers and conduct of sinners. So in Acts iii., 19, we have—"Repent, therefore, and be converted that your sins may be blotted out." My brother read this last night, insisting that *past debts*

would be blotted out, the divine government baffled, and men escape the consequences of their sins. The Bible does not talk in that fashion. It tells us to repent that our sinful life may be changed. In the last part of the chapter Peter says—"Unto you first, God, having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to bless you"—how? My brother would say by saving you from your deserts, in rescuing you from the justice of God, from just damnation. No—Peter did not mean any such thing; but he said—"to bless you by turning away every one of you from his iniquities." So again we read in 1 Peter, i., 18, "And if ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear. Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation"—referring to the mode of life of the heathen world and their idols, which were called vanity, "received by tradition from your fathers." Yes—Christ came to redeem men from ignorance and sin; to renew in them a better spirit, and fit them for the higher service of God.

MR. WESCOTT.—It is true, as my brother has remarked, that God created man, but I cannot believe with him, although endless punishment may be true, that God created man on purpose to inflict it. God created man a moral agent (here we agree), as they alone being capable of the highest happiness. I need not repeat how little enjoyment we find in a *compulsory* good act compared to that which we elicit from a *voluntary* one. This moral agency of necessity involves the power of sinning as well as of obeying; and if man sin, he is subjected to the penalty of that law, the law of the universe—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and soul."

The penalty for disobedience was the displeasure of Jeho-

val, banishment from his presence. Instead of men having been made on purpose for hell, or hell for them, our Saviour says to the wicked—"Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting punishment, prepared—" not originally for you, but "for the Devil and his angels"; *i. e.* as you choose to be his followers, you must share his reward. I do not think it is right to charge Jehovah with malignantly inflicting on the sinner that which the sinner *incurs* wilfully. My brother cannot see the difference, if this doctrine be true, between God and the Devil. I can. The Devil delights in malignity: God, the just ruler of the sinner, inflicts the due and fore-stated penalty on the continual and incorrigible transgressor. Then he says, I introduced Christ as coming into the world to save men from the penalty of a just law. I plead guilty to the charge. I understand the Bible to present Christ in this light. I believe all my brother does about Christ turning men from their sin; at the same time he saves those who believe in him, from the penalty of the broken law; if he does not, I can see no propriety in a thousand passages of Scripture concerning the plan of redemption. I say Christ does save the believer from a just penalty, and I am sustained by the apostle. Paul says,—“We are saved from wrath through him.” I ask whether wrath is not the penalty. What means the Apostle by such expressions as this—“Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood?” Yes, justice is honored in the sufferings of Christ; the law of Moses knew no way of clearing the guilty; but the gospel of Christ does.

Then we are told that “the remission of sin is the turning away from sin.” I never heard the definition before. To remit is to forgive; and to forgive is to deliver from, just punishment. What do we mean when we say that the governor has pardoned a man who was in the State Prison? Do we not mean that he remitted a punishment still declared

to be due to the law transgressed? My brother differs in this from the apostle, who said—(to repeat)—“We are saved from wrath through him.” If we are not, there is no possible way to be saved from endless misery. What mean all the Scripture sayings about believing in Christ? When the jailer asked how he should be saved, the apostle answered, “Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.” Christ does not come to do away the law, but to fulfil it. He finds that the human family *can not* fulfil the law, nor suffer its penalty without being endlessly wretched. But, such is the infinite dignity of the Son of God that he can take the punishment without exposing himself to endless suffering, and yet deliver guilty man. My brother and I view Christ very differently. I understand him as the soul and centre of the plan of salvation; my brother views him merely as an example to the people.

“Repent, and be converted, every one of you, that your sins may be blotted out.” When a man repents, he desires to stop sinning; and, so far, Christ turns him away from his sins; but how does the figure “blotting out” apply to my brother’s exposition of the text? To talk of blotting out what was never recorded seems to me to be talking without sense. But Scripture is always common sense. God grant we may drink in its spirit. To the soul that has a sense of sin, oh, how precious is this salvation! There was some force in the healing power of the serpent which Moses lifted up in the wilderness. And thus Christ, lifted up, heals the sick soul, and gives it confidence in God.

DR. SAWYER :—My brother finds a great deal of satisfaction in his mercantile, or commercial, views of the atonement. It is a regular debt and credit transaction. I am owing you a thousand dollars; but I am poor, and a friend steps in, pays for me, and I am let off; and that is the

whole of it. It is a view of the atonement, my friends, that was exceedingly popular about a half century ago—but it is very seldom advanced in this short-hand method now. The authors I have read take very different views, I beg to say, on the subject of the atonement—orthodoxy, indeed, has as many views as treatises. My brother speaks as if it was the simplest thing in the world, fully written out in the Bible; yet, men of equal learning, talent, and piety reject his whole scheme.

I did not say, as you will remember, nor insinuate, as my brother has understood, that God created man *for the purpose of endless damnation*. I said the consequences to man would be the same as if the devil, with all his malignity and hate had created them for this very purpose! I think God made man for a better purpose, and also that He will see that this purpose is not defeated. I remember the case of the house-holder who began to build without having forecast whether he could finish, but, from want of means, was obliged to stop his work, and his neighbors laughed at him. So, it seems, God commenced a magnificent scheme—and yet a very large, or even the larger, portion of it is to be the reverse of successful! Is that probable? Does my brother believe that God has mistaken his object? Does he believe God will fail in his purpose?

He says the apostle teaches that we are saved from wrath through Christ. I think so too. We are saved from wrath if we are saved from sin, because wrath treads directly in the footsteps of sin. Save from the cause, and you save from the consequence. This is what the apostle meant.

My brother insists that the time is coming when the opportunities of salvation will be at an end; and he quoted from the Old Testament—"Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is near."

David Kimchi, a learned Jewish Rabbi, and Dr. A. Clarke, say—"Seek ye the Lord *because* he may be found, call upon him *because* he is near;" and the particle in Hebrew may be interpreted in this way as well as the other, and the connection certainly favors it, for, "My thoughts are not as your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."

Of Capernaum our Saviour said, Matt. xi., 23, 24, "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be brought down to *hades*—hell." Here, my brother insists, the Saviour teaches that Capernaum was to be brought down to a place of *endless misery*! I have before told you what *hades* means, and on the best orthodox authorities shown that it never conveys the notion of a place of endless torment. Does my brother believe that Capernaum was literally *exalted to heaven*? If not, why does he contend that it will be literally brought down to *hades*? The commentators take quite a different view of the passage. They say that as Capernaum had enjoyed very high religious privileges in the miracles and teachings of Christ, and yet abused them, so would its destruction be correspondingly great. He thinks something more than temporal destruction is intended, because Capernaum never suffered much temporal calamity. I am more inclined to believe the Bible. I think the Saviour stated the facts aright; and if we were acquainted with them, I have no doubt we should find he stated what has taken place.

He quoted from the Psalms to show David had been tempted to envy the wicked—his feet had well-nigh slipped; he fancied it was in vain to wash his hands in innocency, and that he might as well be as wicked as the worst: but, when he went into the house of God he found

his mistake. Have we not seen, in our own city, within a few months, men standing in high positions, and yet whose feet were on slippery places? Their prosperity was all hollow and insecure; the breath of God crushed their supports from under them, and where are they now? They are fugitives from justice—disgraced—condemned to wrath. This is what the Psalmist meant. Besides he should remember that the Psalmist saw his folly and lamented it. "Thus my heart was grieved and I was pricked in my veins. So foolish was I, and ignorant; I was as a beast before thee." How strange it is that my brother sees nothing but endless misery in the Bible! It is a terrible presence to him—it is on all sides of him! I should hate to read the Bible with such views! But the very fact of my brother's quoting such passages to establish the doctrine of endless misery, is proof that he has nothing better. Had he the power to produce clear, conclusive texts, do you think he would take us to the Psalms, and all those inapplicable passages he has quoted to-night. But this is the way that eternal misery is taught and believed. I remember Dr. Dwight once preached a sermon on this text—"Their foot shall slide in due time"—and of course it must be into an endless hell! This manner of treating the doctrine is an insult to our reason. If there be any clear conclusive proofs of it, in God's name, do not trifle, but let us have them. Go to the Old Testament; if there be a law of which this is the penalty, it must be found there, and found as clear as the sun in the noonday heaven. But my brother cannot find it, and thus he is skipping all over the Bible, picking up scraps of texts here and there to prove a doctrine, before which our very souls would blanch if we believed a word of it.

My brother is perpetually repeating the phrase, "Wrath to come," Matt. iii., 7, and applies it of course to endless tor-

ments. But Bishop Pearce tells us that it means "the punishment to come in the destruction of the Jewish state." Dr. Hammond calls it "the destruction approaching." Dr. Adam Clarke "the desolation which was about to fall on the Jewish nation." Dr. Lightfoot says, "These words respect the very last words in the Old Testament, *lest I come and smite the earth*—the land—with a curse, and denote the most miserable destruction of the nation, and now almost ready to fall upon them." And yet my brother, and divines that think with him, do, day after day, week after week, year after year, from these words, maintain and preach a doctrine not only horrible in itself, but which all these, the most learned orthodox divines, cannot discover to be implied in the language of the Scripture. I say again this is wrong, it is imposing on the credulity of the people. The doctrine of endless misery must be proved by clear, unquestionable testimony, if proved at all.

So my brother quotes Luke xiii., 23, "Are there few that be saved?" as if that question related to the subject we are now discussing. Nothing can be more obvious than that this inquiry had sole reference—not to the number which should ultimately become holy and happy—but to those who were then believers in his Gospel, or who should by faith in it escape the calamities about to fall on the Jewish people, and be received into the kingdom of Christ. The answer of the Lord shows this. It was those among whom he had labored and taught who were to be "thrust out." The Jews, as a nation, rejected Christ and were rejected by him, while the Gentiles came from the four quarters of the earth and sat down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of God. And so was verified the saying, "There are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last." Besides, if this question and its answer refer to

the final destiny of mankind, they settle not only the doctrine of endless misery, but also that *many* shall suffer it, while *few* shall be saved.

I have received a letter from some orthodox friend, suggesting that the use of endless punishment is the same as the use of State prisons, as if the cases possessed any degree of similarity! State prisons may be *necessary*, but where is the necessity for *endless misery*? No, this will not do. Endless misery cannot be conceived as doing, or designed to do any good. It cannot honor God, nor benefit sinners, nor bless saints. It can be regarded only as the infliction of mere misery, without object and without end!

FIFTH EVENING.

Prayer having been offered by REV. MR. BALCH of New York,

MR. WESCOTT said :—Very frequently, during this discussion, my brother has taken occasion to introduce to our notice the Catechism, as it is called ; and although I do not intend to be drawn into a defence of that work, or any other, however excellent I may deem it, except the Bible, yet his question, so often repeated, seems to demand a passing notice. The question he introduced is the first in the Catechism—"What is the chief and the highest end of man !" Answer—"Man's chief and highest end is to glorify God and fully to enjoy him for ever." He quotes this to prove the *design* of God in the creation of man. Can he not see there is no such thing alluded to ? Nor is there even an allusion to *man's design*. The word "end" was here used in the sense of "good"—"What is man's highest good ?" Common observation proves it is not man's *design* to glorify God, taken as a mass ; but few have this intent ; the great mass glorify themselves ; now and then one seeks the glory of God. Neither do the Scriptures anywhere teach that it was God's *design* or *purpose* that man should glorify and *enjoy* him for ever. There is no such thing in the Book of God. Jehovah has made man capable of acting for himself under the ordinary supporting

providence of God ; in other words, he is a free moral agent. That Jehovah *wishes* man to glorify and *enjoy* him is evident from numerous passages of Scripture. So, he wishes man's present happiness, in this life ; but man does not obtain it because he disobeys now—may he not disobey for ever ?

My brother said also that Moses' law knew no deliverance from deserved punishment. I ask what *law* does ? no law, human or divine, knows any mercy. Mercy is lodged somewhere else than in the law or the judiciary. But though the law of Moses knows no deliverance, the gospel of Jesus Christ does. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." My brother told us, too, the way Christ saved from wrath was by preventing our sinning—turning us away from sin. If this be right, his interpretation is that Christ saves us from the wrath due to sin which we never committed. That is as logical as the rest of Universalism—just about ! To illustrate : suppose you describe to your son the degradation and wretchedness of a State prison, and then say—"My son, I have saved you from this ?" he would turn up an anxious eye, and say—"How, father ?" "Oh ! by my example—by not breaking the law, I have influenced to obey its precept and escape its penalty. The little fellow would not understand. But suppose he had, consciously or not, violated the law, and that, by much expense, labor, and suffering, you had procured his pardon, and set before him his danger and his deliverance, then he would understand you. But to talk of saving us from sin we have never committed—why it is downright nonsense ! If the forgiveness of sin is not the remission of the punishment due to them, what means the passage in the Lord's prayer—"Forgive us our debts as we forgive them that are indebted to us ?" A man running a large account with you, asks you to forgive him his debt. You answer,

"Oh, yes—but that only means that you will not allow him to go into debt any more! Thenceforth he must pay ready money, and he still owes, and must reckon for, the old sum! I do not think there is much value in that forgiveness—only that it is valuable not to run in debt. I venture to say, when our brother, who led a prayer to-night, said—"Forgive us our sins"—he meant forgive us the punishment due to our sins. If not, he meant nothing.

There are two texts so frequently and *earnestly* quoted by my brother, that one would think they formed the foundation of his entire superstructure. (As I always like to acknowledge favors, I will mention that my attention has been called to them by an esteemed friend.) Matt. i., 21—"Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." This he quotes as if the meaning were simply, "Turn away from sin, reform the life, persuade not to sin any more." I admit the gospel is reformatory in its nature; but this text does not declare it; other texts declare: "Faith works by love and purifies the heart." The words "to save" and "to reform" are not synonymous in Greek, Latin, or English. I have examined twenty passages since yesterday morning, and nowhere do I find the same word to express "save" and "turn away." The word generally used in the New Testament for "save" is $\sigma\omega\zeta\omega$ in some of its forms. Its meaning is, as used anywhere, "to deliver from oppression, or condemnation;" is applied to one who delivers his country from bondage, his friend from prison, generally, any one or number from an undesirable condition *already* existing. Nowhere, in the twenty passages, does it signify to turn about, or reform. When it is said, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins," the meaning is, He shall be called Deliverer, because he shall save, or deliver, his people from the sins that are theirs, the sins they have committed, which they

must be delivered from or perish—not from committing sins in future. You ask, “How, then, does Christ save us from the consequences of our sins?” I answer, By suffering for us. My brother says I entertain a view of the atonement that few do; I do not believe so. I believe mine is the old doctrine—old as Abraham, Isaiah, and Paul, and the Christian church at a later period. Hear Isaiah again—“He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.” (Isaiah liii., 5.) Imputing our sins to Christ, and imputing Christ’s righteousness to us—that is the Bible doctrine of saving men from sin. The Bible speaks of turning men from sin, in numerous passages. Christ is spoken of as turning men from their sins; but never is that word *σῶζω* used, nor any of its modifications; a very different word is employed, namely, *στρέφω*, in some of its forms. Thus, Acts iii., 26, “God, having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to bless you in turning away (*ἀποστρέφειν*) every one of you from his iniquities.” Here the apostle does not use the word “save,” but one that signifies “to reform.” We have an instance where both words occur in the one verse, and *each* with *its own* meaning. Rom. xi., 26—“Israel shall be saved (*σωθήσεται*), there shall come a deliverer out of Zion, and shall turn away (*ἀποστρέφει*) ungodliness from Jacob. Here “saving” and “turning away” are quite different ideas with the apostle. My argument, then, is, that *σῶζω* is never used in the sense of “turning away,” always in that of “saving” or “delivering;” and when Christ is spoken of in the New Testament as saving from sin,” the meaning is that he saves from the *guilt and condemnation* of sin. This my brother will know as well as I do; perhaps he does not at this moment, his attention not having been called to the point.

The other text so often used by him, is—“Then shall he

reward every man according to his work." We subscribe to this; it is very true. The men who do the works of God shall be accepted of him. What is the work of God? The Bible is very plain—Universalism quite at fault. A man once asked our Lord and Saviour—"What shall we do that we may work the work of God?" Jesus answered—"This is the work of God, that *ye believe* in him whom he hath sent." (John vi., 28, 29.) That is—"without faith it is impossible to please God, in any of our works. Again, it is said "Abraham *believed* God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness." (Rom. iv., 3.) Again: "Be it known * * * 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 ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." (Acts xiii., 38, 39.) There is no other medium of justification but faith in Jesus Christ. *Without this* the guilty sinner cannot be saved—*with it*, cannot be lost.

In the last passage, Christ is said to justify those whom the law condemns. Here is the issue between Paul and my brother; it is one that runs all through Universalism. If Christ does not save men from the punishment due to sin, wherein is Christ better than Moses, or the gospel preferable to the law? If Jesus Christ and the gospel leave men to suffer the full penalty, wherein is the glory of the gospel superior to the law? Would to God, my fellow-traveller, you could see the plan that shines all through the gospel for the saving of guilty man, through our Lord Jesus Christ! The Bible says—"Being now justified by his blood we shall be saved from wrath through him." (Rom. v., 9.) My brother says you are saved from wrath by Christ causing you to stop sinning. I would just ask him—would you not be as well saved in that way by anybody else that would persuade you to cease sinning? Is this the level he assigns to Christ?

Again : we read—"Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." You see what the work of God is ; you see the reward. God *will* reward every one according to his work—the believer in Christ shall be saved ; he that believeth not shall be damned. Do not mistake this faith. The Bible here is plain—it is faith in the Christ of the Bible, not in a Christ whom I or any man may set up, and clothe to suit ourselves. Here fails *modern* Universalism ; not the Universalism of Murray, Winchester, Chauncey—they had the Christ of orthodoxy. I know but *one* sentiment of modern Universalism that agrees with the Bible—"There is one God ;" that is the whole story.

