Gen. W. H. Sumner
and Lady,
With Respects of
H. Cobb.

DISCUSSIO[illegible]

OF

[illegible]CE

THE SCRIPTURALNESS

OF

FUTURE ENDLESS PUNISHMENT.

PART I:—THE AFFIRMATIVE.

BY REV. NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D.D.

PART II:—THE NEGATIVE.

BY REV. SYLVANUS COBB.

REVISED EDITION.—WITH AN APPENDIX.

BOSTON:
SAMUEL T. COBB, PUBLISHER,
NO. 45 CORNHILL.
1860.

LITHOTYPED BY COWLES AND COMPANY,

17 WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON.

PUBLISHER'S PREFACE.

Rev. Mr. Cobb, Editor of the "Christian Freeman," and respondent in this discussion, after long deliberation whether to accommodate the public interest or the wishes of his honorable opponent, in respect to the binding up of the "Argument" entire, with the "Reply," at length yielded to the latter. His feelings were tender towards Dr. Adams; and as the Doctor persisted to the last in protesting against the binding up of his part with the other, he omitted it from his edition of the book. He reasoned that, in doing so, there would be no essential good withheld from the public, inasmuch as he had reprinted, in his Reply, and duly explained all the texts of Scripture quoted by his opponent, and all his arguments. And he had the Doctor's testimony in a private note, that he "evidently strove to be fair and candid;" and the very fact of his unwillingness that his part should be published in the book entire, Mr. Cobb regarded as a public acknowledgment that, in the Doctor's own judgment, his "Argument" was answered.

For that first edition, it was indeed of less importance that the "Argument," in its separate embodiment, should go out in the book. The copies of the "Christian Freeman," containing the whole, were then accessible in all parts of the country, so that reference could be made to Part I. of the Discussion, if any question should be raised. But that edition is exhausted, and as I have taken on myself the responsibility of stereotyping the work, and printing it in a permanent form, in which it will be doing its mission with posterity when the folio sheets and the

pamphlets will be inaccessible; and as the "Argument" and "Reply" are two parts of one Discussion, and belong together, and neither can serve its proper mission without the other, I put in both PARTS in full.

To do this is my perfect legal right, as I take it from the columns of the "Christian Freeman," through which it was given to the public freely, and from which it can never be gathered up by any subsequent copy-right. When an author has once given his production to the public without copyright, he has no more subsequent control of it than any other man. But in doing this thing I have regard to the public religious instruction. I have heard but an undivided voice of surprise, that the affirmative part of this able and instructive Discussion should be withheld from its own native place as part of a whole. I act upon the highest principle of honor and right, in presenting it to the public in its proper *wholeness.*

While it is generally conceded that the AFFIRMATIVE ARGUMENT is one of the most able pleas for the doctrine of endless punishment which has ever been given to the public, numerous testimonials from the highest intellectual and Christian sources, estimate the REPLY by the editor of the "Christian Freeman" as a thorough and conclusive vindication of the Scriptures from the imputation of the least favor for that appalling theory.

This revised edition contains some additional notes in the body of the Reply, and a table of contents following the original preface, and also an index of texts explained, at the end of the book. Much pains has been taken to make it a convenient aid for universal use, to a successful and profitable study of the Scriptures.

The reader's humble servant,

SAMUEL T. COBB.

PREFACE.

It is with no ordinary degree of satisfaction that we present to the public a labored and thorough discussion of Future, Endless Punishment, the leading and affirmative part being wrought out by so learned and every way competent a theologian of the Orthodox school, as Rev. Dr. Adams. The origin of this discussion was as follows:—

In the month of May, 1858, Dr. Adams published a discourse in advocacy of the "Reasonableness of Future, Endless Punishment." This discourse we reviewed in the columns of the *Christian Freeman;* and at the close of the Review we addressed to the author of the sermon the following

NOTE.

To Rev. Dr. Adams: *Dear Sir,*—In your Sermon, to the review of which I have devoted some labor as above, and in last week's *Christian Freeman,* though you propose to treat the *reasonableness* of future, endless punishment, yet you are perpetually falling back on the assumption that it is true, and is asserted by the Scriptures; and your argument for its *reasonableness* is but little else than an assumption based on the former assumption, to wit, that it *must* be *reasonable,* because in God's economy it is *true.*

And now, I respectfully invite you, and proffer you the columns of the *Christian Freeman* for the work, to show the *Scripturalness* of future, endless punishment. And to avoid losing the subject in a wilderness of verbiage, and in running quotations of fragmen-

tary Scripture passages, I propose that you select the first passage which, in your judgment, clearly announces this doctrine; or, if it has crept into the Bible so gradually and imperceptibly that you cannot put your finger upon its beginning, select what you regard as one of the most clear and unquestionable declarations of it, and show from the subject of discourse, the natural force of the language, and the Scriptural *usus loquendi*, that it teaches such doctrine. And we will thoroughly discuss that passage before entering upon another. This will afford you an opportunity to carry your strongest reasons into several thousands of Universalist families; and I earnestly hope you will accept my proposition.

Yours most truly, S. COBB.

On the morning of July 6th, we received the following from

DR. ADAMS TO THE EDITOR.

Boston, July 6, 1858.

REV. S. COBB: *Editor of the Christian Freeman. Dear Sir,* — I have received your printed note in your paper of the 2d inst., in which you say: "And now, I respectfully invite you, and proffer you the columns of the *Christian Freeman* for the work, to show the *Scripturalness* of future, endless punishment. This will afford you an opportunity to carry your strongest reasons into several thousands of Universalist families; and I earnestly hope that you will accept my proposition."

The form in which you propose that I should do this, viz.: by an exposition of isolated proof texts, each to be debated by you before I proceed to another, does not strike me favorably. I will comply with your invitation if you will allow me to do it in my own way, — upon one condition, that there shall be no notes or comments on what I write, in the number or numbers of your paper containing my communication.

Very respectfully yours, N. ADAMS.

Several notes in direct succession were subsequently interchanged between us, of which we give the following extract, which is from our second to the Doctor:

Boston, July 6, 1858.

REV. N. ADAMS, D. D., — Your note of this morning is received. We can undoubtedly come to an agreement in respect to the *manner* of conducting the proposed discussion. My reasons for the method I proposed will undoubtedly commend themselves to your good judgment on your duly considering them. I have observed that the advocates of endless punishment in controversial encounters with Universalists, usually fill their space with a long string of promiscuous quotations from the Bible, throwing together fragmentary texts regardless of the connections from which they are taken, presenting no argument for their use of the passages collected, but relying on the sound of certain phraseology upon the ear of popular prejudice. Then, when the Universalist follows with his reply, he must employ *argument* on each passage he deems misused, and would be obliged to fill a volume to get through thus with the catalogue of texts which the other hastily huddled together. You see the unfairness and unprofitableness of this course. If you and I enter into this discussion, it will be with reverence for God's word, and a sincere desire to promote an understanding of it among our readers. And the method which I propose is just as fair for you as it is for me. It is, in its main features, the only method by which you can do the work which you must do in order to make the discussion of any manner of use to the community.

You object to my plan, requiring an "exposition of isolated proof texts, each to be debated by me before you proceed to another." In truth my plan no more requires you to explain *isolated* proof texts, than any other plan you might propose. Your sending to me a collection of Scripture passages unexplained, and my printing them in the *Christian Freeman*, would be of no service. You will agree with me that you are to give your reasons for your use of Scripture texts, and your reasons on the texts one by one. And the method proposed by me allows, and even requires you, when you have selected your supposed decisive proof text, to make such quotations and use of other and collateral texts as you may judge expedient, in order to sustain your use of the

leading proof text. My object is, not to run a gauntlet, but to discuss these matters wherein we differ, rationally, and as Professor Stuart would say, "philologically and exegetically." * * * *

Yours most truly, S. COBB.

Finally, we acceded to the method proposed by Dr. Adams, providing that he should do his complete work in argument for future endless punishment in one long article. And we now regard this as the best method. It brings his whole argument in one continuous and connected work, under seven important classifications, thus giving us at once the best thing that can be done for the doctrine in question. If this fails, the doctrine cannot be sustained.

It will be seen by the extract of our second note to the Doctor, that we were particularly solicitous that he should show reasons for whatever applications he might make of Scripture texts to his espoused position. If it shall be found on review that he has not done this, we are sure that it is not his fault, but the difficulty is in the nature of the case. We regard the *Argument* for Future Endless Punishment as able as any that we have seen, and we do not believe a better can ever be produced. And the excellent spirit in which the work is conducted is signally creditable to the author. We commend the whole, "Argument" and "Review," to the candid and prayerful perusal of the lovers of truth, in hope that, by the blessing of God, it will conduce to the honor of His declarative glory, and the spiritual interests of many people.

S. C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PART I.

THE AFFIRMATIVE, BY REV. NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D. D.

PART II.

THE NEGATIVE, BY REV. SYLVANUS COBB.

CHAPTER V.

CHAPTER VI.

CHAPTER VII.

For a Critical Index of Texts, see pages.....506, 507

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

PART I.

A SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT FOR FUTURE, ENDLESS PUNISHMENT.

BY REV. N. ADAMS, D. D.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

THE invitation from the Editor of the "*Christian Freeman*" to make a statement of views which the "several thousands of families" who, it is said, will read this paper, repudiate, imposes a responsible, yet, for some reasons, a gratifying task. The names of not a few among my ministerial brethren occur to me, in whose able and more competent hands I would gladly place this labor, both for the gratification of the reader and, as I view it, for the truth's sake. I feel encouraged in this work by the comparative regard which many in this denomination profess for the Bible. They do not assail it as the manner of some is who differ from us; but their desire to make it speak in their favor secures for it an acknowledgment of its authority. As an illustration of this remark, I refer to a Review of Rev. T.

S. King's "Two Discourses," by Rev. Dr. Thomas Whittemore, in the *Universalist Quarterly and General Review*, October, 1858. Dr. W. says: "It seems to us impossible to preserve the public reverence for the Bible if we suffer ourselves to speak about it as Mr. King has done." "The four Gospels, according to Mr. K., are mere shreds and tatters of what Christ taught. His manner of teaching was so peculiar, and so poetical, and fanciful, that it is quite a wonder that we have even those tatters." "He (Mr. K.) speaks of God choosing to instruct the Church through a few fragmentary flashes of poetry. Good God! What an idea of revelation! What an idea of Jesus as a teacher! He has lost sight of 'the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.'" p. 377.

Inasmuch as nothing but the clearest conviction that this doctrine of endless retribution is revealed in the Bible would allow us for a moment to believe and inculcate the fearful truth, which all who believe it receive with the most solemn awe, it awakens confidence and friendly feeling to think that the most of those who will read this article, thus regard the testimony of Scripture, explained by the ordinary rules of language, to be of binding authority.

I have also been led to think of this denomination as including many who are much exercised in their minds on the subject of future punishment. It is a welcome effort to show such individuals that some of their thoughts with regard to this subject and its advocates are perhaps disproportioned and

exaggerated. The most of those who believe in future, endless punishment have far more peace of mind with regard to it than they appear to have who deny it; for with evangelical believers it sinks into its just proportion in the universal government of God, as the State's Prison, Courts of law, Officers of Justice, blend, like the tonic element of iron in the blood, into the life of a commonwealth with its virtuous and happy homes, its hundreds of thousands of joyous children, its churches, its products, its whole prosperous tide of affairs. Though hell is not the central figure in the religious ideas of evangelical Christians, the belief in future, endless retribution does exert its powerful influence upon us. We know that it is capable of vast abuse, as we see illustrated in the direful influence of its perversion by the church of Rome. But we find it explicitly revealed, and "knowing, therefore, the terrors of the Lord, we persuade men." If it were preached still more affectionately and plainly by us, conscious of our ill desert and of our obligations to redeeming love, there would be a nearer approach to the apostolic model. Our prevailing associations with this doctrine, we are happy to say, are those of deliverance, through the atoning death of the Son of God. It is in connection with this sacrifice for us that we always endeavor to preach it; so that we trust we may say concerning our system of faith, as it is said of heaven, "The Lamb is the light thereof." While we believe that the contemplation of future misery apart from the cross of Christ would be hurtful to the mind and

heart, we also feel that it cannot be of healthful tendency with our moral natures to base our religious associations mainly on the one idea of opposition to endless punishment. An evil thing, real or imaginary, which we inordinately, or upon wrong principles, oppose, has a retroactive influence on our minds and hearts, corresponding to its own baleful nature.

It is with such views that I now write, — not, principally, with antagonists in my mind, though my statements will meet with antagonism; — so that if any are persuaded by counter statements that these views are unscriptural, they will do me the favor, at least, to think of me as their sincere well-wisher and friend, and as one who has the same eternal interests embarked in this question as themselves. Let us also keep in mind that mere argumentation never convinces men of Spiritual truths, but that there must be on our part an experience, wrought by the Holy Spirit in answer to prayer, to interpret things aright, which otherwise will be stumbling blocks and foolishness. But without further preface, I proceed to my argument.

SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT.

I. THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THERE IS A PENALTY FOR DISOBEDIENCE AWAITING THE FINALLY IMPENITENT.

This is plainly declared in Rom. ii. 5–12, 16: "But after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; Who will render to every man according to his deeds: To them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, honor, and immortality, eternal life; But unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath; tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first and also of the Gentile; But glory, honor, and peace to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first and also to the Gentile; For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law,—In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my Gospel." The parenthetic passages omitted here, which occur before the last of these sentences, are a direct assertion of the full accountableness of the heathen world to the tribunal of God, for their sins against their consciences and the light of nature. I take this whole passage of

Scripture as a revelation of a future judgment and retribution, in which all men are to be judged and treated according to their works.

The ideas which are presented of heaven, both by Christ and his apostles, come to us through objects of sense. Every one supposes that by these images, as for example, "sitting with Christ at his table in his kingdom," "new wine," "beholding his glory," and "gates of pearl," "streets of gold," "harps" and "crowns," it is intended to give us the idea of the highest pleasures of which our natures, body and soul, shall in another world be capable. We never subtract any thing from these images of heavenly joy, saying, They are only metaphors; we rather say, Language here is intensified, to convey the ideas of future happiness. And as we believe that we shall have bodies in heaven, "like unto Christ's own glorious body," we are never unwilling to think that there will be enjoyments adapted to the body with the soul,—spiritual, of course, in both cases, and yet beautifully distinguished but capable of blending, as in this world. This way of representing unseen things to us is not so much "Oriental" as the only possible way, at present, of communicating spiritual objects to our understanding.

But while the attractions of heaven suffer nothing by reason of criticisms upon the language in which they are presented, some do not use the same tolerance, nor apply the same principles of interpretation when they read or speak of future punishment. Here, they say, all is metaphorical, Oriental; they

select certain images, and ask if any suppose that the wicked are, literally, to suffer such things, from just these elements of pain. But the representations of heaven are certainly obnoxious to the very same criticisms, and similar questions may be asked concerning them. But being of a pleasurable nature, they escape criticism. Therefore, if we are inquired of in either case, Do you believe that these things are literally so? the proper answer seems to be in both cases, Either these things, or things which now can only be expressed by them. Those earthly symbols approach nearer than any thing with which we are now acquainted, to the things signified.

The condition of the wicked after death is represented through such symbols by Christ and his apostles as a state of positive punishment. With a desire to speak cautiously on such a point, and to follow only the most obvious leadings of Scripture, very many are constrained to believe that while the finally impenitent will experience the consequences naturally flowing from their moral condition, those consequences of their sins will be kept alive by the power of God, and that continual sin will receive continually new punishment. In the sermon on the reasonableness of endless punishment before mentioned, I assumed, for the sake of the argument, that future misery should consist only in the natural consequences of evil, and then argued that it was reasonable that these should be endless. I also deprecated any inquiry beyond the plain language of the New Testament as to the elements of punish-

ment. The subject forbade any extended consideration of the nature of future punishment, nor did I undertake to state my own belief on that point. In attempting now to show that the Scriptures represent the future condition of the wicked to be a state of punishment, it will be submitted to the reader whether infliction from the hand of God be not necessarily involved in the language of the Bible.

One of those indirect proofs of a thing which sometimes are more forcible and convincing than direct statements, occurs in the words of Christ which I will refer to as proving the future punishment of the wicked, in which he tells us to "*fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.*" Matt. x. 28.

If God has merely the natural ability to do this, while his character makes it morally impossible that he should ever do it, the illustration is singularly at fault. It would never be proper to tell a child as a reason why it should fear its father and mother that they have power to inflict a punishment which we know is morally impossible. Their mere natural ability to inflict it would not justify the exhortation, —"yea, I say unto you, fear them." To associate the idea of destroying both body and soul in hell with our proper fear of God our heavenly Father, if he would do no such thing, would not be in accordance with truth.

Some, to avoid this difficulty, say that the passage means merely that God can destroy life. But so can they who kill the body. There is something more

which God alone can do, and which we need rather to fear. Others, knowing that the original word for *hell* in this passage cannot mean *the grave*, propose to render the warning thus, that God can cast those whom he kills, into the valley of Hinnom. But so could assassins, or judicial executioners. We still look for that which God alone can do. Some say it must be annihilation. But the valley of Hinnom is notoriously symbolical of perpetuity, the fire always burning, the worm ever breeding. Why, moreover, should any *place* be specified in which the annihilation, which is the same thing every where, should occur? Or what appropriateness is there in speaking of the soul as being annihilated there? Destroying both soul and body in hell seems to be equivalent to that expression — "everlasting destruction," — an apparent contradiction of terms, but conveying the idea of perpetual loss and misery.

We get no relief from these difficulties with the passage if we turn to the milder form in which the idea is expressed in Luke xii. 5. "Fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him." For Gehenna, understood literally as the valley of Hinnom, presents to the mind the most terrific image of positive misery. Nothing can be more revolting or fearful. Let those who are jealous at imputations cast upon the character of God by the doctrine of endless punishment, explain how Jesus could even suggest the idea of the Father casting his offspring into a place, the name of which was borrowed from the most fearful object

then known to his hearers. Until this passage is shown to imply no punishment from the hand of God, we must regard it as an impregnable proof of future visitations of misery upon the wicked.

Some who believe in future punishment seek to mitigate the influence of the dread truth upon their feelings by the theory that future punishment will consist only in the natural effects of sin. This relieves them of the necessity to think that God will inflict any thing directly upon the wicked.

One thing seems incontrovertible, viz.: The Bible does not teach us that sin is its own complete punishment. It is true that without the elements of misery in themselves, the Bible tells us, sinners could not be made miserable; nor would outward inflictions constitute punishment unless there were something within for the fire to kindle. But it admits of a question whether if the sinner should be left entirely to himself, undisturbed by any external power, adding new energy to sorrow, or opening new sources of it, he could not in time adjust himself, as in this world, to any circumstances. Even in this world, trouble or the infliction of pain and sorrow, are necessary to rouse the conscience. To some extent God punishes men in this world, for this purpose. "Because they have no changes, therefore they fear not God." "Moab hath been at ease from his youth, and he hath settled on his lees, and hath not been emptied from vessel to vessel." The seventy third Psalm describes the wicked who "are not in trouble as other men; neither are they plagued like other men." Hence

"their strength is firm. But even tribulation is powerless in many cases, and the sinner is either emboldened by temporary respite, or provoked by the rod to further opposition. Pharaoh is an eminent example of this. It is said of another: "And in the time of his distress did he trespass yet more against the Lord: this is that king Ahaz." Other passages in accordance with these, to prove the positions just laid down, might easily be cited.

So that however terrible and bitter the condition of the sinner might be at first, it is not inconceivable that he should at last say, with Satan in Paradise Lost,—"Hail! horrors, hail! and thou profoundest hell!" if God would but depart from him. Sinking into a torpid, brutish state, or rousing themselves into defiant forms of hatred and blasphemy, occupying themselves with plots and counterplots in their strife with each other, the wicked in hell, like bad or abandoned people here, might make their condition tolerable. They would, for example, feel the need of subordination among themselves for their own protection; selfishness would suggest many alleviations of misery by mutual forbearance; and as the worst of men — pirates, gamblers, debauchees, have codes of honor, and ambition its fawning flatteries, and pride smothers its resentment, and selfishness in all its forms is compelled to put on the mask of submission and obeisance, so the wicked, if left to themselves even with their wickedness festering and their crimes becoming gigantic, might manage, by self-control, to reduce things into a system which to their

wretched natures might in very many cases be even tolerable. Sin itself is no misery to a sinner; it must meet with ill success, it must be compelled to feel a superior power acting contrary to itself; then indeed it is the occasion of misery. It is no sorrow to wicked men here for God to depart from them; it is rather their desire; "therefore they say unto God, Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways." Saul never would have uttered that bitter cry, "God is departed from me and is become my enemy," if the Philistines had not pursued hard after him. God and he had been for a long time far apart, but very little did Saul care for this, until the day of his calamity made haste.

If, therefore, there is to be, in the strict sense of the term, punishment after death, it would seem that there must in the nature of things, be visitations upon the wicked of that which the Bible calls "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish." While there must be in the sinner himself a state of things which will make these inflictions punishment, there must also be a mighty hand stretched out forever to make the future condition of the wicked one of retribution. There is both error and truth in the common saying with many that future misery will proceed from conscience; — error, if it be supposed that conscience left to itself will occasion torment; for, if in this world with so much to stimulate conscience, it so easily falls asleep, the provocations, and the necessity of self defence, and redress, and all the bad influences of hell, must have the power totally to

sear it; — but there is truth in the saying, if it be allowed that God is to visit the wicked in ways that will excite conscience against them; this would be "infliction," compared with which fire and brimstone, though the most appalling images of torture, we can easily conceive, do not convey more terrible ideas of retribution.

Now the Bible is continually representing the wicked as receiving from God positive inflictions, and not merely as being abandoned to themselves. Even when it speaks of many sources of misery which might seem to be the natural consequences of their sin, it often represents these consequences as being administered by the direct agency of the Almighty. So that the two things seem to be conbined. "Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and a horrible tempest; this shall be the portion of their cup." "Now consider this, ye that forget God, lest I tear you in pieces and there be none to deliver." "God is angry with the wicked every day. If he turn not, he will whet his sword; he hath bent his bow and made it ready." These passages teach that sinners will not merely be left to the natural consequences of sin. The ideas of arrest, and of execution, are here presented; the transgressor is not left to himself, with merely his sin for his punishment. Then again we read — "Woe unto the wicked, it shall be ill with him; for the reward of his hands shall be given him." "Yea, woe unto them also when I depart from them." Even though the wicked should not suffer otherwise, nor to a greater degree.

than they are capable of suffering in their minds here, yet, if they are to be punished, these sufferings must be kept active by an outward power; for their natural tendency is to harden and stupify, or to excite passions whose gratification affords a certain redress.

All this we may believe without venturing one step into the domain of fancy to depict the kind and manner of those inflictions which are necessary to constitute punishment. Nor is it necessary, for knowing as we do by experience and observation, what the passions of the human heart are when restraint is weakened or removed, we need no external images of woe to represent what it must be for God to minister excitement to them by his presence and his intercourse with them. In a sense He departs from them, as He did from Saul. By this is signified the withdrawal of every thing merciful, alleviating, hopeful, and of a restraining, reformatory nature. Yet He will always make his presence to be felt; for "if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there." While, therefore, material images of woe, if too specific, seem to degrade the subject, and are apt to pass over, in their effect on some, from the extreme of horror to the grotesque, they are not objectionable on the score of over-statement; nothing which fancy ever depicted being capable of expressing the misery which must be felt by a depraved soul opposed to God and with God for its punisher. We have only to think of what is sometimes felt at funerals and closing graves, to see what future misery must be in one of its merely incidental forms, — the loss of all

good, forever. If God shall but keep perpetually fresh such sorrows as men feel here, he will fulfil a large part of that which the Saviour and the apostles have declared to be the future portion of the wicked. So that when good men like Leighton, Baxter, Andrew Fuller, the Wesleys, Watts, and Edwards portray, according to their several conceptions, the pains of the wicked, they fall far below the truth; and their representations, if at all objectionable, are not so for the reason that they surpass the dread reality: for that is impossible. Let us now consider the following passages.

"As therefore the tares are gathered and are burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." These same closing words are used a few verses afterward, in explaining the parable of the Net. Not to burden the attention of the reader, there is one passage more which I will quote in connection with the preceding, for the sake of briefly remarking upon them, before passing to the next topic.

The passage to which I refer is Rev. xiv. 9, 10, 11. "And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture into the

cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb: And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever: and they have no rest, day or night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name."

If the Bible says that angels, at the last day, inflict on the wicked that which can best be compared only to casting them into a furnace of fire, I will implicitly believe it. My reason ascertains whether this is said, beyond reasonable doubt; then reason bows to revelation. I will not object that such employment does not consist with my conceptions of angelic natures. If I did, the question would be appropriate, Do you consent that a holy angel should have cut off the hundred and eighty-five thousand Assyrians of Sennacherib's army in one night, and that another should have directed the pestilence of three days in Israel? What will you do about these things? You are disposed, perhaps, to associate angels with "birds and flowers," with elves and fairies; and not with garments rolled in blood, or hands reeking with slaughter. My reply is, I will correct my natural or acquired feelings, by the word of God. But the word of God says that angels will cast "all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, into a furnace of fire." Inanimate things are not meant; for it is added, "there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." Moreover, the word of God says that the idolatrous worshippers of the beast shall be tormented with fire

and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and of the Lamb.

My only question will be again, Does the Bible mean by this that men will be made to suffer in a way which is most appropriately expressed by fire and brimstone; that even if it be not literally so, there would really be nothing to choose between the two things, the figure and the literal meaning? And does it say that holy angels, and the Lamb of God himself, will look on, approve, and confirm the infliction? If so, I fully and firmly believe it; — be it figurative, or literal, I believe it, and I will take it to be the same as literal. And I will postpone the explanation to my natural feelings, till I know more. I find that when men fully understand the enormities of some outrage upon a fellow creature, and the soul is filled with them, the punishment, swift or slow, meets with no repugnance in their nature. Perhaps when I know more about sin, and unbelief, it will be so with regard to future punishment. Only let me be persuaded that the language of the Bible properly interpreted, declares any thing; then there is no appeal.

But I now respectfully ask the attention of the reader when I say that if I did not believe in there being a state of future punishment which justifies such language, I fear that I could not stop short of the boldest infidelity. I might even assail the Bible as unfit to be read. It is no relief to tell me that the language does not mean all which it would seem to convey. I should reply, This is bad language, unless

there be something which language of this sort only can express. But if it be an exaggeration of a truth, or if, for the sake of impression an idea is conveyed which is false, a man may as well apologize to me for a profane blasphemer, saying that his oaths do not really mean all which they express, as try to reconcile me to the belief that such words as these are inspired. It is not the *truth* which offends me, but the *untruthfulness* of the language. The words are not decorous; my moral sense is abused, when I read such expressions, unless substantial truth requires them. The sin is not against my faith, but against my understanding. If there be nothing in holy angels, and in the Saviour, which corresponds to these representations, I should be tempted to go at once from the Bible to the teaching and preaching of some man who rejects the Bible, and rejects it partly because it uses such language. But where should I find such a preacher who would not trouble me with the inconsistency of taking his text every Sabbath from the very book from which I seek to flee? So true is it that the stoutest unbeliever cannot shake off the hold which the Bible has upon his moral nature. Absolute scepticism seems to be as impossible as universal knowledge.

"Cast them into a furnace of fire;" "in the presence of the holy angels," "and of the Lamb." Some tell me that this is "Oriental;" some that it is merely "flame-picture;" some that it is "mere hyperbole." Now if a mere show of displeasure is signified by this language, the objection is, not to the punishment,

but, that such inappropriate, such defamatory representations should be used in connection with the holy angels and the Lamb of God. If you will insist that the words are true, I have no objection to make. But the Bible does not observe the ordinary laws of decorum in language, unless truth would be violated by the use of other and milder terms than these, in describing the future infliction of punishment upon the wicked.

The following Scriptures, teaching that the wicked are in misery after death, confirm the foregoing statements. "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness." "The ungodly are like the chaff which the wind driveth away." "The men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before God exceedingly." "And the Lord rained fire and brimstone out of heaven and destroyed them all." "The rich man died and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes being in torment." "Judas by transgression fell and went to his own place." "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." "And where I am thither ye cannot come."

He who will say that such men as are here described meet in death with a change of character which prepares them at once for happiness, may as well assert, once for all, that delusion is practised upon us by the representations of the Bible; that the object is merely to frighten the living; that apparent judgments upon the wicked, death and its terrors, are merely a dumb show, a tragic demonstration, a dissolving view turning, within the veil, into manifesta-

tions of compassion and love. There have not been wanting men who in their concern for the character of God have interpreted his words of vengeance and his terrible acts towards the wicked, in this manner, as though such deception were any relief from imputations of undue severity. Archbishop Tillotson ventured such an explanation, and President Edwards' ironical reproof of him and others for betraying their Maker's secret, is well known. There are some even now who, like the sect of Manichees, seem to hold that all evil resides in matter, and therefore that in the separation of the soul from the body, the soul becomes pure. But the question before us is, What do the Scriptures teach? If there be any thing conclusive in positive statements, this is placed beyond all reasonable dispute, that some men die in their sins, and that after death they have in themselves the elements of misery. The rich man surely is an instance of this. Judas's "own place" was not heaven.

We have seen thus far that while the Scriptures represent the wicked themselves to be an essential source of their own misery, future punishment necessarily implies infliction, or excitation, from a source beyond the sinner himself. Some opprobriously call this "the doctrine of endless torture." But there is something more terrible here than "torture." If the sinner were made to feel constantly that he is in the hands of a torturer, many a passion of his nature might minister strength to his resistance, and impart fortitude. But to have his own self excited against

him, forever, so as to seem the proximate cause of his misery, is the more helpless woe. But however the sources of it may be combined, we have seen that the wicked are in misery after death. The question now is, Will their misery remain forever? Do the Scriptures teach that the punishment of the wicked, made up as it necessarily is from the natural consequences of evil doing and positive inflictions from the hand of God, will be without end? The affirmative of this question I have undertaken to prove.

But it may be said, You undertake an impossible task, because you know nothing of futurity. Principles may yet be evolved which now are slumbering in the bosom of God. You must journey farther than man has gone before you can decide this subject. "Have the gates of death been opened to thee? or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow of death?"

The only question to be considered is, What do the Scriptures now teach as to the future condition of the wicked? Do they or do they not represent it as unalterable? If we can ascertain this, we need not perplex ourselves as to ulterior revelations; nor should we refuse to receive the present testimony of God, with the objection that something more may possibly be said hereafter. What, then, does the Bible teach us as to the state and prospects of the impenitent after death?

Let the reader now endeavor to lay out of the question all considerations relating to the reasonableness

or justice of future, endless punishment. Let him not foreclose the discussion in his own mind by saying that it is unreasonable and unjust, and therefore that it cannot be in the Bible. Rather let him first ascertain whether it be taught there, and then if he will, let him debate with himself whether, finding it there, he will or will not receive the Bible itself.

In considering whether the Scriptures teach that the punishment of the wicked will be without end, we will see if the following proposition can be maintained:

II. REDEMPTION BY CHRIST IS REPRESENTED AS HAVING FOR ITS OBJECT SALVATION FROM FINAL PERDITION.

If upon the failure of all which is done in redemption to save men, they are to be subjected to another probation after death, there are powerful reasons to think that the surest way to effect their recovery, is, to let them know beforehand that God will give them a second trial.

For this is manifestly the way in which God proceeded with the Hebrew people whose reformation in this world, and whose allegiance, he was seeking to secure. In foresight of their apostacy and punishment, they were told beforehand that they should have a second probation. The following words are an explicit declaration to this effect, and are an instance of divine wisdom which man would never have devised, from fear of consequences. After telling Israel of the happy fruit which would attend their obedience, and the direful effects of their

apostacy, instead of leaving them in doubt whether they will have a second probation, God expressly tells them that they shall be again restored: "When thou art in tribulation and all these things are come upon thee, even in the latter days, if thou turn to the Lord thy God and shalt be obedient unto his voice, (for the Lord thy God is a merciful God,) he will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which he sware unto thee." Deut. iv. 30.

It might have been argued with much plausibleness that such an announcement would be inexpedient; that it would have a direct effect to make men careless and presumptuous. But infinite wisdom judged otherwise, and proceeded at different times to say, "If his children forsake my law then will I visit their transgressions with the rod; — nevertheless my loving kindness will I not utterly take from them." And again: "If my covenant be not with day and night, then will I cast off the seed of Jacob; — for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy upon them." Again, "I will for this afflict the seed of David, but not forever."

What principle in moral natures is there which makes this announcement, to sinners, of future clemency and restoration, wise and expedient? The obvious answer is, Hope. Whether or not there can ever be repentance without hope, it is certain that hope is a powerful means of repentance. "How many hired servants of my father have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger. I will arise

and go to my father, and say unto him, Father, I have sinned—." The promise of a future trial, the explicit avowal of relenting in his displeasure, with a view to the final recovery of the transgressors, was deemed by the Most High to be essential in the exercise of his administration in ancient times. The admixture of hope in his threatening, the line of light in the horizon below the coming tempest, was regarded by Jehovah as a necessary means of effecting the ultimate restoration of the Jews, so that to this day provision is made for hope to fasten its hands upon exceeding great and precious promises the moment that the thought arises of turning to God. He would have the sinners think in their deep distress under the chastising rod that He would be found of them if they returned and sought him, and that He made provision for hope even while the terrible blow was about to descend.

In offering pardon and salvation to men through the sufferings and death of Christ, and in setting forth the consequences of neglecting so great salvation, if God does not intimate that, nevertheless, the wicked shall not be utterly cast off, surely it is not because it would be inconsistent with the principles of his moral government thus to mingle hope with chastisement. We have seen that intimations of future mercy were made to men who were abusing the most signal acts of divine favor; and that to secure their future repentance, God judged it wise and prudent to prevent the ill effect which wrath and punishment might have upon them, by so ordering it that they

should recollect amidst their punishment that even long before the moment of descending wrath, he remembered mercy, and that, accordingly, when about to cast them off, he said, "How shall I give thee up?—my heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together." And the anointed prophet said in his name, "He will return, he will have mercy upon us; and thou wilt cast their iniquities into the depths of the sea." All this, it will be remembered, was not a sudden relenting; it was part of a plan announced so long beforehand as to give evidence of special design.

We. therefore, say, that if no such foretokens of far distant mercy and forgiveness are now made to those who reject Christ, it cannot properly be argued that it would be unsuitable, and that wisdom and prudence forbid. On the contrary, such promises would be in accordance with those former dealings of God with men in which he has manifested the most peculiar love for transgressors. It would be analogous to his former conduct should he intimate in immediate connection with his threatnings, that if we neglect our present opportunity and means of salvation, and subject ourselves necessarily to a long and fearful discipline of sorrow, nevertheless the time will come when he will return and be pacified toward us for all which we have done. If no such intimations are given, we have strong presumptive evidence that it is because the condition of the wicked at death is final.