What does modern Universalism make of Christ ? (I do not ask what my brother makes of him.) A mere man ! endowed perhaps with the spirit of God to a greater extent than any other man, but *a mere man* ! The Bible says he was man, but God also ? Christ, in the Bible, is called, "the mighty God ;" again, "the Alpha and Omega ;" again, "over all, God blessed for evermore ;" again, "Lord of all ;" again, "Most Mighty ;" again, "the true God." This is the Christ of the Bible ! The Mighty God revealed in human flesh ; "in him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily ;" the Being who placed his right hand on the Eternal Throne, and with his left reached down to the degradation of humanity. This union of the Godhead with human nature is exhibited, too, with all the processes of human nature. On the vessel he sleeps like a man, while the storm rages ; but the mighty God hushes the winds to silence and lays the waves on the Sea of Galilee. As a man he sits faint and thirsty on the brink of Jacob's well ; but, as God, lays open the life and heart of the woman of Samaria, and offers to her penitent soul the water of life. As a man he stands near the grave of Lazarus, weeps with those who

weep ; but as God, utters a voice which calls the dead from his grave and restores him to his friends. As man he hangs, bleeds, and dies on the tree of the Cross ; but as God, he speaks of pardon to the penitent thief, and assures him that everlasting life is his. The faith that saves is faith in *this* Christ, but not in one of flesh. "Let him be cursed that maketh flesh his arm," saith the Scripture. There are other things connected with Christ : the true faith in him, by which we are justified, embraces the belief that he atoned for sin, whereby it can be consistently forgiven. Hence the apostle tells us—"Without shedding of blood there is no remission ;" and again—"He purchased us with his own blood." "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved ; he that believeth not shall be damned," are the words of my divine Redeemer himself.

With these few observations, I was about to resume the thread of my remarks on Friday evening—but I have used out my-time. My course was to present the judgment of the New Testament with its sentence, as full evidence of endless misery. I may have time to present some of my arguments during my remaining fifteen minutes this evening.

DR. SAWYER.—My brother has taken some pains to show that the beginning of the Presbyterian Catechism does not possess any meaning. I am apt to think that interpretation would hardly be allowed by a good Presbyterian. If God did not design that the chief end of man should be to glorify and enjoy him for ever, I would thank my brother to tell me *what* design God had in creating man ? I presume he had some object in view ; men do not rationally act without an object ; and, surely, the Source of all reason would not do so, especially in a matter of such infinite moment. My brother says there is nothing in the Bible to indicate the design of God,—no declaration respecting it. I do not

agree with him, but I cannot, just now, go into a discussion of the topic. We know very well that God sent his Son into the world to save it,—if he had no saving design in creating it, he certainly had in the mission of his Son. And when Christ died for ALL, God showed, very clearly, how extensive that design was.

He has entertained you with some criticisms on the word σωζω; I have been pretty familiar with that word for many years, and understand its meaning, which is—to save from any calamity, present or future, which men are suffering, or to which they may be exposed. Of course all his criticisms fall far short of the meaning of the word. Let a man, in any way, save one from any calamity, State-prison, disease, or death, and the word would be legitimately used. When we speak of Christ's saving men, purifying to himself a peculiar people, blessing them by turning them away from their iniquities, it seems to me the declaration is very emphatic and clear. To save a man from his sinful habits and practices, dispositions and purposes, is the very essence of salvation, without which, all this salvation from punishment would be nothing worth.

I did not intend to go over this subject very largely, nor to enter on the doctrine of the Trinity, which has no business in this discussion; though, if there were opportunity and time, I should be glad to test the few scraps of Scripture which my brother quoted with so much unction and fervor. We believe that there is one God, and that he is the great and good Being,—but, we believe, there is only ONE God; we believe that Jesus Christ is God's Son—not God himself. Of all the riddles on earth, the Trinity is the greatest; my brother cannot state it in clear language so as to understand it himself, or make any one else understand it, nor can any man do so. But it is the doctrine of the church, not running back to the times of the apostles, but

made up, and to be traced step by step, in dogmatic history, as clearly as the planting and growth of a field of corn.

My brother has said a great deal of the atonement ; and yet you can see how the atonement oozes out of his system. As *Man*, he says, Christ hung upon the tree, faint and dying. As man? Yes, as man. Did *God* die? I do not believe it, nor does he, nor you. And if not God, then it was man—but, could the death of man make an infinite atonement? When you read the New Testament clearly you will see that Christ, as the Son of God, and not God himself, died. “Into thy hands I commend my spirit.” Was it one God committing his spirit to another? One person of the Trinity committing his spirit to the hands of another person? It was the Son of God committing his spirit to his Father—to his Father and our Father.

But this is aside from the purpose. We came to discuss the simple question—“Do the Holy Scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery?” My brother discusses almost everything else but that. I know it is not a pleasant subject ; I know he has a very unhappy view to maintain ; I do not blame him for shrinking from it whenever he can. But I wish to discuss this matter with great seriousness, so as, if possible, to come to the root of it. I wish to examine the whole ground, so as to know whether it is in the Bible at all, or only foisted in by the ingenuity, or craft, or misconception, and errors of our fellow-men. I said before, and would say again and again, if this doctrine be taught in the Bible it must be somewhere laid down very clearly ; and further I say, wherever it is *first* taught, it must stand out in such luminous language, such clear and decisive terms, that no mortal could be able to read the Bible without finding it. Whether he believes the Bible or not, he should believe the Bible taught this doctrine.

I wish to mention two or three things before I proceed to

my special subject of this evening, in relation to some matters presented during the past week. On Friday evening, my brother said Capernaum was never destroyed, and he drew an argument from that circumstance in favor of the doctrine of endless misery. He was mistaken in his statement. I thought so at the time ; but, not being quite sure, did not make the correction. Dr. Adam Clarke says the Saviour's words were literally fulfilled ; for that, in the Jewish war, Bethsaida, Chorazin, and Capernaum, were totally destroyed, so that no traces of them remain, and their place cannot be known. Dr. Robinson, who has travelled in Palestine, has been on the ground, and made the most careful search without tracing out its locality.

Besides, I would ask my brother, whether Capernaum as a *city* was to be punished according to the text, or was it the *people* of Capernaum ? Our Saviour's language related to the city as a whole, and not to individuals. Individuals, I suppose, are to be damned, if at all, for their individual sins,—so with states, cities, and empires. Rev. Mr. Barnes says in his commentary on this passage,—“This does not mean that all the *people* should go to hell ; but that the city, which had flourished so prosperously, should lose its prosperity, and occupy the lowest place among cities. The word ‘hell’ is here used, not to denote a place of punishment in the future world, but a state of desolation and destruction as a city.” This is the testimony of a man of great learning and talents, and of great candor, and, besides, a thorough advocate of endless misery. So, B. Pearce says, “It means thou shalt be quite ruined and destroyed.” And so Dr. Hammond, Dr. Adam Clarke, and the whole rank and file of respectable commentators. And yet, my brother would prove the doctrine of endless misery by passages which such men have given up years and years ago. This is not scholarly ; this is not right. I do not

mean to say he is not entitled to his opinion ; but these learned men, believing, as sincerely as he can, in endless misery, have given up this proof, and he ought not to cling to it without some reason.

But there is a comparison made by our Saviour, between the fate of Sodom and that of Capernaum ;—" I say unto you it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." From this declaration my brother argues endless misery. Yet he says that Sodom and Gomorrah had already been in hell two thousand years when our Saviour thus spoke.

I should be pleased to know how it was to be *more tolerable* for Sodom, on this supposition, than for any other place. All were to be in the same condition ; all were to suffer endless misery. How then more tolerable for one than another ? One would think it would be more severe for Sodom and Gomorrah, seeing that they had already suffered two thousand years of hell's torments. But he insisted still more on the declaration " it *shall* be," importing, he held, a *future* judgment. Does my brother believe that Sodom and Gomorrah, after being then two thousand years in hell, and now nearly two thousand more, with how much longer we do not know, are to be brought up and tried over again ? What would such a process import ? That God had made a mistake in sending them to hell in the first place ? The meaning of our Saviour clearly was, and so the best commentators understand it, that the judgment about to fall on Capernaum should be more dreadful than that which destroyed Sodom. No intimation is given that both of these cities are to be brought together on some special day of judgment, but simply that the fate of Capernaum in her day of judgment should be more terrible than that of Sodom was in hers. So our Saviour said, Matt. xii., 41, 42, that " the men of Nineveh," and the " queen of the south, *shall*

rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it." That is, their conduct was far more rational and praiseworthy than that of those who lived in the times of the Saviour, and hence they condemned them. Let me add, that nothing is here said about "*the day of judgment*," of which we hear and read so much. In the original it is simply "*a day of judgment*," i.e., of punishment.

I need not stop to show that there are punishments inflicted by God in this world more severe than that suffered even by Sodom. Jeremiah referred to such a case, Lam. iv., 6. "The punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people is *greater* than the punishment of the sin of Sodom, that was overthrown as in a moment, and no hands stayed upon her."

And this reminds me of what Jude says of Sodom's "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," from which, as always, my brother argues endless misery. Yet such men as Dr. Whitley, Dr. Hammond, Benson, and others interpret that expression quite differently. Thus, Dr. Whitley, "I conceive they are said to *suffer the vengeance of eternal fire*, not because their souls are at present punished in hell fire, but because they and their cities perished from that fire from heaven which brought a perpetual, an irreparable destruction on them." Or as Gilpin says, "The apostle could not well mean *future punishment*, because he *mentions* it as a *dogma*—something that was to be a *visible example* to all."

In Heb. x., 29, we read—"He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God?" My brother relied with some degree of confidence on this *sorer* punishment. Now you can easily conceive a sorer punishment than that inflicted under the law of Moses. That

punishment was by the sword or stoning ; it lasted only a short time. The "sorer" punishment was, as the commentators explain it, the disasters and destruction which was soon to overtake the unbelieving Jews. But what comparison, let me ask, can my brother find between a violent death, and endless misery ? Besides, on the theory of infinite sin, did not they under Moses deserve as sore a punishment as any others ? And yet the apostle declares, Heb. xi., 2, that "the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and *every transgression and disobedience* received a just recompense of reward."

"If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." My brother insists with great pertinacity on this as proof of his doctrine. "Whither I go ye cannot come." On this he also depends much ; yet the very same words the Saviour used to his own apostles—"Little children, yet a little while am I with you. Ye shall seek me, and, *as I said unto the Jews*, whither I go ye cannot come ; so now I say to you." My brother relies on these words of Christ to the Jews, to prove his doctrine of endless misery—and yet the cases are the same ; the words applied to the Jews are also applied to the apostles—"As I said unto the Jews, so now I say to you." So says Rev. Mr. Barnes—"This probably means simply ye shall seek the *Messiah* * * * This does not mean that they would seek for *Jesus*, and not be able to find him, but they would desire the aid and coming of the Messiah, and would be disappointed. This does not refer to their individual salvation, but to the deliverance of their nation. It is not true of individual sinners that they seek Christ in a proper manner and are not able to find him. But it was true of the Jewish nation that they looked for the Messiah, and sought his coming to deliver them—but he did not do it." Josephus's account of the state of the Jewish mind at the time agrees with this view.

The misapprehension about there being a limited time for obtaining salvation, is founded on a passage of this kind. See Rev. xxii., 11—"Let him that is unjust be unjust still, and he which is filthy let him be filthy still." The meaning is, that the time was near when there would be no further use in preaching to those unbelieving Jews any longer. They had fought against Christ, and against his apostles, and their destruction was now coming, as the prophets and the Saviour had foretold: as it is said in the next verse, "Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me to give every man according to his works."

I wish to occupy the remainder of my time this evening on a point of some little importance—the meaning of the word "everlasting," or "eternal." This word my brother will be obliged to rely on, I may say altogether. "Everlasting punishment," "everlasting destruction," are the terms he must fix on at last, and these words must bear the whole weight of the terrible doctrine he maintains. He has already intimated that when this word is applied to the punishment of the wicked, it has the same extent as when applied to the happiness of the righteous, or to *the existence of God himself*! I must say that such an assertion is extravagant and false. That the word "everlasting" is applied to all these subjects in the Bible, is true; but we are not to infer that they are as strong in one case as in another. The word is used precisely as we use the word "great." We speak of a great book, a great house, a great mountain; we apply it to the world itself, and finally to the great God. But how stupid it would be to suppose that a great book must be as the great God himself—or even as a great house! The meaning of the word is to be determined by the subject; as the Old and New Testaments both furnish abundant evidence. The term is applied to the misery of the wicked, the life of the righteous, the being of God; also

to many things that are temporal in their nature, as a lifetime, a period longer or shorter ; and we must judge in what manner it is to be taken, from the nature of the subject.

MR. WESCOTT.—To the criticisms of my brother in regard to the texts quoted on a previous evening, I have only to say, if you understood what he meant by them, you have been exceedingly fortunate. If they have made any impression I only ask, when you go home, to take your New Testament, and read them for yourselves. That in regard to Sodom and Gomorrah will come again, naturally, to-morrow or next day; only allow me to say now, he probably misunderstood me. I said that Capernaum doubtlessly suffered much in the wars waged against the Jews, but that it was not destroyed; and as an authority on this matter, I prefer Josephus to Adam Clarke. I was reading a history of Capernaum a little time ago, and the facts are fresh in my mind. But my argument remains, in fact, untouched; I argued that temporal destruction could not be the meaning of the text, because Capernaum never suffered so much of this as Sodom and Gomorrah.

Christ came indeed to save the world, but he never will violate men's moral agency; men *must* voluntarily yield their hearts to Christ. My brother has given some criticisms on the Greek word σῴζω, but has failed to bring a single instance where it is used to signify "turning away." I do not say it is not there in the sense—but I have examined twenty passages without finding it. What I have found, however, is *another* word used to express turning away. Bear this criticism in mind, because my brother, when hard drove, is apt to lay hold of some little point away back of the argument, and leave the argument itself untouched.

I now resume the argument where I left it on Friday evening.

The Bible account of the day of judgment, together with the sentence to be pronounced, establishes the doctrine of endless misery. In eight passages of the New Testament, the phrase "day of judgment" occurs—I do not allude to passages containing the phrases "judgment," "time of judgment," "in the judgment," but those where "day of judgment" alone is used. Once we find "the judgment of the great day." In eight passages it clearly refers to what we mean by "the day of judgment," or the final judgment. Thus, in 2 Peter, iii., 7, "But the heavens and the earth * * * are reserved unto fire, against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." Same, 10th verse—"The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens (air) shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up." That is Peter's description of what he calls "*The* day of judgment." All this did not occur at the destruction of Jerusalem; we wish to know, *when* it did occur? Again; Jude 6, "The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." My brother may ridicule as much as he pleases, the day of judgment, and the guilty being taken out of hell, judged, and sent back again; but all about it is—he ridicules the Word of God—that is all. Read the passage from Jude again. Again, we have—1 Thes., iv., 16—"The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, and with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first, then we which are alive * * * shall be caught up * * * to meet the Lord in the air;" John v., 28, 29, "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: They that have done good unto

the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." Hebrews ix., 27, "As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment."

From these various passages, which I have taken promiscuously, we learn six general principles:—

First, There is to be a day of general judgment ;

Second, Christ will come visibly and publicly, descending from heaven in a flame of fire ;

Third, The earth is, at that time, to be destroyed by fire, as it was by water—the inhabitants swept away, and the earth burned over ;

Fourth, Some are raised to everlasting life, and some to damnation ;

Fifth, This is the day of "perdition" of ungodly men—emphatically so termed by Peter ;

Sixth, This judgment day is at the end of the world.

I do not intend to say that the apostle means to argue the question of the relative time of the judgment in the passage, "It is appointed to man to die once, and then the judgment." I will just say, that he uses the idea as a conceded truth. Suppose my brother were making an oration, and used this language : "As the people of the United States have declared and established their independence, so all others have a right to declare and establish theirs." In this he would not be contending for the fact that the United States had declared and established their independence; but it would imply that they have done it. So the apostle, in saying, "As it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment," declares that the judgment is after death.

Let us now turn to the 25th chapter of Matthew, commencing with the 31st verse, where the details of this great judgment day are more fully given. I shall go as far as time permits this evening, and resume again.

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was a hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee a hungered, and fed *thee*? or thirsty, and gave *thee* drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took *thee* in? or naked, and clothed *thee*? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on his left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: for I was a hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee a hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee! Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily, I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal."

I shall take it for granted, and suppose my brother and you do, that the time is not yet arrived when Jesus has come in the fulness of his glory, with all his angels; that, as yet, all nations have not been gathered before him; that the righteous and the wicked have not been separated by Jesus; all these things must yet occur—unless the word of God is false.

After describing the events of that tremendous day, with awful bearing upon the interests of the whole human family, and the fearful sentence pronounced upon the wicked, "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire," and the joyful welcome of his people, he closes the whole in these impressive words: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal!" Allow me to say, the same word is used in the original Greek, which, in this verse, is translated once "everlasting," and once "eternal;" it is *αἰώνιος* in both instances, and in both it is applied to the future state of the human family. I ask, in the name of common sense and common interpretation of language, how can my brother say that in one instance the word *does* mean, literally, endless, and that in the other it does not? I take his own rule—the nature of the connection; and I ask him what nature has the connection in the one instance which it also has not in the other? What is there in the nature of the human soul to admit endless happiness and exclude endless punishment? I throw this out that my brother may know what I mean to hold. The same word is used for the unending punishment of the wicked, which is used for the unending joy of the righteous, and for the unending existence of Jehovah, in contradistinction to the gods of the heaven. If he can prove that *αἰώνιος*, when applied to the misery of the wicked, does not mean eternal—he dashes, at that moment, the happiness of the righteous, the eternity of God! Let me name another thing, that he may have an opportunity to refute it, if he can. If *αἰώνιος* does not literally mean "endless," there is not a word in the Greek language which does; there is not a word used by the apostles that does. I refer to an adjective of time;—when endless duration was to be stated, they invariably used *αἰώνιος*. Punishment is *αἰώνιος*, life is *αἰώνιος*.