For, as we read the threatnings against Edom, and

Babylon, and Egypt, and Tyre, we find no words of promise mingled with the predictions of their doom. Probation for them is past; hence, when God is declaring his vengeance against them, not one word is uttered which in the hour of their downfall would come to their memories as a ray of hope. The utter ruin and desolation of these kingdoms show the reason for withholding every promise of future mercy; it was intended that their destruction should be final.

But it may be said, Is God under any obligation to disclose all his future purposes with regard to the wicked? Surely not; but certainly he will not deceive us; he is not obliged to tell us any thing; but if he tells us a part, he will not make false impressions.

But some will say, It may now be wise in God to vary his plan, and suffer the wicked to "Depart" with the full expectation that their doom is forever; and then he may interpose and save them. Who will deny that this is possible?

It is evidently the object of the Gospel to save men here from their sins and to rescue them from future misery, limited or endless. Is it honest, or, would it not be like "false pretences," to make the impression that there is to be no further probation after death, if the idea is utterly inconsistent with the character of God! We know what is thought of one who offers his wares as positively the last, and then produces more. The question is simply this: Would God seek to save men by making them

think that this is their only chance of pardon when He knows that it is not to be the last? But if God intended that we should believe this to be the last, who among the sons of the mighty is entitled to the merit of having undeceived us? It is impiety to assert that there is a future probation, against the plain declarations of the Bible, if such declarations are made.

Now let us examine the inspired record. At the very close of the Bible, we read, "He that is unjust let him be unjust still, and he that 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." As the "unjust" and "filthy" never could be directed to refrain, in this world, from efforts to become good, (unless their day of grace were past) these words are obviously a declaration that character is unchangeable after death. In faithful consistency even to the last with the great distinguishing feature of the Christian religion, viz.: regard for the individual, the closing words of the Bible have reference to each accountable member of the human family: "And behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me to give to every man according as his work shall be." Here is the place where we should look for intimations, if any could be made, of future probation. Here is the promontory which runs down to the unfathomable main, looks forth on "that ocean we must sail so soon;" and as it terminates all earthly efforts after salvation, does it give us one hint about some future method of recovery? are there

signals prepared on this cape and head-land indicating to the eye of despair afar off that the cross of Christ holds out proposals of reconciliation still, to those who trampled it underfoot, on their way to eternity? On the contrary, every thing makes the impression on the vast majority of readers ever since these words were written, that the results of life are to be final. No hopeful class of probationers are represented as "without," when the righteous have entered through the gates into the city. All the sublime images in the last chapters of this book come thronging down to that shore where inspiration lays aside its pen and looks towards the shoreless waste beyond time. It has been said that the Old Testament ends with a curse. This is a mistake. It ends with a promise of turning the hearts of fathers and children, to avert a curse. But no prediction of any turning of hearts in eternity occurs at the close of that book which gives us the last information respecting the future. Its silence is as impressive as its few decisive words.

We can imagine how Christ would have drawn the picture of retribution had he followed the Old Testament, in doing so, in its hopeful and prophetic intermingling of light with the darkness. Making the prospect terrific, at first, beyond all human power of description, to enforce the duty of immediate repentance, and to deter from sin, then, appealing to our sense of propriety, our magnanimity, our shame, he would have told us how in the future, more or less remote, God would visit his erring and perverse

children with his remonstrances; how he himself would weep over them and repeat the offers of pardon; and in view of all this we can imagine how he would expostulate. Such a procedure would accord with the principles of human nature and of the divine government as illustrated in the history of Israel. Is the Saviour less compassionate and ready to forgive than the God of the Old Testament? for we see God listening to catch the first sigh of repentance; and when he hears it, he proclaims,—"I have surely heard Ephraim bemoaning himself thus: Thou hast chastised me and I was chastised, as a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke; turn thou me and I shall be turned; for thou art the Lord my God." Not one word like this do we hear from the lips of him who was the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person. Where is prophecy with her glowing tongue foretelling, at the hour of captivity, the sinner's final return? The opening of hell and the final release of Satan and his angels and of wicked men, would have been an anticipation sublime beyond most other visions; and, if allowable, it could not have failed to excite the imagination of seers and prophets. But where are the Isaiahs stretching their vision beyond time and the captivity of hell, saying, "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to the cursed, and say unto them that their warfare is accomplished, that their iniquity is pardoned; for they have received of the Lord's hand double for all their sins." Can it be that not even from you,

beloved John, is there a vision or a word of hope for sinners after death? You saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, the books opened, and another book, which is the book of life. You saw the judgment, and the doom; the lake of fire was first prepared by casting death and hell into it, and when all was ready, whosoever was not found written in the book of life you saw him cast into the lake of fire. No syllable of mercy? no visit from the angel that talked with thee, saying, Come up hither, to see, from a higher point, beyond that lake? Have you no yearning look? not even one slightly musical dark saying upon the harp, to keep us from suspecting that God can ever be implacable? In the Old Testament he relents and repents. "His soul was grieved for the misery of Israel." "How shall I make thee as Admah! How shall I set thee as Zeboim! My heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together." Is that Old Testament, which is represented by scoffers as "cruel," "sanguinary," "vindictive," actually more merciful in its expressions toward rebellious Israel than the New Testament is toward men who died in their sins?

How strange that He who wept over Jerusalem, could say, "Depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels," and let fall no expressions of commiseration or word of hope, nor leave some elliptical "notwithstanding," — an unfinished sentence, a place with asterisks, a chance even for a guess that all would not be forever determined for the wicked at the last day.

Mark the altered language, the different tone and manner, of the Saviour toward the wicked in the other world, compared with his words and behavior toward our sinful race when he was on earth. "The master of the house has risen up and shut to the door." They knock; he says, "I tell you I know you not, whence ye are. Depart from me." The direction is, "Bind him, hand and foot." They "cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion," not with candidates for heaven under discipline, but "with the hypocrites." He is "thrust out." Christ uses the expressions, "lose his soul;" "be cast away;" "salted with fire;" "grind him to powder;" "son of perdition;" "slay them before me:" "seek me and not find me;" "gathered the good — and cast the bad away." "Great gulf fixed;" "die in your sins;" "where I am ye cannot come." In various parts of the Bible we meet with phrases of the like tenor — such as, "wrath to come;" "shame and everlasting contempt;" "torment us before the time;" "reap corruption;" "wages of sin is death;" "more tolerable for Sodom in the day of judgment;" "mist of darkness forever and ever." Indeed these incidental expressions, interwoven every where throughout the Bible, assume that the doctrine of future, endless punishment for sin is a matter of course. The common mode of referring to the future, implies it. "Because there is wrath, beware lest he take thee away with his stroke;" "then a great ransom will not deliver thee." "I will laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh." The numerous

passages of this tenor do not suggest any idea of future clemency.

Paul thus declares the end of the wicked: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence o the Lord and from the glory of his power, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all them that believe, for our testimony among you was believed, in that day." That this does not apply to the destruction of Jerusalem, as the Papists and some Protestants would have us think, appears from the next chapter, in which the Thessalonians are told that "that day" is not "at hand," because "the man of sin" was first to be revealed.

Then Peter follows him and says, "But 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."

Thus, while the Bible satisfies us that the redemption made by Christ is a final effort to save men, we do not wonder that those who reject the Godhead of Christ and his sacrifice for sin, reject also the idea of endless punishment. There is no adequate necessity for a divine Saviour with his vicarious sacrifice if there be no penalty annexed to the law of God. Every man is then his own redeemer, either by obedience or by suffering.

But the evangelical believer looks into the manger

and upon the cross, and sees there his God incarnate. He sees in that Christ a sacrifice for his sins. The world laugh him to scorn. They demand whether he believes that his God is dying; and every form of intellectual ridicule is poured upon him. He steadfastly maintains that "the word was God," that "the word was made flesh," that this incarnate word was on the cross, "a ransom for many," "a propitiation through faith in his blood," his sufferings a substitute for the sinner's punishment. The believer looks to find some necessity for such an incarnation, and for the sacrificial death of such a being. He cannot find it in the need of example, moral suasion, or representation of the divine interest in him; but in the declaration that Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, he sees the appropriateness of the incarnation to give a divine worth and efficacy to sufferings which are to atone for sin. There is no revelation to be compared with this,—"God was manifest in the flesh," and, he "was manifested to take away our sins." By all the methods of imagery, symbolism, predictions, and most minute, pathetic delineations of his coming, his life, death, and resurrection, by appeals from his own lips and those of men "in Christ's stead;" by that perpetual memorial of him and of his sacrifice, the Lord's supper, men are admonished, and, "as though God did beseech them," urged to accept pardon through this infinite provision made for the forgiveness of sin. This produces the effect, generally, upon the mind, of a last effort.

It might have been supposed that the work of Christ would suffice for the present dispensation, and that men rejecting or neglecting it would in a future state be approached by those influences which belong peculiarly to the work of the third person in the Godhead. But Christ said, "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you. And when he is come he will reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment." Something more than ordinary divine influence is meant here by the Comforter, for the Saviour's being in the world would not of course keep *divine influence* out of it, or prevent the disciples from receiving comfort in God. A special divine agency is here recognized, and by all the laws of language a special divine, personal agent. His object is to reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. All which is implied in the idea of moral omnipotence is thus made to bear upon the hearts and minds of men to effect their reconciliation to God, through Christ.

Resistance to these efforts in a certain way, it is declared, shall have the effect, however long a time before death it may be made, to consign the sinner to hopeless condemnation; for "whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come."

It does not seem easy to explain how any one who "hath never forgiveness, neither in this world,

neither in that which is to come," is to be saved; nor by what moral distinctions it can be made to appear that some who commit one particular sin are justly condemned to a hopeless, unforgiven state, and that all the rest of mankind are to be restored. The work of the Holy Spirit and the unpardonable sin against him convince us that the effort of mercy to save men ends with life. Such words as these from Christ,—"hath never forgiveness, neither in this world nor in the world to come," admit of no appeal.

In this connection let it be observed that evangelical Christians regard the work of the Holy Spirit as of equal importance with the death of Christ, and as essential a part of the work of redemption. It is from sin that we are to be redeemed; it is to holiness that we are to be restored; hell and heaven are a consummation, respectively, of sin and holiness. But we notice that those who reject the idea of future punishment dwell much on sin and holiness as being the sole object of redemption, irrespective of the future state to which they lead. Olshausen, (Commentary v. 302), says, "The Scriptures know no such pretended divestment of all egotism, that man needs as motives neither fear nor hope, whether of damnation or eternal happiness;—and rightly;—for it [i. e. this notion] exhibits itself either as fanatical error, as in Madame Guyon, or, which is doubtless most common, as indifference and torpidity." However some may regard it as a narrow and selfish thing to make so much, as evangelical Christians do, of "sal-

vation" and "safety;" we find that the New Testament sets us the example. Its chief burden is holiness, likeness to God; but it appeals to our love of happiness and dread of pain; sentimental philosophy would substitute for these instincts a perception of the "good, the beautiful and the true;" the Gospel insists on these, but the way to reach them is through the natural constitution which God has given us. Inspiration does not disdain to say, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." "We shall be saved from wrath through him." "Who have fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us." "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul; or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul." The attempt to show that all this is unworthy of our "noble aspirations," is only professing to be wise; but "the foolishness of God is wiser than men." The work of the Holy Spirit in applying the redemption by Christ to the souls of men has for its object not only to save them from sin, but from its "wages" which "is death."

All having failed and men going from under the concentrated influences of redeeming mercy into a future state, if then the God who has provided such a plan of redemption is to meet them and, rather than have them perish, abandon all his terms and admit them to heaven upon their own conditions, rather

than see them suffer, if he who became flesh and died for them will then consent that punishment shall try to effect that which love and earthly discipline together failed to accomplish, and punishment proves to be the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation, and sinners will therefore have more powerful means of grace in hell than under the Gospel, we, for our part, need another revelation to inform us of it, and then to explain its consistency with our present Bible.

III. THE FALL OF ANGELS AND OF MAN, IS A CONFIRMATORY PROOF OF FUTURE, ENDLESS RETRIBUTION.

This will of course have weight only with those who believe in the existence and fall of angels, and in the fall of man. To prove either of these, here, would be out of place; and indeed the necessity of proving them would show that everything which has thus far been said in this article is superfluous, because it takes for granted many things generally believed which rest, however, on the same kind of evidence with the existence of angels and their fall. The Apostles, the Scribes and Pharisees, I have not thought it necessary to prove, had a real existence, and that they were not merely personified principles of good and evil. If the reader be one who rejects the doctrine of fallen angels, and of the fall of man, he will read what is here said merely as showing the way in which those who believe these things are confirmed by them in their belief of endless retribution. Peter says, (2, ii. 4,) "God spared not the

angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." Jude says, (6,) "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."

If God did not keep angels from falling, we are not constrained to think that he will restore them. If he will hereafter re-instate them by a direct act of power, the same power could have kept them from falling, with no greater interference with their free agency. If he allowed them to fall with a view to some great good in their natures, suffering them in the progress of their experience, to ruin this world, and bring in such a fearful plague as sin has been to our race, all to be compensated for in the great sweep of ages by this beneficial knowledge of evil, we are led to the conclusion that sin and suffering are the necessary means of the greatest good. But what manner of Supreme Being have we here for a Universalist to love and worship? His government, it would seem, cannot proceed without suffering a host of angels, falling from their thrones in heaven, to pass through centuries of sin and mischief. This seems neither benevolent nor wise.

In the exercise of their liberty we are told that angels kept not their first estate but left their own habitation, and that God hath reserved them in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. If they are finally to be restored,

God will restore them, or they will come back of themselves. If God foresaw that he must finally restore them, he would have kept them from falling, unless sin and misery are, under his government, the means of the greatest good. If so, this may be one of the cases in which if a little is good, more is better; and perhaps the best interests of the universe will be promoted by protracting this sin and suffering indefinitely.

It is a wholly gratuitous assumption that fallen angels and men will at last of their own accord, repent. Who has travelled so far as to know this? What reason have we to think that hell will finally convince and persuade men? All our present knowledge respecting it contradicts this expectation. Satan and his angels have tried its redeeming power, if it has any, for at least six thousand years. We see no premises, therefore, on which to base the assertion that men will at last universally repent. It does not appear that being in torment, even, will have any better effect, forever, on men than it seems to have had on "the rich man" whose only prayer to Abraham was for mitigation of pain, and for a warning to be sent to his brethren. He seems to think that if one went to them from the dead, they would repent. Why had he not repented himself, among the dead? Surely the very experience of hell itself must be a more powerful means of good than a mere apparition. But as suffering had not made him penitent, it must be that it has no such effect after death. Hell seems a very cruel means of effecting the refor-

mation of sinners, when we think that, if employed for this purpose through such great periods of punishment, it will be employed by him who so easily converted Saul of Tarsus, and the woman that was a sinner, and Zaccheus, and the thief on the cross. This is, to my own mind, one of the insuperable objections to the theory of future disciplinary punishment. I can readily yield my assent to the declaration that "he that believeth not the Son shall not see life;" it does no violence to my understanding that those who refuse salvation by Christ when notified that their refusal will be fatal, should reap forever that which they sowed, and continue hereafter to sow that which they reap, and thus without end. I read this in the Bible. I have no controversy with it. But that a human soul should need ages, in hell, with Satan and his angels, to be made contrite, is as contrary to all analogy as it is destitute of Scriptural proof. Besides—If God does all in this world which he can do without destroying free agency, to convert certain men, it is difficult to see how the use of superior power in hell can fail to destroy it utterly. If God does not use all proper means here to save men, how is He infinitely merciful? But if here he goes to the very boundaries of their free agency, which, it is said, he never passes over, and yet fails to subdue them, it is gratuitous to say that he will certainly succeed any better hereafter.

How much longer than these six thousand years past, angels are to suffer, we cannot tell; but the consignment of wicked men at the last day to such

company as that of "the devil and his angels," looks fearfully unlike a remedial measure for angel or man.

The last sentence is utterly inconsistent with any expectation, or intention, on the part of Christ, that those on whom it is pronounced will return. Otherwise, he would not have pronounced them cursed. Probationers are not accursed. They are prisoners of hope. Everything in the last words of Christ to the wicked is as final as language can make it.

But if the wicked are to be punished until they repent, we say, Punishment thus far has not reformed the original inhabitants of hell. It is incumbent on those who advocate final restoration on this ground to prove that punishment will at last have a restorative power, or they must show how long the wicked must sin and suffer to make it wrong to punish them any more even if they continue to sin.

IV. THE TERMS USED WITH REGARD TO THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD, ARE PROOFS OF ENDLESS RERTIBUTION.

In the "Child's Catechism," by Rev. O. A. Skinner, I find the following: — (p. 24.)

Q. Will sin exist in the resurrection?

A. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. 1 Cor. xv. 50.

Q. What does the Saviour say respecting our condition when raised?

A. Neither can they die any more; for they are

equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being children of the resurrection. Mark xii. 25.

Here, it will be seen, it is assumed that Christ refers to all the dead, and that all when they are raised will be the children of God. This, it is understood, is the prevailing belief of Universalists.

We read that "no Scripture is of any private interpretation;" in other words that the meaning must be ascertained by comparing the Scriptures one with another. The parallel passage in Luke (xx. 35, 36) reads, "But they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

Our esteemed friend, Mr. Skinner, it seems to me, is led into a mistake by regarding the expression, "children of the resurrection," as meaning all who have part in the resurrection; and since Jesus declares "the children of the resurrection" to be synonymous with "children of God," Mr. S. naturally concludes that all who rise from the dead will be the children of God.

Now, allowing me, for the sake of the argument, that the wicked are raised from the dead in their sins, they are not, in the Scriptural sense, "children of the resurrection." Rising from the dead does not make us "children of the resurrection." Being the offspring of God does not make us "the children of

God;" the wicked would not "come forth to everlasting life," though coming forth to live forever. The term, "children of the resurrection," connects with itself the further idea of being qualified for heaven, — "counted worthy to obtain that world." This is confirmed, it seems to me, beyond all question, by one word of the apostle Paul, (Phil. iii: 8–11.) "I count all things but loss, &c., *if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.*" If, on being raised from the dead, all men are to be fit for heaven, Paul need not have used such "means" to "attain" to it, — nor, indeed, any "means" whatever; for he was sure to be raised, like the rest of mankind. Adopt the interpretation just given, viz.: that to be accounted worthy to obtain the resurrection from the dead includes the idea of a distinguishing fitness for heaven, body and soul re-united, and we can see why Paul should say he was willing to count all things but loss to attain unto it — rising from the dead with his perfected nature, body and soul, being, in his view, the consummation of preparedness, in every respect, for heaven. If such be Paul's meaning of "attaining unto the resurrection of the dead," the wicked, in their sins, though raised from the dead, do not attain unto the resurrection, and they are not, therefore, in the Saviour's sense, "children of the resurrection."

The Sadducees had said, "Whose wife shall she be in the resurrection?" I will paraphrase the reply of Christ according to my interpretation of his words: "It is, of course, of no use for me to answer your

question on the supposition that the woman and her seven husbands are not among the saved. They that have done evil 'shall come forth,' as I once said, 'to the resurrection of damnation.' Conjugal relationship among them, or any thing relating to happiness, are not supposable. Your inquiry, therefore, relates, of course, to those who are supposed to be in a condition to admit of friendly and loving relationships. As to them, I say, that being accounted worthy to obtain that world and afterward such a resurrection as is worthy of the name, they stand in no need of earthly joys, and as they die no more, the necessity for re-production ceases; they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being in distinction from the the rest of the risen dead, 'children of the resurrection.'"

This meaning of the phrase is also illustrated by the expression, "children of this world." Good people are, in one sense, "children of this world," equally with the bad; that is, they are *natives* of this world; and yet we read, — "*the children of this world* are wiser in their generation than *the children of light.*"

Thus, the good only are "children of the resurrection," though all are raised, as the wicked only are "children of this world," though bad and good live here together.

Paul said before Felix, and declared that the Jews "themselves also allow" it, (for the Sadducees were small in number though high in rank and power,) "*that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.*" (Acts xxiv. 15.)

The idea advanced by Mr. Skinner and others that all who are raised from the dead are children of God, grows, therefore, out of his mistake, as I view it, in interpreting the expression "children of the resurrection" to mean all the risen dead. Enough has been said in explanation of the opposite, and, as we believe, the more Scriptural sense of the phrase. It seems to us unaccountable that any should adopt the idea that all who are raised from the dead will be the children of God, if they have ever read the parables of Christ in Matt. xiii. How does he there say it shall be in the end of the world? "So shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." The same words are repeated at the close of the parable of the net. Surely there will be some of the risen dead who will not be "children of the resurrection," because they will not be the "children of God."

I proceed now to the argument to be derived from the declarations of Christ in connection with the resurrection. Christ said, "The hour is coming, and now is when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." This he said to illustrate his commission to bestow spiritual life on those who are dead in sin. Then he proceeds at once to assert a power in confirmation of this, in the way of miracle. "Marvel not at this"—(at my power to regenerate the soul,) for the hour is coming

(notice that he does not here add—"and now is") when all that are in their graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth, they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation."

"All that are in their graves" includes all who die, from Abel to the last victim of death and the grave. "They that have done evil," of course, then, are there. Now it appears that they who have done evil will not have atoned, in the intermediate state, for the deeds done in the body, because the Saviour says they will come forth "to the resurrection of damnation." But some of them will have been for a very long time in the separate state. Wherever the rich man went at death he was "in torment;" there were men before his day, and there have been men since his time, who were as wicked as he. But can sin be punished "in torment" so long? Peter tells us that there were "spirits" in his day "in prison" to whom Christ preached by the Spirit in the days of Noah, that is at least three thousand years before. That is a long time for sin to be punished, or even for a sinner to be detained, under the government of a good God. Now these are yet to "come forth unto the resurrection of damnation." If sin can be so punished by the Infinite Father, and if bodies are to be added to these souls, notwithstanding this already protracted experience of misery, and if they, body and soul, are at the last day to be doomed to "fire, prepared for the devil and his angels," on what principles can all this be explained? Does sin merit such punishment,

as the Bible declares has already been inflicted? Would an earthly parent punish thus? Is there not enough, in this ascertained infliction of punishment for sin, to destroy all confidence in the government of God, unless sin deserves it all? And if it deserves all this, we know not how much more it may deserve.

It will be observed, in addition, that Christ does not tell us, *they that have done evil, but by the power of discipline, shall have repented*, shall come forth to the resurrection of life, and the incorrigible *to the resurrection of a further discipline.* How is this? Has not the long interval between death and the resurrection resulted in the salvation of any? Strange that some of the more hopeful of the wicked should not have availed themselves of the opportunity between death and the judgment to confess and repent.

It is contrary to all analogy that it should be necessary to punish men so long before they repent. On the deck or in the rigging of a burning vessel at sea, when death is absolutely certain, it is to be presumed that it does not take a wicked man very long to decide with what feelings he will meet his God. When the soul after death finds itself on the way to hell, can we suppose that an opportunity to escape by repentance, if it were offered, would be rejected? If the only object of God is to reclaim the sinner, he will release him the first moment that he repents. It is so in this world. "And when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him and had compassion and

ran and fell on his neck and kissed him." If the soul, at the sight of its punishment, relents and agrees to the terms of pardon, does a Universalist believe that God will say, "No; you must suffer in hell for your sins, even though you have now repented?" Would an earthly father inflict punishment in such a case? But the Bible represents the wicked to have been in hell from the time of their death till the resurrection, and at the resurrection they must yet come forth "to the resurrection of damnation." It is incredible that so much time and so much suffering should be necessary to make sinners repent. Either they repent, and God still continues to punish them "ages on ages;" or they do not repent between death and the resurrection, nor at the judgment seat of Christ, nor in the immediate prospect of going away to the society and the punishment of the devil and his angels. If a soul which is finally to be reclaimed, can pass through such experience and not repent, it requires larger hope and faith than is common to men to expect that future punishment can be a means of salvation.

That the guilt of a finite creature, man or angel, should merit thousands of years in hell, or that thousands of years should be requisite to bring him to his right mind, no more accords with our natural feelings or with what we call "reason," than does the idea of endless punishment. But if the Bible conveys anything intelligible to our understanding, it teaches that angels and men have been subjected to punish-

ment for a longer period than is "reasonable" for mere discipline.

Surely the end of future punishment cannot be merely the recovery of the sinner. Were it so, moreover, it would follow that sin injures no one but the sinner himself. It violates no duties toward God, no interests of fellow creatures. But the law of God refutes this; the threatenings against those who cause others to fall, and the frequent punishment of men who made others to sin, prove that the punishment of the sinner will have some other end than his reformation.

It being frequently argued that the sins of a finite creature cannot be punished forever, because a finite creature cannot merit infinite punishment, it will be enough to meet this, in passing, with a single remark, viz: That, if this be so, then, even if the whole universe should sin forever, the whole universe cannot be punished forever, because the whole universe, after all, is but finite.

V. THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THE LAW OF GOD HAS A CURSE: — WHICH IT HAS NOT IF FUTURE PUNISHMENT BE DISCIPLINARY.

The punishment, however long and severe, which shall result in restoring a soul to holiness and an endless heaven, under the kind and faithful administration of its heavenly Father, it would be unsuitable to call "a curse." The theory of Restorationists is, that mercy, having failed to recover sinners in this world, will go on hereafter, in the same direction, with more

vigorous methods, till it succeeds,—the same undying, unfaltering love pursuing the wanderer, which here never ceased to plead. Hereafter it will mingle stronger ingredients, and cure the disease of sin. What "curse" there is in such loving-kindness it is hard to see. In this world we experience just this treatment,—

> "Afflictions sorted, anguish of all sizes;
> Fine nets and stratagems to catch us in;"

and sometimes all the waves and billows go over us. Men are stripped of property, family, health, reputation, and finally they turn to the hand that smites them, grateful that God did not spare the rod for their crying; and they testify that through the loss of all things they have gained eternal bliss. Do they call their affliction their "curse?" Have they suffered "the curse of the law?" All the ordinary medicines having failed, the physician brings some extreme remedy and saves the patient. Was that a "curse?" He amputates the limb, and thus prolongs a precious life. Did he "curse" the man, in doing so? We must, therefore, expunge large parts of the Bible, if future punishment be only a wholesome discipline. "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." No, he has only redeemed us from a further dispensation of infinite mercy, if punishment be only for discipline; indeed, he prevents the bestowment of a greater proof of love than he himself gave us in dying on the cross; for if, after all his love for us, he will persist in disci-

plining us in hell, willing to see us suffer that he may finally save us, "herein is love!" The cross is not the climax of his love, but the lake of fire. How it is in any sense a curse, we fail to see. Christians here never look upon the means of sanctification as "the curse of the law." The sinner who by the severest discipline is brought to Christ, feels that he thereby escapes "the curse of the law." But we cannot find that curse, neither here nor hereafter, unless there be punishment which is not intended for the recovery of the sinner.

VI. THE SENTENCE PASSED UPON THE WICKED INDISCRIMINATELY FORBIDS THE IDEA OF DISCIPLINE IN FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

Among the impenitent at death and in eternity, there is, of course, great variety of character. If the object of future punishment be to reclaim them, the wise and considerate methods of earthly discipline seem to be utterly discarded after death. We hardly need to be reminded how indiscriminate are the threatenings which are said to be inflicted on the wicked. The last sentence evidently regards none of them as probationers, there is no forbearance in it toward the more hopeful; they are all addressed as "ye cursed." We are considering the testimony of the Scriptures. What evidence do they afford of any discrimination in the treatment of the finally impenitent, notwithstanding the vast variety which must exist among them? I answer, not any. But the following passages, among others, teach plainly that the

doom of the wicked will be indiscriminate, without regard to hopeful diversities of character.

"And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened, and another book was opened which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the book, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works." Then follows this declaration: "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." Some say, death and hell are annihilated. But this is not the idea intended, unless the wicked also are then to be annihilated; for the next verse concluding the subject says, "And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." The obvious meaning, is, Death and hell, whatever they represent, will then be added to the lake of fire, whatever that is, as new ingredients, and to constitute "the second death," and as a final gathering together of all the elements of sorrow and pain, with all the wicked, into one place. With this passage agree the words of Daniel: "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." The parables of Christ relating to the end of the world recognize only two great divisions of men at the last day. Wheat and tares only are to be in the "field;" good and bad, only, in the "net." The wheat is saved, the tares are burned;

"the good" in the net are gathered into vessels, "the bad" are none of them dismissed for amendment, or growth, but are "cast away." And Christ tells us that every human being, will stand at his right hand or left hand, "blessed" or "cursed."

Now when we call to mind the justice of God, and reflect that undue severity, or the laying on man more than is meet, would alienate the confidence of the good from the Most High, and when we consider the declarations of Christ that sins of ignorance shall receive but "few stripes," and we still perceive that the human race are evidently to fall at last into two divisions, which will include the whole with their countless diversities and degrees as to character in each division, we infer that no provision is made for a more hopeful class to enjoy a further trial. All upon the left hand are doomed alike. If there is to be a new probation after death, the Bible surely does not teach it.

VII. THE DURATION OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT IS EXPRESSED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT BY THE TERMS EMPLOYED TO DENOTE ABSOLUTE ETERNITY.

There is, we all admit, such a thing as *forever*. If the Bible speaks of the natural attributes of God, his eternity is of course brought to view, and there must be a term or terms to convey the idea.

Now it is apparent to all, that the words *eternal, everlasting, forever*, never of themselves signify a limited duration. No one ever learns *from these words* that the duration to which they refer is less than

infinite. The idea of limitation, if it be obtained, always is derived from the context.

It is moreover true beyond the possibility of dispute that the words *eternal*, *everlasting* and *forever*. always mean *the whole* of something. There is no instance in which they are used to denote a part of a thing's duration. It is always the entire period for which that thing is to last. This no one will call in question.

It is well understood that the words "forever" and "everlasting" are used to express a duration commensurate with the nature of the thing spoken of. "Everlasting mountains" are coeval with creation, and are to endure as long as the earth. "A servant forever," is a servant for life. We cannot take the sense which the word has in connection with a certain thing, and by it prove or disprove any thing relating to a totally different thing. We cannot prove, for example, that mountains will not last to the end of time because *forever* applied to a servant means only *for life*. We must consider the nature of the object to which the word is applied. When it is applied to the Most High, of course it means unlimited duration. Now the words which convey the idea of absolute eternity are applied, for example, to mountains, and to future punishment, and to the being and government of God. This then is certain: Because *forever* when applied to some things, does not mean absolute eternity, it does not follow that it does not mean eternity when applied to future retribution. If it were so, we could not convey the idea

of the eternity of God; for it could be said that *forever* is sometimes applied to a limited duration. That is true. Now if this proves that future punishment is not forever, it must also prove that the being of God is not forever.

Two things are beyond dispute. 1. *Forever* and *everlasting* are applied to future retributions. 2. These terms always mean *the whole*, as to duration, of that with which they stand connected. If applied to life, it is the whole of life; if to the existence of the world, it is the entire period of its existence; if to a covenant, the covenant is either without limit as to time, or it is the whole of the duration which the subject permits; and when applied to Jehovah it refers to his whole eternity.

What, then, does it mean, when applied to future retribution? It always means *the whole* of something. Is it the whole of future existence? No one can base a denial of it on the ground that the word when applied to human life means only a few years, or a limited duration when applied to the earth. For, How is it when applied to God and the happiness of heaven? It is certainly the place of any who deny endless retributions to show that the words cannot mean *the whole of future existence* when applied to punishment. The words mean the whole of future existence when applied, by the use of the same Greek words in the same passages, to the happiness of the righteous. The objector must show that when applied to the future life, they mean only a part of it,

notwithstanding they always mean *the whole* of every thing else with which they stand connected.

Such are some of the considerations drawn from the word of God, which satisfy my own mind that retributions after death are without end. Mr. Foster speaks of it as "the general, not very far short of universal, judgment of divines." Such multitudes of the best of men and women are still firmly persuaded of its truth, that we are led to say, There must be a foundation for it in the word of God,—and for this reason: If mankind could have divested themselves of the conviction that it is found in the word of God, it is reasonable to think that it would long since have been discarded. Nay, rather who would have invented such a doctrine? Good men would not have palmed it upon the world, for more reasons than one. Besides, many an error has been exploded; it is unaccountable, if this be error, that it should have kept its hold upon the human mind. No Protestant, it would seem, would quote a belief in purgatory as a parallel case. We have no coercion, nor any kind of motive to bias our minds toward this article of faith. We use no terms on this subject,—certainly we approve of none, which are not derived from the Bible. We are not superstitious, nor fanatical, nor priest ridden, nor cruel, and we think we have far more exalted reasons for believing in the infinite love of God than any have who do not see it, as we do, in the atoning cross. However good and amiable the opposers of this doctrine may be, they will not assume that they are more humane,

more pitiful, more gentle, more the friends of God and man than those who believe it. In view of the hold which it has on the minds of men it would be so great a marvel that the doctrine should not be found in the Scriptures that nothing could be more astounding, not even the fearful truth itself.

And that it may be seen, further, how we are confirmed in our persuasion that we read the Bible aright, I refer not only, as above, to the convictions of believers, that the doctrine is scriptural, but to the positive statements of some who have rejected it.

Mr. Foster tells us: "And the language of Scripture is formidably strong,—so strong that it must be an argument of extreme cogency that would authorize a limited interpretation."

Dr. Thomas Burnett, an English divine, writing in favor of final restoration, says, "Human nature revolts from the very name of future punishment. But the sacred Scriptures seem to be on the other side." ["Natura humana abhorret ab ipso nomine pænarum æternarum.—At Scriptura sacra a partibus contrariis stare videtur." De Statu Mort. et Resurg. p. 228, 2d ed.]

One effect of the recent discussion of this subject in this city has been to elicit from a distinguished advocate of final restoration, the following statement:

"And yet I freely say that I do not find the doctrine of the ultimate salvation of all souls clearly stated in any text or in any discourse that has ever been reported from the lips of Christ. I do not think that

we can fairly maintain that the final restoration of all men is a prominent and explicit doctrine of the four Gospels." [Rev. T. S. King's Two Discourses, p. 5.]

To this, I am able to add the explicit testimony of Rev. Theodore Parker. Wishing to verify a quotation which a friend had tried in vain to find for me in one of Mr. Parker's volumes, I addressed a note to Mr. P., asking him to give me the reference. The following polite and obliging answer will speak for itself. All the italics are Mr. P.'s :—

"BOSTON, Dec. 1st., 1858.

"REV. DR. ADAMS: *Dear Sir,* — I am ill now, and cannot recollect that the passage you refer to occurs in any of my volumes, yet it might, in several. I am sure it does in some *printed sermons* — pamphlets, but cannot now say which. I will try to find the passage.