If this be so, I claim that the doctrine is proved beyond

the possibility of dispute, on any fair principle of interpretation.

DR. SAWYER.—I am glad to have my brother refer you to the New Testament, and exhort you to read and see for yourselves. I wish the world had done this more, and left their ministers' influence to have less weight with them. I would also have you avail yourselves of the best help within your reach to understand God's word, and grasp the whole import of the Divine Oracles, as far as possible.

My brother has spent some time in proving, as he thinks, a day of general Judgment, which is to take place at the end of the world. If he will read the New Testament a little more fairly and thoroughly, he will find that the judgment so often spoken of in the New Testament was to take place at the *beginning* of the Redeemer's Kingdom, and not at the *end*. This judgment was not the closing up, but the commencement of its affairs.

In quoting Jude vi., in relation to fallen angels, my brother quoted, in effect, the Apocryphal book of Enoch, in which you may find the whole history of the fallen angels very fully given; and to this both Jude and Peter, it is very clear, alluded, or to some tradition on which the book of Enoch was founded. Had I time, I should like to give you some information on this subject—but I have not. I will only say, therefore, that this passage can have no weight on the subject of future judgment or endless misery.

My brother finally refers to Matthew xxv., where, he says, our Lord describes very fully the *last judgment*. I am glad he has reached this passage of Scripture at last, for on its right interpretation stands or falls not only the common doctrine of a general judgment in the future world, but also

the doctrine of endless misery. If this passage does not sustain these doctrines, they are not to be maintained from the Bible.

Observe, then, that the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew is but a continuation of a discourse begun in the twenty-fourth, and that the *time* when this judgment was to take place, is very clearly indicated by the Saviour himself. By carefully reading the twenty-fourth chapter, you see at the beginning, that as our Lord was passing from the temple, his attention was called to the buildings of that wonderful structure, when, in reply to their admiration, he said, "There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." This naturally excited their surprise, and when he had gone over and seated himself on the Mount of Olives his disciples came to him, saying, "Tell us when shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?"—*i. e.*, in their sense of the time, the end of the *Mosaic or Jewish dispensation*. In reply, commencing with the fourth verse, our Saviour gives a distinct and circumstantial prophecy of the various events which were to precede the destruction of Jerusalem. This occupies the chapter to close of the twenty-eighth verse, and, therefore, it is impossible that any reasonable man can, for a moment, indulge in the thought of even an allusion to a general judgment in the popular orthodox notion of that phrase. The twenty-ninth verse shows beyond a doubt, that the discourse upon this subject is continued; for the Saviour says, "*Immediately after the tribulation of those days*—see v. 21—shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. *And then* shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven, and then shall all the tribes of the

earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. Now, learn the parable of the fig-tree : When his branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So, likewise ye, *when ye shall see* all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. Verily, I say unto you, *This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled !* Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

I conceive that language like this, so express, so definite, can not be, or ought not to be, misunderstood. It determines the *time* of the judgment which our Saviour described in the twenty-fifth chapter, beyond all controversy. Although "the day and the hour" were unknown, yet, that it was to take place during the generation in which Christ lived, is as true as his own divine word can make it. And I confess, it is one of the most remarkable things in the world, that orthodox men can read these express declarations of the Son of God himself, and yet insist that all these dreadful events are yet future !

This whole matter of a general judgment at the end of the world is a misjudgment, a total misapprehension of the teaching of the Bible. We believe in a righteous and equitable judgment. We believe in a God who, according to the prophet of old, "judgeth in the earth," and judgeth everywhere. The doctrine of the finally impenitent, of whom we hear so much, is also not in the Bible. The apostle tells us that, in the end "every knee shall bow in the name of Jesus, and every tongue shall confess him to be Lord, to the glory of God the Father ;" and again, we are assured that

in the grand sequel, when Christ shall have accomplished his mission, and subdued all things to himself—then shall he surrender up the kingdom to God the Father, and thenceforth “God shall be all in all.”

One word about this “everlasting.” My brother is very clever at strong assertions ; but such assertions will pass better in a revival meeting than in open discussion—they are very broad, they are daring, but they are untrue. We have two words in the original Scriptures that are rendered “everlasting” and “eternal :” *gnolam*, Hebrew, and *αἰώνιος*, Greek. The word *gnolam* means, in the first place, according to Gesenius, *hidden, occult*—hidden time, *i. e.*, obscure, or long ; of which the beginning or end is uncertain or indefinite. It is spoken of time long past, days of old—also of the future, ever, for ever, evermore, in such a way that the *terminus ad quem*, as it is called, is to be determined from the nature of the subject.” Sometimes it is applied to human things, as to the lifetime of an individual ; as when a servant preferred his service to freedom, he was taken to the door-post, and had his ear bored, and then he was said to be a servant “for ever”—plainly not *to eternity*, but for his lifetime. See Exod. xxi., 6. Sometimes it is applied to the continuance of *a family*, as when God made a covenant with David “for ever.” See Gen. xvii., 7. ; 1st Sam. ii., 30, and Ps. xviii., 51. So, the laws of Moses were called “everlasting statutes,” “ordinances for ever.” Exod. xii., 14, 17. The possession of Palestine was an “everlasting possession.” Lev. iii., 17. The Mosaic priesthood was an “everlasting priesthood.” Exod. xl., 10. Then it is applied to the world, and the universe, as, “the earth is established for ever ;” so we say “the everlasting hills.” Death is called “everlasting sleep ;” the grave, the long home, “an everlasting house.” Finally, it is applied to God. It

is frequently applied in the Old Testament to punishment, as I shall hereafter show—*national* punishments—of the Jews and other people.

In precisely the same manner is the Greek word used in the New Testament. Here we have “everlasting punishment,” “eternal damnation,” “everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord,” just as corresponding terms are employed in the Old Testament. And, if I mistake not, you will find such punishments threatened in the Old Testament, even more frequently than in the New. And yet my brother has not referred to a single passage in the Old Testament in defence of his favorite doctrine! How absurd, then, when we consider the meaning and use of this word, to say, as he does, that by denying that punishment is *endless*, I strike down the hope of the righteous for an *immortal life*, and also the *eternity of God*! When we speak of God, we know from the nature of his being that his existence is endless: so of the life that God bestows upon his children. But what is there in the nature of punishment to indicate that it has no end?

There is an intrinsic absurdity in the very thought! I have asked what object there can be in the infliction of endless punishment: and I would ask again. The very nature of its being *endless* refutes the idea of any object aside from itself; it can be only revengeful—the infliction of torture, without any benevolent object whatever. To believe it, is to involve the character of God in the character of a demon.

Though I were to concede a great future general judgment—which I think the Bible does not teach—still, what would that have to do with *endless misery*? It neither proves, nor implies it. I earnestly wish my brother would place his finger on the passage where the law and its penalty are given, which threaten endless misery; we have been

looking for it five evenings, and I have not yet found it. Those who have been brought up in the orthodox school will, no doubt, go away, thinking it is found, or something like it ; or, at any rate, it is there, whether found or not. But see well to it, that you do not allow your fears to mislead you in a matter of this moment. See well to it, that you do not suffer the prejudices of your education to blind you to the truth of the Bible.

SIXTH EVENING.

THE REV. DR. KEESE, having led the meeting in prayer,

MR. WESCOTT said :—Last evening I endeavored to show, from a few passages of Scripture, that the medium of our justification was faith in Christ—in the Christ of the Bible—Christ as man—Christ as God. My brother understood me to say something about the Trinity, and offered his views in regard to the inconsistency of that doctrine. I said nothing about it, nor do I intend to be drawn into any argument on the subject. Yet, in passing, allow me to say that because we cannot comprehend it is no argument against it, provided the Bible states it. It is no more mysterious to us than many other things which we believe. My brother might as well reject the operation of spirit on matter.

“A Socinian said once to an old Welsh minister—that the Trinity in Unity was incomprehensible, and absurd ; and he would not believe it. The minister took him to an iron furnace, and, pointing to the glowing coals, said—

“‘Sir, what do you call that?’

“‘A fire,’ was the reply.

“‘Very well,’ said the minister. ‘What else? Is there not heat?’

“‘Yes, certainly,’ was answered.

“‘And, what? is there not light also?’

“‘Certainly, there is.’

“‘Then, sir,’ said the minister, ‘you have three in one, and one in three ; so that you cannot separate them—they

are indivisible—yet heat and light are, in some respects, the same in their effects.’

“Here the Socinian was confounded ; but, wishing to make one more effort, he replied—

“‘How can it be said, that God is all Father, and all Son, and all Holy Ghost, at the same time ; and unchangeable?’

“‘Look again,’ said the minister, ‘is not all that matter, which you see in the furnace, fire?’

“‘Yes,’

“‘Is it not *all heat*?’

“‘To be sure it is.’

“‘Is it not *all light*?’

“‘Yes, it is so.’

“‘Is it not *unchangeable* in all these respects!’

“‘I believe it is.’

“‘Then, sir, be satisfied ; if this can be discovered in a foundry—in a created matter—doubtless it may exist in eternity, in that which is uncreated and full of glory.’”

My brother may say what he pleases in regard to this, but I will not reply ; it is not the question. We have but three evenings more, and I must be drawing the question to a point.

Last evening, in proof of a day of general judgment, I quoted 2 Peter, iii., 7, 10. “The heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up.” Also, Jude vi., “And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.” My brother, you will recollect, disposed of these passages very summarily. It was probably the

easiest way, though I doubt whether it was the most ingenuous way, considering our question. He said it was from Enoch, an apocryphal book, that Peter and Jude quoted. Suppose Peter did quote, if he quoted *with approval*, that gives the quotation authority. But, unfortunately, in this Second Epistle, he neither names, nor refers to, Enoch. Jude does not name him till several verses after. There is another unfortunate thing in the matter—Professor Stuart, and other writers, have lately proved, to the satisfaction of the most reasonable minds, that the book of Enoch was not written for more than a hundred years after Jude wrote his epistle, and does not contain the passage in Jude, said to be quoted from it. I did not say, as my brother reported me, that the *matter* of this world was to be burnt up, annihilated, but directly the contrary. I said the inhabitants were to be destroyed, as the earth's inhabitants had already been destroyed by the flood; and that a new heaven and a new earth were to be made out of the old matter, when burnt over. In that graphic description of the judgment by the JUDGE himself, in Matthew xxv., my brother informs us, the whole scene was accomplished by the destruction of Jerusalem in the generation which then lived. Poor old Jerusalem is the great reservoir of God's wrath! We can hardly find a threatening anywhere but it means old Jerusalem. To establish his point he refers to Matthew xxiv. I ask your careful attention to this. In the 3d verse (chap. xxiv), the apostles asked Christ three questions:

First, When shall these things be? (That is, Jerusalem destroyed.)

Second, What shall be the sign of thy coming?

Third, What of the end of the world?

In this 24th chapter, the Saviour answers these questions; and there is no difficulty in an honest inquiring mind ascertaining with full satisfaction what part of the lesson

relates to each question. To help you, take any reliable history of the destruction of Jerusalem—Josephus if you have not a briefer, Smith, if you have no better,—compare them with this 24th chap., and you will, with perfect ease, discover what part of this prophetic answer was fulfilled in that event, and what part was left unfulfilled. I will not delay to call your attention to what was fulfilled then, but I will ask it to a few things which were not fulfilled then, and have never been accomplished yet.

In the 27th verse, the Saviour says—"As the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall the coming of the Son of Man be." And here let me direct your attention to the circumstances under which the Saviour throws in two or three verses. He knew that many persons would, during the destruction of Jerusalem, set themselves up for saviours and deliverers; and now, he says, Do not believe in any of them; I shall come, not in the secret chamber, nor in the wilderness, but—as the lightning—plainly, manifestly to all. Then there was no impropriety in continuing the observations on the destruction of Jerusalem. The caution touching pretended Christs, naturally suggested by the topic, was *thrown in*, and then the topic was *continued*. But, *did* Christ come as the lightning at the destruction of Jerusalem? Did he so come ever since? No, verily! This, then, is not fulfilled.

Again, in the 30th verse, the Saviour says—"And there shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and thou shalt see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Did all this happen at the destruction of Jerusalem? Did all the tribes of the earth see him coming in power and great glory? Instead of that, no man, no tribe, no nation has seen him, since he ascended from Mount Olivet. When has been the mourning in which

all the tribes of the earth mourned? There was, indeed, weeping and mourning in Jerusalem—but not of *all the tribes of the earth*. The Romans, instead of mourning, laughed, and so did many other nations.

Then in the 31st verse—"He shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and gather together his elect from the four winds of heaven." Who saw his angels at the destruction of Jerusalem? Who heard the sound of the trumpet? Where was the gathering of God's people? God's people were scattered; they heard the warning thirty-four years before. "When you see armies encamped around Jerusalem, flee to the mountains." Not to any one mountain, but to the mountains. But this is the way modern Universalism interprets the Bible; "gathered," is, scattered; and "eternal," means, a man's life!

Again; the 38th and 39th verses were not fulfilled. The coming of the Son of Man, and the destruction, were to be as general and public as the destruction by the flood. You see plainly that what concerns the world at large remains unfulfilled.

In the 25th chapter, 31st and 32d verses, our Saviour says—"When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, * * * and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another." Did Christ come in his glory at the destruction of Jerusalem? I do not know what explanation my brother gives;—modern Universalism says that Christ came in the army of the Romans, and that the Roman soldiers were his "holy angels." Do not laugh;—Mr. Ballou gives that. Fine holy angels, these heathen Roman soldiers! No, my friends, he has not come yet; he has not yet divided the good from the bad. When he does come we shall know it, the world shall be there; they that slumber in the tomb shall hear the voice of the trumpet, and be there. This is

no by-scene, as the destruction of a single city. Oh, be not blinded ! Who ever saw the dreadful scene our Saviour has described ? Who ever heard the awful words pronounced by the Judge and the God of all—"Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting punishment" ? Who ever heard the benign invitation—"Come, ye blessed, into life eternal" ?

With these few remarks on the judgment, in addition to those of last evening, I now pass to notice the word rendered "everlasting," or "eternal," in the New Testament ; I mean *αἰώνιος*, the adjective from *αἰών*. This word occurs seventy-one times in the New Testament, in sixty-six passages, I believe ; being repeated in some of them. It is applied to future happiness forty-four times, undisputedly ; and, perhaps, seven times more—*i. e.* fifty-one times in all. It is applied to the plan of redemption three times ; to God, his attributes and government, six times ; making sixty times, out of seventy-one, that *every man* admits that it means "endless." What, then, is the meaning of the word ? Suppose it were conclusively proved that, in the remaining eleven instances, it was used in a limited sense, would we conclude that it meant literally a limited time ? Suppose, my brother were arguing for Christ's sacrificial offering for sin, and should say, "Christ died for our sins, his life became extinct, and he was laid in the grave." "No," says the objector, "Christ did not so die : to die, does not mean the extinction of life, but merely depression of spirit. Do you not know that Paul said 'I die daily,' and yet Paul's life did not become extinct."

You would hardly think this reasoning worth answering. And yet *to die* does not more literally mean the extinction of life, than *αἰώνιος* means "endless."

[I have examined fourteen places where this word, in its adverbial sense, is applied to God, his attributes, and government.]

Of the remaining eleven instances noticed above, seven are applied to future punishment. There are but two instances in the New Testament where the word *αἰώνιος* is clearly used in a limited sense ; and two others of doubtful meaning. Am I not justified, then, in maintaining, as I do, that *αἰώνιος* means the same in Greek that "everlasting," "eternal," or "endless", do in English? That it is occasionally used out of its primary sense, as are all words in all languages (as when men speak of an eternal talker, and eternal slanders), cannot be denied : but there is the true, proper meaning of the word.

I am happy to say that these definitions and the best lexicographers agree. Dr. Robinson, whose *Lexicon of the New Testament* is now conceded to be the best we have, (he wrote it at a very late day, with all the helps he could find,) defines *αἰώνιος* thus—"ever-enduring, perpetual, everlasting." Another writer, who may be considered as good authority as can exist, the tutor of Alexander the Great, a fine Greek scholar, about the time of the Septuagint, Aristotle ; he says it means "continual being," from *αἰεῖν*, always, *ᾧν*, being. In his *Treatise* he says, it means "eternity," when properly used ; in his own words, "that beyond which there is nothing."*

In my brother's ascending scale last night, on the use of this word, he admitted much ; he said, in substance, that it meant as long as the subject to which it was applied was capable of existing. Sometimes, he said, it is applied to a man's life ; then, to the continuance of a race ; then to the age of the world ; then, to future life ; then, to God. I do not admit that, in the New Testament, it is ever applied to a man's life ; but suppose it was, I only claim that, literally, it means "eternal," and *always* as long a time as the subject to which it is applied is capable of existing. When

* Aristotle, *De Cælo*, Lib. i, Cap. 9.

applied to endless happiness it is by all admitted to mean absolute, never-ending eternity. What, I ask again as I have fruitlessly asked before, what is there in the nature of the human soul that makes it capable of eternal happiness, but *incapable* of eternal misery? We then conclude that *αἰώνιος* means *unending, eternal existence*. The best lexicons so give it; the best writers, including Aristotle, and the best commentators agree; the New Testament writers so employ it—they contrast the endless happiness of the righteous with the endless misery of the wicked, using this same word, in *both* senses, in the *self-same* verse.—“Those shall go into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal,”—there is no difference in the original; the English version only changes the word to give variety to the expression, but in the original there is no difference. The word which means “eternity” in its form of a noun, and “endless” as an adjective, is applied to future punishment. It is the same as to future life; and as surely as the righteous shall enjoy endless (*αἰώνιος*) life, so surely shall the wicked be consigned to endless (*αἰώνιος*) misery.