"*To me it is quite clear that Jesus taught the doctrine of eternal damnation* if the Evangelists — the first three I mean — are to be treated as inspired. I can understand his language in no other way. But as the Protestant sects start with the notion, which to me is a monstrous one — that the words of the N. T. are all miraculously inspired by God, and so infallibly true, and as this doctrine of eternal damnation is so revolting to all the human and moral feelings of our nature, men said, "The words must be interpreted in another way." So, as the Unitarians have misinterpreted the N. T. to prove that the *Christos* of the fourth Gospel had no pre-existence, the Universalists misinterpreted other passages of the Gospels to show that Jesus of Nazareth never taught eternal damnation. So the Geologists misinterpret Genesis to-day — to save the divine infallible character of the text.

Yours truly,

THEODORE PARKER.

It was but fair to let Mr. P. state his whole belief on the subject. Thus, in his view, if the Evangelists are to be believed, Christ taught that future retributions are to be endless.

There is nothing to be surprised at in this; but it will be seen that it is not without good reason that those who receive the Bible implicitly as the word of God have so generally believed in endless retribution as a doctrine of Scripture.

The question then arises, whether our human instincts or divine revelation, whether man the sinner, or God the Sovereign, shall dictate the penalty of sin? Mr. Foster, seeking relief to his mind from the terrible idea of endless sin and misery, says of the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked, "It would be a prodigious relief." Some one respectfully replies to him that "the divine government is not for the relief of the imagination, but for the relief of the universe."

The question is often asked, How, allowing endless retribution to be a scriptural doctrine, can you have peace of mind in your belief?

I answer, We believe that no one will perish who does not reject the Saviour of the world; or, if he be a heathen, does not sin against light and conviction sufficient to save him.

It has an effect to quiet our minds when we reflect that our thoughts and feelings at the loss of the soul were surpassed in Him whose soul for us was exceeding sorrowful even unto death. Tears were shed by him over sinners: "God hath laid on him the

iniquity of us all." If the thought of endless retribution is so terrible to us who know so little about it, we are constrained to think that there was never any sorrow like unto the sorrow of him who loved us and gave himself for us, when he sees that he must, nevertheless, pronounce upon any for whom he died, the sentence of that everlasting punishment from which he became incarnate and died to save us. Great as our astonishment and sorrow are, we cannot forget that they are infinitely less than his. If, through grace, we are saved, we look to him, who knows what his own tears have been, to wipe away all tears from our eyes.

We also consider that the basis of future punishment is a chosen and cherished state of mind which leads men here to reject Christ notwithstanding his known character and his efforts for them. This may lead them to still reject him; for, as already stated, we do not find that even the loss of heaven and the experience of chains under darkness have reconciled lost angels to God. While they choose to sin, therefore, we see no injustice in their being punished, even if they sin forever.

That the Bible contains forewarnings and instructions which ought to be sufficient to deter men from future misery, we learn even from the reply of Abraham to the rich man in hell. The rich man desired that Lazarus might be sent to his father's house with testimony concerning that "place of torment." Abraham replied that "they have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." The rich

man could easily have reminded Abraham, if truth permitted, that there is nothing about that place in the Old Testament. He makes no such answer, but pleads the supposed efficacy of a visiter from the unseen world. Abraham replied that such a visiter could have no effect on those who do not believe the testimony of the Old Testament on that subject. All this is from the lips of Jesus Christ.

Inasmuch as we cast no blame on God for the present condition and conduct of cannibals, and pagans, and atheists, and blasphemers, and slave traders, and every other description of wicked men, neither do they themselves impute blame to him, we do not feel that God will be responsible for the endless wickedness and misery of sinners; nor will they charge him with injustice more than they now do.

We believe that the God of the New Testament is the same unchangeable God of the Old Testament; that Christ has not modified the divine character nor altered one principle of the divine administration; but that the New Testament reveals the mercy of God in full orbed beauty, though its outlines were always visible from the beginning; that all which was terrible in the God who destroyed the old world and Sodom and Gomorrah, and cast down rebel angels from heaven to hell, is still the same, and that when mercy has failed under the New Testament to recover sinners, the God of the Old Testament and of the New will be their Judge and King. We read that "it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God,"—"For our God is a consuming fire."

And we have our choice, to love and serve such a God as this, or to reject him and take the consequences. Our private experience persuades us that He is good. He has always been just and kind, gentle, easy to be entreated. In all our afflictions he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved us. Knowing this, his stern, uncompromising hatred of sin, his power to inflict suffering, and to look upon it, forever, if necessary, give us confidence in Him. We may need such attributes for the foundation of our safety and of our confidence in God, as much as that attribute which we now separate from the rest of his character and call his love.

We believe that the Bible teaches,—for surely it follows of course from all which has now been adduced,—that some proportion of pain and misery will forever exist under the government of God. The idea that they are to be wholly expurgated is contradicted by the Scriptures, and is mere fancy. But the scale of things being hereafter enlarged to our apprehension, and the reasons for one thing and another which are now but partially explained, being more fully apparent, we think we see in the present feelings of good citizens with regard to law, and punishments, and the officers of justice, how future pain and misery in their relation to the infinitely blessed system of government over a universe of free agents, will by no means diminish the happiness of that multitude of obedient souls which no man can number.

I have always been struck by the consideration that the passages from which Universalists infer the

final happiness of all men, do not occur in the Bible in connection with the punishment of the wicked. This is of the utmost importance. It is one presumptive proof that, occurring as they do apart from any mention of the punishment of the wicked, they belong to other subjects. And so we find them, in connection with the blessedness of the righteous, the ultimate victories of Christ over his enemies, his final reign, and the happiness of heaven. But we look in vain for passages where promises, prophecies, hints, of ultimate restoration occur in connection with the subject of future punishment. It will not be disputed that there are passages which seem to teach future, endless punishment; and the attempt is to show that they are "metaphorical." But some appear to think that "*metaphorical*" means "*fictitious*," "*unreal;*" on the contrary "metaphorical" language is generally the stronger way of asserting any thing, being resorted to for the purpose of intensifying the expression. But how remarkable it is that we find no clause nor phrase, neither literal, nor "metaphorical," limiting the main drift of a passage which speaks of future, endless punishment, or suggesting the idea of restoration. The bold, terrific language of Scripture, asserting the future punishment of the wicked, has not one word of qualification.

We frequently meet with such representations, and illustrations as the following, in modern writers,—from whom I had intended to quote several passages: but the following statement of their views will suffice: The soul is God's child. Will a mother ever cast off

its offspring? No, neither will the great "Mother of us all," the love of God. The worst of men — the Judases, the Neroes, and Caligulas will at last fulfil their career of sin and sorrow, and return to the bosom of God. As the earth in some parts of its orbit drives away from the sun, but soon comes "rounding back again," so every creature that God ever made, Satan and all, (if there be any Satan,) will at last accomplish its terrible career, and passing its solstice, rejoice in a new moral existence. Some astronomical difficulties in this borrowed illustration we will all excuse.

The brief reply to all such fancies, is this: Have we a Bible? Does it give us any intimation of such a revolution, such an orbit, for the lost soul? We read of "wandering stars, to whom is reserved the mist of darkness forever and ever;" but where does the Bible, in speaking of the spirit launching forth on its aphelion, intimate that its path is a cycle, and not a straight line?

We see one part of the race "go away into everlasting punishment." But this is said to be merely "a metaphor." We will be grateful even for "a metaphor," if there be any, representing their return.

We have lately been furnished, from high authority in the Universalist denomination, with some of the principal proof texts in the discourses of Christ in favor of the salvation of all men. They occur in the review already spoken of (in the preface to this article,) written by Rev. Dr. Thomas Whittemore, in which

he endeavors to answer Rev. T. S. King's assertion that he could not find any text or discourse of Christ which contains the doctrine of the final happiness of all men. Dr. W., of course, would here bring forth some of his strong proofs, for he says of Mr. K.'s Discourses, "We think they will do as much to break down Universalism as to break down the doctrine of endless misery." The following are Dr. W.'s quotations from the words of Christ to prove that He taught the final salvation of all men.

1. John iv: 42. "This is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." Dr. W. gives an extended exposition of the discourse of Christ at the well of Samaria, which gave occasion to these words of the Samaritans; and he says, "Jesus Christ, let it be remembered, is declared to be the Saviour of the world; and how could he be justly called the Saviour of the world if the world shall never be saved?" p. 390.

2. "All things are delivered unto me of my Father." This is a major premise. "All that the Father hath given me shall come to me," is the minor premise. "To come to Christ is to become a Christian."—p. 391. This involves the *ergo* of the proposition. He adds, "We have by no means exhausted our proof," p. 392, and he gives us,

3. "'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.' We have the word of Christ for it—'will draw all men unto me.'" p. 392.

4. "Jesus answered, 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage

but are as the angels of God in heaven.' If angels are holy, mankind are to be holy; if angels are to be happy, mankind are to be happy." "This is a distinct and positive declaration of the purity and happiness of all men." "How then," Dr. W. says, "can we adopt the language of Mr. King and say, 'I do not find the doctrine,' &c. Strange declaration! Jesus joined two great facts together, the resurrection of all men and their exaltation to the condition of angels." p. 395.

Such passages are, in the opinion of Dr. Whittemore, a plain, obvious refutation, from Christ himself, of that, in Dr. W.'s view, dangerous assertion by Mr. K. that "the ultimate salvation of all souls is not clearly taught in any text or discourse in the Gospels."

I close by recapitulating the principal topics which have now been considered.

The Scriptures reveal a future state of reward and punishment.

They teach that the body and soul will be joined in future happiness and misery.

Christ teaches that God can destroy both body and soul in hell. If God cannot morally do this, the declaration is unintelligible; it answers no purpose of instruction.

Future punishment will therefore be a natural operation of moral laws, sustained and made effectual by the hand of God upon the sinner;—who, by his state of depravity, will be made susceptible to misery forever.

The essential elements of misery remain in the wicked after death.

Redemption by Christ is represented as having for its object salvation from final perdition.

The work of the Holy Spirit as a part of redemption, and the unpardonable sin against him, prove that the present is the final effort to save men.

None of the passages relied on to prove final restoration occur in connection with the subject of future punishment, but with the reign of Christ and the happiness of the righteous.

No passage of the Bible discloses the future repentance of the wicked.

Promises of restoration, made to sinners who in this world were to become penitent, always occur in connection with threatenings and doom. No such promises are made in connection with the threatenings of future punishment or with the final doom of the wicked.

The Bible closes with an express declaration of the future unchangeableness of character.

There are no prophetic visions in the New Testament which contemplate deliverance from hell, and corresponding to visions of God's ancient people in captivity and of their release and restoration.

The fall of angels and of man is a confirmatory argument in favor of future punishment, seeing that if God did not keep them from falling he can consistently refuse to restore them.

The terms used with regard to the resurrection of the dead show that the wicked will have experienced

no change since death, but will come forth from their graves to the resurrection of damnation.

If the wicked are punished hereafter merely for their own good, there is no such thing as sin against God, or our neighbor;—which is contrary to Scripture.

The law of God has no curse, if future punishment be in all cases disciplinary.

The sentence passed upon the impenitent indiscriminately, forbids the idea of discipline in future punishment.

It is inconceivable that fallen angels and "the spirits in prison" who were on earth "in the days of Noah," should not long ago have repented of their sins, if repentance were the object sought by their punishment.

If death and the scenes within the veil previous to the judgment day, do not effect repentance in the wicked, there is no ground to think that their banishment from Christ with the fallen angels at the last day is intended for their reformation, or would effect it.

"Forever" and "Everlasting" always denote *the whole*, as to duration, of that with which they stand connected.

If a finite being cannot justly be punished forever, then if the whole universe should sin forever, it could not be punished forever, because the whole intelligent universe also is finite.

The duration of future punishment is expressed in the New Testament by the terms employed to denote

absolute eternity in cases which are never questioned.

The provision made in the incarnation, sufferings, and death of the Son of God for pardon and salvation, and the abundant calls to repentance and offers of eternal life through Christ, to all, will make the final impenitence of sinners inexcusable, and their misery will be of their own procuring.

I may be allowed, in closing, to quote the words of the Apostle Paul, which those who preach and are set for the defence of the Gospel, must not hesitate to adopt: "For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ in them that are saved and in them that perish. To the one we are the savor of death unto death, and to the other the savor of life unto life. And who is sufficient for these things?" 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16.

Pursuing my ordinary labors, a Universalist and Unitarian clergyman of this city invited me to repeat in his pulpit, a sermon on this subject to which he had listened in my church. As I profess not to be ashamed of the Gospel of Christ which, in my view, involves the doctrine of endless punishment, I complied with his request. This has led to the present communication. Had mere controversy been my object, I would not have sought to discuss the Scriptural view of this subject, with such admissions before me as those of Rev. T. S. King and Rev. Theodore Parker. When I read them, I thought that one whose only object was to get the advantage of an opponent might be justified in feeling with regard to the doctrine of Restoration, as Joab did when he

found Absalom in the tree, and he blew a trumpet and all the people returned from the battle. Such men as Mr. K. and Mr. P., seeing the doctrine of endless punishment in the literal speech of the Bible as interpreted by us, and rejecting its inspiration partly because they find it there, relieve us greatly from the need of holding controversies on this subject. Controversy has not been my motive. I have sought to persuade my reader to flee with me for refuge, to lay hold upon the hope set before us.

In the foregoing discussion, I am not aware that there is any thing which intentionally reflects upon the understanding or motives of others. It has cost no effort to abstain from being, in any way, derisory, or satirical, or contemptuous. Conscious only of kindness and good will to all, and grateful for this opportunity to state and defend important principles, I am, the reader's friend and servant,

N. ADAMS.

Boston, December 10, 1858.

PART II.

NEGATIVE ARGUMENT.

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

PART II.

THE NEGATIVE:

OR,

A REVIEW OF DR. ADAMS' AFFIRMATIVE "SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT."

BY REV. SYLVANUS COBB.

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS.

In entering upon a work of so great magnitude as this which lies before us, our self-distrust leads us to press near in prayer to the Father of lights, that we may lose our weakness in the majesty and might of Christian truth. We may as well, here in the outset, state the real question before us, in such form that the reader may be possessed from the beginning of a just conception of its nature, in its relations to the honor of God and the interests of human existence. It is, whether the creation of God, and his system of moral government, shall so eventuate, as to make the result of creation upon the whole a catastrophe, and the ultimate employment of the mass of his children the lamenting of existence, cursing Him who made

them, and howling in infinite torments. For the affirmative of this tremendous question, arguments variously classified, scholastically arranged, and ingeniously conducted, by one of the most naturally talented, theologically learned, and practically expert Doctors of the popular schools, we have had the moral courage to spread out in our columns before our thousands of readers; and now it devolves upon us as a bounden religious duty to search these arguments—in the fear of God and love of truth. And we seriously believe, and are confident that our readers generally, who, with prayerful candor, accompany us in this review, will see with us, that the Doctor's arguments, though sincerely estimated by himself as sufficient, do wholly fail of showing the "Scripturalness" of the doctrine in question.

We say not this to forestall the judgment of the people, but to elicit a scrutinizing attention to what we expect to show. We have looked the arguments through, and the fact is, that the learned Doctor has *assumed* his main positions. And we have a fraternal apology to present on his behalf, forefending the impeachment of his moral integrity, for this assumption of his main positions. These assumed positions of his, have, for centuries, been established and cardinal doctrines of the nominally Orthodox Councils and Synods of the Church. This is an apology for his assumption of the ground principles of his arguments, which could not be pleaded on *our* behalf for any assumption whatever. All our positions it is required of us that we prove.

In respect to the settled theological authority which we so fraternally make our learned friend's apology for taking his main positions for granted, Miss Catharine Beecher, daughter of the venerable Dr. Lyman Beecher, in her "*Common Sense Applied to Religion*," gives some interesting historical facts. Speaking of the theological warfare which raged between Augustine and Pelagius, of the Fifth Century, Miss Beecher says:

"At this period all matters of doctrine were settled by ecclesiastical councils. The first council on this matter was in Africa, and led by Augustine, they condemned the views of Pelagius. The two next councils were in Palestine, and both sustained his teachings. Next, in Italy, the Pope, then at the early period of pontifical power, first sustained Pelagius, but finally, by the exertions of Augustine and his party, was led to condemn him with the greatest severity. Finally, the emperors were enlisted against him with their civil pains and penalties. The result was, Pelagius and his followers suffered the perils and miseries of civil ecclesiastical persecution. 'And thus,' says the historian, 'the Gauls, Britons, and Africans by their councils, and the emperors by their edicts, demolished this sect in its infancy, and suppressed it entirely.'

"It is very probable that, if Pelagius had had the power and adroitness of Augustine, the edicts of the emperors and decrees of councils would have maintained *his* views, and those of Augustine would have gone into obscurity. But ever since that day the organized power of the Latin, Greek, and Protestant churches has been arrayed to sustain the theories thus inaugurated."—pp. 299, 300.

So, then, courtly intrigue on the part of the Endless-miserian* Augustine, wielding the bloody power

* This is an adjective of our own coining, which we compounded many years ago, to supply a want in descriptive terms. It is not designed as an opprobrius epithet, expressive of personal disrespect, any more than the term Trinitarian, Unitarian, Calvanist, or Universalist. There has

of semi-barbarous western princes, vanquished by physical force the Universalist Pelagius* and his confriers, and established for the Church a system of orthodoxy, which, to this day, commands the unquestioning reverence of thousands and millions, including learned and good men, rolling on in the fearful majesty of Juggernaut's car, loved and adored while it crushes the heart and outrages the moral nature. This is not declamation. Our readers will see it to be sober fact, as we attend, shortly, to the effort of our worthy friend on that side to adjust the obnoxious doctrine to the benevolent pleadings of his moral sense.

But as we have quoted from the talented Miss Beecher in relation to the adroitness of Augustine, in procuring the decrees of Councils and enlisting the swords of tyrants for the suppression of Pelgianism, we will present her very pleasant but reasonable speculations on the probable results of Pelagius' suc-

not been in use any single term which properly designates believers in endless punishment. The epithets *Partialist*, and *Limitarian*, convey an implication which those to whom they are applied may not acknowledge just. But *Endless-Miserian* expresses precisely the characteristic, in respect to doctrine, by which the opposers of Universalism are distinguished. This epithet, therefore, we apply to Augustine, to avoid a circumlocution which would spoil the measure of the sentence.

**The Universalist Pelagius.* The ecclesiastical historians of the church have not yet been interested to bring out the Universalism of Pelagius. His advocacy of the unity in opposition to the trinity of the Godhead, and of the unselfishness and benevolence of the Divine nature and government, and of man's susceptibility of spiritual culture, has been well known. But Rev. J. C. Pitrat, member of the French Academy of Arts and Sciences, and a convert from the Roman Catholic Priesthood, who reads ecclesiastical history in all languages as familiarly as we read our mother tongue, in a series of original papers published in the *Christian Freeman*, Vol. XVIII. pp. 125, 129, 145, shows that Pelagius held the finite nature of sin, the disciplinary character of punishment, the purpose of Christ's mission to save from sin and not from any arbitrary penalty of the law, and the parental character and blessed result of the Divine administration.

cess, had he possessed Augustine's tact and effrontery:

"It is a matter for interesting conjecture as to the probable results on Christendom had the theory of Pelagius been established by pope, emperor, and councils, instead of that of Augustine.

"In that case we may suppose that the efforts and energies of the churches, instead of to these rites and forms, would have been mainly directed to the *right training* of the human mind in obedience to all the physical, domestic, social, and moral laws of the Creator.

"Instead of instituting two standards of right and wrong, the 'common' and the 'evangelical,' as is now so generally done, children would have been taught that all that was just, honorable, benevolent, and lovely in their feelings and conduct was as acceptable and right to God as it is to men. Their parents, instead of that sense of helpless inability resulting from the belief that their little ones could feel and do nothing but sin until new mental powers were given, and that the gift was bestowed by the rule of sovereign 'election,' would have felt that every successful effort to cultivate all lovely and right habits and feelings was advancing their offspring nearer to God and their heavenly home, and that, when their wisdom failed, the promise of 'the Comforter' was given to encourage them in this great work."—pp. 310, 311.

But the theory of Augustine, by monarchial and military power, prevailed. And here it is worthy of observation, that while, as noted by Miss Beecher, the Eastern or Asiatic Councils, covering the region which was the compass of Jesus' personal ministry, and that of most of his apostles, sustained the Universalist Pelagius, Augustine enlisted the power of the arbitrary governments of Europe, as if there was a marital affinity between the spirit of those governments and that of the espoused theology.

One purpose in the introduction of these facts and

reflections here, is, to prepare the minds of our readers to see our respected friend of the Augustinian side in this discussion, assume that certain Scripture passages refer to future endless punishment, as a matter of course. For when this doctrine was established by the *powers that were*, the ingenuity of the tacticians was expert in reading at it all the Scripture records of legal penalties, denunciations and judgments; and great and good men, in the Orthodox line of reading from childhood, read such Scriptures along in the same line with no dishonorable intention. But more of this in a future chapter, where it is directly called up by the Doctor.

From these preliminary observations, we proceed to a particular notice of two or three things in our learned friend's

"INTRODUCTORY REMARKS."

Of the two or three things referred to, which we must notice before proceeding to the "SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT," the following is worthy of very serious attention.

"The most of those who believe in future, endless punishment have far more peace of mind with regard to it than they appear to have who deny it; for with evangelical believers it sinks into its just proportion in the universal government of God, as the State's Prison, Court of law, and Officers of Justice, blend, like the tonic element of iron in the blood, into the life of a commonwealth with its virtuous and happy homes, its hundreds of thousands of joyous children, its churches, its products, its whole prosperous tide of affairs."

The frame of mind and feeling designed to be exhibited in this remarkable paragraph, must have cost

the heart of its benevolent author a severe preparatory discipline. Of course he had a purpose in presenting this expression of it in his Introductory Remarks. He writes nothing without a purpose. And if his design was to produce such an influence upon the minds of our readers as to predispose them to receive his Scriptural Arguments for the doctrine in question with less scrunity, it is worthy of some reasonable labor here, on our part, to counteract that unwholesome influence, and prepare the minds of the people to approach the whole subject as unbiased and scrutinizing judges, settling every question upon its own merits.

There is a question suggested by the foregoing paragraph, which we feel called upon to notice in various bearings.

Is this a truthful representation of the "just proportion" which the doctrine in question bears, or of its relative importance, in the whole system of this world? We strongly suspect that the benevolent feelings of the Doctor have urged him to an effort at harmonizing his moral susceptibilities with his theology, or his theology with those susceptibilities, by which he has unwittingly deceived himself. In no point of view do his analogies hold good.

1. As it respects the spirit and manner of the inflictions, the difference is infinite. "The State's Prison" removes the offender from the midst of society, for the protection of society, and his restraint and safe keeping. But when he is there the "Officers of Justice" manifest to him their sym-

pathies, and afford him every comfort which they are able to bestow. They make his apartment as pleasant and healthful as may be, in temperature, his labor reasonable, his clothing comfortable, his food nourishing and wholesome, and his whole treatment humane and conciliating. And so far from their taking pains to *prevent reformation* by excluding all means toward it, appropriate means are assiduously employed to enlighten the mind and improve the heart. Among these means are religious books, kindly conversation, the Sunday School, and the services in general of a pious and loving Chaplain. Such is the State's Prison, in connection with the agencies of Officers of Justice.

But how is it with our learned friend's *future, endless punishment?* Turn over to his vivid description of it in his "Scriptural Argument" numbered I. In opposition to the idea held by some believers in the eternity of punishment, that the instrument of punishment shall be their own conscience only, he says,—

"So that however terrible and bitter the condition of the sinner might be at first, it is not inconceivaole that he should at last say, with Satan in Paradise Lost,—'Hail! horrors, hail! and thou profoundest hell!' if God would but depart from him. Sinking into a torpid, brutish state, or rousing themselves into defiant forms of hatred and blasphemy, occupying themselves with plots and counter plots in their strife with each other, the wicked in hell, like the bad or abandoned people here, might make their condition tolerable. . . . . If, therefore, there is to be, in the strict sense of he term, punishment after death, it would seem that there must in the nacure of things, be visitations upon the wicked of that which the Bible calls 'indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish.'

While there must be in the sinner himself a state of things which will make these inflictions punishments, there must also be a mighty hand stretched out forever to make the future condition of the wicked one of retribution. There is both error and truth in the common saying with many that future misery will proceed from conscience;— error, if it be supposed that conscience left to itself will occasion torment; for if in this world with so much to stimulate conscience, it so easily falls asleep, the provocations, and the necessity of self-defence, and redress, and all the bad influences of hell, must have the power to totally sear it;— but there is truth in the saying, if it be allowed that God is to visit the wicked in ways that will excite conscience against them; this would be "infliction," compared with which fire and brimstone, though the most appalling images of torture, we can easily conceive do not convey more terrible ideas of retribution."

In this style our friend proceeds at considerable length to exhibit and elucidate his views of the miseries of hell, as being, in great part, positive inflictions by the hand of God. We stop not to raise questions here as to the correctness of his application of the Scriptures he quotes in this connection, to future punishment. This will be attended to when we reach that point of his argument in our review. Our present aim is to bring his subsequent description of this assumed punishment into one connected view with the representation of it given in his Introductory Remarks. If the Christian people of Charlestown, while going to and from their business from day to day, and to and from the house of God on Sabbath morning, noon and night, should hear the voices of wailing, and the screeches of anguish from the State's Prison, and on inquiry find that the officers of the prison, lest the prisoners should relapse into insensibility to their unhappy state, were employing

most of their time in jeering at their degradation, and stirring them up to a sense of their wretchedness by positive and outward inflictions, by racks, pincers, goads, nettles, scalds and burns,—every feeling of humanity would be outraged, the whole city would be up in arms, and the whole State, as the news should spread, and hurl those fiends from their posts of dishonored power. But our friend represents that the infinite Jehovah will shut out millions of his dependent creatures, finally, from all beauty, light and good, and, lest their habitual gloom and wretchedness should conduce to their insensibility, he will then employ his great power in positive inflictions of pain, and stirring up and exciting their anguish, that, through endless ages, they may roll and writhe in ceaseless living torment. He will say, if this is God's truth we must believe it whether it comports with our moral consciousness of honor and right or not. But this is not now the question. We will give sober attention to that by and by. We are now showing that the Doctor's *Argument* does not make any such tame and comfortable thing of endless punishment, as a subject of faith and reflection, as his *Introduction* would have it. It occupies, in its spirit and manner, no such relative proportion in the system of the world, as prisons and officers of justice occupy in relation to all the enterprise and good of the Commonwealth.

2. And then, in respect to extent, or numerical proportion, the representation in the Introduction is infinitely wide of the reality. The tenants of the

State's Prison, and of all the penitentiaries, compose but a very small fraction of all the population of the State. But according to the theory of our friend and those whom he calls "evangelical Christians," the tenants and heirs of hell are the mass of mankind. The absence from amongst them of the few heirs of heaven will hardly make a perceptible difference of the bulk of the great whole, more than the absence of the prison tenants makes of the whole community of our State. Of the eight hundred millions of living people on our globe, a great majority are heathen, none of whom, except the little handful converted by the Missionaries, will be saved. Our friend's theory as presented by himself, admits of no hope for them. In his tract on *Instantaneous Conversion*, entitled "Truths for the Times, Number Two," he employs the following phraseology:—"A man may be the most perfect of moralists, and if this be all he will yet fail to be saved; because God has not appointed morality to be the ground of justification." (p. 21.) "If the Saviour be, to some, Supreme God, but to others only 'the young man of Nazareth;' or if he be to some an atoning sacrifice for sin, and to others only an efflorescence of human perfectibility; and again, if he be to us One who was 'with God,' as well as 'God,' and to others merely a superhuman testimony of divine love, a created being greatly endowed,—our views and feelings on religious subjects will totally differ in things esteemed by some to be essential to salvation." (p. 2.) Here it will be observed that he speaks expressly of things esteemed by some,

himself included of course, as essential to salvation. And of these things is the belief in Jesus as Supreme God, and as an atoning, meaning a vicarious sacrifice for sin. Again he says, "To begin and be good is not the divinely appointed method of being saved, but to be 'justified' from our sins by exercising faith in the sufferings and death of Christ as a satisfaction to divine justice, and thus to receive, by the grace of God, a change of nature."

The substance of all this, and that whole tract, is, that there is no possible way by which men can be saved, by which he means

"T' escape from hell and fly to heaven,"

but by having wrought in them a preternatural change of nature by the immediate agency of the Holy Spirit, accompanied by the trinitarian belief in the proper Deity of Christ, and his vicarious sufferings in the way of satisfying the demands of justice upon the chosen ones. And this excludes, of course, all the heathen; and it excludes also more than nineteen-twentieths, perhaps ninety-nine hundredths of the population of nominal Christendom. The great mass of good citizens whom the Doctor meets when he walks abroad, and with whom he holds business and social intercourse, are, according to his theory, heirs of hell. And, unlike the penitentiary abode of a very few for a brief space of time where they have administered to them sympathy and kindness and comfort, that dire abode of the mass of mankind for eternity has the Dragon and his angels appointed as God's agents in the work of torturous inflictions, and

in the lead of all, God himself will be eternally employed in sharpening up their pains!

How, then, in view of this theory of future endless punishment, involved in his "Argument" before us, and his other publications, can our friend command his feelings so as to profess so comfortable a "peace of mind with regard to it," insomuch that it sinks into a proportion in relation to the whole race and their destiny, like that of courts and prisons in relation to the population and interests of the State? Some may uncharitably suggest that his theology has hardened his heart and calloused his moral feelings. But it is not so. All who know him will cheerfully accord to his claim where he says in his "Argument" before us, No. VII, "I am not cruel." As we said before, the frame of mind and feeling designed to be exhibited in the remarkable paragraph we have been criticising, must have cost the heart of its benevolent author a severe preparatory discipline. And we think that, instead of his success in soothing himself into this idea of satisfaction and rest resulting from hardness, it implies an undercurrent from the force of his Christian feelings, bringing in, unconsciously to his intellect, a secret heart-hope of better things.

3. But there are, and have been, many of the greatest and noblest minds, in the educated faith of endless punishment, who were unable to pathetize themselves into so comfortable a frame in relation to it.

The pious and eloquent Saurin, having been por-

traying the horrors of endless damnation, broke forth in the following affecting strain:

"I sink! I sink under the awful weight of my subject; and I declare, when I see my friends, my relations, the people of my charge, this whole congregation; when I think that I, that you, that we are all threatened with these torments; when I see in the lukewarmness of my devotions, in the languor of my love, in the levity of my resolutions and designs, the least evidence, though it be only presumptive, of my future misery, yet I find in the thought a mortal poison, which diffuseth itself into every period of my life, rendering society tiresome, nourishment insipid, pleasure disgustful, and life itself a cruel bitter. I CEASE TO WONDER THAT THE FEAR OF HELL HATH MADE SOME MAD AND OTHERS MELANCHOLY."

Rev. Albert Barnes, D. D., one of the most talented and popular living Orthodox divines in our own country, thus ingenuously confesses his deep anguish of spirit from the legitimate influence of the doctrine in question:

"That the immortal mind should be allowed to jeopard its infinite welfare, and that trifles should be allowed to draw it away from God, and virtue, and heaven; that any should suffer forever — lingering on in hopeless despair, and rolling amidst infinite torments without the possibility of alleviation and without end;— that since God *can* save men, and *will* save a part, he has not purposed to save *all*, — that on the supposition that the atonement is ample, and that the blood of Christ can cleanse from all and every sin, it is not in fact applied to all;— that, in a word, a God, who claims to be worthy of the confidence of the universe, and to be a Being of infinite benevolence, should make such a world as this — full of sinners and sufferers; and that when an atonement had been made, he did not save *all* the race, and put an end to sin and woe forever. . . . . I have read, to some extent, what wise and good men have written. I have looked at their theories and explanations. I have endeavored to weigh their arguments — for my whole soul pants

for light and relief on these questions. But I get neither; and in the distress and anguish of my own spirit, I confess that I see no light whatever. I see not one ray to disclose to me the reason why sin came into the world; why the earth is strewed with the dying and dead, and why man must suffer to all eternity. I have never seen a particle of light thrown on these subjects that has given a moment's *ease to my tortured mind*, nor have I an explanation to offer, or a thought to suggest, which would be of relief to you. I trust other men — as they profess to do — understand this better than I do, and that they have not the ANGUISH OF SPIRIT which I have; but I confess, when I look on a world of sinners and sufferers; upon death-beds and grave-yards; upon the world of woe filled with hosts to suffer forever; when I see my friends, my parents, my family, my people, my fellow-citizens — when I look upon a whole race, all involved in this sin and danger, and when I see the great mass of them wholly unconcerned, and when I feel that God can only save them, and yet he does not do it, I am struck dumb. It is all dark — dark — dark to my soul — and I cannot disguise it.— *Barnes' Prac. Sermons,*" *pp.* 123 — 125.

Professor Stuart, than whom the Orthodox church can boast none more profoundly learned and universally beloved, exposed his fine moral feelings in relation to this subject in a manner which honors the man. We transfer to this article the following extract of the *Biblical Repository*, from the *Christian Freeman* of Dec. 27th, 1850, with the editorial remarks which we then made when the venerable Professor was in the active service of life.

"Speaking of the fact that a great many preachers and laymen in the Orthodox churches have a secret belief in Universalism, the reasons of it the Professor gives in the following language:—

"There are minds of a very serious cast, and prone to reasoning and inquiry, that have in some way come into such a state, that

doubt on the subject of endless punishment cannot without the greatest difficulty, be removed from them.

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

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

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

even monstrous to suppress them.' They are, therefore, as they view the case, constrained to doubt whether the miseries of a future world can be endless.

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

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

We agree with the Professor, of course, that all good men, who reflect at all, must be conscious of the thoughts and feelings above expressed, and that by these feelings many are led to hope for the ultimate salvation of all men. And many more are led by it to such a candid and earnest search of the Scriptures, as discovers to their view this hope, clear as noon-day, everywhere taught in the word of God. And we are confident that Prof. Stuart himself, if it were not for the embarrassing influence of his official name and station, would see this hope, so consonant with all his Christian prayers and sympathies, *and sense of justice*, to be the conspicuous revelation of the gospel.

4. And not only have a great many of the greatest and best of men felt the crushing weight of the doctrine of endless punishment, in its irreconcilable warfare against their moral sense and social sympathies, but not a few such have found it the destroyer of their peace in life by the uncertainty in which it involves their own case. Believing that their eternal all, for happiness or woe irreversible, is to be determined at a given day, by a jealous king and inexorable judge whose rule of government is his own glory and not the good of his creatures, (as if he might have a glory in opposition to the interest of his creation,) and believing that the final decision is to be based upon the discernment, by his all-searching eye, of a nicely balanced model of Orthodox belief and experience, their modest self-distrust shrinks and quails, and their lives are distressed with harassing fears.

An interesting and instructive example of this unhappy influence of the doctrine in question, is furnished in the case of Miss Catherine Beecher, before quoted, as drawn by herself in her "Common Sense Applied to Religion." It will be borne in mind that she is a lady of the first order of intellectual ability, and literary culture, and of fine moral mould; and that she was religiously educated from the cradle by one of the most faithful and pious fathers, and eminent Doctors of the Divinity under discussion. She says:

"In the earlier periods of my religious train, my parents, in their instructions, and also my little hymns and catechisms, made the impression that God loved little children, and, though he was an-

gry when they did wrong, he was pleased when they did right; and as parental government was tender and loving, my impression of the feelings of the heavenly Parent were conformed to this, my past experience.

"But when, in more mature years, I came under the influence of 'revival preaching,' all this impression seemed to be reversed. I was taught to look at God as a great 'moral governor,' whose chief interest was 'to sustain his law.' Then there seemed to be two kinds of right and wrong, the 'common' and the 'evangelical.' According to this distinction, I could not feel or do any thing that was right *or* acceptable *to God* till my birth-gift of a depraved heart was renewed by a special divine interposition.

"Meantime, there did not seem to be any direct and practical way of securing this supernatural interference; for it was to be the result, not of any efforts of mine, nor were any divine promises or encouragements offered to secure my efforts. On the contrary, the selection of the recipients of this favor was regulated by a divine decree of 'election,' without reference to any acts of a being who did nothing but evil, and only evil, till this favor was bestowed. Moreover, all the exhortations to effort were based simply on the fact that, ordinarily, those who took a certain course were selected, though I perceived that sometimes those who did the least were chosen, while those who did the most were passed by.

"It was this view of the case that had the chief influence in leading to an entire neglect of all religious concerns. It was so nearly like a matter of mere chance, and there seemed so little adaptation of means to ends, that, to one so hopeful, and, at the same time, so practical, there was very little motive of any kind to lead to a religious life."—pp. 16—18.

* * * * * * * * * * *

"At twenty that betrothal took place, so soon and so fatally ended! It was the realization of all my favorite dreams of earthly bliss. Affection, taste, ambition, every thing most desirable to me and to family, friends, seemed secured. In a few months all was ended, and in the most terrible and heart-rending manner.

"After the first stunning effect was over, the next feeling was, 'This is that indispensable sorrow. This is to save me from *eternal death!*' And so, as soon as I could do any thing, I began a

course of religious reading, prayer, and mental conflict. I tried to remedy that pernicious mental habit of reverie and castle building; I tried to do I know not what in 'becoming a Christian.'

"Shut up in entire seclusion, all my dearest hopes forever crushed, without hope or object in life, overwhelmed with grief, horrified less at his dreadful death than at the awful apprehensions he himself had imparted that he was unprepared to die, I spent week after week in reading the stern and powerful writings of President Edwards, Dwight's System of Theology, and other similar works. I hoped for nothing, cared for nothing but to become a Christian. Yet no one could tell me intelligibly how to do it, while it was clear that all expected nothing from my efforts, and that all was dependent on a divine efflatus that was to change the birth-gift of a depraved heart.

"Next, I went to visit the parents of the friend I had lost. Here I read his private records of *years* of almost superhuman effort to govern his mind, and to achieve the very thing I was laboring for, and yet to his mind, all ended in entire failure; and this, too, without any murmuring, or any accusation of any one but himself. It was, as he maintained, because he was so ungrateful, so hardened, so obstinately 'unwilling,' so averse from God and his service. And yet he was the model of every domestic, social, and official virtue; so reverent to God, so tender as a son and brother, so conscientious and faithful as an instructor! In not a single duty did he fail that the closest intimacy could discover; and yet, by his own showing, he had no love to God, and was entirely 'unwilling' to love and serve him.

"At the same time, I found his intelligent, tender, heart-broken mother, had for years been living just such a conscientious life, without any hope that she was a Christian, while now her pride and darling son was lost to her forever on earth, and oh! where was he? and where should she meet him at last? And thus she died. The only brother too, as conscientious and exemplary, was, and long continued in the same position of mind." pp. xix--xxi.

With what perfect truth and naturalness this sketch of experience is given. And the experience belongs to the theory to which it is here ascribed, as effect

to cause. Miss Catharine was discouraged on finding that so many of her dearest friends, persons of the best culture and highest moral excellence, were in her own predicament. They were reposing full confidence in a theology, (so sovereign was the power of education over their minds,) which made them totally corrupt sinners, and heirs of hell, while they were straining every effort to be and do right. And the reason why they could not believe themselves to be Christians, was, that their intellect and moral nature warred against their theology.

But to return to the experience of Miss Catharine. After speaking, as quoted above, of the astounding discovery, that so many of her most orthodox and cherished friends were cursed with the same war of the creed with their moral nature, she continues:—

"These revelations took away all hope of any good from any farther efforts of mine. At this period I almost lost my reason. For some days I thought I should go distracted. The first decided 'change of mind' I now recall was an outburst of indignation and abhorrence. I remember once rising, as I was about to offer my usual, now hopeless prayer, with a feeling very like this; that such a God did not deserve to be loved; that I would not love him if I could, and I was glad I did not! It was but momentary, and the long training of years resumed its sway.

"It was at this period that I framed my first attempt at serious argument in a letter to my father. I took this position, that our own *experience* and *consciousness* were the highest kind of evidence of our mental power, and that I had this evidence of our mental inability to love God as required. My father's reply was published in the *Christian Spectator*, and was regarded as masterly and unanswerable. Its chief aim was to lessen confidence in my own consciousness, and to show that, as God was just and good, and

certainly did require supreme love to him, we had the power to obey. I was unable to meet the argument, and so allowed that it must be so, and that all that was in my way, was my own obstinate 'unwillingness.'" pp. xxi—xxii.

It appears from this that her father's treatment of the subject was sophistical and arbitrary, entangling the mind in its snare, while the heart throbbed convulsively its moral protest. But she proceeds in a strain which shows that her reason was but partially paralyzed :—

"But there was another point about which I attempted to reason that I did not give up so easily. According to the theory of 'obstinate unwillingness,' there was nothing in the Bible by way of promise, or even encouragement, for any like me. For how could God feel sympathy for obstinate rebels, or how make promises of hope and encouragement to those whose only difficulty was an unreasonable dislike to God and his service? Such texts as I quoted to the contrary (as Prov. ii. 1—5; Matt. vii. 7; John iv.10;) were not for such as I, but for those already converted; and no prayers even were acceptable till offered by a renewed heart. So it seemed impossible in any case, to pray acceptably to God for the greatest of all boons, redemption from the awful doom of eternal death; for at regeneration the blessing was already given, and before that act no prayer was acceptable. So there was no place for such a prayer. This I never accepted, though I did not quite venture to oppose it."

How clearly this brilliant paragraph exposes the perplexity of the orthodox theory, associating the duty to try, with the utter inability to do. We were sometimes almost distracted, in our childhood, by the shifting of the ministry to which we listened, backward and forward, to and from the injunction to pray for a new heart, and the assurance that, until after we should have got a new heart our very prayers would be an abomination to God, and sink us deeper in hell.

While we honor the motives of those who labor to propagate such a system of theology, honestly believing it to be true, we cannot but believe it to be unfavorable in its influence with regard to the encouragement and progress of the mass of minds in the pursuit of Christian knowledge and the achievement of Christian culture.

We are protracting this division of our labor beyond our first intention; but our friend has given our mind an impulse in this direction, and we desire to have the subject in these experimental and practical bearings well understood. And to this end we will present two or three more specimens of the influence of the doctrine of the "Scriptural Argument" before us, to torture the souls of great and good men with self-fears, as well as sympathetic anguish.

The following is a paragraph of a sermon, preached between twenty and thirty years ago, by Rev. Dr. Tenny, of Weathersfield, Ct., at the funeral of Dr. Austin, for many years pastor of the elder Orthodox Society in Worcester, Mass.

"But for the last three or four years, a thick and dark cloud has hung over the course and enveloped in dismay the mind of our revered friend. He lost nearly all hope of his own reconciliation to God and interest in the Redeemer. He sunk into a settled, deep religious melancholy, which occasionally appeared in paroxysms of despair and horror. His bitter groanings were, at times, sufficient to wring with sympathetic anguish the most unfeeling heart."

Commenting on this case, the *Unitarian Advocate* for July, 1831, says:—

"Dr. Austin, for a long time before his death, was in a state little short of madness; and we do not see what is to hinder that effect in a man who sincerely believes in endless misery, and applies his doctrine to himself. The same remark may be made concerning the celebrated Dr. Bellamy, well-known as an orthodox divine. Cowper, the beautiful poet, it is well known, more than once attempted to destroy his life through the influence of religious melancholy. 'He was led into a deep consideration of his religious state; and having imbibed the doctrine of election and reprobation in its most appalling rigor, he was led to a very dismal state of apprehension. We are told "*that the terror of eternal judgment overpowered and actually disordered his faculties; and he remained seven months in a continual expectation of being instantly plunged into eternal misery.*"' Although he at times recovered from this dreadful depression, he at last sunk under it, being gradually worn out, and he expired upon his bed."

But we must rest our quotations on this point, which might be continued indefinitely. Our purpose in this department has been, as before explained, to set the doctrine in question before the reader's mind in its true character, and in its "just proportions" as a part of the whole system. We do not mean to avert the Scriptural Argument, but to prepare the mind to come to that argument in a proper attitude. We would have the reader see that there is no such beauty in the doctrine of endless punishment, or *a priori* reason and probability of its truth, as should persuade us to employ forced constructions and applications of Scripture in its support. Let us not undertake to speak for the Bible, but let the Bible speak for itself.

Our friend further says in his preface:—

"While we believe that the contemplation of future misery apart from the cross of Christ would be hurtful to the mind and heart, we

also feel that it cannot be of healthful tendency with our moral natures to base our religious associations mainly on the one idea of opposition to endless punishment."

This is a creditable concession, that the contemplation of hell, of itself, is debasing and hurtful in its influence upon the mind and heart. And even the cross of Christ, as it stands in the theory under discussion, is a matter of such dubious uncertainty in its relation to individuals, and will so certainly prove to be of no avail to the mass of mankind, that it can generally exert but feeble power to divert the mind, when it believes in that future misery, from the contemplation of it.

And here we will be equally candid in relation to the last clause of the above quoted paragraph:—"We also feel that it cannot be of healthful tendency with our moral natures to base our religious associations mainly on the one idea of opposition to endless punishment." We sincerely thank the Doctor for this good and true word. It relates to those pretended Universalists who are merely anti-orthodox. They are good for nothing—nay, they are worse than nothing, in relation to our cause and denomination. We have known little societies, here and there in the country, thrown up into being by the repulsive force of the doctrines and manœuvres of the dominant sects, appropriating to themselves the name Universalist;—but where this centrifugal force was the only or principal moving power, they have been

"Like bubbles on the sea of matter borne;
They rise, they break, and to that sea return."

But Universalism proper, is not a mere system of negations. It is a living system of positive principle of faith and practice. Its mission, and that of its church and ministry, is, to win home the alienated affections of God's wandering children in faith and love to Him their Father through Jesus Christ, and to a life of childlike trust, reverential and filial devotion, and cheerful obedience.

One thing more. Dr. Adams, in his Introductory Remarks, says:—

"I feel encouraged in this work by the comparative regard which many in this denomination profess for the Bible. They do not assail it as the manner of some is who differ from us; but their desire to make it speak in their favor secures for it an acknowledgment of its authority."

This ingenuous testimonial shows to our friends that we have an honorable man to deal with in this discussion. We suggest but one amendment of the above paragraph, and that is the striking out of the words "many in,' which were interlined in the Doctor's manuscript after he wrote it, perhaps thinking of some names as Universalists philosophically, who are not of our denomination. Striking out these words, the paragraph will be a testimony to the "regard which *this denomination* profess for the Bible." It is the ground of our faith and the man of our counsel; and we shall make it our authoritative appeal as we go with our learned friend, in our succeeding numbers, into the SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT.

CHAPTER I.

SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT OF DR. ADAMS' FIRST CLASSIFICATION, REVIEWED.

Dr. Adams, in his *Scriptural Argument for Future, Endless Punishment*, presents his whole case under seven classifications, to each of which we will devote a distinct chapter in our Review. We begin with the following:—

I. THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THERE IS A PENALTY FOR DISOBEDIENCE AWAITING THE FINALLY IMPENITENT.

On the terms of this general proposition we have a few remarks to offer before proceeding to his use of Scripture in the case.

That "the Scriptures teach that there is a penalty for disobedience," we most unreservedly concede. And it is not enough to say that we concede it;—we most emphatically affirm it, always and everywhere. And that penalty is awaiting, always awaiting, the transgressor.

But the last two words of the above Proposition, *finally impenitent*, require a little criticism. What does the Doctor mean by the *finally impenitent?* If he means a class of people who will remain impeni-

tent to all eternity, we must remind him that the assumption that there shall be such a class, is begging, in the outset, the whole question in discussion. If any portion of the human family will remain endlessly sinful and impenitent, that portion of the human family will be endlessly miserable, and the controversy is closed. But there is no such thought written in the Book,—nor any such phraseology as *finally impenitent.*

Nevertheless, there is a sense, and a very good sense, in which we may say of some, that they are finally impenitent. In this admission we use the word *finally* in a restricted and special sense, as relating to a given order of series. The *finale* of a tragedy is the termination of that play. The *finis* of a book is the termination of that particular work. And every vicious course of practice, when persisted in, has its natural and legitimate *finale,* its resulting harvest of accumulated evil. So, then, though the devotee to any vicious habit is, by virtue of the ever-living law and ever-operative judgment of God, a recipient from day to day of a punitive recompense of reward,—even as St. Paul, in the connection into which we are about to follow our opponent's quotation, testifies of such as "receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet," (Rom. i. 27,) yet a persistence in that habit produces a condition of things in his character, and his circumstances in various relations, which shall at length, or *finally,*—i. e. in the result or *finale* of this course of things, bring him signal disaster. In this sense we

can speak of the *finally impenitent*,—persons rushing on in the career of sin through the full period which the nature and relations of things will admit, to the resulting calamity. Or, to employ the language of Scripture which will come in for particular exposition before we close this chapter, such are "treasuring up unto themselves wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." (Rom. ii. 5.) It is so in all ages, and in all cases, that a persistent course in any criminal practice has its legitimate cycle, at a given point of which, by the ordinance of God, the ultimate must come, and an "awaiting" penalty make the climax of a progressive series of miseries.

But does this cycle sweep into the life immortal, and run the round of eternity,—the cycle, we mean, of moral corruption, vice and misery? This is the great question of the present discussion, the *affirmative* of which is assumed by Dr. Adams. And here follows his *leading Scriptural proof:*

"This is plainly declared in Rom. ii: 5—12, 16: 'But after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; Who will render to every man according to his deeds: To them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, honor, and immortality, eternal life. But unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath; tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first and also of the Gentile; But glory, honor, and peace to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first and also to the Gentile; For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law,

shall be judged by the law,— In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my Gospel.' The parenthetic passages omitted here, which occur before the last of these sentences, are a direct assertion of the full accountableness of the heathen world to the tribunal of God, for their sins against their consciences and the light of nature. I take this whole passage of Scripture as a revelation of a future judgment and retribution, in which all men are to be judged and treated according to their works."

This, we say, is the Doctor's *leading Scriptural proof;* and it is nearly the only one offered to this leading and fundamental Proposition. The rest of this first division of his "Scriptural Argument," which is his longest and most labored division, is chiefly occupied in exposition of his view of the use of metaphors, and the various species of figures in the Bible, especially as applied to punishments,—and maintaining that they represent something that is a reality. In all this he is right, and we shall only have occasion to give it a passing notice in its place, and *that* a notice of approval. He throws in, also, at the latter part of this division, a few more Scripture quotations as proof texts, without an attempt to show them germain to the question; and these, too we will suitably examine in their place.

But it is of the first importance that, now and here, we faithfully examine, and form an enlightened and conclusive decision, in respect to this, the Doctor's opening Scriptural argument. If he is right here, his work throughout, in the main, will stand. If he is wholly and utterly wrong here, his whole effort is a failure. The reader will see, therefore, that we must not hurry over the matter of this

opening plea of the Doctor, with which the whole must stand or fall.

By what process does our friend bear away the above cited portion of Scripture to an application to events and conditions of the future world? There is no visible process. He gives us no manner of reason for such an application. It is a magic leap in the dark, and there is no light shining on the way. We respectfully recall him to the starting point; and we will endeavor to accompany each other in our research for the sense and application of this section of the Record.

And here, as a preparatory step in this research, let it be distinctly observed, that the *time* of fulfilment of this Scripture, is *the day of judgment by Jesus Christ.* Passing, for the present, all between verses 6th and 16th, we have it thus,—"Who will render to every man according to his deeds, ... in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel." Hence it is the next regular step in this momentous research, to ascertain

THE TIME AND NATURE OF THE JUDGMENT OF CHRIST.

1st. Of the General Judgment,—using the word general in opposition to special or particular.

2d. Of special or particular Judgments.

SECTION I.

The Time and Nature of the Judgment of Christ with reference to his general or entire judicial administration.

St. Paul says to the Athenians, (Acts xvii. 30, 31,) "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent; because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

When is the day, appointed of God, and foreshown in prophesy, in which he would judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ? Dr. Adams may assert one thing, and we another, and a third theorist yet another:—but none of these assertions are of the least value to the Christian student any farther than they are sustained by an intelligible "thus saith the Lord." If the Scriptures inform us on this point, we will receive their instruction. If not, we must let it pass as a matter unrevealed and unknown. But the Scriptures do give us most clear and decisive information on the question in hand. Be patient, gentle reader. Let us be faithful Bible students. Be not holden in chains of error by the mere sound of words and phrases as toned by semi-barbarian councils, and prolonged by reverence for ecclesiastical authority. With all *due* respect for human authorities, let us respect supremely the word of God.

When is the day appointed of God and foretold by the prophets, in which he would judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ? The theory of our learned friend assumes that it is a day beyond the close of this mundane system, when all the individuals of the human race, including Adam and his latest posterity, shall be simultaneously arraigned at the bar of the Divine judgment, and receive sentence for eternity according to character formed or works done, in the brief life on earth.

But before we get the concurrent voice of the whole train of Bible testimony on the subject, the very terms of this passage itself repudiate and explode such a use and interpretation. And so we shall find generally, on careful examination, that there is that in the very proof texts themselves, appropriated, to the support of endless punishment, which forbids such an application. In this case the popular application destroys the harmony of the passage in the bearings and relations of its parts. Paul had been making reference to the benighted and idolatrous condition and practices of the Gentiles, without a supernatural revelation. "And the times of this ignorance God winked at, (or suffered to remain, as the same idea is expressed in chapter xiv. 16, 'Who in times passed suffered all nations to walk in their own ways,') but now commandeth all men every where to repent." Why, now? Why is the ministry of repentance, or of a turn from idolatry to the great and good Father, sent out now, to the nations who in times passed were suffered to walk in their own ways?

The apostle proceeds to answer:—"Because he hath appointed a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained."

Why should this fact, the fact of the approaching day appointed of God for judgment by Jesus Christ, constitute a reason for sending the gospel ministry of repentance to the Gentile nations now, more than in the former ages? The application of this passage to the "Orthodox" theory of judgment renders impossible an answer to this question. How should the fact, which that theory assumes, that there is an appointed future day of Judgment, which shall arraign, and sentence for eternity according to works in time, all men of all former as well as present and future ages, constitute a reason why the gospel ministry of repentance should be sent to "all men every where" now, more than in former ages? Will it be said that it is because the people of the present and coming ages are to be amenable at that judgment? The same is true, upon the theory in question, of all men of the former ages. And this theory makes nonsense of the passage. It makes the fact of the judgment of Christ to constitute no reason why all men every where should be commanded to repent now, more than in the former ages. Therefore the popular theory is a false one. Any theory of the appointed judgment by Jesus Christ, which does not make it involve a reason why the ministry of a supernatural revelation unto repentance should commence in the apostolic time, to go out into the Gentile nations, and not in former ages, is certainly a false theory.

Now, therefore, we will go more directly into our inquiry for *The Time and Nature of the Judgment of Christ.* And when we shall have accumulated the light of the Scriptures on these points, which is full and lucid, we will recur again to the question of harmony in the relative parts of the passage in Acts xvii.

The similarity of language in this declaration of Paul to the Athenians, carries us back to the prophetic breathings of Isaiah, which abound in the book of his prophecies, especially in chap. xi. Indeed we know that his mind was a store-house of the prophetic teachings, and he was constantly "reasoning with the people out of the Scriptures" of the Old Testament. Isaiah had said (xi. 1–10,) "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots; and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him; . . . . and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears; but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth. And he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. . . . . The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. . . . . And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious."

Bear in mind that we are now inquiring for the time and nature of the judgment of Christ. And

here we have clear and decisive information. The subject of this prophetic Scripture is the same judgment by Him whom God had ordained, as that spoken of in Acts xvii. 30, 31. Indeed the apostle evidently had this chapter of the prophet in his mind. He says, "Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will *judge the world in righteousness*, by that man whom he hath ordained." So the prophet had said, "And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him; . . . and *with righteousness* shall he judge the poor," &c.

But you will remind me that St. Paul calls the time of his judgment "a day." So does the prophet. After describing the operations of his judgment, he adds, "And in *that day* there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek; and his rest shall be glorious."

When was to be this appointed judgment by the Messiah? Answer, when the Gentiles were to seek unto his standard. Hence, if we can ascertain when the Gentiles were to seek unto the standard of Christ, and find his glorious rest, we shall have ascertained when is the day or dispensation of judgment in righteousness by Him. And in respect to this point, all Christendom know that the time when the Gentiles were to seek unto the standard of Christ is the *gospel day*, or time of his Mediatorial reign; which commenced when he set up his kingdom in the world, and will continue to the great consummation.

There is no mistake here; there can be none.

You cannot misunderstand this subject; if you try to do so, you cannot. The testimony of the prophet before us is decisive. Speaking of the Messiah's judging in righteousness and equity, he says, "And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek." And all Christendom know, as we have said, that the time when the Gentiles should seek unto the standard of Christ is the gospel day, or time of Christ's Mediatorial reign, which is now in progress. This, then, is the day of judgment by Jesus Christ.

The original terms rendered judge and judgment in the Scriptures, primarily denote *light*, *decision*, *order*, &c. And as government is designed for order and involves decision, the same word is often used for rule, or govern. When we read of Samson, Jephthah, Ibzon, Elon, and others, that they judged Israel respectively a given term of years, it is not meant that they were engaged exclusively in deciding character and meting out rewards and punishments. They governed Israel. The business of deciding disputed cases, and meting out adequate recompense, was included in the business of the office; but the term judge was not applied to this business alone, but to the general administration of him who governed the people.

That such is the application of the term judge in its broadest sense, when appropriated to the official character of Jesus Christ, will be rendered the more clear by the following quotations from our evangeli-

cal prophet. See Isa. xlii. "Behold my servant whom I uphold,—I have put my spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. . . . . He shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth; and the isles shall wait for his law." Here, his judgment, which he should establish in the earth, and for the law of which the isles should wait, is obviously his government, his kingdom. And now, to describe the nature, and the ultimate design of this government or judgment, the prophet thus proceeds:—"Thus saith God the Lord, . . . I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house."

Observe, he had just said, "He shall bring forth *judgment* to the Gentiles." And here, "He shall be a light to lighten the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, and bring out the prisoners from the prison;" thus showing conclusively, that the bringing forth of judgment to the Gentiles, is the extension of his kingdom among the Gentiles. And whatever external means his judgment or kingdom may employ; though it may employ teachings, gifts, promises, threatenings, rewards, punishments,—yet these are all instrumentalities in the hand of one government, with one spirit and aim, concurring to one ultimate, the deliverance of mankind from the prison of dark-

ness, sin and death. The same operation and ultimate effect of the judgment of the Messiah is described in the quotation we made from Isa. xi. He shall judge in righteousness and equity, smiting the earth with the rod of his mouth, and slaying the wicked with the breath of his lips, the word of his truth, justice and love, so that the most stubborn and lion-like spirits of rebellion shall be subdued to the beautiful loveliness of the peaceful lamb.

The application which we have been led, by force of truth in the connections, to make of the foregoing prophecies of the judgment of Christ, to his reign, is the exact and direct New Testament application. St. Matthew, in his record of Christ's charge to the people in a given case not to make him known to his enemies who were seeking to kill him, adds, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Behold my servant whom I have loved, ... I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall show judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive nor cry, ... the smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory. And in his name shall the Gentiles trust."

It is this adorable view of the mission of God's judgment by Jesus Christ, that gives tone and form to the royal Poet's jubilant song, in Psalm xcvi. "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof. Let the field be joyful and all that is therein; then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord; for

he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth: he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth."

We have now ascertained, from the Scriptures, *the time and nature of the judgment of Christ.* Its time is the time of his Mediatorial reign. In respect to its nature, in the broadest sense, as we have seen, it is synonymous with his kingdom. And when used in a restricted and special sense, as applied to the administration of rewards and punishments, it is a co-operative branch of his kingdom.

And here we have common sense as well as Bible sense. Whence did you ever hear of the thought, except from human theology, of a kingdom without a judgment, and the judgment postponed to the end of the kingdom? When did you ever know of a good family government without a judgment, and the judgment put off to the end of the government? What a thought! Is not the judgment a co-operative branch of the family government? Always. When did you ever hear of a good civil government without a judgment, the judgment being assigned to the end of the government? Never. Is not the judgment a co-existent and co-operative branch of the civil government? Always.

So with the Divine government. When the great Father commenced the exercise of his government over his intelligent family, he commenced the administration of judgment. When our first parents transgressed, how soon they were called to judgment, and sentence pronounced. And that heinous sinner,

Cain. How soon he was arraigned at the bar of God. Hear the examination; — "What hast thou done?" And the witness; — "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground." And the sentence; — "A fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth." And the culprit cries out, "My punishment" ——— What does he mean? What, a punishment when there has been no judgment? The punishment were as likely to be wrong as right if there were no judgment. But there was a judgment, a righteous judgment; and we wonder not that the subject of it exclaimed in anguish, "My punishment is greater than I can bear." How many young people now, for the want of a knowledge and faith of their amenability to the living, operative judgment of God, putting far away their accountability, and imagining devices of escape from it all, make themselves subjects of this awful sentence, — "A fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth."

And so all through.—Moses says, (Deut. xxxii. 4,) "All his ways are judgment." That is, in all the dispensations of his govenment he proceeds upon a just and righteous decision. And so Nebuchadnezzar was constrained to attest, that "all his works are truth, and his ways judgment." (Dan. iv. 37.) David says, (Ps. lviii. 11,) "So that a man shall say, Verily there is a reward for the righteous; verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth." And Solomon, "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished. . . . . Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked

and the sinner." (Prov. xi. 21, 31.) And Jeremiah, (xvii. 10,) "I, the Lord, search the heart, try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings." And the Bible abounds with this plain and truthful sentiment of judgment, making it the government, or a co-existent and co-operative branch of the government of God.

But in these latter days God judgeth the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ. "And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man." (John v. 27.) "He hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained;" which is the passage had before under consideration. And here, too, as well as under the former dispensation, the judgment is a co-operative branch of the government, as we have fully proved in this chapter.

In respect to this whole subject, embracing both dispensations, as it relates to the retributive and disciplinary operations of the judgment, St. Paul gives us the following summary, in Heb. ii. 2, 3; "For if the word spoken by angels (that is the "law given by the disposition of angels") was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" Here is the truth recognized, that, under the former dispensation, every transgression and disobedience, sins of commission and omission, *received* a just recompense of

reward. And it is followed by the interrogatory assertion, that neither can we, under the gospel dispensation, when God judgeth the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ, escape a like just recompense of reward, if we trangress and abuse the principles of the gospel of our salvation.

And this is precisely the subject of the same apostle's testimony in Rom. ii. made by Dr. Adams his leading and fundamental proof text of future endless punishment. The testimony here is, that God, who under the old dispensation rendered to "every transgression and disobedience a just recompense of reward," "will render to every man according to his deeds — in the day when he shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ;" — "tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile. But glory, honor and peace, to every man that worketh good." We shall presently attend more particularly to all the important expressions of this whole passage; but it was imperatively necessary that we should first obtain the clear Scriptural light of the main subject of judgment in general, as a Divine system, or economy. And the light which we have gained on this general subject, and which will shine unto perfect day as we shall progressively study the subject in all its bearings, special as well as general, places us in a commanding position for a true observation and correct application of all the particular and progressively developing parts. Dr. Adams, after the manner of all who have gone before

him on that side of the question, makes up his roll of texts, taking those generally which relate to special dispensations of judgment, and bounds with them into eternity, and there opens and distributes his awards, just as if there was no question of their being *there* in their appropriate sphere. If they could show that the general judgment of Christ is alone a judicial tribunal, for the bestowment of awards for the future in consideration of the past, and that its place is at the end of time and the opening of eternity, then the familiar testimonies of the Scriptures in relation to special judgments and retributions would very naturally fall in as parts of the same economy, and there would be, at least, great plausibility in the Endless-miserian argument. But this is all assumed. This view of the character, the time, and mission of the judgment of Christ, is assumption altogether. No man on earth ever attempted to show, by Scriptural argument, that any passage of Scripture utters such a view of Christ's judgment. There was never a better reason offered, or attempted, than our friend offers in the argument before us, from Rom. ii. 5–16, — which is in these words: — "I take this whole passage of Scripture as a revelation of a future judgment and retribution, (meaning a judgment in the future world) in which all men are to be judged and treated according to their works." "Yes, "*I* take this whole passage of Scripture" so to mean. We are perfectly aware of this. But *why* do you take it away into such an application? This is a question which we hope our

friend will attempt to answer in our columns, when we shall have closed our Reply to his Scriptural Argument. It would have been an even reply on our part, to say, "*I* take this whole passage of Scripture as a revelation of a judgment then about being established by Christ on earth, involved in his spiritual kingdom, which, in its retributive dispensation, renders unto every man according to his deeds." This would be barely setting our opinion against his. But we are not inclined to serve the reading public to any such fare. We feel bound to make good improvement of this rare opportunity to promote Biblical knowledge, and hence we labor to lead the inquiring mind into a clear and comprehensive discovery of the Scripture teachings in relation to this supremely important subject. We set the ample testimonies of the Scriptures against human assumptions. The assumptions even of great and good men are nothing, when opposed to the inspired record. And we have shown conclusively, and intend to show more fully in subsequent portions of this Reply, that the Scriptures do, definitely, and in various illustrative and explanatory connections, set forth, in relation to the *time of the judgment of Christ*, that it is the time of his Mediatorial reign, which commenced when he set up his kingdom in the world, and will continue unto the great consummation, when he shall resign the kingdom to the Father, having put down, destroyed, all rule, and all authority and power, i. e. all in opposition to his own, leaving no satan's kingdom in the universe, and having subdued, harmonized, all

things to himself, (1 Cor. xv. 20–28);—and in relation to the *nature* of his judgment, that it is, in its broad and general sense, synonymous with his kingdom; and in all applications to special dispensations of reward and punishment, it is a co-operative branch of his kingdom. If the simplest idea, or matter of fact, can be intelligibly expressed by the use of human language, this is the Scriptural view of the judgment of Christ. And for the reason of this declaration we commend not the reader to any human authority or church tradition, but to candid Bible reading.

Now the importance of the special pains we have taken to be right at this grand starting point, and to show the unscripturalness and consequent worthlessness, of the Doctor's capital assumption on which he builds his whole fabric, is obvious to all who have understanding. In the light which we have obtained on the time and nature of the judgment of Christ, as a general economy, it will be easy to explain and apply all the testimonies of particular and special judgments, because they all come within the scope of the general economy. Accordingly all that is particular in the testimony of rewards and punishments in the Doctor's leading proof passage, declared to come within the compass of the judgment of Christ, must be understood as relating to the awards of the operative administration of his judgment established in the earth.

In concluding our present labor on the general judgment of Christ, before proceeding to the particular consideration of special dispensations of

judgment, which are all, with unquestioning complacency, referred by our opponent direct to his assumed future and final tribunal, we will go back with our present information, and see how it is with the harmony of parts in St. Paul's testimony of the judgment of Christ in Acts xvii. We specially noted the fact that the apostle speaks of the appointed day or dispensation of judgment by Jesus Christ, as the reason why God *now* sends out the ministry of repentance to the Gentile nations, who in times past were suffered to remain in their general ignorance of the character and purpose of God. We saw that the "Orthodox" view of the appointed day of judgment by Jesus Christ, making it a simultaneous arraignment of all men of all ages, at the end of the mundane system, to sentence them for eternity according to their works in time, would make it constitute no reason why the ministry of repentance should be sent to all men every where now, more than in all former ages. But in the Scriptural light of the subject which we have now attained, all in this passage is clear and consistent. It stands thus: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at," or suffered to remain. He did not in the former ages send inspired messengers with supernatural revelations to the Gentiles. He made the Hebrews a chosen people to whom he committed his oracles as a preparatory economy; and the embodiment of the religious system which he committed to them was adapted to that people specially, and not to the other nations. Hence the prophets and teachers of

that preliminary covenant and religion had no ministry nor mission for the Gentiles. It was a covenant with the house of Israel and Judah. It did not belong to others. But now comes in, at Paul's time it was opening, the new dispensation, the better covenant, the Messiah's reign, of whom it was foreappointed that he should "set judgment in the earth," and be a covenant to Israel, a light of the Gentiles, and salvation to the ends of the earth. His covenant embraces all people; his religion is alike adapted to all nations; his kingdom is designed to be universal; in him is the gift of life immortal for all. Therefore, *now*, God sends out his specially qualified messengers, ministers of this better covenant and kingdom, to all nations, because the covenant of which they are ministers, and the kingdom and judgment, belongs to them all.

So beautiful is the harmony of Scripture, when it is understood in the light of Scripture. The following paraphrase will present this interesting passage, (in which "Orthodoxy" makes the apostle stultify himself,) in the relative and consistent bearing of its parts. "And in these former ages God suffered the prevailing ignorance of the Gentiles to remain, the revelation made to the Hebrews not being designed for them. And even during the personal life of our Master on earth, it was not meet that even his Ambassadors should go in the way of the Gentiles, but only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But *now* he hath broken down the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles, and has enlarged the

sphere of our mission, commanding us to go into all the world, and preach the gospel of universal love, and of repentance and salvation, to all people. And this is because he hath appointed a day or dispensation, and it is now being ushered in, when he would judge or rule the world in righteousness, by that Man whom he hath ordained to "bring forth judgment to the Gentiles,' and 'to be his salvation to the ends of the earth.'"