DR. SAWYER.—My brother has introduced a very beautiful illustration of the Trinity; but he seems aware that I might say something about it; and he anticipated, therefore, any remark I might make, and attempted to ward off the edge of it. I think his Socinian, as he calls him, could not have been greatly troubled by the good Welsh minister's illustration. If I understand the doctrine, the Trinity is made up of three persons, who are all infinite and equal in eternity power and glory. That the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are each the infinite God—each is the same—yet, all are different—and all together constitute one infinite God! But how is it with the Welshman's illustration? Are fire, and light, and heat one? On the con-

trary, are not light and heat more the effects or products of fire? Fire without them would not be fire. Indeed, we do not know what fire is, except from the heat and light that emanate from it. I think the illustration of the other clergyman was quite as good, who, not seeing his text very clearly, read "hen" for "hind," thus—"He maketh my feet like hen's feet"—and used the passage to prove the Trinity, from the three toes being united in one foot. There is a very striking difference between mystery and absurdity. The Trinity is, properly, no mystery. There is mystery all around us, in the growth of a plant, in life of all kinds. But that *three* co-equal infinite beings make but *one* is no mystery at all—it is a simple absurdity. I do wish sincerely that men would speak with a little more accuracy. You cannot think of the Trinity, nor express it, without involving a clear absurdity and contradiction of terms. But it is a matter of very little moment here. I would not object to the doctrine, if its advocates would make a *better* God by having three persons in it; but, if there is to be no improvement in this respect, I should object somewhat. The doctrines of a Trinity and a future general judgment, let me remark, do not properly stand in the way of Universalism at all; there are many Universalists who still maintain both those doctrines.

There are, I think, some difficulties with the doctrine of a general future judgment, difficulties which, perhaps, have never occurred to my brother. When the whole human race has gone through with its course, and its fate is, as he represents, settled for eternity, I do not see what occasion there is for a future general judgment—what occasion there can be to call up Sodom and Gomorrah from their damnation of over four thousand years, and I do not know how many more, and then subject them anew to a general judgment. What mockery to bring them out of hell, and judge

them again after centuries, and centuries, and centuries of damnation and torment !

I spoke of the passage in Jude and the corresponding passage in Peter, both obviously relating to the same thing. I know there is a doubt as to the age of the book of Enoch ; but it is obviously very old. I said last evening, that Jude either quoted, or repeated the tradition which is exhibited in that book. Dr. Laurence thinks that without doubt Jude quoted it. Professor Stuart inclines to the contrary opinion. So Dr. Laurence believes the book to have been written shortly before the Christian era, while Professor Stuart regards it as more probable that it was written in the latter half of the first century.

The book of Enoch gives a circumstantial account of the fall of some angels, with the occasion and consequence of it. Of all this the Bible says not a word and gives not a hint, if we except these passages of Peter and Jude. And one only needs to read the book of Enoch to see that the allusion of these apostles corresponds exactly to its account of this matter. It is a fact, too, that Jude refers to a prophecy of Enoch which we find in this apocryphal-book.

But we have the most specific account of the last judgment, as it is called, in Matt. xxv., commencing with the 31st verse. I need not repeat what I have before said, that the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew are one discourse. They contain what our Saviour uttered *on one occasion*. There are, as my brother says, three questions asked—but commentators generally hold that they mean the same thing, being only different forms of interrogation, the events being identical in the minds of those who proposed them. Our Saviour answered, not as to three distinct questions, but as to so many different phases of one. His “coming,” “the destruction of Jerusalem,” and “the end of the world” are all thrown together in the answer, and

considered as making up one grand event. My brother says any honest mind can easily distinguish the difference between these things; and so it ought if they are as unlike and as remote from each other as the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world, in the common acceptation of that phrase. But can he himself do this with all the attention he has paid to the subject? Can he tell us where the prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem ended and that of the end of the world began? He cannot do it, and no man can. Indeed nothing can be more certain than that no reference is made in this whole discourse of our Saviour to what we call the end of the world. That discourse had *one* subject, related to one *time*, and described one great event.

I have already shown that to the close of the thirty-fifth verse of the 24th chapter, the Saviour spoke exclusively of the destruction of Jerusalem. In the thirty-fourth verse he determines the time of that event, "Verily I say unto you this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." But my brother asserts that several things here foretold did not take place in that generation, and have not taken place yet. Among these are the darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars, and especially the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. We are then reduced to this unpleasant dilemma; either to disbelieve my brother's declaration, or to disbelieve Christ's words. Christ declared as plainly as language could express it that *all these things* were to be fulfilled during that generation in which he lived! my brother says they were not. Which shall we believe? Either these things have occurred as they were foretold, or the Son of God prophesied falsely. Dare my brother say here to-night that these things have not taken place, when Christ himself declared that they should take place within

a single generation after his death? Any one familiar with the Old Testament prophecies will understand that the execution of God's judgments is often described in language similar to this of the Saviour. There is nothing remarkable in this diction—or the vivid imagery employed. It is oriental and Scriptural, and is not of course to be literally interpreted.

I need not pursue the subject, for the whole controversy turns on this point. If these events have already occurred as our Saviour declared they should, then this discourse of the Son of God is no description of the last or general judgment, and the passage on which my brother is forced chiefly to rely, is lost to his cause. You can read the remainder of the 24th chapter from the 36th verse to the end, and you will see that it treats upon the same subject. Although this great event was to take place during that generation, yet its "day and hour" were unknown, and on this circumstance rested the duty of great *watchfulness* on the part of the apostles. It was to come *suddenly* and unexpectedly, as did the flood; and so rapid were the events to be and so full of danger the time, that of "two men in the field one should be taken and the other left," and so of two women "grinding at the mill." Interpreted of the destruction of Jerusalem and the escape of the Christians from its terrible fate, these things are natural and easy; but taken as describing *the end of the world*, I would ask my brother what they mean. He maintains that then the whole world is to be burned up or burnt over! How in such a case, of two men in the field, or two women at the mill, could "one be taken and the other left?" What possible significance have these things? They are sheer nonsense. The coming of the Son of Man and the destruction of that proud, wicked city was to come like a thief in the night, while the people were marrying and giving in marriage. Even some of the

professed Christians would say in their hearts, "My Lord delayeth his coming, and begin to smite their fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken;" but such evil and wicked servants would be taken unawares, and their portion appointed with the hypocrites.

Now we turn to the 25th chapter, and please observe there is no break in the discourse; our Saviour goes on, "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be like ten virgins," etc. When? at the time before named, *i. e.*, during the then existing generation. We then have the parable of the ten virgins, designed to illustrate the ruin of unfaithful Christians at the time when the kingdom of heaven was to be set up; and going on to the 14th verse we have the parable of the talents, which presents another phase of the same event. Observe that, in this parable, our Saviour represents himself as about to return, and those servants, his disciples, are to be required to account for the treasures confided to them, that is, the gospel. He was going into a far country; as was the custom then for those of Judea, who sought political authority, to go to Rome. Our Saviour borrowed the image to represent himself as going to heaven to receive his kingdom and return.

At the 31st verse our Saviour exhibits another view of what was to take place at the establishment of his kingdom, *i. e.*, of the judgment which he was to execute. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." Now, the important point to be determined here is, *when* the Son of Man was to come in his glory. If this can be clearly shown, we shall see at once whether this judgment was to take place at the destruction of Jerusalem, *i. e.* at the *establishment* of the Saviour's kingdom, or not till the end of the world, *i. e.*, the *close* of his kingdom, when he is to deliver it up to the

Father. By turning to verses 29-34 of chapter xxiv, you will see that Christ was to be seen coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, during that generation in which he lived. In Matt. xvi., 27-28 it is also declared by Christ himself that he would come during the lifetime of some of those who heard him. "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then shall he reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom."

Now it needs no argument to show that *coming in his glory and sitting on the throne of his glory*, Matt. xxv., 31, is precisely the same thing as *coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory*, Matt. xxiv., 30, and *coming in the glory of his Father*, and *coming in his kingdom*, Matt. xvi., 27, 28. And this coming we know was to take place during that generation. So the Saviour himself declared, in terms so express that we cannot deny or doubt it. The judgment then described in the passage before us is not the judgment of which my brother is speaking, and has no reference to it. They are as unlike and as far removed from each other as the destruction of the Jewish city and state on the one hand, and the end of the world on the other. They differ in time and design as widely as the beginning and the end of the Redeemer's kingdom!

There are two or three considerations more that go to confirm this interpretation. My brother's general judgment is to succeed the resurrection of the dead. But in all our Saviour has said upon this great judgment, not a word occurs in reference to the resurrection. It is very remarkable indeed that in the New Testament, where that doctrine is treated upon, we have no judgment, and where judgment is

the subject, we have no notice of the resurrection. These two things which our church orthodoxy always connects, the Bible as uniformly keeps separate and distinct.

Then it deserves your notice that in this judgment of our Saviour, *two* classes of persons are judged for their treatment of a *third* class. Men were received or rejected because they had done or not done thus and thus, to "*these my brethren*." These brethren are not judged at all, but only those who stood outside to them.

I need not add that this judgment was predicated exclusively on *works*. Nothing is said about *faith*; but they are approved or condemned, because they had done or not done certain good works to the Saviour's disciples or brethren.

Once more: you cannot fail to observe that this judgment was to take place at the very beginning of the Saviour's kingdom. When he came in his kingdom and glory, then he sat on the throne of his glory, and manifested his power by the exhibition of his judgments. My brother places the judgment at the close of this kingdom, which the Bible never does.

MR. WESCOTT.—Very many persons, when they have made a mistake in reading the Bible, get into an absurdity; thus the brother who read "hen" in mistake, committed a similar absurdity to Universalists; then down comes the whole superstructure,—but the good Welsh clergyman did not make any mistake.

I am glad my brother has so far conceded the doctrine of general judgment, as to say it does not stand in the way of universal salvation—there is some hope of him yet. What object, he asks, can there be in a general judgment? Well—suppose we see none, yet, are we to question God? If we are told in the Scriptures that the world shall be judged, and that he has appointed a *day*, a day in which

he will judge the world in righteousness, shall we say "Lord! what use?" Suppose it says again that we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, are we to question God? But there is an object which I can see. God proposes, in the end, to satisfy himself who ought to be condemned and who acquitted, and he intends that the result shall honor the justice of his administration, and the intelligent universe acknowledge the same. Then shall the influence which every man exerted be brought to light—Voltaire and Paine, Paul and Peter, the whole universe shall see that sentence is pronounced aright; and then shall all acknowledge Him to be righteous. Hence the general great judgment is left to the close of time.

My brother says there is no other book, besides Peter and Jude, that gives so particular a description of the judgment. Well, suppose there were not; are we to demand of God to repeat over and over again, when he sends a minute description by two inspired writers? Our question is—"Do the Holy Scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery?" Not, "Are these the Holy Scriptures?" We are not going to be drawn into a defence of the Sacred Writings—but for that too I am ready when it is necessary. Peter and Jude belong to the Canon for 1700 years; they are included therein by Eusebius. No one can pretend to reject either Peter or Jude as an inspired writer. But there *are* other descriptions nearly as full as theirs, though we are told there are not. We read in Revelation vi., commencing at the 13th verse—

"And the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig-tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind: and the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places; and the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains,

and the mighty men, and every bond-man, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains : and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb : for the great day of his wrath is come ; and who shall be able to stand ?”

I suppose he will tell you this is old Jerusalem.* Again he brings us to Matt. xxiv., but the only argument was that “ this generation ” occurred after *a part* of our Saviour’s description. I ask whether my explanation was not rational, that Christ, in giving an account of the destruction of Jerusalem, knowing that false Christs would appear, should make a digression from the thread of his discourse, to warn his apostles against those impostors—for that, when he should come, it would be in a manner that every one would understand ? My brother says this alludes only to the suddenness of his coming—but there is nothing about suddenness, not a word. The only thing is about the wilderness, or the secret chamber, and Christ says that instead of coming in any such private way he will come openly on the lightning. So of the flood, which is introduced to show the general nature of the destruction. Yet we ask, did this destruction come so suddenly ? War was raging around the city for four continuous years ; the invading army was not out of Palestine for four years ; on the last of February or first of March it sat down near Jerusalem ; unaccountably it retires—returns again in the month of March—continues to besiege the city until September. Is this sudden ? My brother, let me say to you as Christ did to his disciples—“ Be ye not deceived,” for when the Son of man comes his coming shall be like the flash of the lightning, so sudden ;

* Mr. W. here alluded to a *lapsus lingue* of Dr. S., who said Jude gave an account of the fallen angels—being a mere mistake. Reporter leaves all out.

like the deluge in the days of Noah, so universal. My brother makes some remarks in regard to the two men in the field, and the two women grinding at the mill. He says I attribute all these scenes to the coming of Christ. I did not do so. The plain reasoning is, that he comes to the world and finds us at our pleasures and our business, just as usual. My brother observes that the description represents customs which *then* existed in Palestine—but it is the same still; life is stagnant there; there still two women grind at the mill as they did in the days when the Son of Man spoke. When he comes he will find men in the field, in the crowded mart, in the places of amusement, on the high seas, everywhere. When the light of the great throne breaks upon the world, he will find a world busy as in the days of Noah, and the influence of his coming shall be as universal as that flood—it will be appropriate as it was then.

The resurrection of the righteous is to precede that of the wicked; we are not told how long; that explains one being taken and the other left. The Bible always places the resurrection of the righteous first; not only that, but the righteous are to be raised before the living are changed. There is a minuteness in the order of these events; my brother does not find it, but I do, instance after instance.

Then he tells us the coming of Christ with his angels is illustrated by Matthew xvi., 28—"There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." Is there not a difference between coming in his kingdom, that is, establishing his church, and his coming with his holy angels? He did come from the grave to establish his kingdom, and those there then saw. But there is a confounding of different expressions to apply those passages to the same event.

My brother has told us there is not an expression in the New Testament which includes judgment with resurrection.

What will he make of these :—Acts x., 42, “ And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead ?” I suppose my brother has no difficulty in understanding what “ the quick ” means, and the “ dead.” There are other passages : “ I saw the dead, small and great, standing before God, and the books were opened ; and another book was opened, it was the book of life * * * death and hell gave up the dead which were in them.” All these stood before the judgment-seat ! It is not necessary that the Scriptures take up all in detail, nor collect all into one passage. But all is done so that he who reads may run, and who runs may read. As to the parables in Matthew xxv., I only ask you to take your Bible when you go home, read them, and ask your own conscience, in the sight of God, if they represent the state of things at the destruction of Jerusalem, or at any time since. I will not follow my brother in that part, because he said nothing there to be particularly commended or refuted.

Towards the close of the 25th chapter of Matthew, my brother would have it appear that our Saviour promises that men shall be rewarded or punished, according to their works ; and he seems to say that I admitted this. In his sense I did no such thing. But in the sense of Jesus, I did : for he, when once asked what the work of God was, answered that it was to believe on him whom God sent. So said I ; faith in Christ is the medium of justification ; but I added that faith always gives good works ; “ faith works by love ;” and again, “ faith purifies the heart.”

Those passages which I quoted in Matthew, representing Christ as coming in the glory of his father, with his holy angels, sitting on the throne of his glory, I repeat, he has given no account of, as to how they were fulfilled at the taking of Jerusalem, nor of the gathering of the nations

before him. They remain in all their force ; and unless he brings arguments to show that all these things have occurred, we are left to believe that they are yet to occur.

DR. SAWYER.—I do not wish, by any means, to bandy words on this subject. If you will have the goodness to read the 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew in connection, you will see, almost at a glance, all that I wish to say. My brother has made some criticisms, and some remarks, on what I said ; but the point to which I particularly direct your attention he *did not touch* ; viz., that our Saviour, *after* his description of his coming in great power and glory with all his angels, added that all these things would occur *during that very generation*. Is not that plain enough ? I ask my brother what he understands by that language. He cannot tell us ; to him it has no meaning ; and you see he is disposed to jumble up passages, to change their order, for the purpose of making out his awful doctrine. I believe in a judgment ; I believe there was a judgment (as he has repeated with something of a sneer) at the destruction of Jerusalem. This is so unless the most orthodox commentators, those most devoted to endless misery, are altogether mistaken. He says I find nothing but old Jerusalem everywhere :—I reply that he seems to find nothing but endless misery everywhere. Which is the more reasonable and natural you can judge by reading the New Testament for yourselves.

He says the word *αἰών* means “eternity.” Suppose I grant his definition. Now, we find in the New Testament a great many places which speak of the end of this *αἰών*, *eternity* ; as Matt. xxiv., 3, *συντέλεια του αἰώνος*, the *end of eternity* ! What does that mean ? Paul, referring to himself and his co-workers, speaks of the *ends of the eternities*. 1 Cor. x., 11, “On whom the ends of the world are come,”

τήλη τῶν αἰώνων. Again, Heb. ix., 26, "But now once *in the ends of the eternities*," συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων, "hath he" (Christ) "appeared to put away sin"—not *punishment*—"by the sacrifice of himself."

This is getting on bravely! Give Aristotle and the critics, all the weight you will, do you suppose the apostle Paul would be guilty of such nonsense as to speak of the *end and ends of eternity*? But we have more; we have the phrase, εἰς τὰς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων—the *eternities of eternities*! Are we to suppose that men who understood the force of words could ever talk after this fashion? What is the manifest meaning of this word but "a time indefinite, a long time, a very long time?" I do not dispute Aristotle; he is good authority; but then the Greek ἀεὶ, on which the whole force of the word rests, means *always*, just in the sense that "always" is used by ourselves. Thus, Mark xv., 8, "The multitude crying aloud, began to desire him to do as he had *ever*—ἀεὶ—done." Titus i., 12, "The Cretans are *always*—ἀεὶ—liars." Now, I do not think that my brother, or even Aristotle himself, would maintain that Pilate had *endlessly* given up some prisoner annually to the people; nor that the Cretans were *endless* liars. The force of the word is too plain to require remark. The adjective αἰώνιος is derived from αἰών, and the rule is pretty clear that the adjective does not, ordinarily, have a greater meaning than the root; and, as αἰών does not, and can not, mean *eternity*, strictly in itself, so neither can nor does αἰώνιος.