Will our learned friend show us any essential mistake committed, thus far, in our Scripture studies?

SECTION II.

Special Judgments.

In the preceding Section of this Chapter we brought out the Scripture light on the general judgment of God, and especially of Christ. We found that the judgment, in its broadest sense, is the kingdom or government, and in any restricted application, a co-operative branch of the government. Accordingly, the day of judgment by Jesus Christ is the day or dispensation of his spiritual reign, which is now in progress; and the leading proof text of Dr. Adams, Rom. ii. 5–16, has no reference to such an arraignment of the universe as he has assumed, at the end of time and opening of eternity. God has not made this infantile, momentary life a state of probation for eternity, and fixed a dread tribunal at the end of mortal time, which shall strike off their fate for eternity, to infinite bliss or woe, according to their

improvement of the infantile moment. No such idea is anywhere stated or implied in the Bible. We shall see, as we progress, that Dr. Adams, whose eager and practised eye would have caught the passage if there had been any such, has not even attempted to show that any text of Scripture expresses such a thought. God has provided this earth as the abode of his human children in their rudimental and mortal state. He is their Governor and Judge, disciplining them by want and supply, pleasure and pain, sunshines and storms, gifts and bereavements, teachings and admonitions, rewards and punishments, all of which are adapted to their state and nature in this sphere of their being, but never involving in these things the fate of eternity. This is the view of the Divine administration visible on every page of the Bible, and confirmed by experience, observation and history. We don't mean to leave the reader to take this truthful view of the subject at our hand. He who studiously goes with us through this investigation will see it to be the uniform and prominent Bible view, as clearly as he ever saw that the surface of the earth is variegated with hills, valleys and plains.

Having shown from the Scriptures that the general judgment, that is, the Divine judgment as a general and complete administration, is a branch of the Divine government, now, always,—we are prepared to understand, and to apply with truth and accuracy, the particular judgments, or special administrations of recompense, as we come across the Scripture

records of them. Dr. Adams having, by assumption alone, placed the *general* judgment in the resurrection state, and made it a dispenser of final dooms, as naturally draws after him into that state and to that purpose all the records of special judgments, as the great magnet draws the steel filings to itself. But finding the general judgment to be comprised in the general and ever operative government of God, we shall find the special judgments, which are the ever-operative workings of the general judgment, to come in, with perfect naturalness and certainty of truth, with this corrected view of the general administration.

In this light of the subject, let us trace the legitimate application of the particular judgments embraced in the Doctor's grand fundamental proof text, which we have had under general consideration. They were all to take place under the general administration of Christ, who should "set judgment in the earth;" and "bring forth judgment unto victory."

Well, what are they? The Doctor commences his quotation at the 5th verse. "*But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God.*"

1. "*Treasurest up unto thyself wrath.*" In what sense do the Scriptures teach us that vicious people treasure up unto themselves wrath? This single sentence does not answer the question. We must look into the general teachings of the Scriptures on the subject. We said at the opening of this chapter,

in relation to the Doctor's leading proposition, that every vicious course of practice, when persisted in, besides its current awards of evil, has its natural and legitimate *finale*, its resulting harvest of accumulated evils. Such a habit, continued, produces a condition of things in respect to character and circumstances, which shall bring signal disaster. Hence, while he is suffering evil, eating of the fruit of his doings, he is *treasuring up* evil for an impending out-break. And this we shall find to be the idea of the passage before us, as it is of the Bible record throughout.

Open the New Testament, and read from the beginning of the preceding Chapter, which commences the Epistle to the Romans. The apostle was addressing a Christian Church of Gentiles, who were in the midst of the idolatries and moral corruptions of Gentile nations, and who, themselves, as it appears, were retaining too much of that moral defilement. After speaking of the revelation of the righteousness of God from faith to faith in the gospel, he adds, "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness." This, while true for universal application, was spoken particularly for the admonition of those "who held the truth in unrighteousness,"—that is, professing Christians to whom adhered the heathen corruptions. And this revelation of wrath has no reference to any administration of God in another world. Any person, even of the humblest capacity, who will attentively read along the whole connection here will see that it

refers to the current administration of the Divine government in our world, running in full course with the view established in the preceding section of this chapter, in respect to the judgment of God as a co-existent branch of his ever operative government.

The word *wrath*, as applied to the Deity, cannot, consistently with any rational and reverent view of the Infinite, be taken to denote any passionate and changeable emotions of the Divine Mind. Sometimes it refers to dispensations of his visible providence in raging calamities, and sometimes to the condemnatory operation of his law against transgressors, by a spiritual administration. This we shall see most clearly elucidated as we proceed with our Scripture investigations.

The apostle proceeds, in this first chapter, to exhibit the *modus operandi* of the Divine judgment in manifestation of wrath, or condemnatory power, against unrighteousness. "Because, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God," but made defilement and self-indulgence their God, — "for this cause God gave them up to vile affections, ... working that which is unseemly, ... and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet." Here it is shown that it is one of the methods of God's judgment, when his counsels are persistently despised, to give over the sinner to the full rage and natural consequences of his vices.

The apostle proceeds, — "Who, knowing the judgment of God, (that they who commit such things are worthy of death,) not only do the same, but have

pleasure in them that do them." Here the same living judgment of God is kept in view; and the transgressors are held up in two classes, the heathen idolaters, and the unworthy Christian professors who held the truth in unrighteousness, condemning the heathen corruptions in form, yet imitating them in practice. For he thus proceeds into chap. ii:—"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 (that is, condemnest) them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despiseth thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance." And here follows the Doctor's proof text:—"But after thy hardness and impenitent heart *treasurest up unto thyself wrath.*" Why, it is difficult to conceive of the frame of mind in which a man of talent can assume that the apostle is here describing God's dealings with mankind in the immortal world. If anything in the simplest expression is plain, it is, that the apostle was describing existing character, and both existing and impending consequences, under the current administration of God.

With regard to the "*treasuring up wrath,*" as denoting an accumulative force of evil to persistent transgressors, to result in special calamity, the Scriptures, as well as the world of fact, are full of it. But we must only afford space here for two or three citations.

Moses, in the Song which he spoke in the ears of the congregation of Israel, prophetically denoting the approaching calamities on their enemies, spoke thus in the name of the Lord: — "Is not this laid up in store with me, and sealed up with me? To me belongeth vengeance and recompense; their foot shall slide in due time; for the day of their calamity is at hand, and the things that shall come upon them make haste." (Deut. xxxii. 34, 35.) With reference to accumulating evils to the portion of Ephraim, to be more fully realized by him afterwards, making no reference, however, to eternity, the prophet Hosea says, (xiii. 12, 13,) "The iniquity of Ephraim is bound up; his sin is hid. The sorrow of a travailing woman shall come upon him; he is an unwise son." But this binding up of the iniquity of Ephraim, or treasuring it up as wrath against the day of wrath, even our opponent will not claim as denoting his doom to endless punishment; for, in another division of his argument he expressly refers to the Divine promise of Ephraim's restoration.

And so, throughout the Scriptures, in a thousand different forms, this idea is expressed, of the accumulation of dangers by persistence in sin, to terminate in special judgment.

2. "*Against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God.*" Is this day of wrath, which should reveal the righteous judgment of God, a day beyond Christ's Mediatorial reign, for striking off eternal dooms? So Dr. Adams assumes. But we have put out of the way that off-hand assumption

by showing from the Scriptures, that the day of judgment by Jesus Christ, as a general administration, which is the general period wherein all these special dispensations of judgment must take place, is the day of his Mediatorial reign, which is now in progress. And we invite the attention of the reader to the beautiful harmony of the Scriptures in relation to this subject, in this clear light of it in which we now stand.

In the book of Job, speaking of the portion of him who seeks to live by the gain of oppression, in addition to the constant disquiet of his life which is expressed by the saying, "he shall not feel quietness in his belly, he shall not save of that which he desireth, — it is said, (Job xx. 28, 29,) "The increase of his house shall depart, and his goods shall flow away in the day of his wrath. This is the portion of a wicked man from God, and the heritage appointed unto him by God." Again, (Job xxi. 28–33,) "Where are the dwelling places of the wicked? — Have ye not asked them that go by the way? And do ye not know their tokens, that the wicked is reserved to the day of destruction? They shall be brought forth to the day of wrath, ... Yet shall he be brought to the grave, and shall remain in the tomb. The clods of the valley shall be sweet unto him." Even our opponent will admit that this relates solely to temporal destruction; yet it is a destruction to which the wicked were *reserved*, and to be consummated in the *day of wrath.*

David prophesied, (Ps. cx. 5, 6,) "The Lord at thy

right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath. He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill the places with the dead bodies; he shall wound the heads of many countries." By reading the whole Psalm it will be seen that the passage just quoted stands in connection with prophecies of the Messiah's reign; and of course it refers to some special judgment upon the enemies of truth which should take place during the general reign and judgment of Christ.

Again, (Prov. xi. 4.) "Riches profit not in the day of wrath: but righteousness delivereth from death." Here, too, *the day of wrath* stands for any time of raging calamity and sweeping desolation, when a man's riches would rather increase his danger than promote his safety.

In further elucidation of the Scripture phraseology under consideration, read the prophecy of Zephaniah, (i. 13–18.) "Therefore their goods shall become a booty, and their houses a desolation. The great day of the Lord is near, it is near, and hasteth greatly, even the voice of the day of the Lord. That day is a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, and a day of wasteness and desolation, a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness. A day of trumpet and alarm against the fenced cities and against the high towers." The time here described, because of its marking a severe and desolating calamity which no man will stultify himself by applying to any other than a national and temporal desolation, perhaps the destruction of Jerusalem by

the Babylonians, and perhaps that by the Romans, is called *the great day of the Lord, the day of wrath, and the day of trouble and distress*, or "tribulation and anguish."

Of the same character shall we find, when we come to it in review of another of the Doctor's Scriptual Arguments, the day of wrath in Rev. vi. 17:—"For the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?"

In relation to special judgments, or the revelation of wrath and the righteous judgment of God in just and ample retributions, from time to time under the general administration of his government and judgment, we must take room for one other Scripture quotation. See Ezek. vii.—"Thus saith the Lord God unto the house of Israel. Now is the end come upon thee, and I will send mine anger upon thee, and will judge thee according to thy ways, and will recompense upon thee all thine abominations. . . . Now will I shortly pour out my fury upon thee, and accomplish mine anger upon thee; and I will judge thee according to thy ways, and will recompense thee for all thine abominations. . . . . The time is come, the day draweth near. The sword is without, and the pestilence and the famine within." Here a national temporal calamity is described as being sufficient to *accomplish* God's anger upon the wicked people referred to, and to *recompense them for all their abominations.* Mark ye, these calamities poured out upon those exceedingly wicked people on the earth, are distinctly certified by the inspired record to be an

accomplishment, a *full accomplishment* of the Divine anger upon them, and to be a judgment *according to their ways*, and a *recompense for all their abominations.* This single passage is a full and effectual bar to all theological pleas for a post mortem judgment and endless punishment, in order justly to recompense this life's doings.

But no such descriptions are ever applied in the Scriptures to the scenes, conditions, and events of eternity, or the immortal, spiritual world. We now see clearly that our opponent's reliance on *the mere sound* of the words, "treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath," as proof of sin, corruption, and calamity, in the spiritual world, is utterly vain and futile. The light which we have now obtained on the time and nature of the general judgment of God, and of his Messiah, and of the times and natures of the special judgments, which are but timely administrations of the general judgment, settles this point most conclusively.

But before proceeding to other proof texts of the Doctor, we will briefly glance at other phraseology of this first proof passage. "To them who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality; eternal life." This naturally describes a current good life and its fruits, and it is clumsy work to wrench it out in this connection and force it into the future world. The word rendered *immortality* here is not *athanasia*, which is rendered immortality in connection with the resurrection and deathless state, — but it is *aphtharsia*,

which signifies *incorruption*, and is familiarly used in the sense of Parkhurst's second definition, "incorruptness in a moral or spiritual sense, freedom from corrupt doctrines and designs." In Eph. vi. 24, it is rendered *sincerity*. "Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity;" that is, with pure and incorrupt affections. The same Greek word occurs in the same sense in Titus ii. 7: "In doctrine, showing *incorruptness*." There can be no reasonable question of its bearing this sense in the passage under consideration; "to them that seek for glory, honor, and *incorruptness of principles*." Coming down as we now do from the preceding connection in the apostle's letter, there is visible a great degree of beauty and force in this expression, taken in this sense. He had just been exhibiting a most disgustful degree of moral defilement and corruption; and now, to set forth the principles of moral purity and incorruption as the high aim of human effort, is a most symmetrical process of apostolic labor.

"Eternal (*aionion*) life." To those who seek for incorruptness in doctrine and life, the judgment of Christ awards aionion life. This phrase, generally, when used in such practical relations, describing the living influence and experimental fruit of a given attainment of mind, denotes a characteristic property of the Christian life. "He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting (aionion) life." (John iii. 36.) "And this is life eternal, (aionion,) that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." (John xvii. 3.) The

single term, *life*, is also familiarly used to express the same thing. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting (aionion) life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." (John v. 24.) This is the life spoken of by Solomon:—"Happy is the man that findeth wisdom; . . . . she is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her, and happy is every one that retaineth her." (Prov. iii. 13, 18.)

"But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath; tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile. But glory, honor, and peace, to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile; for there is no respect of persons with God."

How naturally this language applies to the current awards of the progressive administration of the Divine government, bearing upon living characters. And the closing sentence of the passage, announcing that these administrations of just and appropriate recompense are dispensed under the general government and judgment of God by Jesus Christ, which we have shown to be one and simultaneous with the Messianic reign, confirms this import of the language on the special judgments in detail.

We have been thus particular in establishing certain great principles at the foundation of the general subject under discussion, and thoroughly to dispose

of our opponent's opening argument, that the way may be clear to understand other and collateral Scripture testimonies, and to dispose of his other and relative and depending positions and arguments.

Dr. Adams fills some space succeeding the effort which we have now answered, in exposition of his views of the nature and instrumentalities of his assumed future punishment. He seems to have imagined that we might object to the pertinence of some of his proof texts to the use he would make of them as descriptive of future punishment, on account of the sensible and material objects employed in their description. After enumerating several sensible objects of a pleasant nature which describe the enjoyments of heaven, he says:

"But while the attractions of heaven suffer nothing by reason of criticisms upon the language in which they are presented, some do not use the same tolerance, or apply the same principles of interpretation when they read or speak of future punishment. Here, they say, all is metaphorical, Oriental; they select certain images, and ask if any suppose that the wicked are, literally to suffer such things, from just these elements of pain. But the representations of heaven are certainly obnoxious to the very same criticisms, and similar questions may be asked concerning them. But being of a pleasurable nature, they escape criticism. Therefore, if we are inquired of in either case, Do you believe that these things are literally so? the proper answer seems to be in both cases, Either these things, or things which now can only be expressed by them. Those earthly symbols approach nearer than any thing with which we are now acquainted, to the things signified."

Indeed, there will be no controversy between the Doctor and ourself in respect to the fitness of all the

imagery and symbolical representations employed in the Scriptures to indicate *whatever punishments God has ordained, and wherever executed.* However figurative the descriptions, they mean something; they denote positive, and sometimes very terrible sufferings. But the question is, in each case, *what punishment?* and *where?* Dr. Adams proceeds to answer:

"The condition of the wicked after death is represented through such symbols by Christ and his apostles as a state of positive punishment."

Let him prove this assumption, in a single case, and the argument is his. His first earnest effort has proved futile; and here we come to his second, which is this:

DESTRUCTION OF SOUL AND BODY IN GEHENNA.

The Doctor says:

"One of those indirect proofs of a thing which sometimes are more forcible and convincing than direct statements, occurs in the words of Christ which I will refer to as proving the future punishment of the wicked, in which he tells us to "*fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.*" Matt. x. 28.

As the Doctor makes much account of this passage in his "Scriptural Argument," and as it is commonly relied upon by those of his side with more assurance than any other words of Scripture, we must devote to it deliberate and candid attention. And as our friend does attempt some *argument* here, at least some negative argument, making objections to certain other interpretations of the passage, we will transfer to this connection all he says upon it,—thus:

"If God has merely the natural ability to do this, while his character makes it morally impossible that he should do it, the illustration is singularly at fault. It would never be proper to tell a child as a reason why it should fear its father and mother, that they have power to inflict a punishment which we know is morally impossible. Their mere natural ability to inflict it would not justify the exhortation,—'yea, I say unto you, fear them.' To associate the idea of destroying both body and soul in hell with our proper fear of God our heavenly Father, if he would do no such thing, would not be in accordance with truth.

"Some, to avoid this difficulty, say that the passage means merely that God can destroy life. But so can they who kill the body. There is something more which God alone can do, and which we need rather to fear. Others, knowing that the original word for *hell* in this passage cannot mean the *grave*, propose to render the warning thus, that God can cast those whom he kills, into the valley of Hinnom. But so could assassins, or judicial executioners. We still look for that which God alone can do. Some say it must be annihilation. But the valley of Hinnom is notoriously symbolical of perpetuity, the fire always burning, the worm ever breeding. Why, moreover, should any *place* be specified in which the annihilation, which is the same thing every where, should occur? Or what appropriateness is there in speaking of the soul as being annihilated there?—Destroying both soul and body in hell seems to be equivalent to that expression—'everlasting destruction,'—an apparent contradiction of terms, but conveying the idea of perpetual loss and misery.

"We get no relief from these difficulties with the passage if we turn to the milder form in which the idea is expressed in Luke xii. 5. 'Fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell: yea, I say unto you, Fear him.' For Gehenna, understood literally as the valley of Hinnom, presents to the mind the most terrific image of positive misery. Nothing can be more revolting or fearful. Let those who are jealous at imputations cast upon the character of God by the doctrine of endless punishment, explain how Jesus could even suggest the idea of the Father casting his offspring into a place, the name of which was borrowed from the most fearful object then known to his hearers. Until

this passage is shown to imply no punishment from the hand of God, we must regard it as an impregnable proof of future visitations of misery upon the wicked."

Now the leading question is, does Jesus here use the term *Gehenna* as the name of a place of torture beyond death and the resurrection? To this our opponent answers, *yes*; and we, with all the emphasis of devout love for the honor of God and reverence for his word, reverberate, NO! Come, now, to the study of the subject, philologically and exegetically.

Dr. Adams himself makes note of the fact here, though not with such particularity as to make himself well understood by his unlearned readers, that the word in the original language of the New Testament which is rendered *hell* in this passage, is *Gehenna*, and that this is literally the *Valley of Hinnom*;—and furthermore, that Jesus "*borrowed*" this literal name of that odious valley, for a secondary or metaphorical use in relation to the subject of his discourse. So far he is unquestionably right. But this word was in very familiar use as a metaphor, and as Jesus does not explain it in this case as turned out of its common usage, we are to be guided in our judgment of it here by what we can know of such usage.

But there was no usage in the world, by which *Gehenna* was, or ever had been, in our Saviour's time, appropriated as the name of a place or state of future punishment. We are aware that it has been asserted by some of the learned, that this word was used by the Jews, in our Saviour's time, as the name of such a place, making it synonymous with the heathen

fabulous *Tartarus.* If it were so, it would be most natural to suppose that Jesus, who was the Messiah of the prophets, and the exponent of the Scriptures and not of heathen fables, used it in the Old Testament sense. But that assumption in respect to the usage of the word by the Jews of the Saviour's time, is without historical proof. It has been so easy and natural for learned men, of biased minds, to assume on mere presumption, even in questions of fact where authorities were at hand, that it was assumed, and generally conceded, until recently, that Gehenna is used in the *Apocrypha* for a place of after-death punishment. Some theologians, in an unaccountable manner, caught such an impression; and, there being not much criticism on such matters, they promulgated it as fact without even searching to see. But the late Rev. Walter Balfour, who was educated in Lady Huntington's School, and, while preacher of a Baptist Society in Charlestown, Mass., was put upon a train of study by Prof. Stuart's controversial writings against Unitarians, which resulted in his conversion to Universalism, being a good reader of Hebrew and Greek, read the original of the Apocrypha through with this question in view, and found that the term Gehenna does not occur in those writings at all.

But more common reference has been made, as the only other evidence, to *the Targums,* which are Jewish Scripture commentaries, for proof of the assumption that Gehenna was used in our Saviour's time for a place of future punishment. And here, too, the evidence vanishes on inspection. It is granted that

some of the Targums use the term under c er- tion for a place of future punishment; but acco g to the best authority, and accredited "Orthodo " authority, the earliest of them, which uses the term thus, that of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, was not written earlier than the third, or more probably not earlier than the fourth century of the Christian era. Some critics have referred the work to as late a date as the seventh or eighth century.*

So, then, the term in question was not in use among the Jews of our Saviour's time, in the sense which Dr. Adams attaches to it. Therefore, in the process of coming at the sense in which our Lord employed it in the New Testament, we are shut up exclusively to the Old Testament usage of it, and the explanations afforded by the occasions and connections of its usage in his discourses.

With regard to the Old Testament usage of Gehenna, it is,

1. The proper name of a valley. Parkhurst, in his Greek and English Lexicon, says, "The Gehenna of the New Testament is a corruption of the two Hebrew words, *ge*, *a valley*, and *Hinnom*, the name of a person who was once the possessor of it. This valley of Hinnom lay near Jerusalem, and had been the place of those abominable sacrifices in which the idolatrous

* Balfour's First Inquiry, Gehenna, Sec. v. Uni. Expositor, vol iii., p. 433. Ib. vol. ii., p. 368; referring to Prideaux's Connections, vol. iv. pp. 215-220; vol. ii. p. 130. Gesenius Jesaia, Einleit, § 11. Jahn's Introduction to the Old Testament, Gen. Introd. § 47, p. 66. New York, 1827. Eichhorn's Einleit, in das alte Test. Kap. iii. § 226, 227. Bertholdt's historische Einleit. in Schriften des alt. und neu. Test. Zweyter Th. § 173. Horne's Introduction, vol. ii. p. 160.

Jews burned their children alive to Moloch, Baal, or the sun. A particular place in this valley was called *Tophet*, and the valley itself the valley of Tophet, from the fire stove, *toph*, in which they burned their children to Moloch."

King Josiah, in his reign, in order to put a stop to the idolatrous practices of his people there, "defiled Tophet," making it a common receptacle of garbage and filth from the city. A fire was kept constantly burning to consume the principal part of the garbage, and the worms were constantly preying upon the scattered portions in the valley. So much of the history of the place Dr. Adams takes note of, in the words as quoted in their place, "the fire always burning, the worm ever breeding."

2. From these characteristics of ghe ben Hinnom, the valley of the son of Hinnom, it came into use by the Jews as an emblem or metaphor of odiousness and wretchedness. To catch up a visible scene, or the name of a place, with reference to its prominent characteristic, and use it metaphorically, for the good or the bad as the case may be, is common in all ages. How soon, after the Russians made Sebastopol their strong hold in their late war with France and England, was the main position of a party, and the strong point of a lecture, a Sebastopol of the party and the orator. Thermopylæ of Greece, as the stand point of contestants, and Egypt as the surname of darkness, are equally familiar.

Ge hinnom came to be used by the prophets, as a metaphorical representation of the suffering and

desolation which should consummate the overthrow and dispersion of the Jewish nation. Jeremiah prophesied, saying: "And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, (ghe ben Hinnom,) to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter; for they shall bury in Tophet till there be no place. And the carcasses of this people shall be meat for the fowls of heaven, and for the beasts of the earth; and none shall fray them away." (Jer. vii. 31–33.) There are two prominent reasons why such a denunciation as this should have been of terrible import to the Jews. First, they placed such an estimate on what they called a burial, or what was such in Jewish form, and such infamy on the non-reception of this rite, that the common sentiment and feeling is truthfully expressed by Solomon when he says, that if a man "have no burial, an untimely birth is better than he." In the second place, the associating of *the valley of Hinnom* with this extensive destruction of life and exposure of their bodies, filled out a most horrid picture to their minds. And as such a judgment must affect their nation universally, this prophecy represented the whole nation as subjected to the punishment of Gehenna. So again, (Jer. xix. 12,) "Thus will I do unto this place, saith the Lord, and to the inhabitants thereof, and even make this city as Tophet."

So, then, while, as Schleusner observes, among the

Jews "any severe punishment, especially a shameful kind of death, was denominated Gehenna," the prophets made it especially a metaphor, or analogical representation, of the judgment upon their nation, which should desolate their city, and dissolve their church and polity. And this is the farthest. It is the extreme to which the prophets went in emblemizing punishment by the valley of Hinnom. Indeed, *they could not go farther*. God, who made it their mission to warn the people of all real dangers, never inspired them with any knowledge or conception of a greater and more terrible judgment than this. The prophet Daniel, (xii. 1,) speaking in relation to this judgment, said, "And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time." And Jesus, in his last discourse to his disciples on this subject, the judgment being then near at hand, (Matt. xxiv. 21, 34,) said, "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass till all these things shall be fulfilled." And Josephus, in recording this judgment after it had transpired, expressed the opinion that all the sufferings of all cities and nations, including Sodom and Gomorrah, put together, would not make an aggregate equalling the miseries of his people in that dispensation of judgment. This was, then, emphatically, and in the highest sense of that metaphor, according to the prophetic testimonies of Daniel, and of the Lord Jesus, and the confirmations of authentic history, "*The punishment of Gehenna.*"

Such is the light with which we enter upon the New Testament usage of Gehenna. Let it be suitably noticed, and reverently appreciated, by every reader. As we go to take our seat at the feet of Jesus, to hear from his lips the word Gehenna, either as a literal place of execution or as an emblem of punishment, we go without the prepossession of a thought in our minds of its being the name or emblem of a place of future, endless torments. In this attitude, I mean, we go as Bible students, and students of Jewish history. For the word was never used in such a sense in the Old Testament, nor in any Jewish writing known to have been extant in our Saviour's time. And, more than this, coming up to Jesus from the reading of the Old Testament from the first of Genesis to the last of Malachi, we bring with us no thought of a future state of punishment revealed in any language whatever. This is generally conceded by the most eminent "Orthodox" theologians, — that the doctrine of future punishment is not revealed in the Old Testament. And this we will make plain by the record itself, when we come to Dr. Adams' next Scripture Argument, the Rich Man and Lazarus.

And, further, while we come to Jesus, without any Old Testament revelation of a place of future torment, under the name *gehenna*, *sheol*, *hades*, or any other appellation, we come impressed with the fact that the old covenant is the legal covenant, depending chiefly on external sanctions to enforce obedience, and that we are to find the new covenant a covenant of "grace and truth," the revealments of which are distinguished by the appellation, *Gospel*, or good tidings. What

a surprise it would be, then, if we should find this *good tidings* to uncap a fiery pit of endless burnings, appointed of God as the final home of most of his offspring,—a horror which the voice of Sinai's thunder never hinted. Let us not, Christian friends, on our way to Jesus as a Teacher, abandon the route of the Old Testament, and meander through the smoking underground regions of heathen fables, and thence gather up the rudiments of a theology to throw into the face of our new Master. The communications of God, at sundry times and in diverse manners, by the Patriarchs, Moses, and the Prophets, are the preparatory revealments by which we are to come directly to Jesus. So let us come.

GEHENNA IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Our esteemed friend, Dr. Adams, as a standard bearer in the cause of "Future, Endless Punishment," plants himself confidently, as we have seen, upon the words of our Lord concerning the destruction of soul and body in Gehenna, Matt. x. 28; and Luke xii. 4, 5. But as the mere sound of the word Gehenna is not, in the estimation of him who derives his religious education from the Bible, enough to create a world of "immortal pains," we have been seeking, and do now seek, a fair and reliable exegesis of the passage. We renew and press the inquiry, whence does our friend derive the idea which he foists upon the word in question in the case which he has chosen? Not, as we have seen, not from the use of it by the Jews, even the apostatized Jews, in

our Saviour's time,—and surely not from the use of it in the Old Testament Scriptures. For we have shown it to be clear beyond controversy or cavil, and a fact which, happily, is not controverted, that ge Hinnom in the Old Testament, literally the valley of Hinnom, when used as an emblem of punishment, in no case emblemizes a punishment farther or greater than that which, in the end of the Jewish age, should involve the destruction of the Jewish city and nation. With this light in our minds we come to the usage of the word by the Master himself.

Its first occurrence in the New Testament is in the following passage :

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, thou shalt not kill: and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment. But I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, (shallow brains), shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say to his brother, Thou fool, *(Moreh, apostate)*, shall be in danger of hell-fire." *(Gehenna fire)*. (Matt. v. 21, 22.)

Here, coming up from the old prophets, whose mission it was, as we have said before, to warn the people of all real dangers, we meet the great Messiah for the first time, in a discourse on punishment intensified by the word Gehenna. And how does the occasion and manner of his use of it in this instance explain to us his meaning? Does it appear to be the announcement of a new doctrine? Is this the first development, in the revelations of God, of a world of endless woe for man? If it is announced here at

all, it is the first announcement, the original revelation of the astounding economy. For we have seen that neither the patriarchs, Moses, nor the prophets, ever announced it; and this is the first utterance of our Lord which the advocates of such a post-mortem world for man have presumed to claim as an announcement of it.

In our original note of invitation to Dr. Adams to enter with us into a discussion of "The Scripturalness of Future, Endless Punishment," which we have placed in the preface to the Discussion, we used the following words:

"And to avoid losing the subject in a wilderness of verbiage, and in running quotations of fragmentary Scripture passages, I propose that you select the first passage which, in your judgment, clearly announces this doctrine; or, if it has crept into the Bible so gradually and imperceptibly that you cannot put your finger upon its beginning, select what you regard as one of the most clear and unquestionable declarations of it, and show from the subject of discourse, the natural force of the language, and the Scriptural *usus loquendi*, that it teaches such doctrine."

The Doctor did not accede to this proposition in-so-far as to undertake the discovery of *the first appearance* of his doctrine in the Bible. Nor did he pledge himself, neither has he attempted. to "show from the subject of discourse, the natural force of the language, and the Scriptual *usus loquendi*," that *any* text "teaches such a doctrine." But he has selected a passage which he undoubtedly regards as "one of the most clear and unquestionable declarations of it." Whether it be so or not depends on the sense in which we shall see our Saviour to have used

the word Gehenna. The first instance of his use of it is before us, and we repeat the inquiry, does he astonish his disciples and the world, in this blessed sermon on the Mount, by flashing upon their eyes through this word the revealment of a world of endless torments? We do not believe there is a Sunday School pupil in our land, who, looking upon this passage from the stand point which we now occupy, would not resist, as sacrilegious, the imputation of any such meaning to this saying of Jesus. There are three successive grades of punishment named here, as all belonging to one series of civil administration, —viz: the judgment, the council, and Gehenna-fire. So that if there is one "Orthodox" hell designated here, there are three. The terms judgment and council might just as well have been translated hell, in the vulgar sense, as the term Gehenna.

Dr. Adam Clarke, in his Commentary, says upon this passage:

"It is very probable that our Lord means no more here than this; if a man charge another with apostacy from the Jewish religion, or rebellion against God, and cannot prove his charge, then he is exposed to that punishment (*burning alive*) which the other must have suffered if the charge had been substantiated. There are three kinds of offences here, which exceed each other in their degrees of guilt. 1. *Anger* against a man, accompanied with some injurious act. 2. *Contempt*, expressed by the opprobrious epithet, *Raca*, or *shallow brains*. 3. *Hatred* and *mortal enmity*, expressed by the term *Moreh*, or *apostate*, where such apostacy could not be proved. Now, proportioned to these three offences, were three different degrees of punishment, each exceeding the other in severity, as the offences exceed each other in their different degrees of guilt. 1. The *judgment*, or council of *twenty-*

three, which could inflict the punishment of *strangling*. 2. The *sanhedrin*, or great council, which could inflict the punishment of *stoning*. 3. The being burnt alive in the valley of the son of Hinnom. This appears to be the meaning of our Lord. (See Clarke's Com. *in loco*.)

It would not be unworthy of our Lord to give his disciples the instruction which this would comprise taken literally as Dr. Clarke here represents it. His disciples were unlearned men, and in the faithful discharge of their duties as Christian teachers would be exposed to contumelious treatment from men in whom they would discern the characters described by the epithets here designated. They were of like passions as other men, and if they were not suitably circumspect and guarded they might throw themselves into the power of those who were watching for occasions to accuse them, to subject them to legal punishment. We are aware that it has been objected to the literal acceptance of this passage, that there was no court which could punish for mere *anger*. But we think Dr. Clarke's view is a fair one, that Jesus meant to imply in the word anger, such injurious act as usually accompanied hasty outbursts of violent passion.

But admitting this whole passage to be figurative, employing the three grades of civil adjudication and punishment as analogies of the appropriate degrees of recompense according to desert administered by the moral government of God, it creates no new hell, it puts no new sense upon the term "Gehenna," any more than upon the "judgment," and the "council." Taken as figurative it does but elucidate and enforce

the doctrine which Universalists above all others admit and maintain, to wit, that recompense is wisely and justly apportioned to character, by the Divine administration.

Gehenna occurs again in the 29th and 30th verses of the same chapter. "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into Gehenna." The other verse is a repetition of this, with the difference only of substituting the *hand* for the *eye*. St. Mark (ix. 43) records the same in the following words:—"And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, (Gehenna,) into the fire that never shall be quenched;" or, as the most literal translation is, *into the unquenchable fire;* "where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." This word is twice repeated in the same sense in the verse which follows the above.

And what here do we learn from Jesus in respect to his use of Gehenna? Has he put upon it any new definition? Or has he inoculated his theology with the heathen Tartarus, and transferred Gehenna to that as its proper name? Nothing of the sort. Not a shadow of occasion does he give for such an interpretation, but every consideration connected with these passages forbids it. We have said before, that there is in all cases something in the very texts themselves employed as proof of future endless punish-

ment, besides the surroundings and general Scripture teachings, which forbids the use to which they imperturbably subject them. So here. The language of this record involves the fact that one might enter into the life set in opposition to Gehenna, maimed, and that too on account of parting with the offensive member. This cannot apply to the immortal world. Even our learned opponent will not contend nor admit that any saint will enter into the immortal heaven *maimed*, and that, too, for having done so well on earth as to suppress impure desires and sacrifise interests which would have involved offence against the truth. No such thing is supposable. But here one may curtail selfish desires and practise self-sacrifice in various ways, for the gospel's sake, and thus enter into the aionion life of the gospel, yet feeling a kind and degree of maimedness from some of those sacrifices, especially if they were the loss of social friendships. So here, *but never hereafter*, the self-sacrificing Christian, through faith and obedience of the gospel, may *enter into life maimed.* And as the going into Gehenna, into the unquenchable fire, is set over against the entering into life maimed, it of course refers to a temporal evil to which apostates would subject themselves, who should foster the offensive member until the corruption should spread through the whole body. It is probable that Jesus had reference here to that approaching judgment on his nation which was emphatically *the punishment of Gehenna.* But then, for general application in all ages, the sentiment is sound, both physically and morally. It is

wise to part with a member of the body through which a virus is spreading, rather than that the virus should spread to the destruction of the whole body. And in a moral respect it is better to cut off any cherished associate or habit of hurtful influence, than that our whole character should be ruined and our life made wretched.

With regard to the *unquenchable fire* of Gehenna, "where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched," Dr. Adams recognizes the whole fact of its history in these few words before quoted, "the fire always burning, the worm ever breeding."

When used as an emblem of punishment, the unquenchable fire, or fire that shall not be quenched, simply denotes that the judgment, or tribulation, or calamity, signified by it, should not be hindered. To this point Jeremiah prophesied, (vii: 17, 20,) "Seest thou not what they do in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem? Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, mine anger and my fury shall be poured out upon this place, upon man, and upon beast, and upon the trees of the field, and upon the fruit of the ground; and it shall burn and shall not be quenched." If our opponent assumes that the mere phraseology, "mine anger and my fury shall be poured out upon this place," is proof sufficient that it refers to God's treatment of the wicked after death, which would be as good as any of his arguments, or of those on his side generally, he is reminded that this wrath was to be poured out "upon man, and upon beast, and upon the trees of the field, and

upon the fruit of the ground." If all this may be assumed to be descriptive of events in the immortal world, then there is no longer any mark of distinction between the two worlds. But all will admit this to be a testimony of a temporal judgment, which was in part to consist in pestilence and famine, affecting the beasts of the field and fruits of the ground. Yet it was a fire of wrath which should not be quenched; —that is, it should not be prevented, nor checked short of its completed retributive action. Again the same prophet,—(Jer. xvii. 27,) "Then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched." Such descriptions are familiarly employed in the Bible, of scenes and events of earth, but never of the life immortal which is brought to light through the gospel.

Another instance of the use of Gehenna by our Lord is in Matt. xxiii. 33; "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" (*tes kriseos tes Gehennes;* literally *the condemnation, or punishment of Gehenna.*) Does Jesus here give us notice of a change in his use of this word, insomuch as to make it the name of an after-death prison of torment? No, not a hint in this direction. On the contrary, he uses it in a connection which renders it obvious that, in the exact sense of the prophets, he makes it to emblemize the desolating judgment upon the Jewish nation. In the other cases which we have noticed of his use of this word, it was in addresses to his disciples. But here he is

addressing the unbelieving Jews, with regard to whose nation the prophet had admonished them that their great city should be like unto Tophet in ge Hinnom. But they were blind to their true character and condition, though that very judgment was impending. Accordingly he said unto them in this connection, "Woe unto you Scribes, and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the punishment of Gehenna?" How obviously he uses the term in the metaphorical sense of the prophets; as if he had said, "How can you, bearing the very character on which your prophets based their prediction that your land and city should be like Tophet in ge Hinnom, how expect to escape that doom? And that this was his subject, his words which immediately follow render it unquestionably certain. For he proceeds immediately to say:

"Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, wise men and scribes, and some of them ye shall kill and crucify, and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city; that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you,

All these things shall come upon this generation. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, ... how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, but ye would not. Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

We think that no one of our readers, of any sect, on reading this whole connection, can fail to see that the *punishment of Gehenna* in this case, which is rendered "damnation of hell," is the destruction of the Jewish city and nation. And all our readers must, by this time, be agreeably impressed with the fact, that when we have attained to a true basis of Scripture interpretation, all the Bible testimonies on kindred topics concurrently flow in to confirm and establish our positions.

There are two other cases of the use of Gehenna, in the New Testament, besides our opponent's chosen proof text. The first of these is by our Lord, (Matt. xxiii. 15,) "Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when ye have made him he is two-fold more the child of hell (Gehenna) than yourselves." We doubt whether even our learned friend will assume that this should be rendered, "two-fold more the child of *a place of future endless punishment.*" As the valley of Hinnom was, in Jewish usage, an emblem of odiousness as well as of suffering, the design of Jesus was to intensify his description of the odiousness of the Jewish proselytes, by calling them children of the valley of Hinnom.

The other case to which we have referred, is James iii. 6; "And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity; and is set on fire of Gehenna." The sense here is similiar to that in the last case noticed,—denoting mischievous odiousness.

And now we come to the instance of the use of Gehenna, on which our opponent has planted himself for defense of his favorite doctrine, that of "future endless punishment." How does he make his proof in this case? We have correctly noted the use of ge Hinnom before Christ, by the prophets; and its *non*-use in the Jewish writings of our Saviour's time; and we have carefully studied every case of its use by Jesus except this now in question; and it was never used either as the name of a place or the emblem of a place of future endless punishment. To this statement every reader who has deliberately and intelligently accompanied us in this investigation will respond with an emphatic *amen*. Therefore the destruction of soul and body in Gehenna is not the consignment of the person to a place of future endless punishment, because Gehenna is not the name or emblem of any such place or state. The Doctor might, with a small degree of plausibility, take it to denote an extinction of being. But he offers as an argument against this, that "the valley of Hinnom is notoriously symbolical of perpetuity, the fire always burning, the worm ever breeding." But he assumes here for the valley of Hinnom what is not true in fact. The perpetuity applies to the instruments of punishments and not to the sufferings of any individ-

ual. They who were burned in the fire of Tophet, whether sacrificed to Moloch or executed for crime, were despatched very quickly. So there is virtually a slight of words, though not so designed, in this attempt of the Doctor to make the valley of Hinnom symbolical of his theory of endless punishment in opposition to annihilation.*

But the passage proves neither. Whatever it may mean, it does not utter, by any implication or figure, future endless punishment; because Gehenna is not, in any Scripture usage, either the name or emblem of a place or state of such punishment. Therefore, so far as our discussion with the Doctor is concerned, we need say nothing more on this portion of Scripture. But we make it our principle, while we tear down error, to build up truth, and to promote the faith and love of the Scriptures by elucidating their harmonious teachings. Therefore we will devote a brief labor to what we regard as a truthful exposition of the passage.

Some very able and candid expounders of Scrip-

* Dr. Adams' argument against the Destructionist, from the apparent reference to a *place*, in his proof text, turns equally against himself. He says "Why, moreover, should any *place* be specified in which the annihilation, which is the same thing everywhere, should occur?" This question is equally pertinent turned back upon him. "Why, moreover, should any *place* be specified in which spiritual punishment, which is the same every where, should occur?" Does he think it will occur in a *place* called the Valley of Hinnom? No. He takes the Gehenna-fire to be a *symbol* of future punishment. Then what about its meaning a *place?* He seems to be slightly confused in this matter. At one time he views Gehenna as a symbol of future punishment; and then he talks of it as the proper name of a *place* of future punishment.

With regard to "everlasting destruction," which the Doctor takes to be "an apparent contradiction of terms," we shall doubtless find, when we come to consider it in its place, that it involves no contradiction at all.

ture have adopted the opinion, that this casting into *Gehenna* after killing the body, or destroying both soul and body in *Gehenna* as it is recorded by Matthew, means the destruction of the very principle of human existence, after the death of the body, so that man should never live again. They have not understood, however, that God would ever do this, annihilate his offspring,—for it would be against the leading doctrine of the gospel, the resurrection of all men from the dead, immortal and incorruptible. The sentiments that *some* men are to be so destroyed as never to exist again, and that *all* men are to be made alive in Christ, immortal and incorruptible, cannot both be true. Therefore, as the latter is unquestionably a Scripture doctrine, the former cannot be.

Consequently they who suppose that the destruction in *Gehenna* here spoken of, means the destruction of men's *existence* so as to prevent their living again, lay particular stress on the word *power;* "Fear him, who, after he hath killed, hath *power* to cast into hell;" or as in Matthew, "Who is *able* to destroy both soul and body in *Gehenna.*" They understand that Jesus designed this as merely a reference to the *power* of God; and that his object was to inspire the disciples, unto whom these words were addressed, with confidence in that power,—saying directly after, "But even the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear ye not, therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows." Thus they view the saying, "who is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna," to be designed as merely an expression of

the *power* of God, like the saying, "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham."

But Dr. Adams alleges that if the passage refers to God's natural ability to do what is here meant to be expressed by the destruction of soul and body, "while his character makes it morally impossible that he should ever do it, the illustration is singularly at fault." However this may be, our friend appears even *more* singularly at fault when subjected to this scale of reasoning. St. Paul says of Christ, (Phil. iii. 21,) "he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." But the Doctor will not allow this to constitute the least reason for hoping that he *will do* so good a work. Nay, more. The inspired record positively affirms that "God will have all men to be saved;" that "The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world;" that "For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil," which are sin and all its evils; that he hath "made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, *which he hath purposed in himself*, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ." But all this must go for little or nothing. What all good men pray for, God desires and purposes, and Christ was commissioned to accomplish, it is heresy, presumptuous heresy to expect! But with regard to *the destruction of soul and body in Gehenna*, it being first misconstrued to mean what it does not denote or imply, an infinite instead of a limited evil, the mere mention of God's

being *able* to inflict it, must be taken as positive assurance that the thing shall be done!

Well, we only draw this picture to delinenate the unenviable condition of mind in relation to the testimonies of God's word, in which the opposition is involved. As it respects the passage under consideration, we shall not differ from the Doctor upon the question of its relating to a real danger. We think Jesus designed to admonish his disciples of a real danger. But what was that danger? It was the danger of becoming involved in some temporal destruction, of such a nature as to be appropriately described as *the punishment of Gehenna.*

That endless punishment was not the danger referred to has been sufficiently shown. The phrase, "to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna," no more proves endless punishment, than the phrase "So they took up Jonah and cast him forth into the sea," proves endless punishment. For Gehenna no more means a place or state of such punishment than the sea does. True our translators have rendered Gehenna, hell; and so they make Jonah call his place in the sea "the belly of hell;" but the original writers in either case, had no reference to such a place as Augustinian Christians have distinguished by this name.

Neither does his language denote annihilation, in the sense of modern destructionists, or semi-sadducees. The destruction of soul or life and body in Gehenna, to the mind of a Christian of that primitive Christian age, conveyed no idea of a forfeiture of

their immortal existence, or the destruction of the resurrection life. The word *psuke*, rendered life in this passage, is, we think, never used in the Scriptures for *existence*, or *state of being*, in the abstract; nor for the *life from the dead*, or the life immortal, which shall have the victory when "mortality shall be swallowed up of life;" nor for the spiritual life. In all these relations the word for *life* is *zoe*. *Psuke* is familiarly used for persons, as, "We were all in the ship two hundred and seventy-six souls;" for the affections of the mind, as, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul;" and for the natural life, of which we will give a few of the many cases for examples:

Peter told Jesus that he would lay down his *life* for his sake. And Jesus said that he came to give his *life* a ransom for many. In these cases the same word is rendered *life* that is rendered *soul* in the text; but no one understands that Peter and Jesus meant to give their immortal souls a ransom for others. Jesus said to his disciples, "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life (*psuke*) also, he cannot be my disciple." That is, one must have such a supreme love to the Redeemer's cause, as to be prepared to abandon all these things for the sake of it, if occasion should require. But who will suppose that Jesus meant to require his disciples to abandon their *immortal souls* for his sake? And Paul said, "Neither count I my life (*psuke*) dear unto me." Surely Paul did not mean

that he did not count his immortal soul dear unto him. The immortal existence for which he hoped was infinitely dear unto him. It is written also that when the Pharisees murmured because Jesus healed on the Sabbath day, he said unto them, "I will ask you one thing: Is it lawful on the Sabbath days to do good, or to do evil? to save life or to destroy it?" Here it is implied that it was possible for man either to preserve or destroy the life, *psuke*, the same that in the text is rendered soul.

It is indeed a plain case that the language of the passage before us could not have conveyed to the minds of his hearers the idea of any other than temporal destruction, or physical death under circumstances of aggravated suffering and shame. The destruction of *psuke* and *soma*, life and body, would suggest no other thought. The coupling of life and body in this case, as elsewhere, intensifies the idea of completeness or thoroughness. St. Paul employs this mode, and the addition of spirit, for the same purpose of expressing completeness, but in relation to a different experience. "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your (*pneuma*, *psuke*, *soma*) spirit, and life, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." The destruction of life and body, applied directly to the person, has the same sense of thoroughness that *destruction root and branch* has in figurative speech. And it will be distinctly observed that the body, the same physical body which men could kill or torture, is here coupled with the *psuke*,

life, as sharing the same destruction. This is another circumstance which forbids our opponent's application of the passage.

But the critical student will ask us how, upon this view of the subject, we can explain the language of Jesus, implying that men could kill the body, but were not able to destroy the life? Introductory to our answer to this inquiry, we ask the reader to consider that Jesus was addressing his own disciples alone, instructing them as to the duties before them, and the dangers which should surround them. He knew that the strongest temptation they would have to betray their post of duty in his cause, would be the fear of harm from men in consequence of their Christian labors, and the prospect of safety by banding with his enemies. In view of these circumstances he instructed them that, in his service, they were appointed messengers of God for a mission which men could not thwart nor hinder. While they were faithful to the work of his mission, though it would be permitted that men might scourge their bodies, and inflict upon them temporal privations, God would preserve their lives. But if, for fear of men, they should betray the cause of Christ, they would subject themselves to the destruction of life also, by the retributive judgment of God.*

* One eminent theologian, among his later productions, assumes that the person referred to by the pronoun *him*, whom the disciples were rather to fear, was not God, but the Roman Emperor, who alone had legal authority to put his subjects to death. But this view does not appear to us to harmonize with the scope of the passage. It would make human authority to be the highest or governing fear, — while it appears to be the design of the Saviour to warn them against being swayed from the course of duty by the fear of any human power whatever. As ambassadors of Christ, they were immortal to the work of their mission, in spite of any human power, Jewish or Roman.

Such appears, from the occasion, the leading design, and the whole scope of this address of the Master to his disciples, to be the sentiment of this passage. And the particular language employed here is very properly, while very succinctly expressive of this sentiment. We know that, in the common usage of the term kill, the killing of the body would imply the destroying of life. But this form of expression in such case would be a clumsy one, and is never used. We never speak of killing men's bodies, but of killing the men, or taking their lives. Nor is the killing of the body any where else named in this form in the Scriptures. Therefore, the use of this singular phraseology in this case, naturally implies that the word kill as here applied to the body in distinction from the life, is employed in a modified sense, meaning something short of taking the life. In such modified sense our word *kill* is sometimes used; as where Paul says, quoting from the Psalms, "For thy sake we are killed all the day long." That is, they were subjected to physical privations and sufferings. But the Greek word rendered kill in the case before us, admits of construction in the modified sense with the strictest propriety, when the connection requires it. The word *apokteino*, here rendered *kill*, signifies, according to Schrevelius, *to kill, to slay, to take away, to remove, to beat almost to death, to tease or plague, &c.*

How obvious, therefore, it is, from all the considerations which we have noted, that Jesus spoke of the physical privations and discomforts which they might expect to suffer at the hands of men, while, if

they were true and faithful, men should not be permitted to take away their lives.

But could not men destroy the lives of those ambassadors of Christ? No; in the theory of thought to which Jesus was here elevating the disciples' minds they could not. Faithful to duty they were immortal to the performance of the work of their mission. And this is the sentiment with which Jesus was here laboring to inspire them.

There are two senses in which it is true that men could not destroy the lives of the innocent disciples of Jesus. In the first place, the Jews, who were the only violent enemies of the gospel in that age, had no legal authority, being subject to the Roman government, to put any man to death. When Pilate, before whom the Jews brought Jesus for a mock trial, requested them to take him and judge him according to their law, they said unto him, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death." Neither was there in that age any law of the Roman government, by which the innocent disciples of Jesus could be put to death for their religious belief. So that in respect to *legal* authority, no man had power to put to death those Christians who were obedient to the law of Christ.

Another, and higher sense, and that which we take to be the sense of the text, in which the disciples might rest assured that men had not power to kill their lives, is in this,—That God had engaged his power to protect them, if they would remain faithful to his cause, and men had no power, not even the *physical* power, to prevent the fulfilment of

the divine promise. Christ had given a promise for the faithful, saying, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," or age. If they abandoned his cause, they would have their lives destroyed in the most miserable manner, by the punishment which the power of God would execute. But if they were faithful in his service, whatever men might *wish* to do to them, no earthly power could take them out of the specially pledged divine protection, so as to destroy their lives. For though Jesus told his disciples that *some* of them, their enemies would kill and crucify, yet this could only be in such individual cases, as when God should see that it was necessary to give them up to their enemies, to be sacrificed for the sake of the cause of truth. And in such cases he would inspire them with that spirit and power, by which they would cheerfully lay down their own lives in the cause they supremely loved. It could then in truth be said of them, as Jesus said of himself, "No man taketh it (my life) from me, but I lay it down of myself." Though men might be instruments of taking some of the disciples lives, yet as long as God had anything for his faithful servants to do, no man was able to destroy their lives. But if, for fear of men, they should forsake duty and band with the enemies of Jesus, they would be brought to some such shameful and miserable end as might appropriately be called the destruction of life and body in Gehenna.

With this construction the passage in question speaks a sentiment which is abundantly taught in the Scriptures. It is the general sentiment of the

Scriptures, that, though we should heed the caution, "*Beware of men*," we should yet fear God rather than man; that the greatest evil we have occasion to fear is the evil of sin, or the misery which the established government of God will execute upon us, if we go in the way of transgression. The word of the Lord saith by the prophet, (Isa. viii. 12,) — "Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid. Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread." And in Isa. li. 12, — it is said, "I, even I, am he that comforteth you: who art thou, that thou shouldst be afraid of a man that shall die, and of the son of man which shall be made as grass, — and forgettest the Lord thy Maker?"

And the sentiment before us, that the disciples' greatest fear should be of the evils of an apostacy from their Master's cause, Jesus himself directly urged upon them in various other places. See Matt. xvi. 24; "Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man 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 will lose his life for my sake, shall find it." That is, if any should abandon the cause of Christ with a view to save their lives, they would in consequence be subjects of that judgment which should destroy their lives;—but if they faithfully adhered to his cause, though it might seem to human view as if they were hereby losing their lives for Christ's sake, their lives

should be preserved. And in Matt. xxiv. 48: Jesus, speaking of the judgment of that generation, which he elsewhere, as we have seen, denominated the punishment of *Gehenna*, that greatest of all tribulations that ever were or shall be, said unto his disciples, —"But if that evil servant shall begin to say in his heart, My Lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to smite his fellow servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; the Lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

But the general preservation of life through all those calamities, to the servants of Jesus abiding in their fidelity, is a familiar theme of prophecy by the Jewish seers, and of promises by Jesus Christ. Daniel, prophesying of these tribulations, said, "Then shall thy people be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." And the Revelator, writing as the judgment of that age was at hand, speaks of the angels' sealing in their foreheads the servants of God, who should be preserved in the midst of the general desolation. (Rev. viii. 3.) And Jesus, describing the same judgment, which he expressly dated as an event of that generation, said, "he shall send forth his angels with the great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Matt. xxiv. 31.) This is a figurative description of the instrumentalities which should be employed to inspire

and guide the disciples in their escape for preservation, according to the direction given, "Let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains."

But notwithstanding so much was said by the Master, and properly and necessarily said, (as it was so essentially related to the comfirmation of the prophets, the lives of the Christians, and the preservation of the church to her subsequent mission in the world,) upon the signal and pre-eminent judgment of that age, yet all along there was an individual responsibility and an operative judgment. Hence, Judas, when he had betrayed his Master, came to his death in so miserable a manner, and connected with such shame and obloquy, as rendered it in a striking sense, *the punishment of Gehenna.*

We would not be understood as urging the doctrine of *slavish fear.* In the path of duty we have *nothing* to fear. Father Murray was strong in this confidence, when, on being entreated by his friends to descend from his pulpit in Boston lest he should be killed by the miscreants who, inspired with hatred by his theological opposers, were casting stones at him through the pulpit window, he calmly responded, "While the Lord has a work for me to do, all the stones in Boston cannot prevent it." Nor have we, in any case, occasion to fear the ultimate failure of that purpose of grace in Christ, which shall finally destroy death, and sin, and misery. The grand and leading principle of Christian obedience is the love of God and of duty. But circumstanced as we are in this life, occasionally temptations may beset us, and

promise us an escape from evil, or a gain in the enjoyment of good, by doing wrong. In such case it is profitable, and instead of promoting bondage, frees from it, to be assured that the promise of our escaping evil, or obtaining benefit, by doing wickedly is all delusion; that the evils which we have the greatest reason to dread, will be found in that destruction which the government of God will execute on transgressors. "The way of transgressors is hard." But "great peace have they that love God's law, and nothing shall offend them." And though they may occasionally meet with trials in this excellent way, they need not fear, for God is with them there.

SECTION III.

Indifferent Speculations, and Miscellaneous Texts.

By *indifferent speculations* we refer to the labor of our learned friend on his theory of future punishment respecting the manner of its infliction. On this point he differs from some of the Endless-miserian Doctors, in-as much as he holds that the poignancy of future endless sufferings will proceed mainly from immediate and of course miraculous inflictions of torture, by the hand of God. He devotes more than thirteen pages * to this point, arguing that if, as some of his brethren affirm, the punishment of eternity is to consist in the wicked being finally left to the

* "Argument," pp. 19–32.

natural operation of their own evil principles and passions, and of their outraged consciences, they will at length become so callous to it from sameness as to be measurably insensible to suffering; and that, to prevent any such lulling of their pain, God will make it an important part of his administration to all eternity to blow the fire of their torment directly with his own breath, and pierce their souls with torturous instruments wielded by his own hand. We quoted liberally from this part of the Doctor's "Argument" in our Preliminary Observations, when disposing of his effort in his "Introductory Remarks" to sink the doctrine of endless punishment to the proportion in the whole economy of God which our courts and prisons bear to the interests of the whole state. It is entirely uncalled for that we should step aside from our main course to dispute with our opponent about the instruments and qualities of future punishment, until he gives us some sort of proof of the *fact* of future punishment itself. We have looked to him in vain, thus far, for any proof of such an economy; nor do the passages which he proceeds to quote in this connection make any reference to human condition in another state of being. We think that he himself could not have quoted them as affording any evidence in themselves of a reference to the future life. But presuming that he had proved the *fact* of a future state of punishment by the prominent texts which we have been considering, he uses these miscellaneous quotations for argument in favor of his views of the nature and manner of punishment there.

But as we have removed the false main position in respect to judgment and retribution, and planted ourself on the Bible position of judgment as an ever-existing branch of the Divine government, the many thousands of Bible students who read this will perceive, as fast as they glance at our opponent's texts of this class, that they describe punishments administered by the government of God which was, and is, and is to be. So, then, strike out the Doctor's interpolation, "*future*," and he and I can read together, as members of one Bible Class, his Scripture lessons of punishment; and I can adopt his reading, comments and all, with a slight modification of a few words. The following is his paragraph, embracing his Scripture quotations and brief comments, from which even he drops his usual prefix of *future* to *punishment*:

"Now the Bible is continually representing the wicked as receiving from God positive inflictions, and not merely as being abandoned to themselves. Even when it speaks of many sources of misery which might seem to be natural consequences of their sin, it often represents these consequences as being administered by the direct agency of the Almighty. So that the two things seem to be combined. "Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and a horrible tempest; this shall be the portion of their cup." "Now consider this, ye that forget God, lest I tear you in pieces and there be none to deliver." "God is angry with the wicked every day. If he turn not, he will whet his sword; he hath bent his bow and made it ready." These passages teach that sinners will not merely be left to the natural consequences of sin. The ideas of arrest, and of execution, are here presented; the transgressor is not left to himself, with merely his sin for his punishment. Then again we read—"Woe unto the wicked, it shall be ill with him; for the reward of his hands shall be given him." "Yea, woe unto them also when I depart from them."

It was sufficient for our friend to barely *quote* these passages. But as the purpose for which he quotes them is to elucidate the nature of punishment in the immortal world, and as it is our mission to aid the reader in a knowledge of the Scriptures, we will go over again with this list of texts, note their places in the Record, and refer to a few collaterals.

1. "Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and an horrible tempest. (Ps. xi. 6.) The following are a few collaterals: "Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven." (Gen. xix. 24.) "Yea, the light of the wicked shall be put out, ... the light shall be dark in his tabernacle, ... it (destruction) shall dwell in his tabernacle, because it is none of his; brimstone shall be scattered upon his habitation." (Job xviii.) "He gave them hail for rain, and flaming fire in their land." (Ps. cv. 32.) "Fear, and the pit, and the snare are upon thee, O inhabitants of the earth. . . . . And it shall come to pass in that day that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth." (Isa. xxiv.) "And I will plead against him (Gog) with pestilence and with blood; and I will rain upon him, and upon his bands, and upon the many people that are with him, an overflowing rain, and great hail-stones, fire and brimstone." (Ezek. xxxviii. 22.) Thus familiarly do the Scriptures attest the idea of the first of the foregoing catalogue of texts, as a usual dispensation of God's government in our world.

2. "Now consider this, ye that forget God, lest I

tear you in pieces and there be none to deliver." (Ps. l. 22.) For a collateral see Hosea v. 14;—"For I will be unto Ephraim as a lion, and as a young lion to the house of Judah; I, even I, will tear and go away; I will take away, and none shall rescue him." Precisely the same sentiment, and essentially the same language. Yet Dr. Adams takes pains to prove, in his second division which we shall come to by-and-by, that Ephraim, of whom this was spoken, had the assurance of restoration.

3. "God is angry with the wicked every day. If he turn not he will whet his sword; he hath bent his bow and made it ready." (Ps. vii. 11, 12.) Our learned friend will not himself say a word nor indulge a thought of God so irreverent, as that he is every day literally agitated with anger. Such a definition of wrath ascribed to God, in connection with the idea that he is to have men in their wicked characters before him to all eternity, would make the eternal life of God one of restless perturbation. But, with the view which we think many of the learned of all denominations hold, that the word anger applied to God describes a visible manifestation of his providence and condemnatory operation of his law against transgressors, the saying that God is angry with the wicked every day, expresses fully and emphatically what we have shown and will show to be the uniform teachings of the Bible on the perfection of God's moral government in our world, even in its judicial and retributive department. As it respects his bending his bow for a more signal infliction if the wicked

turn not, which is the idea elucidated in the second section of this chapter, on treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath, the Psalmist proceeds directly to elucidate the idea in the following verses of the same Psalm: — "He made a pit, and digged it, and is fallen into the ditch which he made. His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violent dealing shall come down upon his own pate."

4. "Woe unto the wicked, it shall be ill with him; for the reward of his hands shall be given him." (Isa. iii. 11.) We need not take room for quoting collaterals here, for the reason that the fact and the manner of the wicked's receiving the reward of his hands have been fully elucidated, and the reading out of this chapter discovers that the recompense here particularly referred to, should come in national calamities.

5. "Yea, woe also unto them when I depart from them." (Hosea ix. 12.) This also is said of Ephraim, referring solely to temporal calamities, to consist in part in a withdrawal of those favors which they had been receiving from God's hand. "As for Ephraim, their glory shall fly away like a bird. . . . . Though they bring up their children, yet will I bereave them: — Yea, woe also to them when I depart from them." And here again we remember the fact that our opponent advocates the restoration of Ephraim. Therefore his picture of the effect, deduced from this passage, of God's departing from a portion of his children in eternity, must be regarded as a fancy sketch.

We have now completed our examination of this collection, made by the Doctor, of Scripture phraseology in relation to the punishment of the wicked; and we find it all decisively confirmatory and illustrative of the principles which we have set forth, and, as we think, Scripturally established. Thus much, however, these passages clearly indicate of the view to which he adduced them.—to wit, that punishment often involves external inflictions additional to internal sufferings. But they do *not* prove that, generally, these external evils are inflicted by the hand of God in a direct and miraculous manner. True, in some cases, as in that of the hail and tempest upon Egypt, which came, and disappeared, by the instance of Moses as God's specially instructed servant, the instruments of the calamities were put in motion by an immediate exertion of the Divine power. But usually, as we have seen by reading the quoted passages in their connections, even the external evils which were suffered as punishments, consisting in wars, commotions, famines, and the like, were induced in the ordinary way, by the natural operations of their follies, vices and crimes, private, social and national. Yet they are described as punishments from the hand of God, (the prophets speaking in the name of God saying, *I, the Lord, will do this unto you, I will bring these plagues and calamities upon you,*) because they were to be brought about by the regular administration of God's laws, which he hath in-wrought with the physical and moral natures of man, and the relations of society. So it

comes out, in relation to the execution of punishment by the administrative authority of God, and yet through the operation of established laws, as our friend well expresses it, — "that the two things seem to be combined." It is so; and it is comprehensively expressed in the oracles of wisdom, thus: "For the ways of man are before the eyes of the Lord, and he pondereth all his goings. His own iniquities shall take the wicked himself, and he shall be holden with the cords of his sins." (Prov. v. 21, 22.) Again, "Thine own wickedness shall correct thee, and thy backslidings shall reprove thee." (Jer. ii. 19.)

In continuation of the same topic, the constant presence and agency of God in the direct infliction of sufferings upon the wicked, (in eternity, he means) our friend proceeds to argue, — "Yet he will always make his presence to be felt; for 'if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there.'" Now it is to be observed that, when the Doctor uses the word hell, he means hell, not in the sense of the Hebrew *sheol*, or the Greek *hades*, or the old English or Saxon *helle*, but in the more modern and perverted, or rather theological sense of the word. So by his quotation of the Psalmist's words, "if I make my bed in hell," — he intends to direct his readers' minds to a place of endless torment in the spirit world. But this appears to us, and we are sure it will appear to our intelligent readers generally, a palming upon David a clumsy illustration of the omnipresence of God. Such is the subject of the passage from which these few words are taken. The whole illustration reads

thus: "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, (*hades*) behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." (Ps. cxxxix. 7–10.) There is no moral state referred to here, but there is an eloquent poetic expression of God's omnipresence. The literal heaven is meant, (not the spiritual,) the etherial heights, — and the literal *hades*, the opposite lowest depths; and then for breadth, added to the height and depth, the literal extremity of the sea. But the music of the stanza is shockingly marred when our opponent substitutes his place of endless torment for the Psalmist's *hades*.

Here is a similar representation of God's omnipresence, addressed to Israel in transgression, admonishing them of the impossibility of escaping the Divine judgments: "And I will slay the last of them with the sword; he that fleeth of them shall not flee away, and he that escapeth of them shall not be delivered. Though they dig into hell, thence shall mine hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down; and though they hide themselves in the top of Carmel, I will search and take them out thence; and though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence will I command the serpent and he shall bite them; and though they go into captivity before their enemies, thence will I command the sword and it shall

slay them." This, in its own proper sense, is a harmonious combination of imagery to represent the idea intended, the searching severity and unavoidable certainty of the impending judgment of God upon transgressing Israel. There was no *aerial* height, nor *hadean* depth; no feint of surrender, nor distance of flight, by which they could evade the threatened calamity. But let our esteemed friend, learned in the theology of the schools, displace the old *hades* with his scholastic pit of future endless punishment, and all is ajar again; the representation becomes even ludicrous. It would be indeed surprising to see a host of people, enlightened into the nature of the place as our friend appears to think the people of God, or Hebrews were, digging down into the place of endless torments to get away from punishment! And it would be even more surprising that Jehovah, when they had committed such a blunder, should take them out to punish them!

If it shall seem to any that there is somewhere here a use of the sacred record which borders on irreverence, we call on all men to witness that it is not our fault that it is so, but that it is our effort to remedy the evil, and vindicate the Scriptures from such dishonor. Let a view of the sad havoc made of the Scriptures by a perverted theological use of their phraseology, incite us to a faithful *de novo* study of the sacred pages.

We do not here stop for a general view of the Scripture sense of *hell* as rendered from *hades;* this work will come in our way directly. We have only

shown, as we were passing, how unjustifiable is our friend's quotation of it for the use to which he puts it, in the case just noticed.

A little further on in the same paragraph,* he refers to the deep anguish sometimes felt at funerals and closing graves, and adds, "If God shall but keep perpetually fresh such sorrows as men feel here, he will fulfil a large part of that which the Saviour and the apostles have declared to be the future portion of the wicked." And then speaking of Andrew Fuller, and Edwards, men who seemed to take a savage delight in horrid fancy paintings of the future torments of the non-elect, representing God as holding them over the flames of hell eternally as you would hold a spider over the blaze of the candle, our friend endorses them all, saying that their portraitures "fall far below the truth," and that to "surpass the dread reality — is impossible."

As a brief specimen of what Dr. Adams fully endorses in Dr. Edwards, and which he thinks "falls far below the truth," we will transcribe the following from his *Sermon on the Eternity of Hell Torments:*

"How dismal it will be when you are under these racking torments, to know assuredly that you never, never shall be delivered from them; to have no hope. When you shall wish that you might be turned into a toad or serpent, but shall have no hope of it; when you would rejoice, if you might but have any relief, after you have endured these torments millions of ages, but shall have no hope of it; when, after you have worn out the ages of the sun, moon, and stars, in your dolorous groans and lamentations, with-

* "Argument," p. 2.

out rest day or night, or one minute's ease, yet you shall have no hope of ever being delivered; when, after you have worn out a thousand more such ages, yet you shall have no hope, but shall know that you are not one whit nearer the end of your torments; but that still there are the same groans, the same shrieks, the same doleful cries incessantly to be made by you, and that the smoke of your torments shall still ascend forever and ever; and that your souls which have been agitated by the wrath of God all this while, yet will still exist to bear more wrath; your bodies which will have been burning and roasting all this while in these glowing flames, yet shall not have been consumed, but will remain to roast through an eternity yet, which will not have been at all shortened by what shall have been past."

Such is the strain in which Dr. Jonathan Edwards was wont to "charge God foolishly," aye, and as we view it, wickedly too. I would not utter these words in the house of God, to be understood as expressing my own thoughts of God, for all the gold of Galconda. I would be afraid to utter them even in the lone field or in the wilderness, both as I would shrink from belching out the most odious blasphemy, and would fear to be struck dead for such an open insult to the Most High.

But my opponent will plead, as the apology of his theological model, and as his own apology for endorsing all this, that the Scriptures warrant it. We respectfully suggest, however, that it would have been wise and prudent in him to show that "the Saviour and the apostles have declared" any such "future portion of the wicked," or have in any case testified that there shall be such a class as the wicked in the immortal world, before making so free with these

horrible paintings of the great Father of men as their eternal tormenter. No such showing has yet appeared. But we will pursue our search.

SECTION IV.

Parable of the Tares — End of the World.