I need not repeat my statement of last evening, from Gesenius, with respect to the meaning of the Hebrew *gnolam*; which is always translated in the Septuagint, αἰών. My brother tells us of αἰώνιος being used seventy-one times in the New Testament; in sixty, he says, it applies to endless things, the happiness of the righteous, future life, and the attributes of God; in two instances, he

acknowledges, it is used in a finite sense ; and seven times, he says, it is applied to future punishment. Now, I believe *gnolam* is as often applied to future punishment in the Old, as *alōn* in the New Testament, and yet it *never* in one single instance means *eternity* ; on the contrary, it clearly alludes to events in this life, and has reference to the punishment of the Jews and other nations.

Let us go back to Matthew xxv. ; here you will find this word, on which my brother is obliged to predicate his whole doctrine of endless misery. He says it is used for future punishment seven times, in the New Testament, and this is one of the times, in the passage before us. Now, if you understand *alōntos* as *gnolam* in the Old Testament, there will be no difficulty. This word is applied to life very often, thus,—“ He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life,”—it is not *shall* have at some future time, in another state of being ; it is present, he *hath* it now ; he is in the present enjoyment of it. “ But he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him ;”—that is, the unbeliever, while he continues in unbelief, cannot enjoy this spiritual, Christian life, but is the object of the divine displeasure ; he is condemned already. So the Saviour says, “ This is *eternal* life that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” Here are two instances, out of many, in which the word “ everlasting ” is applied to life, and I would respectfully ask if any man can interpret it to mean absolutely *endless*. If this be so, then the Calvinistic doctrine of the perseverance of the saints is settled. Once in faith, endlessly safe. And yet the apostle speaks of some who had “ fallen away.”

Observe, if you please, the use of this word, or these words, in the sacred writings. The Jews were threatened, Deut. xxviii., with punishment “ for ever,” that is, “ everlasting

punishment." The house of Eli, 1 Sam. iii., 13, 14, was to be judged and not purged "for ever." Solomon was threatened, 1 Chron. xxviii., 9, that the Lord would cast him off "for ever." Idumea, Isaiah xxxiv., 10, was to be converted into brimstone and pitch, and her smoke was to go up "for ever." In Jeremiah xvii., it is said Judah should discontinue from her heritage and serve her enemies, "for ye have kindled a fire in mine anger which shall burn for ever." So the prophet's enemies, Jeremiah xx., 11, were threatened with "everlasting confusion." So the Jews, Jeremiah xxiii., 39, 40, were threatened with being forgotten and forsaken and cast out of the divine presence, and subjected to an "everlasting reproach" and a "perpetual shame."

Now it is in this manner that the word is used in the Old Testament. In the New the style is not changed. The Jews were threatened with "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power," with "everlasting punishment," etc., etc.

Let it be observed, however, that while the punishment itself is represented as everlasting, it is not said that any individual would suffer *everlastingly*. The Jewish people went away into everlasting punishment, for that punishment endures to this day, and generation after generation have suffered it.

I believe that Christ has established and is now carrying on his Kingdom. I believe he came in his power and glory at the destruction of Jerusalem. Bishop Warburton says that Christ's government over the world is the same as God's was, before Christ, over the Jews, only enlarged and perfected. It was not till the close of the apostolic age that this kingdom was set up. All through the writings of the apostles we find them waiting for "the coming of the Lord," for the destruction of their enemies, and for their establishment in peace and power. From that time the

kingdom of Christ has been going forward; and Christ is now judging the world. My brother has quoted a passage in Acts, for which I thank him, as it explains this subject. "God has appointed a day, a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance to all men in that he hath raised him from the dead."

But there is no allusion here to any judgment at the end of the world. The meaning is that he has appointed a period for the carrying on of a righteous government in the earth by Jesus Christ, as the Jews were ruled by *judges* in ancient times. The word "world" here means "the habitable earth," and, by metonymy, the inhabitants of the earth; but there is no reference to final judgment; the judgment is that which Christ is administering to-day, by establishing the principles of equity and truth wheresoever his religion goes.

I meet with a difficulty in the general judgment which my brother advocates, of this kind; it does not present an equitable administration. The old sinner, who has lived through his three score years and ten in sin, and is at last brought to the gallows, may repent an hour or a minute before his execution; and then he is to be taken into heaven! While a child that sins once and dies without repentance, must, since sin is infinite, suffer endless punishment! Behold heaven the habitation of this old sinner, whose heart was steeped in iniquity and whose hands were red with human blood, looking down, perhaps exultingly, upon the torments of this child, this little being, I may say this innocent little being, whose one sin has consigned it to an eternity of misery! And this is orthodox justice! Do you believe in any such justice—in any such administration of God?

Solomon, wise, good and gifted in the earlier part of his life, served God. At last, falling into idolatry, he became

a miserable sinner! Where is Solomon, who, possibly, died impenitent, where, on my brother's hypothesis, is he to receive for his good deeds? Saul of Tarsus persecuted the Church of God. But the light shone on him, and he became a minister of Divine Truth. Is all his sin to be blotted out, and is he to receive nothing but reward? There is no doctrine more clear, and none more salutary, than this—that every man shall be “rewarded according to his works,” for every deed, thought, and purpose an equitable reward. This ought to be the doctrine of the church, but it is not. While the church launches her anathemas at the head of the sinner, she opens a way so easy, for escape, that he never doubts of his salvation. A thousand times over is it said,

“While the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return.”

Preach to the world this great truth that God is Judge, and that he is just, and that he will reward every man according to his works, and you will have better results. Tell all men, in the words of Paul, “He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done; and there is no respect of persons.” No man shall receive at the hands of God more than he deserves; but I would whisper in your ear, my fellow-sinner, that for what you have sinned you shall be condemned; for God's justice and truth are pledged for your condemnation.

SEVENTH EVENING.

PRAYER being offered by REV. MR. MOORE, of New York,

MR. WESCOTT said:—I probably shall not be able to make my brother see the propriety of Christ's digressing from the general tenor of his discourse regarding the destruction of Jerusalem, in order to guard his disciples against the danger which might arise : but I think you understood not only what I meant, but also the propriety of it. Allow me briefly to recapitulate. Jesus, in the 24th chapter of Matthew, to the 34th verse, answers, *mainly*, the first question asked by the disciples regarding the destruction of Jerusalem simply: and, knowing that a danger would arise, calculated to deceive them, he says : " If any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders ; insomuch that, were it possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold I have told you before. Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold he is in the desert, go not forth ; behold he is in the secret chambers, believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west ; so shall the coming of the Son of man be." Yes, publicly; and the tribes of the earth, we are also told, shall behold him and weep on his account. The whole passage amounts to this: Until ye see the Son of Man as plainly as the vivid flash of lightning is seen in the heavens, and hear the sound of the

trumpet as plainly as the thunders roll in the clouds, believe no rumors concerning my coming. When I come, it shall be in this open, public, unmistakable manner. Having given caution, the Saviour returns to the main subject, and then utters the phrase upon which my brother relies with so much confidence—"This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." Now, what things? The things in the main thread of the narrative, not the matter contained in the digression. What public speaker that does not sometimes digress from his principal subject? but would he have what he predicates of that subject understood of the incidental matter? I should think not. As further evidence that this was so, take a passage which occurs in the same history, as given by Luke, where we are taught that Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. Has that been yet accomplished? They have been "treading down Jerusalem" for seventeen hundred years, even to this moment, and the times of the Gentiles have not yet been fulfilled—yet, *after that*, our Saviour says, "this generation shall not pass away until these things have been fulfilled." I do not utter this again to have my brother understand it; he probably will not, any more than my reply to his question, for what purpose God appoints some to everlasting misery, which I have answered twice. It is not for him, but for you, that I argue and plead.

If you will not believe that the things in the digression were excluded from those which were to happen before the then generation passed away; or, in other words, if you believe that everything Christ uttered in all the verses preceding that in which the generation is mentioned—you are driven to another conclusion, that the word generation cannot be used in its more literal acceptation; for, the things uttered in the digression have not been accomplished—I

challenge my brother to show an instance in which they have. We have authority for understanding generation differently—I do not; I retain the views uttered before. Yet I know generation is used to express a whole race, the whole race of men. Let me give a few instances where “generation” is used in this sense. Psalms xiv., 5, “God is in the generation of the righteous.” Psalms xxxii., 30, “A seed shall serve him, it shall be accounted to him for a generation.” Isaiah liii., 8, “Who shall declare his generation.” Matt. iii., 7, “O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?” That is, all the generations of the wicked, one or a thousand. Matt. i., 1, “The book of the generation of Jesus Christ.” That is, forty-two successive lines of men, embracing a period of two thousand years; all called a generation! In this 1st chapter of Matthew the word is used in both senses; but I have no doubt of my first explanation.

In my remarks last evening on the Greek adjective *αἰώνιος*, I said it occurs seventy-one times in the New Testament, that it is applied to future happiness fifty-one times; to the plan of redemption three times; to God, his attributes and government, six times; to future misery seven times; making in all sixty-seven times, in which the sense is indisputably endless; while the remaining four times, up to seventy-one, are made up by two instances where the sense is doubtful, and two where the word means limited time. My brother replied, but gave his criticism on the noun, not on the adjective. He told us the meaning of *αἰών* was *almost* always limited to an age or race. I will not take up your time much with this word; I have examined it; and I find that it is used in the New Testament ninety-five times; it is applied to God, Christ, his kingdom, and government, twenty-six times; to future happiness nine times; it is translated “ever,” “for ever,” and “never,” eighteen times, most of

them applied to something Christ did, and embracing the idea of unlimited time ; it is used in reference to time past (as in Ephes. ii, 11), and as expressive of eternal purpose, seven times ; and to express future misery, five times ; making sixty-five times out of ninety-five ; leaving thirty for use in a limited sense—and yet this is the noun ! It is sometimes used as for the world, because the old philosophers believed this world to be eternal, though race might succeed race, and ages roll on. Many later writers have it the same sense ; but, sir, Aristotle said that its proper meaning is eternity.

The criticism, therefore, presented last night on *αἰών*, is all wrong. In sixty-five out of ninety-five times it is unlimited ; and, indeed, the adjective is unlimited in all instances but four. If *αἰών* had been as definite as the Greeks wished, they would not have invented or derived *αἰώνιος*. In all languages nouns are first used ; adjectives, being formed from them, come after them. If any word can mean endless, that does. So long as we have this word used for this purpose, let us adhere to it, and believe what it teaches.

Last evening having shown that *αἰώνιος* means endless, and is so used in almost every passage where it occurs in the New Testament,—that future happiness and misery are indicated by it, the doctrine of endless misery, till this can be overthrown, is established. The two texts to which my brother referred last evening, where the Greek adjective is used (I believe there were only two) do not alter the case, viz., “He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life ;” and “He that believeth on the Son hath life.” Who believes the Bible that does not also believe that whoso eats and drinks spiritually of Christ hath eternal life ?

Indeed, my brother (unguardedly, I suppose) admitted eternal misery last evening ; he said that endless was applied to misery, but not to souls. I cannot see the force of

the reasoning ; but you, perhaps, can see the force of the admission. He said the misery might be perpetuated by being the abode of successive generations,—and, so, misery while no one soul would suffer endlessly. Well, you know our question—Do the Holy Scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery ? that is all. But if the misery be endless, so must the sufferers be, because there can be no misery if there be no one to suffer it ; and there could be no successive generations to follow after the end of the world.

I now proceed with the argument to show that, inas-much as everlasting misery is the sinner's doom at the judgment-day, there is no possibility of his deliverance from it ;—although I am not bound to do it, for the proof, properly, falls on my brother. If we trace the sinner into eternal misery, after the terrible sentence, “Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire,” it belongs to him to show a deliverance ; but as he cannot, I proffer the proof of this negative side of the question.

It is evident, because there is no intimation in any part of the Word of God that there are any means of grace in hell. Is the gospel to be preached there ? Who is to preach it ? Is repentance to be proffered ? Who is to proffer it ? Is there an atonement to be made ? Who is to make it ?

Again ; the philosophy of the human mind proves that happiness cannot be enjoyed by any person who has offended, until he has the sense of forgiveness. It is not in the power of punishment to give peace ; punishment cannot restore the offender to the good graces of the offended. A child is punished, he is turned away—has he peace until he knows his parent has pardoned him ? Never, till he feels your forgiveness. It is not in the power of punishment to give peace. Suppose a man steals five thousand dollars from you ; he is imprisoned for five years ; he comes out,

but is he happy when he sees you? Never, until there is a restoration to peace and your favor by your forgiveness. Until, then, you can prove forgiveness in hell, you can prove no peace of soul.

Again; the Scriptures not only fail to intimate any means of grace, but most clearly intimate their absence. Mark iii., 29, "He that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." Matthew, xii., 32, "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come." Take which view of forgiveness you please; take the Bible view, which means the remission of punishment; or take my brother's view, which means turning away from sin; and the result is the same. If the sinner is never to be turned away from sin, he will continue in it, and so continue to suffer. Again; we have another passage which is, if possible, more expressive, but only because more in detail:—Luke xvi., 19—31.

"There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivest thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they who would pass from hence to you can-

not ; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence. Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldst send him to my father's house : for I have five brethren ; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets ; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham : but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent : and he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

I shall not discuss the question, whether this is a parable or a plain statement of facts, because it is immaterial. If a parable, it was either based on some known facts, or some conceded principle of truth. There are two figures used in passage ; and but two. The one is " Abraham's bosom," the other, the " great gulf : " all the rest is in plain, simple language ; the figures do not destroy the force of the passage, and a dozen would not.

Let our inquiry be :—What did the Saviour intend to be understood by the passage ? That it relates to the future world there can be no question. Both had died ; the events occurred subsequent to their deaths ; not only were they dead, but the rich man was buried ; and was in " *hades*." My brother, some time back, told us " *hades* " never meant a place of future misery ; I gave it as the place of the departed ; the word means simply so, but the circumstances must determine whether torments attend or not,—and here the text tells us that the rich man was *in torments*. What has my brother to say to that ? He " lifted up his eyes, being in torment ; " he was in torment. " *Hades* " is also a place of consciousness ; his body was in the grave, yet his soul was conscious. Abraham says, " Remember ! "—memory was at work. We also see from the passage, that he had no hope of deliverance, he did not pray for it ; and this accords with other passages of Scripture, " When a wicked

man dieth his expectation perisheth." Yet he does pray for a mitigation, a slight mitigation, of his misery. Even this is not afforded him. Then he fears that those over whom he had exerted a bad influence, might come down to this place of torment, and heap imprecations on his head (he had, probably, told them that there was no future punishment, no hell). Then he begged—Send Lazarus to warn them, that there is such a place of torments. But no, the reply clearly showed him there were no means of grace in the future world. None are sent thence ; if the means of grace on the earth are not used, none are sent from beyond the grave. If any man, after reading this declaration of Divine Truth from the lips of the Son of God, can hold out a hope of deliverance for damned spirits, he does more than I, for my right arm, would attempt to do. Unless we have a purpose to serve, can there be a doubt ? Let us heed this text ; let us seek a refuge in Christ ; and tread the road to heaven, that leads by the cross of Jesus, instead of through the fires of hell. This is a safer way, and a happier way.

DR. SAWYER.—We seem now to be fairly engaged, at last, in our work ; and are this evening precisely where we ought to have been the second evening of the discussion ; then we should have had a long time to go over this matter, which is pretty large, and not, perhaps, altogether without its difficulties ; now we are crowded into two or three hours. Whether this is precisely the better way to discuss the subject, to spend the greater part of the time upon immaterial things, I leave to you : you can judge as well as I. I ask the advocates of endless misery in the audience to observe the manner in which the subject has been conducted.

Last evening we came, for the first time, to any passage

of Scripture which can be pretended to teach the doctrine distinctly: previously we were occupied with things which seemed, in the estimation of my friend, to have some reference to endless misery. We came last evening to Matthew xxv., on which rests the whole argument; because, unless sustained there, it cannot be sustained at all from the Bible.

My brother has two separate and distinct things to do: *first*, to show that the discourse of our Lord here has any reference at all to a world beyond the present state of being; *secondly*, to show that the word "everlasting," when used in reference to *punishment* or to *life*, means literally and absolutely *endless*. Has he done either of these things? In opposition to my brother's arguments, on the first point, we have the plain and express declaration of our Saviour himself, who tells us that "*all these things*," his coming in the clouds with great power and glory, with his holy angels, to judgment, were to take place in that very generation!

My brother has two modes of getting over this difficulty. The one is by shuffling the cards; now making our Saviour turn aside from his discourse, and afterwards resuming it again, and so enabling the interpreter to come to any conclusion he pleases. Is that the way a Scripturist treats the Bible? What show of reason has he made to prove that the Saviour digressed from his subject of the destruction of Jerusalem to the other trifling subject—so fit for a digression, a mere passing allusion!—of the end and destruction of the world? Not a word can be so tortured without violence. It is a simple abuse of the Bible; "for our Saviour plainly declares, "This generation shall not pass, till *all these things*"—all he had been describing before: famines, pestilences, earthquakes, wars, and tribulations, *the darkening of the sun*, the shaking of the powers of the heavens, and *the coming of the Son of Man*, with power and great glory—"shall be fulfilled." And, as if he foresaw that

some, like my brother here, would disbelieve, he added, with great solemnity, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away." That is, heaven and earth shall *sooner* pass away than my word fail. The other method of avoiding the force of our Saviour's declaration, is by a criticism on the word "generation." It sometimes means this thing and sometimes that ; sometimes a pedigree and sometimes a race, etc., etc. This will not do. There are four words in the Greek New Testament translated "generation." They are—γένος, a race, stock, or lineage ; γένεσις, generation, or the history of a man's birth and parentage ; γέννημα, a brood, flock, or progeny, as of vipers ; γενεά, an age, the people of an age, the time of human life—*never* anything else, though frequently used.

My brother's criticism is false, length and breadth. The meaning of our Saviour is very clear from the whole discourse. Take up that discourse, and see if it be not as directly *personal* as is my discourse to you here this evening. There were with our Saviour, at the time, only four apostles : Peter, John, James, and Andrew. It was these four who privately questioned him about these events, and they were privately answered. They wished to know when the temple and, of course, the city of Jerusalem should be destroyed. They desired to be informed what should be the sign of his coming for this event, and of the end of that dispensation. As my brother will have it, they inquired for the end of eternity, for here is his αἰών, which, according to Aristotle, means this.

Read the New Testament with care, and you will be struck with the fact that the Jews totally misapprehended the prophecies with regard to the coming of Christ. He was in their midst, working miracles and speaking as man never spoke, and yet they knew him not, but persecuted him, and would not rest till he was nailed to the cross. They

mistook with respect to his *first* coming; and the Christian world is not much more fortunate with respect to his *second* coming. They blunder in the same manner, and as egregiously and hopelessly, as the Jews. We have, I believe, no mention of but one coming of Christ after his ascension, but of this the apostles spoke frequently. Was it to be at the end of the world, or at a nearer time? Christ himself established the point within certain limits—the very generation in which he lived and taught was to see it.

I will present to you some of the Scripture proofs of this matter, because it is of great importance. You will remember the destruction of Jerusalem occupied a very prominent place in the teachings of our Saviour during his ministry; and it was always in the minds of his disciples after his ministry was ended. This is not very wonderful, because the same event occupied a prominent place in the minds of the prophets in olden time. It was a city much larger than this; eleven hundred thousand perished according to Josephus at its destruction—probably more. The destruction was that of a great people; it annihilated all their political hopes, blasted their political existence—they have been from that time to this, a by-word, and a hissing among the nations of the earth. Living among this people, teaching them familiarly, about to be crucified by them, foreseeing the terrible calamities that impended over them, is it singular that our Saviour should have occasionally dwelt on this topic? He often did, seriously and pathetically:—"Oh Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that stonest the prophets and killest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." Had he failed to speak thus, he would have been wanting, it seems to me, in his prophetic duty, and in his characteristic humanity and love.

I wish here to introduce a few more Scripture proofs that Christ was to come in his kingdom and glory during that very age in which he lived and taught. See Mark viii., 34-38, "Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the Gospel's, the same shall save it. For what shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his life, or what shall a man give in exchange for his life? Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." And to show that he was not speaking of an event as distant as the end of the world, he immediately added, "*Verily I say unto you that there be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power.*" Matt. xvi., 24-28 records in almost precisely the same words this discourse of Christ, only varying the phraseology thus, "*till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.*" So also Luke ix., 23-27, "But I tell you of a truth there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God."

In addition, I beg you to read Matt. x., 16-23, where after charging his apostles to go out and preach the gospel he adds, "Verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel *till the Son of man be come,*" or as Dr. Whitby says, "till the Son of man be come with his Roman army to destroy that nation and burn up their cities." Look also for a moment at John xxi., 22, where it is recorded that Peter, seeing John following Jesus and himself, "Saith to Jesus, Lord and what shall this man do? Jesus saith to him, If I will that he *tarry till I come,* what is that to thee? follow thou me. Then went this saying

among the brethren that that disciple should not die; yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, *If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?*" I mention this passage to show that Christ promised to come during that generation, and here intimated that John in particular should live to see his coming. Peter, it is believed, died a violent death as Christ foretold, but tradition teaches that John lived many years after the establishment of Christ's kingdom.

But not only did Christ foretell his coming, and the circumstances connected with it, but it seems to have formed a constant expectation of the church during the apostolic age. The epistles are full of allusions to this great event. The apostles wrote like men who were expecting and waiting anxiously for the return of the master.

1 Cor. i., 7, "So that ye come behind in no gift, *waiting for the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.*"

1 Thess. ii., 19, "For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not ye *in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?*"

1 Thess. iii., 13, "To the end he may establish your hearts unblamable in holiness before God, even our Father, *at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.*"

1 Thess. v., 23, "Now the very God of peace sanctify you wholly, and I pray God, your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless *unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.*"

1 Tim., vi. 13, 14, "I charge thee * * * that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable *until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ.*"

Titus ii., 13, "Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."

Heb. x., 37, "For yet a little while and he that shall come, will come and will not tarry."

2 Peter iii., The apostle mentions scoffers who should say, "Where is the promise of his coming?" that is the fulfilment of his promise. Then after explaining that the Lord is not slack concerning his promise, he adds almost in the very words of Christ: "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night;" and then gives a prophetic description of the mighty changes which should take place at his coming, as the heavens passing away with a great noise, the elements melting with fervent heat, etc., etc., and closes with the personal exhortation to his brethren: "Seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace."

Nothing can be more manifest than that Christ foretold his second coming to establish his kingdom and judge the world at the end of that age, and that the apostles anxiously expected and waited for this event.

My brother objects to 24th Matthew teaching the coming of our Saviour at his second appearing, because he says no such display as there described has ever taken place. He forgets how few difficulties he has found in interpreting the Bible elsewhere. He forgets how often he has said—Let all be dark as it may, yet, if the Bible teaches it, we must believe. Now, here the Bible says it, pretty plainly too, I think; and he will not believe; just because the Bible here does not at all suit his prejudices, but runs exactly counter to them. However, hell must be bolstered up; we cannot get on without it; so some kind of jugglery is introduced to help the matter along. All those things, he says, have never taken place. But is he quite sure of that? I beg of him, and you too, to read on this point, Dr. Adam Clarke, Doddridge, Hammond, Bishop Pearce, Barnes, and see what they say. I do not wish you to take

their opinions as gospel, but take them *with the gospel*, and see what they are worth. You will find a great deal in them which, I suppose, my brother will not believe at all. This mistake of my brother arises from the neglect or forgetfulness of prophetic phraseology. Saint Peter, in Acts ii., 16—21, says

“This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel ; * * And I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath ; blood and fire and vapor of smoke ; the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord come.”

In the Old Testament the fall of Babylon is described in the same way, Isa. xiii., 9, 10. So the destruction of Egypt, Ezek. xxxii., 7, 8, and other places and cities. Who needs to be told that in the Old Testament the imagery is much more vivid than ours, the result of a temperament more glowing and imaginative than our own? Thus—“God came from Teman and the Holy One from Mount Paran. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. * * The mountains saw thee and trembled : the overflowing of the waters passed by : the deep uttered his voice, and lifted his hands on high. The sun and the moon stood still in their habitation,” &c., Habak. iii. See also Ps. xviii., 6—15.

All these images are to be taken in a figurative manner ; beautiful in their kind, but not to be interpreted literally. The task is beyond any human power. Old Dr. Lightfoot, as familiar, perhaps, as any one with the Hebrew, tells us that, —“ The Jewish heaven shall perish, and the sun and moon of its glory and happiness shall be darkened, brought to nothing. The sun is the religion of the Church and the moon the government of the State, and the stars are the judges and doctors of both.” My brother must cling close

to his interpretation of this passage Matthew, and make it out if possible ; because, if he loses this passage, he loses all. This endless punishment of which he talks began to be inflicted then, and eternal life to be enjoyed then. He takes it for granted that this word *αἰών* means endless. Whatever use Aristotle and the classic Greek make of it, every one familiar with the New Testament knows that the writers of that do not so use it. *Gnolam*, the Hebrew word which is always translated by *αἰώνιος* in the Septuagint, never means endless unless joined to a noun whose nature carries that idea. Thus Jonah says—chap. ii., 2, 6. “Out of the belly of hell cried I. * * I went down to the bottom of the mountains ; the earth with her bars was about me for ever,” and yet he was there only three days and three nights ! See Habak. iii., 6. “He stood and measured the earth : he beheld and drove asunder the nations ; and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow : his ways are everlasting.” My brother’s mode of reasoning would here make the *mountains* as endless as *God*.

MR. WESCOTT.—Well, then ; if we are to place confidence in our brother, we may dismiss the idea of Christ’s ever coming. Poor old Jerusalem had the whole of it—that’s all. The difficulty with me is, I cannot take that view yet. He has produced three passages to show that Christ would come in that age. Christ said, “You shall not die till I come in my *kingdom*.” So it was ; he came on the day of Pentecost ; that is all. We have, in John xxi., 20, Peter’s question respecting it, and the reply. Peter, always inquisitive, asked many questions, in answering which our Saviour took his own method and time. This he asked on another occasion : “Lord, are there few that be saved ?” Our Lord gave no direct answer, but urged an important duty. In the present instance he asked, “Lord, what about this man

John?" and Christ answered as much as to say, "What is that to you, Peter?" Let me read the whole passage :

"Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following ; which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee? Peter seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me."

There is the passage; look at it ; that is all I ask you.

We were told that the apostles all expected Christ immediately : well ; but *he did not come*. Let us look at a few passages, and see if Paul was expecting the Saviour immediately. In 2 Thess., ii., we read : "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means ; for that day shall not come, except there cometh a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition ; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God." Then the apostle gives the description of the Roman hierarchy, now nearly two thousand years after this prediction ; and yet it exists. Look at it ! I did not wish you to go away with the impression that Christ had already come, as my brother asserted. No ; when Christ comes, it will be as visible as the lightning ; the dead will be raised, the living changed, the elements melted, the earth burned over, and the human family judged. That is the Bible description of the second coming of Christ.

I have proved that the word rendered "everlasting," "eternal," means endless. I have quoted so good an authority as Aristotle—I have cited him. All our good

lexicons give the same definition. Sixty times out of seventy-one it means endless in the New Testament, excluding the passages relating to future misery.

He says I have now another way of getting rid of the expression "generation." But I have no want to get rid of it. The disciples asked three questions—When shall these things be?—What shall be the sign of thy coming?—What of the end of the world? The Saviour goes on to give his account of the destruction of Jerusalem, and then answers the other questions—but my brother jumbles them all together, so as to give us no intelligible answer to any of them. Well; I cannot help him! Then he tells us this endless misery commenced then, at the destruction of Jerusalem—it had not been heard of before. I think it commenced long before; writers of *some* authority tell us Sodom and Gomorrah received the vengeance of eternal fire two thousand years before.

Last evening my brother said the judgment had been going on for eighteen hundred years; it commenced at the commencement of the Christian dispensation, and is continued to the present. I have waited patiently for the Scripture authority, but it has not appeared. Long after Christ's ascension, Paul said to the Athenians, "God has appointed a day on which he *will judge* the world in righteousness." He did not understand that it was then in progress, but was still in the future; the New Testament account everywhere presents it in the future. There are two or three passages in which it is said, "Now is the judgment of this world"—"Now is the prince of the world," &c.; but my brother will not dare to use these; he knows very well that they do not refer to "the judgment day."

Another objection of my brother's, last evening, was that the judgment destroyed all principles of equity. He says, if a man be judged on the ground of his belief or disbelief

in Christ, that destroys all the principles of equity; and he wishes to know how he is to be punished, if all his sins before he was converted are charged against him; and how he is to be rewarded for his virtuous deeds after. Just as if the God of heaven could not give an equitable decision, because a day of judgment is established! Then he is troubled about Solomon, who built the temple, and did many good acts, and then fell away. He does not pretend to know how he died, but he wants to know how he is to be treated. I am not able to say how the judgment interferes with the arrangement of this matter; but, whether, or not, if Jehovah has appointed a day of judgment, he will see that equity rules.

He then gives an illustration—I was astonished at the kind of illustration he gave! He supposes the case of an old sinner, the perpetrator of numerous depredations, who repents on the gallows. He asks—Is this hardened sinner to be pardoned? I say I wondered at the kind of illustration my brother used, so analogous is it to a circumstance that really did occur. There *was* a hardened sinner in Palestine, who had spent his life in theft, robbery, perhaps murder, and he was nailed to a cross, a hardened sinner still. There he hung close by one called Jesus of Nazareth. Hanging there, he lifts his eyes towards the man called Jesus, utters a penitent prayer—and then this Jesus says to him—“To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.” Did that man escape punishment? or did he go down to hell like the other thief? Was there no deliverance there? Oh, my brother! I *did* wonder at your illustration! But we have had so many that clash with Scripture that I ought not to have wondered. I do not wonder, when I recall the words of Mr. Boyce before the Universalist Convention—“We differ widely on every point. We have a different God, a different Christ, a different sin, a different sinner, a different law, a

different heaven, a different hell; in fine, a difference in every vital point of religion." Oh! is this Universalism? Will you be blinded by a system that takes Jesus from the plan of salvation; robs faith of its power to justify, the blood of Christ of its power to atone, banishes the Holy Spirit in its regenerating and sanctifying influence, makes all that the Bible tells us of these things seem mere allegory, or sheer nonsense, and leave the sinner, who has fled to Christ for a refuge, to suffer the penalty of his sins? Oh, may we not say with Mary—"You have taken away my Lord, and I know not where you have laid him?"

DR. SAWYER.—My brother finds three distinct questions in the 24th chapter of Mathew; the two last, he says, refer to the future judgment and the end of the world; the first relates to the destruction of Jerusalem. I would ask him to tell us to-morrow evening where the answer to each begins and terminates; that would be quite satisfactory. And if such a distinction exists it can be pointed out. It should be very plain. But observe; in Mark and Luke, where we have the same description, we have but *one* question, not three. See Mark xiii., 3, 4. "And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives over against the temple, Peter and John, and James, and Andrew, asked him privately, Tell us, when shall these things be? *and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?*" Then our Saviour gives just the same description—jumbles all together—as my brother must suppose—just as is done in Matthew; and adds the same assurance, with the same asseveration, that all should happen in that generation. It is the same in Luke xxi., 5. The same simple question; the same description, the same limitation of time for the fulfillment, with all the circumstances, precisely as they stand in Matthew, with my brother's *three* questions. There is not a word in either Mark or

Luke about the end of the world ; the question relates alone to the destruction of Jerusalem and associate events, while the answer is as obviously foreign to everything concerning the general judgment and the end of the world.

I ask, in addition, to call your attention to the fact that the doctrine of endless punishment, if taught in the Bible, is taught in the Old Testament and in the self-same words, only taking the Hebrew for the Greek upon which he so much insists in the New Testament. I ask my brother why he has not hunted up these texts, when, for a week, night after night, I have been urging him to do so? Has he not "Moses and the prophets" as well as the rich man in *Hades*? Why then does he not produce their testimony to endless misery? I tell him that doctrine can be proved from the Old Testament as well as from the New. But my brother knows that orthodox authorities have given up the doctrine there. He knows, too, that your minds are familiarized to certain phrases in the New Testament, and that you have always been taught to associate his favorite doctrine with them. He therefore appeals to your prejudices and plays with your credulity. But is this fair dealing? Is this one of the fruits of a pure orthodoxy? I think I can refer him to twenty passages in the Old Testament where endless punishment is threatend, if *gnōlam* means endless, and it certainly does so if *alōnios* does. I have urged my brother to this work till I am ashamed to say another word upon it.

But my brother clings to the notion that "everlasting life" means endless life in the world to come: he tells you that, in sixty, or more, out of seventy-one cases, *alōnios* means "endless." I dispute; I deny it: I challenge him to the proof. Does not Christ say that—"To know God is eternal life?" And does my brother contend that is endless? Does he hold that "faith in Christ is endless life?"

He knows well it is not ; he knows the life meant is the spiritual life which Christians enjoy here.

I have called my brother's attention to the original words rendered *Hell*, viz. *Sheol*, *Hades*, and *Gehenna* ; I have urged him to show that these words ever mean a place of endless misery, and to what purpose you will easily remember. Where is his explanation of one of them ? Where has he even attempted to prove that they ever indicate such a place ? But now he has pitched on one passage in which *hades* must actually mean *hell* ; I refer to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Does he forget that passage in Paul—" O *Hades*, where is thy victory ? " As Paul teaches, Christ has gained a complete victory over death and hell, and they are to be utterly despoiled of their power. But this passage about the rich man and Lazarus, he says, is either a *parable* or a *history*. There I agree with him. But he also borrows that stupidest thing Dr. Clarke ever said, that it is no matter whether it is a parable or a history. Can anything be more absurd ?

A history is an account of facts, or a narrative of events that have actually occurred, as the history of England, or of the works, teachings, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. A parable, on the contrary, is a kind of fable, or similitude taken from any realm of thought intended to convey some moral or spiritual instruction ; or, according to Bishop Lowth, a parable is that kind of allegory which consists of a continued narration of a fictitious event, applied by way of simile, to the illustration of some important truth ; as the parable of the trees going out to choose a king.—Judges ix., 7—15. A history always says what it means : a parable always says one thing and means another ; the story, whatever it may be, serving only as the vehicle for conveying, in a pleasing manner, the intended lesson. It matters not whether the story of a parable be true or false,

possible or impossible, in point of fact. It only requires that verisimilitude to give it an air of probability, without which fiction would be uninteresting and offensive. And yet, many parables are made up of a story which not only is not true, but which is actually impossible. A child knows that the *trees* never went forth to choose a king, and that it is impossible for them either to move or to talk: but still that parable is a very beautiful and pleasing one.

This account of the rich man and Lazarus, is either a history or a parable. If it is a history, it simply relates facts as they occurred. Lazarus died; and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom, or into heaven, if you please. The rich man, also, died, and was buried; and in *hades* he lifted up his eyes in torment, etc., etc. And this is the whole of it. It is the history of one rich and one poor man in this life and after this life. If it be a parable, then the story is a fiction, but it teaches some important moral or spiritual lesson. To say that it matters not whether it is a history or a parable, is to talk nonsense. Which does my brother understand it to be? Let him take his ground. Let him interpret it one way or the other. I cannot examine his position till I know what it is. If he says it is a history, I will answer him; if he says it is a parable, let him tell us what it teaches. Taken either way, he will find it does not support his doctrine of endless misery. But let him especially remember that it cannot be both history and parable at the same time.

Let me say one word. My brother nearly made you cry by his description of the old sinner saved from punishment. No doubt he believes his own doctrine; but how does it agree with the apostle Paul—"He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done, and there is no respect of persons?" How is the little child with one sin

unrepented of, to fare? I hope he will bring this up to-morrow evening. Let him carry out his views; and let us have the hoary wretch rejoicing in heaven over the damnation of that little child.

EIGHTH EVENING.

THE REV. DR. PRATT, of New York, addressed the Throne of Grace.