The "Argument for Future, Endless Punishment" makes its next effort in the following paragraph:

> Let us now consider the following passages:
>
> "'As therefore the tares are gathered and are burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.' These same closing words are used a few verses afterward, in explaining the parable of the Net."

Here, as elsewhere, the essential deficiency of the "Argument" is, that it does not *argue.* But our friend is not to be censured for this, since it is the only way for that side of the question. No advocate of this theory has done better. They all habitually assume, outright, the application of such passages to the final condition of mankind, from the sound of certain phraseology, without attempting to show the reason why. Long habit has made it natural. But it devolves upon us, according to the injunction of our Master, to "search the Scriptures." We reverence the method of Jeshua, Bani, and others, who, in the great reformation of Israel, "read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and

caused them to understand the reading. (Neh. viii. 8.)

Now let us look for the sense of the parable of the tares, as applied by our Lord. The first thing for which we inquire is the time of the transaction described. "So shall it be in the end of this world." This is the time. But we ask further, the end of *what world?* For the Doctor to throw in this fragmentary quotation of an important portion of the great Teacher's discourse, in a connection and manner to float along the unquestioning mind of the prejudiced and uninstructed reader with the whole subject into eternity, as if the end of the mundane system, or material world, were unquestionably the time referred to, is an expedient that may do for the theologian, but in the scholar, such as he is, it is hardly excusable. He knows perfectly well that the original word *aionos*, here rendered world, does not mean *world*, in the usual sense of that term, that is, not the material world, but an age, or periodical dispensation of God's providence.

And here, before we proceed another step in the exposition, we will have one other matter settled. The learned opponents of Universalism, (we refer not to Dr. Adams,) seeing that, in some important proof texts, they derive an advantage from taking the words used by King James' translators, and these in a certain canonized theological sense, attempt to discourage common inquiry in these cases by sneering at our reference to the original. But in these cases there is nothing pedantic in such references; it is a

necessity, and a Christian duty. A mistranslation of *hades* and *gehenna*, by the word hell, and the change in the use even of this English word since the Common Version was made; and *aionos* by world; and *aionion* by eternal; and *krisis* by damnation,—constitutes the chief instrumentality by which the advocates of endless punishment manage to keep their theory in countenance with the public. And it is not pedantic, we repeat, to refer to the original, and that familiarly, in the case where these words occur. The Greek words of this class have become Anglicised. They have long been so familiarly introduced and explained in religious publications, that every child trained to systematic study of the Bible is as familiar with them as with his mother tongue. And it should be so. The translators of our Common Version produced an excellent translation as a whole; but in some of these important cases they must needs conform the rendering to the doctrines of their church. They had but just emerged from the dark night of Romanism. If religious discussion and Biblical knowledge in the Protestant church had then advanced to its present state, we believe those high-minded men would have Angelicised hades, gehenna, and aion and its derivatives, and left them in the text untranslated. It was thus that they did with the Greek *baptizo*, when used for a religious rite. The word primarily signifies immersion, or dipping. But it is used in different shades of meaning, such as drenching, washing, &c. The church differed as to the manner in which it should be applied as a religious

rite, and therefore the translators judiciously Anglicised the word and left it untranslated, thus leaving it for every reader to judge for himself by the general light of the Scriptures on the subject. If they had rendered it *sprinkle*, every Baptist, great and small, would have been made familiar with the original, and would have referred to it whenever the subject should come under discussion. But we have infinitely greater reason to refer to the original in the controverted passages now alluded to, because they refer to infinitely more important subjects. And our children, in the family and in the Sunday School, should be made as familiar with the prominent original words in these cases, as with the multiplication table.

And now to the *time* in question, denoted in Christ's application of the parable of the tares. It is the end of the *aionos*. This word is defined by Donegan's popular Lexicon, thus,—"time; a space of time; life time, and life; the ordinary period of man's life; the age of man; man's estate; a long period of time; eternity; in the memory of man." No case is found by this approved Greek Lexicographer, in all classic writings, of the use of *aionos* for *world*. Its use for *eternity* is rare and exceptional; and our opponent would not put this sense upon it in the New Testament, for then he would make an end of eternity. Nor is it ever used in the New Testament, any more than in the classics, for *world*. It here denotes an age, or periodical dispensation of God's providence. We challenge contradiction here.

Kosmos is the Greek word for world, the universe,

the earth and its inhabitants. It occurs in this same explanation by our Lord of the parable of the tares. in Matt. xiii., at verse 38; "The field is the world." *(Kosmos.)* And at verse 39, "The harvest is the end of (not *kosmos*, the world, but *aionos*,) the age." Did not Jesus, and his historian, Matthew, understand their words? Why did they not speak of the *end* of the same *kosmos* which was the *field?* Because they meant no such thing. The field is the *world*,—the harvest is the end of the *age*. Of what age? Jesus informs us in the very next verse. "As, therefore, the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be at the end of this aionos." Mark ye, the Divine Teacher is so particular in this case, as to use the pronoun *this*, though he usually, in relation to the same event, employs the article *the*. "So shall it be at the end of *this* age." He of course referred to the end of the Jewish age. The language of the Saviour is decisive to this point.

The parable of the tares sown by an enemy into his neighbor's wheat-field, represented the infusion into the church, by the spirit of evil, of false doctrines and corrupt moral principles, the influence of which constituted their recipients characteristically children of *diabolos*, which denotes imposture and enmity. Those who were characterized by imposture and evil principles, were called children of *diabolos*, by the same form of speech by which persons, usually, who were distinguished by any remarkable quality, were called the children of that quality. They of thundering eloquence were called sons of

thunder; and enlightened men were called children of light. The London Improved Version of the New Testament has the following truthful note to the phrase, "children of the wicked one":—"The principle of evil personified. 'Sons of the evil one' are wicked men. Such in the Old Testament are called sons of Belial, or worthlessness; i. e. worthless men.''

"So shall it be at the end of this age. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, (messengers of his power,) and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." Here again it is seen how harmoniously all the parts are found to work together, when we get up a true basis of Scripture exposition; whereas, a false main position is constantly encountering insuperable difficulties. "His kingdom," in this passage, is taken by our opponent to be the immortal heaven of purity and bliss in the spirit world. But how should they that offend and do iniquity be there? And how should they, for a considerable season, have been living and flourishing there, among the holy angels and glorified saints? For, the intelligent reader will observe that, to maintain the analogy of the application and the parable, they who offend and do iniquity are, for the season denoted, among the true disciples, as the tares among the wheat; and that, as in the harvest the tares are separated from the wheat, so at the end of that age those evil doers should be separated from the true

disciples, or gathered out of the Master's kingdom. This is turned all into jargon by our opponent's application, making the kingdom here the resurrection state of bliss. And yet without this view of the kingdom, and of the end of the world, his effort with this passage to prove his theory, as with all the others we have examined, proves an utter failure.

Now see the consistency and harmony of this part with the whole parable and the whole explanation, when viewed in the light which the Scriptures shed upon themselves. In the New Testament usage the kingdom of Christ and kingdom of heaven or of God, are one. When John, the fore runner of Christ, proclaimed his approach, he preached, saying, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." And Jesus said, "Now is the kingdom of God come unto you," meaning the Messianic reign. But as the name of a kingdom is sometimes attached to the community which is nominally classed under the kingdom, so the name, "kingdom of heaven," is sometimes applied to Christ's visible church, or the body or community of professors, who were nominally ranked under his kingdom, or claimed to receive him as the Messiah. But among these there were foolish and hypocritical ones. To this point see Matt. xxv. 1. In describing a series of signal events which should transpire in that generation, our Lord continued, "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins . . . . And five of them were wise, and five were foolish." The kingdom of heaven in this case cannot mean the spiritual reign of Jesus in the abstract; for

that was not half foolish. And certainly it cannot mean the glorified state of immortal purity and bliss; for neither is that half foolish. It clearly is used here for the visible church, or the body of Christian professors. And a portion of these were foolish, having come into the profession of the Christian name from false views and sinister motives. These, in the time of trial to men's souls in the conclusion of that age, would appear in their real character, fail to receive the benefits of Christ's warnings and instructions, and, mingling, in spirit and conduct, with the enemies of Jesus, would miserably perish with them. And in the same sense in which the kingdom of heaven is represented, as above, as comprising both wise and foolish people, it is represented in the parable of the tares as containing, with the wise and good, them that offend and do iniquity. And in both cases the latter class are doomed to be separated and made wretched by the judgment of that age.

This matter was repeatedly and urgently pressed upon the attention of the disciples by our Lord, in various discourses. In that remarkable discourse to his disciples on the Mount of Olives, of which the words are a part which we have just quoted from Matt. xxv., this peculiar danger to false and treacherous Christians was emphatically depicted. Jesus first announced the woes that would become the portion of the unbelieving Jews in general; and he then dwelt upon the causes which would be likely to induce the defection of some of his disciples, and the consequences of such defections as far as they

should occur. "And many false prophets shall arise, and deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." That is, they who remained steadfast throughout should be preserved. And it was so. Dr. Adam Clarke, whose head is a historical library, says on this passage, "It is very remarkable that not a single Christian perished in the destruction of Jerusalem, though there were many there when *Cestius Gallus* invested the city; and had he persevered in the seige, he would have rendered himself master of it; but when he unexpectedly and unaccountably raised the seige, the Christians took that opportunity to escape." But they who were not thoroughly believing, and truthful, and watchful according to the Lord's direction, would not be in circumstances to avail themselves of the provided measures of safety. Accordingly, after declaring that the then present generation should not pass until all these things should be fulfilled, but of the particular day and hour no one knew but the Father only, so that he could not give them a memorandum of the time for escape, but they must watch the signs which he gave them, he said, "But, and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My Lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to smite his fellow servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; the Lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion

with the hypocrites; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

All this, from Matt., xxiv. is descriptive of events which, as we have seen, were to be fulfilled in that generation, and was delivered in answer to the questions of the disciples suggested by his prediction of the destruction of the temple, saying, "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?" (*Aionos, age.*)

(*A more full exposition of the coming of Christ here referred to, and the end of the world, will be brought out in our Chapter* vi., *which will be devoted to the Doctor's classification* vii., *on the* TERMS *which express the duration of future punishment.*)

These evil servants who should connect themselves with the iniquities of the Jews, and should have their portion with them in wailing and gnashing of teeth; these foolish virgins in the kingdom of heaven or visible church, who should find the door of Christian blessings shut against them when the day of calamity should come; and the things that offend and do iniquity, which should be gathered out of the Messiah's kingdom or church, and cast into a furnace of fire,—all at the end of that *aionos;* these are all one description of class, character, and condition, presented in connection with different illustrations, called out by different occasions. As it respects the metaphor employed in the latter case, the parable of the tares, to represent the intensity of the sufferings to which they should be subjected, viz. "a furnace

of fire," while no theological acumen has shown us a passage in the Bible which employs it in description of any human condition in the immortal world, the Scriptures abound in the use of the same and similar descriptions of judgments in this world, and particularly of that to which the parable of the tares is applied, at the end of that aionos. A remarkable instance of this description is the following: "And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying,—Son of man, the house of Israel to me has become dross; all they are brass, and tin, and iron, and lead, in the midst of the furnace; they are even the dross of silver. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God; Because ye are all become dross, behold, therefore I will gather you into the midst of Jerusalem. As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt it; so will I gather you in mine anger and in my fury, and I will leave you there, and melt you. Yea, I will gather you, and blow upon you in the fire of my wrath, and ye shall be melted in the midst thereof. As silver is melted in the midst of the furnace, so shall ye be melted in the midst thereof; and ye shall know that I the Lord have poured out my fury upon you." (Ezek. xxii. 17–22.) How natural and appropriate it was for Jesus to represent the messengers of the Divine power as casting the apostates signified by the tares, "into a furnace of fire," when treating of the same judgment in connection with which the prophet had employed the same figure. Indeed, the description of direful calamities on the

earth by the figure of raging and devouring fire, is common throughout all the Bible. See one other impressive instance: "Therefore wait you upon me, saith the Lord, until the day that I rise up to the prey: for my determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour out upon them mine indignation, even all my fierce anger; for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy." (Zeph. iii. 8.) But this fire is not endless punishment, for it was both to do its work on the earth, and to prove reformatory in its results. For the next words are, "For then (after consuming the earth with the fire of Divine jealousy) will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the Lord, to serve him with one consent."

No, all our readers must see, even our esteemed friend on the other side must see upon this review, and this explanation of Scripture by Scripture, that he has made discovery of no furnace of fire which is a synonym of endless, or even future punishment.

SECTION V.

The Lake of Fire and Brimstone, and the Smoke of Torment forever.

After closing his remarks on the burning of the tares, or casting those who were represented by the tares into a furnace of fire, Dr. Adams proceeds as follows:

"Not to burden the attention of the reader, there is one passage more which I will quote in connection with the preceding, for the

sake of briefly remarking upon them, before passing to the next topic.

The passage to which I refer is Rev. xiv. 9, 10, 11. 'And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark on his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever; and they have no rest, day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.' "

What is here called being "tormented with fire and brimstone," is elsewhere in this vision called being cast into a lake of fire and brimstone. "And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." (Rev. xix. 20.) Again, "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever. . . . . And death and hell where cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." (Chap. xx. vs. 10, 14, 15.)

We ask now, where is this lake of fire? There are thousands of theologians, good men, whose testimony we would not hesitate to receive in any matter whereof they know, who are ready to answer in-

stanter, "Lo here! and lo there!" But we most respectfully set aside their testimony in this case, and come to the Revelator himself. Where is this lake of fire? The Revelator answers, It is where the beast and the false prophet are. See his words just quoted as above: "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are." What beast? See him described in chap. xiii., coming up out of the sea, "having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns." This beast, with his seven heads, and ten horns and crowns, John's guiding angel explains to represent certain wicked kings and kingdoms of the earth, and the false prophet was his leading emissary. These were in the lake of fire; and of course the lake of fire was presented to the Revelator in vision as a metaphorical representation of the judgments in which those kings and kingdoms were and were to be involved in the earth. We do not undertake, and no sane man in our time will undertake, to explain and apply minutely and in detail all the visionary scenes and bold poetic figures of the book of Revelation. Dr. Adam Clarke sets off in its supremely ludicrous light the presumption of those self-conceited expositors who have come out successively with their theories of interpretation, clapping every symbol and every expression upon some particular person and event, each exploded shortly by actual events, and another to succeed him with equal presumption. And this great expounder confesses that he does "not understand the book." And

in general consistency with this modest concession, with but occasional and slight theological guess-work, he makes his commentary of this book to be mainly scientific and historical, to aid in a discovery of the derivation of the imagery. But notwithstanding we would not undertake to give a particular explanation and circumstantial application of all the minute parts of this book, it is not difficult, when we start upon the correct view of its date, to perceive the general subject of its main divisions, and the principles, legal and evangelical, which gleam out from its teachings. And more especially is it easy in various cases, as in the one before us, to determine decisively what certain portions of the book do *not* mean, thus exploding certain false assumptions with regard to their teachings. In this case we have proved positively by the Revelator himself, that he does *not* mean, by the lake of fire, a place of torment in the immortal world, — but that he *does* mean to represent by it certain temporal judgments, involving in their retributive force earthly kings and kingdoms.

The visions of St. John, in these revelations, imaged to his mind much of the metaphorical scenery of the old prophets. How vividly Isaiah, (chap. xxxiv.) paints to our imagination a lake of fire and brimstone, though not using the name: "For my sword shall be bathed in heaven; behold, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment. For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompense for the controversy of Zion. And the streams thereof shall be turned into

pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up forever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it forever and ever."

This description, which pictures to your mind a whole country as burning pitch and brimstone, figures to your view a lake of fire and brimstone. That this describes a judgment in the earth all will admit, and yet it employs the very terms in reference to duration, forever and ever, which our friend regards as his strongest proof of future endless suffering connected with the lake of fire in Revelation. But we have shown conclusively that the latter, even as this in Isaiah, does *not* describe the scenes of eternity, but that it is definitely applied, by its own connections, to events on earth.*

We have spoken of the date of the book of Revelation, as affording aid to an underestanding of its general descriptions. The authors of the Common Version adopt the year 96, which makes it subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem, and leaves no series of events which were then "shortly to come to pass," to which the progressive openings of the visions would well apply. But Dr. Clarke, whom we have spoken of as being in himself a historical library, says that the most respectable testimonies place the date of the book before the destruction of Jerusalem.

* Our full discussion of these terms expressing duration, we reserve to Chapter vi.

Though the external testimonies are divided on this point, yet to this most respectable external testimony add the internal evidence of the book itself, and the point is, to our mind, conclusively settled.

The internal evidence to which we refer, is the correspondence between the prophetic representations of the book, and the events which immediately preceded and accompanied the destruction of the Jewish city, church and polity. The Revelation opens with the following prologue:—"The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John; who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw. Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand." Then proceed the addresses to the angels or ministers of the seven churches of Asia, administering commendation and reproof. And here again the angel testifies of the near approach of the things which were the principal topics of his communications. To the angel of the Church of Philadelphia, John was instructed to write,—"Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth. Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." Then follows the opening, successively, of the seven seals,

which, being read in connection with the discourse of Jesus on the Mount of Olives, recorded in Matt. xxiv., xxv., Mark xiii., and Luke xxi., are seen to develop the same series of signs, commotions, wars and tribulations, terminating in the same national devastation. There is more here of the metaphorical; but as far as Jesus employed figures in that discourse they are the same as here in the opening of the seven seals. In filling out the description of the train of calamities to their consumation, the seven trumpets are sounded, and the seven thunders utter their voices; and the seven last plagues, and the seven vials of wrath are poured out upon the earth. Further descriptions are made to fill out the great picture, including those of the lake of fire into a consideration of which we have been led by the Doctor's use of it in his "Argument." And at the close the angel reiterates the near approach of the events the revealment of which was the leading purpose of this particular prophetic mission. "And he said unto me, These sayings are faithful and true; and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel to show unto his servants the things which must shortly be done. Behold, I come quickly. . . . . And he said unto me, seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book; for the time is at hand."

We have taken pains at this point to exhibit some of the internal evidence of the book itself, to confirm Dr. Clarke's "most respectable external evidence," that it was written just before the destruction of Jerusalem, while the preceding signs before described

by Jesus were being fulfilled; and that, though there are occasional developments of great principles which belong to all ages, and of the gospel purpose, which runs to the consummation of the Messianic age, (which, by the way, was *not* then *at hand*,) yet it mainly relates to events connected with the special judgment of that age, which was then "shortly to come to pass." And the labor which we have now devoted to this matter will make it convenient for us to be the more brief with the references which the Doctor makes to this book in subsequent parts of his "Argument."

In relation to the Son of man's sending forth his angels to gather out of his kingdom them which do iniquity, and cast them into a furnace of fire,—and to the torment of the worshippers of the beast in the presence of God and the holy angels, Dr. Adams remarks:

> If the Bible says that angels, at the last day, inflict on the wicked that which can best be compared only to casting them into a furnace of fire, I will implicitly believe it. My reason ascertains whether this is said, beyond reasonable doubt; then reason bows to revelation. I will not object that such employment does not consist with my conceptions of angelic natures. If I did, the question would be appropriate. Do you consent that a holy angel should have cut off the hundred and eighty-five thousand Assyrians of Sennacherib's army in one night, and that another should have directed the pestilence of three days in Israel? What will you do about these things?—*Argument*, *p.* 28.

Yes, we will believe what the Bible says of these things; but we should not force upon the Bible lan-

guage a meaning which should make the very paper it is printed on writhe like the sensitive plant at the rude touch. The Bible says nothing that tasks the benevolent Christian soul with the painful labor of crushing out its manhood and suppressing its finest moral sensibilities, in order to be conformed in feeling to its teachings. We know that the Bible says, the angels of the Lord shall gather out of his kingdom them which do iniquity, and cast them into a furnace of fire; but it does not impute to them the act of plunging any creature into endless sufferings. Nor does it inform us what the angels were that were to be made the instruments of this calamity on the impostors, represented by the furnace of fire. Our friend knows that the word angel describes not the nature of a being, but an office. It signifies an agent or messenger. It is applied often to spiritual beings, and often to others, animate and inanimate, when employed as messengers of God. "He maketh the wind his angels, and the flaming fire his ministers." Such is said by the learned to be the literal rendering of Ps. civ. 4. Whatever instrumentalities God employs in the administration of his government are the messengers of his will.

As it respects the worshippers of the beast being tormented in the presence of the holy angels, it is sufficient to receive it as signifying that God, in this, as in all the other dispensations of his government, has the approval of all enlightened and holy moral beings. Of the heavenly angels, it is represented in the Scriptures that they have a living sympathetic

interest for the welfare of mankind. When Gabriel announced to the Shepherds the advent of the Saviour of the world, a multitude of the heavenly host descended with an anthem of joy and praise. And Jesus informs us that the angels of heaven rejoice at every step the work of salvation advances among men. But they know that mankind here are in a rudimental, peccable state; that they are liable to all possible degrees of mortal sin and mortal suffering. But they know that it is a wise economy in the system of the Creator that man should commence his being in such a rudimental state, and suffer whatever discipline the Father seeth best. And when they witness human sufferings, it is in the spirit in which Jesus wept in view of the sufferings which should come upon the Jews—yet all full of comfort, because they know that, in due time, the human "creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." But if the thought should enter the angelic minds that God will make the existence of any of his creatures an endless round of suffering, it would fill all heaven with sorrow, and with sorrow not to be assuaged until the thought should be removed.

No, there is no judgment of God but what angels and good men will fully approve when they understand the design. God's enlightened servants, in heaven and earth, can cordially respond amen to the sentiment of the Psalmist, "Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy; for thou renderest unto every man according to his work."

With regard to the question proposed by our friend, "do you consent that a holy angel should have cut off the hundred and eighty-five thousand Assyrians of Sennacherib's army in one night?" we answer, that God, even in his judgments, rules in wisdom and love, not disregarding the ultimate good of any of his creatures. For "the Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." We therefore consent, and that most cheerfully, that God should act as his wisdom may direct his actions, and that he should employ such instrumentalities as he seeth best to employ. If I should see a merciless cannibal pursuing my child to slay him, and the next minute see that cannibal fall dead, I should thank God for the providential preservation of my child; and whether the stroke which averted the death-blow to him, were by a direct interposition of Divine power, or by a spiritual messenger, or by my cherished Christian friend, I should look upon that instrument or agent of God's good will with no disaffection. But if either of the personages here referred to should take that cannibal, after having disabled him from injuring any one, and put him to torture a lifetime, a year, a day, or an hour, out of retaliation, and for the sake of his injury, I should frown upon the fiendish transaction with everlasting contempt.

Sennacherib, to whom our friend refers, threatened the destruction of Israel, and vaunted blasphemously against Israel's God. It belonged to the economy of God which chose that people to be the repository of his name and his oracles, and, by plagues upon Egypt, and the destruction of Pharaoh and his host

in the Red Sea, and many other special interpositions, redeemed, preserved, and led them on to the fulfilment of this mission; it belonged to this economy, I say, to interpose in their behalf in this case, and to do so in such a manner as to make evident his own presence in the work. Accordingly he destroyed so large a number of the invading army, as to cause the king of Assyria to retire with the residue of his forces. What the angel was that smote them, the record does not inform us. It says in brief, "Then the angel of the Lord went forth, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and four score and five thousand." None will assume that a personal messenger from God went to each of these Assyrians and smote him to death with his fist, or with a sword. It was undoubtedly pestilence that did the work; and the record does not require us to construe it as implying the direct agency of any other angel.

So with regard to the pestilence of three days in Israel, recorded in 1 Chron. xxi. David was permitted to choose between three things, the last of which was three days pestilence, called the sword of the Lord. He preferred the latter, which he called falling into the hand of the Lord. "So the Lord sent pestilence upon Israel." This is the whole affair. It does not appear that there was any angelic person either inflicting or directing the pestilence of the three days. But when the desolating scourge approached the great city, the fact was represented to the vision of David by the appearance of an angel standing between earth and heaven, over the city,

with a drawn sword in his hand, in a threatening attitude. And to denote the pleasure of the Lord to stay the plague, the angel was commanded to put up his sword. Whatever this visible angel was, for he was visible and communicative to David, the repugnance to our moral sense, of the doctrine of endless torment, cannot be in the least modified by a comparison with the agency of this, or any of God's messengers, in the administration of his moral government on earth. And we cannot but regret that our worthy friend should feel constrained, by the necessities of his theology, to exercise his eminent talents in the way of representing those ancient Scripture records of the Divine primitive administration in the most unfavorable light, so as to make them appear unnecessarily oppugnant to refined Christian sentiment and feeling. Mankind, from early childhood, meet with difficulties in the way of harmonizing many of the events under God's providence on earth, with the idea that God is infinitely wise and good. And it seems to be the true mission of the Christian teacher, not infinitely to aggravate these difficulties by resolving those mysterious dispensations into a principle which will culminate in infinite evil, but to reconcile the mind to God by explanations which shall fill the soul with the assurance that they shall yet see and know that, as the friend of all his creatures, God doeth all things well.

In his solicitude to attune our moral feelings to the doctrine of endless punishment, the Doctor says in this same connection, —" I find that when men fully

understand the enormities of some outrage upon a fellow creature, and the soul is filled with them, the punishment, swift or slow, meets with no repugnance in their nature." He here refers to the class of cases where the multitude, enraged by some bloody enormity, thirst for the blood of the criminal, and, if the legal process is slow, lynch him at venture. But this is not the principle which Jesus taught, and illustrated by his life, and his prayer on the cross. He repeatedly referred to this principle, but to condemn it. It cannot, therefore, be His theology, which would discipline the heart to the likeness of this blood-thirsty spirit. It is true that the reasonable punishments administered by those laws of the State which are just and humane, meet with no repugnance in our nature involving censure, though they pain our sympathies, as the punishments of the Jews pained the sympathies of Jesus. But every act of barbarity, every infliction of pain for the sake of pain, every deprivation not required by the good of the offender or the safety of the community, or both, even if perpetrated by civil government, must excite the deep repugnance and stern reprobation of every enlightened Christian. And even the lynching mob, in all their violence, if they should see the victim of their rage struggling long in his death agony, would be unable to endure the sight, and hasten to end his sufferings. No, you cannot find upon earth, bad as it is, even outside of the Christian religion, a fair synonym of the spirit involved in the doctrine of endless punishment.

To our friend's statement, and amplification through the next long paragraph, of the conditions which would lead him to reject the Bible as unworthy of respect as the word of God, we will devote due consideration when we come to his use of Theodore Parker as a witness for his "Scriptural Argument."

SECTION VI.

The Rich Man and Lazarus.

The following is the next cluster of Scripture quotations in the "Argument for Future, Endless Punishment:"

"The following Scriptures, teaching that the wicked are in misery after death, confirm the foregoing statements. 'The wicked is driven away in his wickedness.' 'The ungodly are like the chaff which the wind driveth away.' 'The men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before God exceedingly.' 'And the Lord rained fire and brimstone out of heaven and destroyed them all." — 'The rich man died and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment.' 'Judas by transgression fell, and went to his own place.' 'If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins. And where I am thither ye cannot come.'"

Notwithstanding we admonished our friend in our second preliminary note to him, that our printing in the *Christian Freeman* promiscuous collections of texts made by him without reasons given for the uses for which they are quoted, would be of no good service, yet it is perceived that he goes extensively into this line of argument. Not the least effort is

made in the present case to show, from the connections and subjects of discourse respectively, that any of the passages adduced refer to the condition of humanity in the future life. Some of our friends have expressed disappointment at this, which is the same throughout; but we had no reason to expect aught else. There are no reasons for the popular application of these passages, besides the mere detached phraseology itself, taken in a theologically canonized sense. No man on earth ever attempted any other argument than our friend has employed, which is assumption.

Of the passages here thrown together, none will require a labored examination but that referring to the Rich Man and Lazarus. To this we will devote some extended attention, and then the others will only require a word of remark, such as may be suggested by their language and positions.

The story of the Rich Man and Lazarus has been regarded by many as the most evidently declarative of punishment after death of any portion of the sacred record. For here, they say, is an account of one who died and was buried, and subsequently lifted up his eyes in hell, being in torment. "What will you do with this?" Verily we have nothing to do with it but to inquire what Jesus meant to be understood as teaching by it.

1st. We inquire, Is this story to be taken as a literal history, or as a parable? Well, says one, if it is a *parable* it must *mean something*. Our opponent has taken pains to show that parables, and metaphors,

and symbols, mean something that is real. They are not mere "flame-picture." True, herein he is right, and we perfectly agree with him. If the story before us is a parable, it is a parabolic representation of some solemn reality. So we shall find it. But we choose first to inquire whether it is parabolic, or a literal narrative.

If this be a literal narrative, then *hades*, which is the word rendered hell in this case, is here declared by our Lord to be a place of torment after death. If so, it is the first and only time it is so declared in the Scriptures. It is not so represented in the Old Testament. *Hades* in the Septuagint or Greek version of the Old Testament is generally used for the *sheol* of the Hebrew Bible. The literal meaning of hades, from *a*, negative, and *eidea*, to see, is *unseen*, or *invisible*. Accordingly the word is literally employed to denote any hidden depth; and by accommodation it is used for the state of the dead, as being unseen and unknown. The learned and Orthodox Dr. Campbell, in the 6th of his Preliminary Dissertations to the Four Gospels, has the following truthful observations:

"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 translated *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 in Scripture to be rendered *hell*, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by Christians. 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."

We make this quotation from Dr. Campbell, to which agree Prof. Stuart and the learned generally, who have given particular attention to the subject, not that we would rest the question on the decision of a Commentator, but because the theology of such men demands of them the use of *as much* evidence as they can find for future endless punishment, and consequently their ingenuous and unhesitating relinquishment of all evidence for this doctrine from the Scripture use of this word, is a testimony to us that the most learned and talented men, when ingenuous, while they want the evidence of such doctrine in this word, cannot find it there. And this circumstance supersedes the necessity of our detaining the reader with so minute and full examination of the Scripture use of this word, as might otherwise have been expedient. It may be regarded as a settled question. And it will be remarked that the decision of Dr. Campbell comprehends both Testaments. Of *hades* he says, "In my judgment it ought never in the Scriptures to be rendered *hell*, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood among Christians." This throws out the word hell, in the "Orthodox" sense, from the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. But even with regard to the word *hell*, Dr. Campbell goes on to say, what all the learned know, that, "In its primitive signification it perfectly corresponded" with the meaning of *sheol* and *hades*.

"For, says he, "at first it denoted only what was secret or concealed. The word is found with but little variation of form, and precisely in the same meaning, in all the Teutonic dialects." Dr. Parkhurst, in his Greek Lexicon, speaking of this agreement of the word *hell*, in its primitive signification, with *hades*, says that in the time of his writing the word was familiarly so used in some of the western counties in England. "To *helle* over a thing, is to cover it."

So, then, the English word hell, like some other words, has had its definition changed since the rendering of king James' Version. And it *is* rather strange that so learned a man as our opponent should quote scraps of Scripture containing this word, relying on the mere occurrence of the word as an argument for future endless punishment. Let us illustrate this impropriety by reference to other words which have changed their meaning since the date of the Common Version. The word *prevent* then signified *to anticipate*, or *go before*. David says, (Ps. cxix. 147, 148,) "I prevented the dawning of the morning, and cried." That is, he anticipated the dawning of the morning, or awaked before dawn, and engaged in supplication. "Mine eyes prevent the night watches, that I might meditate in thy word." Now if a religious teacher should assert that David possessed and exercised miraculous power to *hinder* the dawning of the day, and should quote the above words of Scripture to prove it, he would pain his sensible congregation. But if you should invite him to look into

the primitive meaning of the word *prevent*, and into the connection in which it is used in the case referred to, that he might see his error, and understand that David did not speak of hindering the dawn, but of awaking before it, he would peradventure sneer at your pedantic reference to the primitive sense of the word, and to the connection in which it was used, pronouncing with emphasis, "David says, 'I prevented the dawning of the morning;' and prevent means prevent,—it is God's word, and that is enough." And you would be obliged to let him go. Again, the word *let* has been entirely turned about. It used to signify *hinder*. Now it means *permit*. God says by Isaiah, "I will work, and who shall let it?" The idea is, that none could let it; that is, none could hinder it. Now suppose that some teacher who insists that a word is a word, and we must not concern ourselves about what it once was, should declare that no man will permit God to work, and should prove it by these words, "I will work, and who shall let it?" Your intelligent children would look upon him with wonder.

We have no unkind allusion in these illustrations. There are many of the greatest and best of men who, being incumbered with a scholastic theological education which is unscriptural, feel not the same liberty to criticise in matters of essential doctrine, which they exercise on those of smaller moment. What we mean by these references to change of meaning with other English words, and the impropriety of insisting on their being taken in their modern sense when

found in ancient writings, is to illustrate the necessity of our studying important Scripture words and phrases in the light of their primitive signification, the connections in which they occur, and their common usage when the Scriptures were spoken or written.

To return to the word *hades;* though the concessions of the learned of the "Orthodox" schools render it unnecessary that we should go into an extensive examination of its Scripture usage, yet we will glance along through the sacred volume, sufficiently to enable all to see for themselves that those Doctors are, in these concessions, decidedly right.

In the first instance in which the word *hades* is rendered *hell* in the Old Testament, it is used in its most literal sense, referring to hidden and unseen depths. It is in Deut. xxxii. 22. "For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell." That this was designed to signify deep and hidden recesses of the earth is seen by reading the verse out;—"and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains." By reading the whole chapter it will be seen that the general sentiment is the same as that represented by the prophet Amos, in the passage noticed before, saying that though they should dig into *hades,* God's hand would take them thence. The idea is that no secret depth should avail the wicked to screen them from the righteous judgment of God.

Hades occurs in three instances before this, where it is rendered grave. In the first instance it is used

by Jacob, saying, "I will go down to *hades* to my son, mourning;" and in the second instance, by the same in his charge to his sons concerning Benjamin; and in the third, by Judah in his plea before Joseph, —on the danger of bringing down the gray hairs of the patriarch with sorrow to *hades*. Surely Jacob did not deliberately calculate on going down to a place of future punishment to his son Joseph; nor did Jacob apprehend that any misfortune to Benjamin would bring down the gray hairs of his father to such a place.

The words of David, (Ps. ix. 17,) "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God,"—have been familiarly used by advocates of future punishment as an expression of that doctrine. If *hades* does take upon itself this before unknown meaning in this place, it must be shown, not by the force of the word, for it had no such force, but by the connection in which it occurs. But the connection here explains it in accordance with its familiar Jewish usage, as signifying the state of the dead, or temporal destruction. Read the whole Psalm. David was praying for deliverance from the power of his enemies, and prophesying their destruction. "The heathen are sunk down in the pit which they digged: in the net which they hid is their own foot taken. The wicked shall be turned into *hades*, and all the nations that forget God." Thus should they sink in the pit which they digged for David and his people. What was that pit? It was temporal destruction. The heathen did not plan a place of

endless punishment for Israel, but only their temporal overthrow. This should become their own lot. This was the *pit*, or the *hades*, into which they should sink. Precisely the same idea is expressed (Ps. lxiii. 9, 10) in the following terms:—"But those that seek my soul (my life) to destroy it, shall go into the lower parts of the earth. They shall fall by the sword, they shall be a portion for foxes." If any take the lower parts of the earth, in this case, which are the sheol or hades of the ninth Psalm, to be a place of future torment, they will consistently follow their hand by metamorphosing the foxes into devils as tormentors.