MR. WESCOTT then said :—In the course of my remarks, last evening, I said that the word rendered “generation, in Matthew xxiv., was employed in the New Testament to represent the lifetime of an individual ; sometimes a race ; sometimes a longer period of time. My brother said if I had been familiar with the Greek Testament, I would not have made such a mistake. He is very kind to attribute the error to my ignorance, instead of a wilful misrepresentation of the truth. I have made no boast, during this discussion, of great erudition ; I have not, nor ever had, half as much learning as I wanted, nor do I ever expect to have ; yet I have, in the course of my life, read the New Testament in English, some. I have occasionally read a passage or two in Greek. I admitted, or at least I knew, that there are different words rendered “generation” in the New Testament ; but with others I did not concern myself, being confident that *this* word in Matthew xxiv. was used as I explained it—yet, as my brother asserted the contrary with so much confidence, I did not wish, at the moment, without further or renewed research, to take a stand against him. This morning I took Dr. Robinson’s Lexicon of the New Testament, and consulted it as to this word γενεά. He tells us it means “the lifetime of an individual, times, times past,

from ancient times, never-ending duration." He then gives instances of each of these senses. I examined five or six ; I will give you two. Acts xiv., 16, "Who *in times past* suffered all nations to walk in their own way." "Times past" is in the original this same word *γενεὰ*, which there means a little more than the lifetime of a man. This instance alone covers all I contended for last evening. Again, Acts xv., 21, "Moses hath, of old time, in every city them that preach him." Here *γενεῶν* covers *all* the time that the law of Moses had been read in the synagogues. Let me say that I do not understand the word *γενεὰ*, in the 24th of Matthew, to be as properly used for long time as other words are ; I simply said it was so used, and I say so still.

My brother asserted last evening, in his closing remarks, that, although the rich man was in hell, or *Hades*, yet he was to be delivered, and then asks, Does not my brother know that death and hell are to deliver up the dead in them ? I answer, Yes ; and that death and hell are to be cast into the lake of fire afterwards, which is the second death. If that help the case much, I do not see it. My brother is much troubled in this discussion, because, all along, I have chosen to draw my arguments from the New Testament. He thinks I ought to have begun in the Garden of Eden, and traced the whole affair down the course of history, I suppose, to the present moment. Had the people patience, and we three hundred and sixty-five evenings instead of eight, this method might have been judiciously adopted. My reason for confining myself mainly to the New Testament was, the whole Bible is too large to be thoroughly examined in eight evenings ; while the New Testament is more read, and would be more easily understood by the people generally. Another reason was this—the New Testament shines with a clearer light than the Old. Compara-

tively this is moonlight, while the New glows with the fervor and shines with the brilliancy of the noontide sun. If we can ascertain what the New Testament teaches, we may be sure the Old will accord with it. My brother implied, although he did not say it, in answer to my question last evening, that the penitent thief on the cross did have to suffer almost as much in the future world as if Christ had not forgiven him, nor he repented:—he told us *no* man could be delivered from deserved punishment. So, then, although the Saviour promised the thief Paradise, the thief found himself greatly mistaken—if Universalism be true. Yet I should trust the Saviour; if his lips assured me of bliss, I would believe the words of his lips, let my past sins and life be what they might.

With those few remarks on the arguments of last evening, I say it is proper, on this closing evening, to review the arguments of the preceding evenings. And I think you will be able to see something of a connection in the positions which I successively assumed.

On the *first* evening, I presented a plea for Scriptural authority as that which should decide our question, instead of our sympathies, mistaken views, and imperfect feelings. On the *second* evening, I attempted to show that sin was so great a moral evil as to justify God in inflicting endless misery on sinners. I did this because I knew that, if I did not, I would be met every evening with the injustice of punishing man eternally. I think I established it; I attempted it, on three grounds—the dignity of God's law; God's view of sin, as manifested in his threatenings; and the widespread destruction of human happiness which is the result of sin, too plainly shown in the sighs and groans that come up from every part of the world—the fruit of sin! How did my brother meet those arguments? By spending a good part of three evenings in fruitless criticisms on the

word "infinite," which happened to occur in a passage I quoted! He made no attempt to weaken my main position. He did not say before you that the position that sin was so great a moral evil as to deserve endless punishment, unless Christ delivered by grace the guilty soul, was false; but, instead, he has played on the word infinite, saying that God alone was infinite, and that to call *sin* infinite was wrong, that was all! No attempt made to disprove the main argument.

On the *third* evening I attempted to show that God had provided a plan of salvation for the human family; yet, made it conditional, and surrounded it with limits in regard to time; that no man could avail himself of this deliverance without faith in Christ, without regeneration, without repentance towards God; that he must embrace it within a given time or be debarred of its privileges for ever. This we established by numerous passages of Scripture:—and this, being established, implied that the sinner who neglects the enumerated conditions, is left to experience the just demerit of sin, which was before proved to be endless misery.

On the *fourth* evening we showed that this danger was the more apparent from the threatenings and warnings which God had given in the Bible. We gave you, from the sacred volume, the following instances, though they are but a part:—"Strive to enter in at the strait gate; for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able." Again: "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins, and whither I go ye cannot come." Again: "He that believeth not shall be damned." Again: "The wrath of God abideth on them." Again: "They shall be destroyed soul and body in hell." Again: "The smoke of their torment ascends up for ever and ever." Again: "Cast into outer darkness." Again, God sware: "They

shall never enter into my rest." Again: "The mist of darkness is reserved to them for ever." Their future condition is—"the perdition of ungodly men." Again: "They shall not see life but the wrath of God abideth on them." Again: "Because I have called and ye have refused, I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded. But ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof; I also will laugh at your calamity, and mock when your fear cometh; when your fear cometh as desolation and your destruction as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish come upon you. Then shall they call upon me but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me."

How were these fearful warnings and threatenings from the wrath of God met by my brother? Why, some were met by ridicule; some by reference to the destruction of Jerusalem; and others, which came home with power, were met with this expression—"If they be true, I tell my brother, and I tell you, that the glory of God sets in an eternal eclipse!" Those were the arguments brought to bear to overthrow the plain and positive declarations of the Infinite God, which are scattered, broad-cast, through the Scriptures of divine Truth!

On the *fifth* evening we presented the Bible account of the day of judgment; and, from this, we proved that Christ would then come in the clouds of heaven, by the following and other texts of Scripture: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts i., 11.) In like manner, passage after passage was quoted to prove (which we need not repeat here) that the Lord would come publicly and visibly as the lightning of heaven, descend from heaven with the shout of a trumpet of the Archangel—and "the

dead in Christ would rise first ;" that the coming would be universal, like the flood that swept over the whole earth ; that all the tribes of the earth should see him, and mourn because of him ; that "the great men, and chief captains, every bondman and every freeman hid themselves in the dens and rocks of the mountains, and said to the mountains and rocks—Fall on us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb, for the great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand ?"

How were these truths met? How was this glorious and awful appearance of Christ explained by my brother? Merely by referring all to Jerusalem, that great reservoir of God's wrath ! I showed, from Peter and Jude, that, at the coming of Christ, "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up ;" that "the angels which kept not their first estate * * * he hath reserved in chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." How were these passages met? Why, we were gravely told that Peter and Jude quoted from an apocryphal book ; and *that* settled their whole testimony !

We showed that, at the judgment, the dead should be raised, and judged according to the deeds done in the body ; that the good should be separated from the bad, those received into eternal life, and these banished into everlasting misery. "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God." (Rev. xx., 12.) "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ." (2 Cor. v., 10.) "When the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, and the holy angels with him ; and before him shall be gathered all nations ; he shall separate them one from another." "Then shall he say unto them on the left hand—Depart ye cursed

into everlasting fire." "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment—but the righteous into life eternal."

How were these truths met? By the old word "Jerusalem!" Jerusalem, that drinkest all the wrath of God! There is none left for any other sinner! It would seem there were no other sinners in the universe of God but those created in old Jerusalem!

On the *sixth* evening I proved, as clearly as any philological question can be proved, or any question not mathematical, that the word rendered "everlasting" in that sentence of the divine Judge—"Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire," literally signifies "*endless*." I proved it from the best lexicons; from one of the best writers the Greeks ever had—one of Greece's profoundest scholars; also from the use made of the word in the New Testament, where the word occurs seventy-one times only; whereof in six sentences it is applied to the being and attributes of God—fifty-one times to future happiness—three times to the plan of redemption; all these uses, making sixty out of the seventy-one, being such as there can be no dispute about; and then I showed that, of the remaining eleven instances, seven applied to future misery, two were doubtful, and two limited. How were all these *facts* met? By an unsound criticism on *another word*, *αἰών*, instead of *αἰώνιος*! My brother has not yet attempted to disprove my position regarding the Greek adjective *αἰώνιος*; nor can he, without exposing himself to a charge of which he is not guilty, namely, ignorance of the original language of the New Testament. He knows that no other Greek word so properly expresses "endless;" consequently, if I am wrong, the Greek writers must have been without the idea of endless duration; and so must the writers of the New Testament—an idea altogether preposterous and not to be entertained for a moment.

On the *seventh* evening, I proceeded to prove that from

the miseries of hell there is no deliverance ; firstly, because the Scriptures furnish no intimation of there being in hell any means of grace, without which no sinner can reform ; secondly, from the philosophy of the human mind, which shows that no one who has offended can feel happiness until assured of the forgiveness of the person offended, no matter how much he may have been punished, or how thoroughly he may have reformed ; thirdly, directly from the Bible, which does intimate that there is no pardon in hell—we proved that to some sins there *is no pardon*, “He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation.” We presented the case of the rich man and Lazarus. I did not say (as my brother said I did) that I would leave the question undecided whether this was a parable or a history ; I told him to take his choice, and I would (for this argument) abide by it. What I said was that, whether parable or history, our Lord meant *something* by it, meant to impart *some* truth, and that in regard to the future world, for the rich man had died, was buried, was in hell, and *in torment*. What was that great truth which our Lord and Master meant to impart ? That there was an impassable gulf between the regions of the wicked and the blest, and that from the former there was *no deliverance* ; in them no mitigation, no means of grace—with the evident meaning and lesson that the whole world was thrown on the means of grace which are *here*, and if these be not employed, that there is no hope elsewhere. And how was this met ? By a criticism on the parable of the two sons, whose father said : Go work in my vineyard—one of whom went, the other went not.

This was the way ! So it has been from step to step. I leave you to judge whether the arguments I presented have, to support them, Scripture connection, and common sense ; and, so far as any question not mathematical can be settled,

whether we have not established the fact that endless misery is the doctrine of the Bible.

DR. SAWYER.—My brother's criticism from Dr. Robinson, on the word *yeved*, does not answer his purpose. He only needs to open the Greek Testament to see that in Acts xiv., 16, where it is rendered "in *times* past," it is in the original simply "in *generations* past." So *times of old* is nothing but *ancient generations*. The word *yeved* has indeed but one meaning in the New Testament, and that is *the period of time from one descent in a family to another, i. e., the average time of human life, a generation*; and then by a frequent figure, the *people* of the same period or generation. So Matthew says, 1, 17, "All the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations," and in the passage in debate, "this generation," *i. e., the people* of this generation—"shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled." My brother cannot refer to a single passage in the New Testament where the word is used in any other sense, and where it does not convey clearly the notion of the time or period of an *age, a lifetime*.

My brother offers, as a reason, why he clings to the New Testament, and avoids the Old, in proving endless misery, that the Old Testament is *rather obscure* on the subject. I am well aware of the fact. It is not only obscure, but very dark; so much so indeed that my learned brother dares not refer to a single passage in all that portion of the Scriptures to support his doctrine! And yet *THE LAW came by Moses*. Why did not that *awful penalty* come by him too? Was it fair dealing in God, if sin is an infinite evil, and justly deserves an infinite punishment, even endless torments in hell,—was it fair dealing in God, to leave the world four thousand years in such darkness about it? Was it fair in him to leave the children of Israel, that stiff-necked people,

during their whole existence as a nation, with only faint glimmerings of this doctrine, so faint indeed that my brother here cannot even see them? If I understand anything about government, *laws* require *penalties*. Had the law of Moses no penalty? If it had what was it? Penalties it had enough, and they were written out clearly, but among them all that of endless misery cannot be found.

Now, while "the law came by Moses," *Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ*. He "is the Mediator of a *better* covenant, which is established on *better* promises." And yet it happens, according to my brother, that while Moses does not teach the doctrine of endless misery, or while he teaches it only obscurely, Jesus Christ brings it out clearly! This then, I suppose, makes a pretty important part of that *better* covenant of which he is the Mediator! Now, is not this a most remarkable thing? Moses, who stood amidst the thunderings and lightnings of the Mount that burned with fire, and amidst all the darkness and terrors of Sinai, heard nothing, said nothing, knew nothing of endless hell torments; and yet the awful doctrine of those torments shines forth in the face of Jesus Christ, and breathes itself out from the mildness and guiltlessness and love of the Son of God! You do not see it in the tempest of Sinai, but it glares out with a malignant light from the cross of Calvary. You do not find it in the multiplied curses of the law of Moses, but you have it in the "Father forgive them" of Jesus Christ!

Well, this is one mode of making out the doctrine of endless misery. And yet it has one slight difficulty. According to my brother's account of the matter, *Christ came to save us from a PUNISHMENT WHICH HAD NEVER BEEN THREATENED*, or if threatened at all, only in such an obscure manner that a learned advocate of endless misery in the year of

grace 1854, cannot find it in the writings of Moses and the prophets !

My brother has just given you a sketch of his argument during this discussion, and of my replies : and I freely confess that his arguments look very strong, and my answers exceedingly weak—as he has now stated them. But is his recollection of all that has passed quite clear ? Does he now see the matter as it has been presented to you ? It is not my design to go over the ground again. Such as our discussion has been, you have heard it and must judge of its weight and character. My brother says with a good deal of emphasis, “We have proved,”—“We have proved,”—but what has he proved ? I think he has not proved a *single position* that has been in debate. But that is for you to judge. Has he proved that sin is infinite and deserves an infinite punishment ? Has he proved that endless misery is threatened in the law, or even in the Gospel ? Has he proved that either *Sheol*, *Hades*, or *Gehenna*, means a place of endless torments ? Has he proved the doctrine of a general judgment at the end of the world ? Has he proved that the words rendered “everlasting” and “eternal” ever mean *endless* when applied to punishment ? He has asserted all these things again and again, but where is the proof ?

My brother says there is no other word in the Greek to express the notion of *endless* if *αἰώνιος* does not. He further asserts that this adjective is stronger than the noun *αἰών* from which it is derived. How this can well be I do not understand, for he told us the other evening that *αἰών* properly means eternity, and referred to Aristotle in support of his position. But he has since seen that this Greek eternity is one of very odd character. It has *ends* ! One eternity follows another ! There are indeed a great many of these eternities, “*eternities of eternities*.” Since this dis-

covery, my brother begins to doubt whether *αἰών* does really mean eternity, notwithstanding Aristotle. But if *αἰών* does not mean *eternity*, he is very certain that *αἰώνιος* means *endless*.

Now, even this is not so clear as demonstration. There are several words in the New Testament which seem to have been regarded by the sacred writers as much stronger than *αἰώνιος*. Of this kind is *αἰδίδιος*. Rom. 1, 20, "his eternal power and Godhead." *αφθάρτος*, immortal, 1 Tim. 1, 17. *ἀκαταλυστος* "after the power of an endless life" Heb. vii., 16. And so Dr. Parr, that giant in Greek says, "In the minds of many contemplative, and serious men, doubts have sometimes arisen upon the *eternity of punishment*, and much criticism has been employed upon the signification of the term in which that opinion is thought by some and denied by others to have been conveyed. But upon a state of immortal happiness all parties are agreed; all admit that such a state has been announced to us in the gospel. All have allowed the precise and definite "signification of the words *incorruptible and immortal*."

There is one fact which deserves particular attention. Philo and Josephus, two learned Jews, who flourished the one a little before and the other a little after Christ, and who were thoroughly familiar with the Jewish opinions and language at that time, never seem to have employed the phraseology of the New Testament on the subject of punishment beyond the present life. Josephus describes the faith of the Pharisees,—who thank God, were believers in endless misery, as well as hypocrites and murderers—but he never uses the word *αἰώνιος* for the purpose of expressing the eternity of punishment. This proves that the language of Christ and his apostles was not that of the great advocates of this abominable doctrine in their day.

There is another fact. Origen, a Christian father, who

flourished during the first half of the third century, to whom Greek was his native tongue, and who stood pre-eminent for learning and labors in his age, and I may almost say in all ages, and who was at the same time a great patron and advocate of Universalism, habitually used this word, *αἰώνιος*, in reference to the punishment of the wicked, although he totally rejected the notion of its eternity. Should not Origen have known the force of this word ?

My brother has not made out the doctrine of a judgment at the end of the world,—because it is not to be proved from the Bible ; it does not appear in the Old nor in the New Testament ; and the grand passage, on which he spent so much time, is clearly applicable to no other event than that stalking-horse of Universalism (as he says), the destruction of Old Jerusalem. But our Saviour said emphatically, *that generation should not pass away* until his coming in his kingdom, in the power of his Father, with his holy angels, to sit on his throne and to judge the world ! You have this simple choice, either to reject the words of Christ or this doctrine of my brother—there is no alternative.

Last evening he called your attention to a passage which I thought would have been introduced earlier ; that about the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. I wish he had told you what that blasphemy was, because there is some dispute among theologians on the subject. If there be such a sin which exposes us to endless damnation, it is clearly important in the last degree to know what that sin is. I also wish that he had quoted the preceding verse of that memorable passage where the Saviour says (Mark iii., 28), “ Verily, I say unto you, *all sins shall be forgiven unto men, and blasphemies*, wherewith soever they shall blaspheme.” The blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is the *only* exception. If we can find what *that sin was*, we know how far we can go, and escape endless damnation. By the Bible you will see

that the Jews sinned in this way, because they ascribed the miracles of Christ to Beelzebub. It is unfortunate for my brother, however, here as in other passages, that his own friends, the commentators, differ from him. You have been treated, night after night, to passages in proof of endless misery, which they, almost unanimously, throw aside. In the case before us, Dr. Clarke takes a very different view from my brother; and so do other commentators. Grotius, one of the most able commentators, says:—"The sense is this; any crime which may be committed, even all calumnies (or blasphemies) which hold the first rank among crimes, may be forgiven *more readily* than the calumny (or blasphemy) against the Spirit of God.

Gilpin says—"Nobody can suppose, considering the whole tenor of Christianity, that there can be *any* sin which, on repentance, may not be forgiven. This, therefore, seems only a strong way of expressing the difficulty of such repentance."

Dr. Adam Clarke says—"When our Lord says that such a sin has no forgiveness, is he not to be understood as meaning that the crime shall be punished, under the Christian dispensation, as it was under the Jewish, by the destruction of the body? * * * The punishment for presumptuous sins under the Jewish law certainly did not extend to the damnation of the soul, though the body was destroyed."

If Christ came, as the Bible teaches very distinctly, *to save the world*; if he tasted death for every man, and gave himself as a propitiation for our sins, and not ours only, but the sins of the whole world; if the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin, you will readily see there cannot be a question on this matter. Dr. Hammond, Bishop Pearce, Rosenmüller, and Wakefield, take the same ground.

I did not understand my brother on that other passage

relating to the Rich Man and Lazarus. I understood him last night, to say that it made no difference whether it was parable or history; and if I understand him to-night, it is pretty much the same thing. If that passage be a parable, as almost every respectable commentator in the world believes, we are not to interpret it as if it were history. What is said of the Rich Man and Lazarus, of their relative conditions here, of their death, and their condition after death, must not be understood literally, but as figuratively teaching something else; the story only serves as a medium for communicating some more important spiritual or moral truth. The material of the parable, it ought to be observed, is not Hebrew but Greek. Dr. Macknight says: "It must be acknowledged that our Lord's descriptions of those things are not drawn from the writings of the Old Testament, but have a remarkable affinity to the descriptions which the Grecian poets have given them. They, as well as our Lord, represent the abodes of the blessed as being contiguous to the region of the damned, and separated only by a great impassable river or deep gulf, in such a sort that the ghosts could talk to one another from its opposite banks. * * * The parable says the souls of wicked men are tormented in flames; the Grecian mythologists tell us they lie in Pyriphlegithon, which is a river of fire, where they suffer the same torments they would have suffered while alive had their bodies been burnt. If from these resemblances it is thought the parable is formed on the Grecian mythology, it will not follow that our Lord approved of what the common people thought or spake concerning these matters, agreeably to the notions and language of the Greeks. In parabolical discourses, provided the doctrines inculcated are strictly true, the terms in which they are inculcated may be such as are most familiar to the ears of the vulgar, and the images made use of such as they are best acquainted with."

Thus it appears that this is a parable, founded on the fictions of the Greeks in reference to the future world. In thus employing those fictions our Saviour expressed no opinion of their truth or falsehood. He merely took them as they existed at the time and among the people whom he addressed. But what did he design to teach? What was the lesson which that parable conveyed?

The Rich Man represented the Jewish nation. Lazarus represented the Gentiles. By their dying is meant the radical change that took place in their condition and relations at the abolition of Judaism and the establishment of Christianity. The Gentiles were received into the kingdom of Christ, while the Jews were cast out and subjected to punishment. The great gulf expresses the relation these people now sustain to each other. During these long centuries they have not passed over from one to the other. As Dr. Lightfoot says, "The main scope and design of the parable seems to be this: "to hint the destruction of the unbelieving Jews, who, though they had Moses and the prophets, did not believe them, and would not believe though one (even Jesus) arose from the dead." And so Dr. Gill says the Rich Man's being in hell in torments "may regard the vengeance of God on the Jews at the destruction of Jerusalem."

But my brother insists that the Bible holds out no hope of escape from hell—that is, of getting out of it when once in it. But where does the Bible teach that there is any such place? At an early day in the discussion, I called his attention to the words in which the doctrine is commonly said to be taught, and challenged him to show that they are ever used in the Bible to express any such meaning. Yet, he has not spent an hour in proving that they ever mean a place of endless misery. But now he goes on talking about *hell* as a place of endless punishment, as flippantly as if he

were in a conference-room among his own people! He has not done that most necessary work; he has not attempted to do it—because he knows it is impossible. There is no learning, no skill, that can bring such a meaning out of the words *Sheol*, *Hades*, and *Gehenna*, and he knows this very well. I deny the existence of any such place as that popularly called hell; it cannot be proved. Now, if there be no such place, there is no sense in talking about escape from it. The Bible, I repeat, holds out no hope of escape from just punishment; no man ought to hope for any such escape—it is not wholesome to hope for it. One of the greatest evils in this world, is the flattering unction which bad men lay to their souls that there is *some* way of escaping from the just punishment of their iniquities. Banish that false hope, and then the expectation of being dealt with exactly according to their deeds, will have its proper restraint and salutary effect. But, to give to punishment the idea of endlessness; to make *that* the desert of sin, as my brother insists it is; to call it infinite even, *in a certain sense*, and then to provide a way of easy escape, as orthodoxy perpetually does, is to defeat as far as we can the very design of moral government. No, let punishment come if it be deserved. Let sinners learn by experience that sin is an evil and bitter thing.

The pious Psalmist prayed thus: Psalms xxviii., 4, “Give them *according to their deeds*, and according to the wickedness of their endeavors; give them after the works of their hands, render unto them their deserts.” Do you suppose that David believed endless misery was the punishment due to them? On my brother’s theory he must, because they have sinned, and every sin is infinite and deserves an infinite penalty. You of orthodox churches, have you ever thought of this? Will you think of this? I see no impropriety in this prayer; for David knew that

God would judge them aright. But take your own belief, apply it here, and try it by the application. Did the pious David pray that those, his fellow-men, should be endlessly damned? If endless misery be the just punishment of sin, none but a demon could utter a prayer like that!

MR. WESCOTT.—My brother, in his remarks upon the Old and New Testaments, seems to forget that the substance of the moral law is brought forward by our Lord in the New Testament, and his summing up in that emphatic passage—“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy soul, thy mind, and thy strength: and thy neighbor as thyself.” There, the consequences of sin are too clearly revealed to leave any reasonable doubt upon the mind of a sincere and anxious inquirer.

He does now deny that *αἰώνιος* means endless. Well—I cannot help it! I can only say that, in this respect, he places himself at variance with every respectable lexicon published, in conflict with its entire use throughout the New Testament, except in four instances, and seven others, if you throw away those relating to future misery. He then does admit that the word is used as applied to God and his attributes. Let me, in the name of common sense, and plain language, ask—Would not the apostles, when holding up their eternal God, in opposition to the vain gods and idols of the heathen, would they not have used a word that expresses “endless,” if they had it? And then he talks of the ends of eternity being doubled up, amusing himself with *another* word, when, all the time, you thought he was giving illustrations of the use of the Greek adjective *αἰώνιος*.

Remember, a criticism on the noun is not sound, so far as being applicable to this adjective. He says that, although *αἰώνιος* may be “endless” when applied to God, yet, when applied to the spiritual life which a Christian has, it is not

endless. I said before that the spiritual life of a Christian and the misery of the wicked must be parallel. The argument that destroys eternal punishment, at the same fell blow, dashes to atoms the hope of the righteous, and aims an impious denial at the eternity of Jehovah. He may make a distinction between the spiritual life we now have, and the eternal life of the Bible—but the Bible makes no such distinction. When this spiritual life is imparted to the soul, it is secured eternally, commencing in the ransomed soul the moment it reposes its faith in Jesus Christ: thenceforth it runs parallel with the existence of God.

Having only fifteen minutes, I will not take up my time in regard to the sin against the Holy Ghost. He has quoted those divines; against their words I place those of your Judge, and his, and mine, the Judge of the quick and the dead; lay the words of that dread Judge to your conscience, and then reject them if you please. "He that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation."—Mark iii., 29.

Then he brings out, and dwells at some length on, what I could not get last spring, and almost despaired of this time—his explanation of the passage regarding the rich man and Lazarus. He tells us, if a parable, it may mean one thing, and another—and perhaps nothing. However, he gives us his view, namely, that the rich man is—the Jewish nation, and Lazarus is—the heathen or Gentile world. But I would briefly ask, who are the five brethren of the Jewish nation; Also, did you ever know of the Jewish nation entreating the Gentiles to bring them spiritual comfort? Did you ever know the Jews to be afraid that anybody would come to them—that any of those who are not of them, should embrace their doctrine and come where they are? How is Gentile or Jew to get over the great gulf? He says the rich man could not be in hell, because there is no such place.

The text does not say so; that pretty plainly tells that he died, was buried in hell, and *in torment*. If my brother be right, what a strange figure for the infinitely just and merciful Jesus to employ—the figure of a hell, a place of torment, out of which there was no hope of deliverance—when, all the time, there was no such hell, and no such torment! Would the infinitely wise Jesus use the the figure of a thing that never existed, to illustrate nonsense? My friends, when you go home, take the 16th chapter of Luke, commencing with the 19th verse; read it; and, if you ever pray, pray to Infinite Wisdom to instruct you what was the lesson of danger which the great Instructor of men and Judge of the quick and the dead meant to impart by this recital. Bring your conscience to the task; pray that your heart may be imbued with the same spirit which Jesus meant to impart; and then, if you *can* side with my brother—why, you must do so.

He denies that Universalism takes away Christ out of the plan of salvation; and, in the next moment, reiterates the very thing that takes away Christ as a Saviour.

Then he says I have not proved anything—the day of judgment, the existence of hell, God's threatenings of everlasting punishment. I ask you, then, to let go all the texts of Scripture I have quoted during the last seven evenings, to take only those which I have presented to-night, and enough has been done to establish every point I contend for.

During this discussion, many side-issues have, of course, been joined; they must be expected in an oral discussion. Universalism has been exhibited in its true light—I have exhibited my views of the Bible. I ask you to look at Universalism as it has been displayed.

And here let me say *that* for my brother, as a scholar and a man of gentlemanly feeling, I entertain the highest respect.

If anything has, during our discussion, been uttered, rather less free from personality, or other undesirable leaning, than might be wished, I hope he will forget as readily as I am willing to do. But for his doctrine you must not expect me to have the same respect. Take Universalism as it has been represented here. It strikes to the ground the deity of Christ ; it sweeps away, "at one fell swoop," the entire efficacy of the atonement of the Son of God ; it rejects *in toto* the justifying nature and power of faith ; it denies the forgiveness of sin in the sense that releases from the just deserts of that sin ; it leaves every one—believer though he may be, repentant though he may be, though, like the penitent thief on the cross, he have the promise of the Redeemer, promise of happiness, sounding in his ear—to suffer the full demerit of his crime in the future world, and the full demerit of his crime is endless misery. If Universalism be true in this respect, the impenetrable gloom of endless misery hovers over the whole human family ! If Universalism be true, just as surely as Justice demands the penalty of sin, just so sure is it that no human soul can ever reach heaven.

DR. SAWYER :—And yet David prayed for it ! He prayed that God would give to men their deserts, and render to them according to their works. I think David could not have been acquainted with my brother's system of theology.

I was about to say, when I sat down, that, although the Bible gives us no encouragement to hope for escape from the just punishment of our sins, which our heavenly Father sees to be fit and right, it *does* present something quite contrary to my brother's mercy—a just but limited amount of punishment. To the idolatrous Jews, Isaiah lvii. says—"For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity

* * * *I will not contend for ever*, neither will I be always wroth, for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made."

Does this look like endless misery? God assigns the best of all reasons why there should not be any such thing, because the spirit would fail before him, and the souls which he had made.

In Lamentations iii., 31, Jeremiah says—"For the Lord will not cast off for ever, but though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies; for he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." My brother conceded that the other night, when he suggested, as the only difference between the infliction of hell torments under the hand of the Devil and under the hand of God, was—that the Devil would take *pleasure* in inflicting them, while God would not! I am glad there is even that redeeming quality about it. So the Psalmist says (xxx., 5)—"Sing, ye saints, and give thanks at the remembrance of his holiness; for his anger endureth but a moment; in his favor is life; weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." Does this look like endless misery? Is that the spirit and temper of our God? So Hebrews xii., 9, 10, where the apostle lays down the great doctrine of the divine chastisements—"We have had fathers of our flesh, who corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live. For they, verily, for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure, but He *for our profit*, that we might be partakers of his holiness." Here you see the purpose of God's chastisements brought out in a clear light; it is, to teach us truth, to make us acquainted with our duty, to lead us to be the partakers of his holiness.

Christ established his kingdom at the destruction of Jerusalem, and the commencement of his reign was distinguished

by great judgments. Since that time he has been judging among the nations ; he is, spiritually, King of Kings and Lord of Lords. "God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness ;" that is, this world, this habitable earth.

The end of the Saviour's kingdom, is represented by my brother and the orthodox world, to be the period when the judgments of God are to be most striking. I do not so read the Bible. I read that, at the end, all things shall be subjected to Christ ; and then "he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, and God be all in all." Is there any "endless punishment" after that ? All souls are subjected to Christ ; Christ becomes subject to the Father ; the kingdom is delivered up ; and God, henceforth, is all in all. That is the termination of the Saviour's kingdom ; as Paul teaches in another place, "In the name of Jesus every knee shall bow of things in heaven, and things in the earth, and things under the earth ;" the whole universe, according to this Hebrew phraseology,—*"and every tongue shall confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."* That is the termination of Christ's government ; that is the close and end of all things—not a state of endless torments for millions and millions of the human race, whom God created in his own image, whom he so loved that he gave his only-begotten Son to die for them—whom Christ came to save, but universal reconciliation and endless happiness.

I have two or three objections to the doctrine of my brother. I have as many and as serious ones against his theory as it is possible for him to have against mine, and, I think, more. I look upon his doctrine as simply abominable.—he cannot so regard mine. I cannot pray for his—he *always* prays for mine, and so does the whole Christian world. Right or wrong I have his best sympathies and wishes ; while all the consolations he can find in Christ

must be blended with the most fearful apprehensions for himself, at least, his neighbors, friends, and family.

I object to the doctrine of endless misery, in the *first* place, because it is perfectly useless ; it is not calculated to benefit any being in the Universe, not even the damned, because it places them out of mercy's reach ; they do not know even the restraint of hope to keep them from blaspheming God. In the olden time, orthodox men thought the view of the damned in hell would cause the saved to bless God the more, seeing—as old Dr. Edwards has it—“the discriminative grace of God.” I hope Christians of this day are not such epicures in felicity as to need this relish to make heaven palatable.

I object to it, in the *second* place, because it is opposed to all the attributes of God ; at eternal war with his goodness, love, and mercy, those great attributes on which all our hopes are predicated. It is no less at war with his infinite justice. Do you tell me that men are to be damned endlessly, that eternity is to be wasted in wailing and torture, and that infinite justice demands it ?—it is an insult against heaven.

I object to endless misery in the *third* place, because it is wholly unnecessary—it is not merely *useless*, it is an unnecessary waste of suffering. Oh ! how the soul is represented as thirsting and panting for death even ! Dr. Young has a passage on this part of the subject :

“ Oh grant, great God, at least,
This one, this slender, almost *no* request :
When I have wept a thousand lives away,
When torment has grown weary of its prey,
When I have raved ten thousand years in fire,
Ten thousand thousand—let then me expire.
Deep anguish ! but too late.”

“ No,” says Drexelius, “ God will always punish them, and

he cannot punish them enough, though their torments will endure to all eternity." Why, my friends, the Devil himself could not do worse ! Why punish them ? Is it necessary ? Only let God withdraw his hand, and all living things cease to exist in an instant. It is only because He *will* have it so, because he delights in it, and carries in his bosom the spirit and feeling of a demon. My brother said last night, and I thank him for it, that the God of Universalism is not the God of Orthodoxy. It is so. The God who could act as he represents his God as doing, my soul could not worship. He may send me to hell, but I cannot love him—I could not if I would, and I would not if I could ; it would be an insult to my moral nature, an insult to him whom I believe to be my Creator.

I wish to say two words more. I am opposed to the doctrine of endless misery because it crushes out of us our dearest hopes. If believed earnestly and faithfully, as men ought to believe it, it leaves us nothing but desolation and death around us. We may feel that we shall *ourselves* be taken to heaven, but what of our friends ? What of those whom we love as our own life ! Are not some of these at least to be cast off and subjected to endless torment, objects of God's wrath, howling out blasphemies and curses while we chaunt anthems of praise ? One of the most frequent effects is this desolation of spirit, which often leads to insanity and suicide !

I object to it because it is *immoral*. I know I speak against the feelings and cherished opinions of my friends of the orthodox school, but I understand what I say, and I say it is, in all its bearing and influences, utterly immoral. Place God in a man's mind in this light, and what is the effect ? What can it be but to harden the heart, to make man cruel, to make him like his God ! All history shows this. Look back ; look at the Catholic Church, in which this doctrine

is inculcated ; look at her Inquisition, that mimic hell which the advocates of this doctrine reared, and filled with all the instruments of torture they could contrive—humbly trying to imitate their God ! It is so everywhere. The spirit engendered and fostered by the doctrine of endless misery is always harsh and cold and cruel. It familiarizes the mind to torment, and sanctifies the infliction of every species of torture. I object to it, finally, because *it is not in the Bible.*

I thank you for the kind attention with which you have listened to us in this discussion, and hope you have received at least some instruction and benefit.

THE END



DISCUSSION

ON

UNIVERSAL SALVATION.

DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THE FINAL
SALVATION OF ALL MEN?

AFFIRMATIVE.

REV. T. J. SAWYER, D.D.

NEGATIVE.

REV. ISAAC WESCOTT.

HELD AT THE BROADWAY TABERNACLE, APRIL, 1854.

THIS discourse occupied eight evenings, and attracted immense audiences.

It was reported by MR. BRENAN, and revised by the disputants.

Published in one volume, Price 75 cents.

HENRY LYON,
548 BROADWAY.