Isaiah (xiv.) employs *hades* in its commonly accommodated application, to the state of the dead, in connection with bold poetic imagery. Predicting the restoration of Israel from Babylonish captivity, he says, "Thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased! The golden city ceased! The whole earth is at rest and quiet; they break forth into singing. Yea, the fir-trees rejoice at thee, and the cedars of Lebanon, saying, Since thou art laid down, no feller is come up against us. Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth; it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations. All they shall speak and say unto thee, Art thou also become weak as we? art thou become like unto us? Thy pomp is brought down to the grave, and the noise of thy viols; the

worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee." It is clear that *hades* is here used for the grave, or rather the state of the dead, which was then regarded as a state of darkness, silence, unconsciousness, and inactivity. For Solomon says, "There is no work, no device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in *hades*." Why then does Isaiah represent *hades* as being moved to meet the king of Babylon, and the dead kings therein as rising up and addressing him? We answer, it is by precisely the same rhetorical personification, that the fir-trees and cedars are represented as rejoicing, and addressing the fallen monarch. His fall was an event of so signal interest to the world, and especially to Israel, that all departments of living nature are represented as rejoicing at his egress, and the dead as greeting his coming. This is a style of personification common to poets and orators of all times, though coming nearer the *common* style of earlier ages. American patriots arouse the national pride of their countrymen by citing them to the voice of their father's blood, crying unto them, "Sons! scorn to be slaves." Nobody misunderstands such language, except theologians; nor they, but when they read it in the Bible.

With regard to the word under inquiry, to multiply references to the Old Testament usage is unnecessary; but we must make two or three citations more.

Job says, (xiv. 13,) "O that thou wouldest hide me in *hades*, that thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint me a

set time, and remember me." Job did not pray to be hid in "a mad sulphurious tide" of wrath; but by *hades* he meant a condition of repose from all those raging evils which were signified by the wrath of God. But this condition, and the dispensations of wrath, he regarded as temporary, destined to pass away, when he should be remembered of God in his loving favor.

Jonah said in his song of deliverance, "Out of the belly of hell *(hades)* cried I, and thou heardest my voice."

David said, in praise to his God, "Great is thy mercy towards me; for thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell."

And here is a glorious prophecy with which we must close our Old Testament citations:—"I will ransom them from the power of *hades;* I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plagues; O *hades,* I will be thy destruction." *Not,* surely, a place of endless punishment, is that *hades.*

And now we come to the use of the term *hades* in the New Testament. Has it, in the mouths of God's inspired servants, or by revelation of Jesus Christ, received any new sense since the last of the prophets? We will briefly notice all the cases of its occurrence in the New Testament, which are eleven only. For the reader will bear in mind that in twelve of the cases in which the word hell occurs in our Common Version of the New Testament, the original is *Gehenna;* and all these cases have been fully considered in this Chapter of our Reply to Dr. Adams. What we

are now to examine is the New Testament usage of the word *hades*, which is rendered *hell* in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, and in nine other cases, and *grave* in one instance.

The first case of its occurrence in the New Testament is Matt. xi. 23. "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shall be brought down to (hades) hell." None will assume that the exaltation of Capernaum to heaven, (*ouranos*, literally the ærial regions above the earth,) signified the location of that city in the spirit land. It is a figurative representation of their temporal exaltation in wealth and privilege. So their being brought down to *hades*, literally a hidden deep, is a figurative representation of the depth of degradation and ruin into which that city was doomed to fall. We are not aware that there is any Commentator whatever who takes a different view of this passage. And this is the first instance of the occurrence of *hades* in the New Testament—precisely a continuation of its Old Testament usage.

The same words of Jesus are recorded by Luke, x. 15, which require no separate consideration.

The next instance to be noticed is Matt. xvi. 18. "And upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of (hades) hell shall not prevail against it." Here it is used for the *grave*, or the state of death. Gates are ways of ingress and egress. The idea is, that none of the powers of death, or instrumentalities that consign men to the grave, should destroy the church of Christ. It is virtually a prophecy that his church should be perpetual, in spite of all forms of

opposition, even the machinery of death. We think the learned of all religious opinions are agreed also on this passage.

We come next to Acts ii. 27, 31. "Because thou wilt not leave my soul in (hades) hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." "He (David) seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in (hades) hell, neither his flesh did see corruption." We hardly need say a word by way of comment here. Nobody understands that hades, in this passage, means a place of endless punishment; for into it the soul of Christ entered. The Papists, to be sure, regard it as referring to their purgatory, into which they believe Christ entered between his death and resurrection. But it is with them, as is the application of *hades* to a place of endless punishment by Calvinistic Protestants, a mere assumption. It is used here, in its Old Testament sense, for the state of death, into which Joseph went and Jacob was going; and in which Job desired to be hidden until the reign of evil should have passed away. The idea is that Jesus was not left in the state of death until his body underwent decay.

We pass to Rev. i. 18. "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forever more; and have the keys of (*hades*) hell, and of death." The keys are an ensign of official authority and power. And the assurances that Christ, the unchanging Friend of man, has the keys of *hades* and of *death*, saves us from the fear of death, and puts into our mouth the song of David vitalized, "Though I walk through the

valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil; for thou art with me: thy rod and thy staff they comfort me."

Again we find the word under notice, in Rev. vi. 8. "And I looked, and behold a pale horse: and his name that sat on him was Death; and hell (*hades*) followed with him." *Hades* is always associated with the work of *death*, as it was in the mind of Jacob with regard to his deceased son, and to his own approaching lot. It is the lot of all. Solomon says, (Eccl. iii. 20,) "All go unto one place: all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." Accordingly it follows, that when being turned into *hades* is spoken particularly of the wicked, as a dispensation of punishment, either the word is used figuratively for temporal degradation and wretchedness, or reference is made to an unusual harvest to the grave by a raging calamity. Hence, though it may be objected by a superficial opposer that being turned into *hades* in the case of the wicked must mean more than temporal destruction, because all, even the righteous must die, —yet the intelligent Bible student will perceive that this objection is invalid, in-as-much as it would, if admitted, lie against the numberless Scripture records which are acknowledged by all to denounce and to narrate temporal destruction in the line of punishments for sin.

We pass to the only remaining case of the use of *hades* in the book of Revelation. "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell (*hades*) gave up the dead which were in them; and

they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell (*hades*) were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." (Rev. xx. 13, 14.) Our friend, Dr. Adams, quotes this passage in his classification of Argument, No. VI., and holds the following language:

> Some say, death and hell are annihilated. But this is not the idea intended, unless the wicked also are then to be annihilated; for the next verse concluding the subject says, "And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." The obvious meaning is, Death and hell, whatever they represent, will then be added to the lake of fire, whatever that is, as new ingredients, and to constitute "the second death," and as a final gathering together of all the elements of sorrow and pain with all the wicked, into one place.

So it seems the Doctor is in doubt as to the meaning of *hades*, and also of the lake of fire, in this place. He says, "The obvious meaning is, that death and hell, *whatever they represent*, will then be added to the lake of fire, *whatever that is*." Hitherto he had seen no reason to doubt, or query, but that *hades* is the place of endless punishment, and the *lake of fire* is the place of endless punishment. The mere occurrence of these terms any where had seemed to him *prima facie* evidence of the existence of a place of "future, endless punishment." But now he wavers. He doubtless perceives that it would be rather ludicrous to talk of taking one place of endless punishment and casting it into another place of endless punishment.

To show that our learned friend is not alone in his discovery of this difficulty, (for we think he did dis-

cover it), we will quote Dr. Campbell's remarks upon it, in his Dissertation before cited. On the passage now before us he says, "Indeed, in this sacred book, (meaning the book of Revelation) the commencement as well as the destruction of this intermediate state (meaning *hades*) are so clearly marked, as to render it almost impossible to mistake them. In a preceding chapter, vi. 8, we learn that *hades* follows close at the heels of death; and from the other passage quoted, that both are involved in one common ruin at the universal judgment. Whereas, if we interpret *hades*, *hell*, in the Christian sense of the word, the whole passage is rendered nonsense. *Hell* is represented as being cast into *hell*: for so the lake of fire, which is in this place also denominated the second death, is universally interpreted."

So much from the learned Campbell. The Doctors find insuperable difficulties in the way of getting straight through the Book with their false theological definitions of Scripture words and phrases. We showed in Section V. of this Chapter, that the lake of fire is *not* a place of future endless punishment, but that it *is*, as explained by the guiding angel of John, a metaphorical representation of certain calamities in the earth. For the seven headed and ten horned beast, representing certain kings and kingdoms of the earth, was in the lake of fire. And as the lake of fire was a figure of earthly national calamities, the casting into it, of *death and hades*, can neither mean the merging into it of a place of endless punishment, nor even of the place of limited after death purga-

torial punishment, which Dr. Campbell thinks is here signified by the term *hades*. When we come to reply to Dr. Adams' sixth department of his extended "Argument," where he regularly introduces this passage, we will endeavor to show clearly what *is* meant by death and *hades* being cast into the lake of fire. In this place we have only quoted his remarks on this passage for the purpose of showing that *even he* saw insuperable difficulties in the way of making *hades*, here, to be a place of endless punishment. All must see that it bears no such sense in this passage.

There is but one other instance of the use of the word *hades*. in the New Testament, outside of the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, which is before us. This is in 1 Cor. xv. The great apostle had been giving his luminous testimony of the resurrection of all men from the dead in the image of the heavenly man; "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive;" and he brings his argument to this result;—"So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O *hades*, where is thy victory?" If *hades* were a place of future endless punishment, to be thronged eternally, as a popular theology assumes, with countless millions of the human race, she would respond in tones of eternal defiance, through the howling voices of legions of devils and damned re-embodied spirits, "Here I am, in full blast, with my splendid victory in the long contest with the

Son of God, a victory embracing more of God's children than adorn his courts above, and a victory which I will maintain as long as God's throne stands." No, no. God forgive us for even writing this impious thought. The apostle's jubilant exclamation, "O *hades*, where is thy victory?" has the significance of an interrogatory assertion, that not a victim shall remain in the embrace of *hades*, nor *hades be* to give an answer.

We come now to a direct consideration of the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, furnishing the only other mention of *hades* in the New Testament. What is the sense of this word in this case? and what was the story designed to teach? We stand before the Saviour here, and listen to his discourse, with the knowledge of all the teachings of Moses and the prophets, and of Jesus himself up to this time, and we have derived no thought, from any of these sources, of *hades* being a place of after-death punishment. Accordingly his use of the word *hades* in this case does not, of itself, suggest to our minds any such thought. Nevertheless, if Jesus publishes a new and improved history of *hades* in this instance, drawn from a new survey and new discoveries, and in this new history he describes it as a place of torment in the immortal world, we are bound to receive his history as reliable, and to recognize *hades* as a place of after-death punishment.

And now we devoutly ask for the truth on this point. Let there be no haste, no attempt at perversion. God's truth will stand, and all the evil conse-

quences of sin which his law ordains will be verified, however we may misinterpret his word. And it will be borne in mind that the proclamation of unreal dangers and false alarms is no less injurious than the hiding of real dangers. What we want is the truth.

Well, says our friend, we here have the declaration of Jesus, that the rich man died, and was buried, and in *hades* he lifted up his eyes, being in torment. What more do you want? What more?—We want to know whether Jesus delivered this story as a piece of literal history, or as a parable.

But before proceeding to this question direct, we will take the occasion to remark, that, however literally you construe this story, it affords no proof of future *endless* punishment. For we have seen it to be the most positive assurance of God's word, sure as his eternal purpose in Christ Jesus, that *hades* shall be emptied of all its tenants, and itself destroyed. Sometimes a shrewd opponent has said to us, "There is an account of a rich man in hell. How will you get him out?" We reply, There is an account of the resurrection of all men from the state of death, when death shall be swallowed up in victory, and *hades*, hell, the state of death, shall be without a victim, and itself shall be destroyed.* And we retort the question, When all men shall be delivered from *hades*, and itself destroyed, how will you get them back into *hades* again?

But we return to the inquiry, whether Jesus delivered this story as a piece of literal history of any, even a limited term of torment in *hades*, or as a parable.

* Hosea xiii. 14. 1 Cor. xv. 55.

1st. We will show that no Christian in this enlightened age can receive it as a literal history. It represents the abode of the subject of the story to be a place of literal fire, and his body to be material, and his tongue to be parched with the heat of the flame, and his conception to be that his broiling tongue might be soothed by a drop of water sprinkled by a friendly finger. All this must be understood as literally so if the story is taken as a veritable history of fact. For to say that there was no flame of fire there, and no body capable of being scorched and pained by the fire, and no broiling tongue, and no call on Lazarus to come with a drop of water to cool the agonized tongue,—but that all this is figurative, is to ignore the historic literality of the whole thing.

And then, allowing the strict literalizer to mix his narrative with figure enough to have Abraham's bosom to signify heaven, the story represents heaven and hell as being in one and the same country, on a level, separated by a gulf or river, yet in such contiguity that the inhabitants of the two places can and do hold familiar conversation with each other. Does any Christian believe this to be literally true? Does even Dr. Adams believe, with all his warm and benevolent heart, that those of his dear friends and relatives who were not quite Orthodox enough to be entitled to his theoretic heaven, will be forever broiling in a flame in plain sight just over the river Styx, where he shall hold converse with them, and repel their often entreaties that he may obtain per-

mission of God, or of father Abraham, to bring them water to assauge their anguish? We venture to affirm that he believes no such thing. This description answers precisely to the heathen fables of *hades*, with its Elysian fields, and its Tartarian prison of fire, separated by the river Styx; but it bears no resemblance to the view of any Christian sect, with regard to heaven and hell.

But the throwing out of this conversational intercourse between their heaven and hell, is throwing out the very evidence which our opponent relies upon to prove that *hades*, in this particular instance if in no other, is a place of after-death torment. For all the evidence is in the description of the condition which impelled Dives to lift up his eyes to Abraham, and the words ascribed to him in conversation with Abraham, "for I am tormented in this flame." Now by denying the reality of personal conversational intercourse between the inhabitants of heaven and hell, they deny the reality of all the testimony they have in this story, of *hades* being a place of torment.

No, there is not a Christian amongst us, even of the class who employ as a proof of future punishment so much of this story as our opponent quotes, who will take it as a piece of history. They do not believe in any such relation between their heaven and hell as this story represents between Abraham and Dives.

Again, it is quite certain that the disciples of Jesus did not understand him to relate a historical fact, in the utterance of this story. For, while all these

things were uttered in parables to them who were without, Jesus gave his disciples understanding of them all. And what they heard in secret, they were to proclaim upon the house-tops. Therefore if they had understood their Master in this instance to teach that *hades* is a place of after-death torment, it would have startled them as a new and terrific revelation, no teacher from God having divulged such a fact before, and they would have sought an early private interview with him now on the subject so new, so strange and exciting. For so they did on various other occasions when they did not clearly understand their Master. And possessing themselves fully of the new and astounding revelation of torment in *hades*, they would have proclaimed it in thunder tones upon the house-tops, to Jews and Gentiles, in "all the world." But not a word of this do we find in all the apostolic ministry. In all the apostolic Epistles the word *hades* is not used at all, except in 1 Cor. xv., before quoted, "O *hades*! where is thy victory?" which is St. Paul's jubilant exclamation of the universal triumph of life immortal over death and *hades*. Nor in all of the recorded ministry of the apostles does this word occur at all, except in the discourse of Peter to the Jews, recorded in Acts ii., which also we have adduced before, reciting the prophecy of David, that the Messiah should not be left in *hades* till his flesh should see corruption. It is not among the moral possibilities that the apostles should have utterly omitted to preach a *hades* of after-death punishment, to saints or sinners, if they had received a

revelation of any such fact from their Master. ☞ *They did not so understand him in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus.* ☜

Now, therefore, these are the facts. The word *hades*, or the corresponding word in the Hebrew, *sheol*, had never been used by any patriarch or prophet, or by the Son of God, up to this time, as a place of future punishment; there is nothing in the occasion of the introduction of this story, nor in the manner of its delivery, which suggests a design to introduce any such new doctrine, but all the reverse as we shall see; his disciples, to whom he gave an understanding of his parables, and especially of his literal teachings, did not understand him to introduce any such doctrine in this case; and no modern Christian will receive this story, including the conversational portion which is about the whole of it, as literal history.

2. The only alternative, and the natural, easy and legitimate method of Scripture reading, is to receive it as a *parable*.

And what is a parable? It is a story, borrowing its imagery either from natural scenery, or from historic incidents, or from popular opinions, to represent some truth in principle, or event in fact. Of the first named class, the borrowing of the imagery from natural scenery, is Jotham's parable of the trees assembling to choose them a king. (Judges ix.) Of the second, are such parables as those of the lost sheep, the prodigal son, and the unjust steward. Of the third class, borrowing the imagery from popular opin-

ions, is the following:—"When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none. Then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept and garnished. Then he goeth, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there; and the last state of that man is worse than the first. Even so shall it be with this generation."* We think no sane man will assume that Jesus related this as a literal narrative of the habits of a class of evil personal beings, and the manner of their clubbing together and consecrating the persons of men as their houses, or places of abode. Jesus was in no more danger of being so understood by men of common sense, than our orators, when they introduce, for embellishment and illustration, Mars as the God of war, Jupiter as the God of thunder, Neptune as the God of the ocean, Minerva as the God of wisdom, and Mammon as the God of riches, are in danger of being understood to sanction the fables which have created these pieces of fancy work. In this story of the unclean spirit, Jesus took up some one of the "Old wives fables" which abounded among the apostatized Jews, for the purpose of illustrating this one idea, that the last state of that generation of Israel should be worse than the first. So Jesus applies it.

The word *parable* is defined in our English Diction-

* Matt. xii. 43–45; Luke xi. 24–26.

aries in agreement with the construction of it which we have given above :—thus—" Parable,—A method of conveying instruction by the use of short fables or tales; a fable conveying instruction: a comparison; a similitude." (J. E. Worcester.)* And the parable before us, that of the Rich Man and Lazarus, evinces remarkable wisdom in its selection and application, in that it makes a perfect finishing of the train of theological and prophetic instructions which commenced with the preceding chapter; and, while it lays the scene of its story in the heathen fables partially adopted by the Jews to the neglect of their Scriptures, makes it to explode those fables by reproving the Jews for their adoption of them, and remanding them back to Moses and the prophets.

This parable, we say, makes a perfect finishing of the train of theological and prophetic instructions which commenced with the preceding chapter. By commencing the preceding chapter, (Luke xv.) and reading the two chapters through, it will be seen that this of the Rich Man and Lazarus closes a series of parables the occasion of which is given in these

* Dr. Albert Barnes, an eminent Presbyterian author and commentator, says,—" A parable is a narrative of some fictitious or real event, in order to illustrate more clearly some truth that the speaker wished to communicate. It is not necessary to suppose that the narrative is strictly true. The main thing, the inculcation of spiritual truth, was gained equally whether it was true or only a supposed case. Nor was there any dishonesty in this. It was well understood; no person was deceived. The speaker was not understood to affirm the thing literally narrated, but only to fix the attention more firmly on the moral truth presented." And since we penned this reference to the parable of the unclean spirit, we have observed a quotation from Dr. Lightfoot, giving the same view of that parable. Lightfoot says of this case,—"Here the Saviour takes a parable from something commonly believed and entertained, that he might express the thing propounded more plainly and fully."

words: "Then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him. And the Pharisees and Scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." In answer to these sneers at his kind attentions to sinners, he delivers, first, the parable of the lost sheep. Here he takes them on their own ground, and shows them that, admitting they were as sheep who were not astray, they were unreasonable in their scoffings at his mission for the recovery of the lost. Then follows the parable of the lost piece of money, further to illustrate the same idea. The parable of the prodigal son follows, to paint in stronger colors the meanness of the spirit which they manifested towards his work of love for sinners. He did not mean to admit that they had always been faithful sons, never having wandered from the Father's house; but as they held this conceit of themselves, he took them on their own ground, to make the application and reproof of the parable the more unmistakable and scathing. He made them see their own character mirrored in that of the elder brother, who was angry and refused to go into the father's banquet, because his poor miserable brother that was lost was received with favor. Next comes the parable of the profligate steward, who was turned out of his stewardship. In this Jesus begins to turn upon the Jews with a representation of their real character, and their impending condition. They were really unfaithful stewards, and were soon to be ejected from the inheritance which had been committed to them as God's chosen people. But the Pharisees who stood by, and knew the points of his parables,

"derided him." Then he closed up the series of parables for that occasion, with this of the Rich Man and Lazarus, going yet another step, and while, as in the last preceding parable, that of the wasteful steward, he represents the fall of the Jews, he adds the representation of the conversion and exaltation of the Gentiles.

But the opposer will urge that Jesus says, *There was a certain Rich Man, &c.* To be sure; and so parables usually commence the story employed as a parable with an affirmative statement as of a fact. Jotham said, "The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them." Jesus said, "Behold, a sower went forth to sow;" "A certain man had two sons; "There was a certain rich man which had a steward." The parable must employ a tale or fable which affirms something; but it uses the tale for the representation of some truth not asserted by the original story.

We have spoken of the admirable wisdom in the framing and application of this parable, borrowing its imagery from the heathen fables partially adopted by the Jews, and introducing a part in its conclusion which directly explodes those fables, and reproves the people for adopting them. That he lays the scene of the parable in the heathen fabulous geography of *hades*, is evident, because the description precisely agrees with the construction of those fables;—the prison of fire, the Elysian fields, (called here, to adapt the parable to the Jewish conception of the source of their help, Abraham's bosom,) and the separating gulf or river. So much of the story as relates to the feast of a rich man, and a poor beg-

gar out at the gate, was ready at hand to be taken up by our Lord for use in this case. It was contained in a work then extant, the *Gemara Babylonicum*, where, as cited by learned commentators, it runs thus: — "A king made a great feast, and invited all the strangers; and there came one poor man, and stood at his gates, and said unto them, give me one bit or portion; and they considered him not. And he said, my lord, the king, of all the great feasts that thou hast made, is it hard in thine eyes to give me one bit, or fragment, among them?" And in the *Gemara* the title of this passage is, "*A parable of a king of flesh and blood.*" So, taking up this parable of the rich king and the poor beggar, in closing up his reply to the sneer of the vaunting Pharisees, who murmured at his kind regards to the despised Gentiles, he adds to it an after scene, drawn from the Judaized heathen fables of the under world, representing the approaching change of the relative conditions of the Jews and Gentiles, and introduces a colloquy between the rich man and Abraham, which draws from Abraham a reproof to his people for their resort to these fables. For when the rich man in the parable asks that Lazarus be sent to his people to admonish them, lest they should come to the same place of torment, Abraham is made to reply, "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." Let them hear Moses and the prophets about what? Surely not about a place of torment in *hades*, for they never said a word of such a thing. This we have already shown, and it is almost universally conceded

by the learned. Jesus did not mean, then, by putting these words into the mouth of Abraham, to represent him as referring the Jews to Moses and the prophets for information of *a place of torment in hades;* but he meant to make the parable utter this sentiment: — "Your neglect and perversion of Moses and the prophets, who have abundantly warned you of all the real dangers which impend over the way of sin and transgression, and your resort to the heathen fables of distant, false, silly, under-world dangers, is working your ruin. Moses and the prophets have told you in your Scriptures, how that your persistence, after minor chastisements, in a course of corruption and crime, shall bring upon you such 'great tribulation as never was since there was a nation,' and the desolation of your city and country.* These calamities are now approaching, and your determined course of life is hastening their consummation; yet your study and obedience of Moses and the prophets would avert the impending desolation. But if you will not hearken to Moses and the prophets, one sent to you from the dead with a reiteration of their teachings would only be mocked and scouted by you." And it was so. When Lazarus was raised from the dead as a witness of Christ's Messiahship, they sought to kill him; and though Jesus himself, when they had slain him, was raised from the state of death, they believed not, but rushed on to the predicted destruction.

So then, in the parable of the Rich Man and Laz-

*Lev. xxvi. Deut. xxix. Dan. xii.

arus, in which our opponent thinks he finds direct proof of a place of torment in *hades*, we find a most effective repudiation of that fable, from the highest authority, that of the Son of God. We repeat,—It is admirable wisdom in the great Teacher, in this closing parable of the series in reply to the censure of the vaunting Pharisees for his grace to Gentile sinners, that he should take up a parable of a rich man and poor man from one of their books, to represent them and the Gentiles, and add to it a scene drawn from the fables by which they were corrupted, for the double purpose of representing an approaching change in the relative conditions of the two parties, and a reproof for the adoption of those fables, in the injunction that they go back to their own Scriptures, to Moses and the prophets, and hear and heed their wholesome prescriptions of duty, and warnings of real dangers.

This view of the subject, in the main, seems to have been held without opposition, by some of the older and most eminent Orthodox commentators. The later Doctors of that school have been made more desperate by the prevalence of Biblical knowledge and benevolent views; and, the sphere of evidence being narrowed, they cling more pertinaciously to some detached phraseology of such passages as this. Our learned friend, for instance, deems it sufficient to quote the words, "and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment," to prove future endless punishment. But the old commentators, though they had not all the advantages of extended

Protestant Biblical criticism which is the privilege now of them who will use it, compassed very clear views, honorable to their heads and hearts, of this parable.

Whitby, in his annotation on the passage, says:—

That this is only a parable, and not a real history of what was actually done, is evident: (1.) Because we find this very parable in the *Gemara Babylonicum*, whence it is cited by Mr. Sheringham, in the preface to his *Joma*. (2.) From the circumstances of it, viz., the rich man's *lifting up his eyes in hell*, and *seeing Lazarus in Abraham's bosom*, his discourse with Abraham, his complaint of being *tormented with flames*, and his desire that Lazarus might be sent *to cool his tongue;* and if all this be confessedly *parable*, why should the rest, which is the very parable in the Gemara, be accounted history?

Lightfoot, in his Hebrew and Talmudic Exercises, on Luke xvi. 19, says:—

Whosoever believes this not to be a parable, but a true story, let him believe also those little friars, whose trade it is to show the monuments at Jerusalem to pilgrims, and point exactly to the place where the house of the "rich glutton" stood. Most accurate keepers of antiquity indeed! who, after so many hundreds of years, such overthrows of Jerusalem, such devastations and changes, can rake out of the rubbish the place of so private a house, and such a one too, that never had any being, but merely in parable. And that it was a parable, not only the consent of all expositors may assure us, but the thing itself speaks it.

The main scope and design of it seems this — to hint the destruction of the unbelieving Jews, who, though they had Moses and the prophets, did not believe them — nay, would not believe, though one (even Jesus) rose from the dead. For that conclusion of the parable abundantly evidenceth what it aimed at: *If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, &c.*

Wakefield also maintains decidedly that this passage is a parable. So also do Hammond, and Theophylact, a more ancient critic, and others. But we must add a quotation from the *very* Orthodox Gill. After having, in his exposition of the passage, run it, for the sake of his *theology*, into the future state, for the credit of his *understanding*, he explains as follows:—

"'*The rich man died:*' It may also be understood of the political and ecclesiastical death of the Jewish people, which lay in the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, and of the temple, and in the abolition of the temple worship, and of the whole ceremonial law; a *Loammi* was written upon their church state, and the covenant between God and them was broken; the gospel was removed from them, which was as death, as the return of it, and their call by it, will be as life from the dead; as well as their place and nation, their civil power and authority were taken away from them by the Romans, and a death of afflictions, by captivities and calamities of every kind, has attended them ever since."

In hell — in torments; "This may regard the vengeance of God on the Jews, at the destruction of Jerusalem, when a fire was kindled against their land, and burned to the lowest hell, and consumed the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains; and the whole land became brimstone, salt, and burning; and they were rooted out of it in anger, wrath, and great indignation — see Deut. xxix. 23, 27, 28, xxxii. 22 — or rather the dreadful calamities which came upon them in the times of Adrian, at Bither; when their false Messiah, Bar Cochab, was taken and slain, and such multitudes of them were destroyed, in the most miserable manner, when that people, who before had their eyes darkened, and a spirit of slumber and stupidity fallen upon them, in those calamities began to be under some convictions."

We have been the more particular in our expo-

sition of this parable, because we have had written requests for an explanation of it, from candid inquirers after truth, and because it is clung to more pertinaciously than any other passage of the Scriptures, as at least favoring the doctrine of future endless punishment. We have shown that the word *hades*, in no other instance in the Bible, is used for a place of future punishment; that if it were so used here, it could prove only punishment in an intermediate state, because all shall be raised out of *hades*, and the state itself be destroyed; but that the passage does not prove even that limited punishment in *hades*, since it cannot be received as a real history, but must be taken as a parable,—and as such, though a part of its imagery is drawn from the heathen fables of the under-world, instead of giving sanction to those fables, it forbids our adoption of them, and commands us back to the word of God in the Scriptures of truth. To this word let us hearken.

SECTION VII.

The Case of Judas.

In the cluster of fragmentary passages thrown together by our learned opponent, which we transcribed into the beginning of the preceding Section, succeeding the reference to the rich man in *hades*, is the following: "*Judas by transgression fell, and went to his own place.*" There is an error here in the quotation, as the reading of the text is, not, *and went to his own*

place, but, "*that he might go* to his own place." A careless reader might overlook the importance of this error in the Doctor's quotation; but the critical student will perceive that there is a significance in the true reading of the record which has an instructive bearing upon the sense of the passage. It makes the going to his own place the fulfilment of a prophecy or purpose. If it relates to Matthias, as some eminent Orthodox commentators suppose, it expresses the purpose for which the election fell to him by lot; and if it refers to Judas, it expresses the purpose for which he withdrew from the apostleship, or his allotment in the fulfilment of prophecy. "And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two (Barsabas or Matthias) thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place." (Acts i. 24, 25.) The idea is, that it was for the purpose that he might fill the place assigned him by the counsel of God prophetically revealed, or else, that he might return to his former occupation, that he by transgression fell.

But Dr. Adams considers the mere quotation of this scrap of the record an "argument" for future punishment. He gives us not a word explanatory of his reason for so regarding it, except the following in his next sentence, "Judas' 'own place' was not heaven." How does he know it was not? If *Paradise* was the place of the thief on the cross, even if it be placed on the ground of his dying expression of

respect for Jesus, what authority has Dr. Adams to assert that it was not the place of Judas, who uttered the strongest dying testimony of the purity of Jesus, and gave practical proof of the sincerity of his penitence by throwing down the price of his perfidy at the feet of his seducers, and either they or he purchased with it a field; and so severe was his anguish that "he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out," — or his heart broke, as the word bowels is sometimes used in the Scriptures for heart. With this agrees a fair rendering of Matt. xxvii. 5, reading, instead of "hanged himself," *choked of anguish.* Thus are the records of Matthew and Luke, which in the Common Version are contradictory, seen to be in harmony, — both implying the death of Judas by internal rupture from excessive anguish on account of his sin in betraying innocent blood.* His repentance was as real as that of the thief on the cross, and no man, even on the popular scheme of making the hereafter heaven a reward of dying penitence, can say that Judas' place is not heaven.

But *we* do not understand that heaven *was* meant by this language in the case before us, — neither a place of future endless punishment. Some place, or position, or allotment, was evidently referred to,

* On the manner of Judas' death, Dr. Clarke quotes with full approval the following from Rev. John Jones, in his *Illustrations of the Four Gospels:* — "So sensible became the traitor of the distinguished rank which he forfeited, and of the deep disgrace into which he precipitated himself, by betraying his Master, that he was seized with such violent grief, as occasioned the rupture of his bowels, and ended in suffocation and death." "The late Mr. Wakefield," says Clarke, "defends this meaning with great learning and ingenuity." And Dr. Clarke, I may say, endorses this opinion, and adds, that "the Greek word which we (that is, King James' Assembly) translate *hanged himself*, is by the very best critics rendered, *was choked.*" For more on this subject, see the APPENDIX.

either which Judas had in view upon abandoning Jesus, or which he was to fill in the verification of prophecy in relation to the mission and trials of Jesus.

But we will present our readers with the opinions, and the *arguments* too, of numbers of the most eminent Orthodox Biblical critics, on the case of Judas, and on this passage in particular. We do not understand that our opponent is to receive those revered Doctors of his school as *authority;* but we would have it clearly understood, that his mere paraphrastic quotation, Judas "went to his own place," adding the sententious assertion, "Judas' 'own place' was not heaven," has no weight at all against the deliberate opinions and exegetical *arguments* of his learned and honored brethren. And we would have it understood that these Doctors whom we shall quote were believers in "future, endless punishment," and were predisposed to find in the Scriptures all the support for it which they could conscientiously apply as such, — so that it was by the force of truth upon their understandings, against their prejudices, that they were compelled to throw out this passage from the use to which they wanted it.

On the phraseology in question, "that he might go to his own place," Dr. ADAM CLARKE, in his commentary on the passage, says, — "1. Some suppose that the words *that he might go to his own place,* are spoken of Judas, and his punishment in *hell.* 2. Others refer them to the purchase of the field, made by the thirty pieces of silver, for which he had sold our Lord. So he abandoned *the ministry and apostolate, that he might*

go to his own place, viz: that which he had purchased. 3. Others with more seeming propriety state, that *his own place*, means his *own house*, or *former occupation;* he left the ministry and apostleship, that he might resume his former employment in conjunction with his family, &c. This is the primary meaning of it in Num. xxiv. 25. "*And Balaam returned to* HIS OWN PLACE, i. e. to his own country, friends, and employment. 4. Others think it simply means *the state of the dead* in general, independently of either *rewards or punishments;* as is probably meant by Eccl. iii: 20. *All go unto* ONE PLACE: *all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.* But, 5. Some of the best critics assert that the words (as before hinted) belong to Matthias — *his own place* being the office to which he was about to be elected."

Now it is to be remarked that all these critics to whom Dr. Clarke refers with so much consideration, are eminent Orthodox theologians. He seems to give his own preference to the third hypothesis, taking *his own place* to be his former occupation, for the sake of which he abandoned the ministry of Jesus when he discovered that he was not to set up an earthly kingdom to be shared with his disciples.

Hammond argues extensively for the opinion that the phrase, "that he might go to his own place," refers to Matthias, as going to the place or office which became his own by lot, having been vacated by Judas. He says, "It was not Luke's office to pass sentence on Judas, any further than by setting down the hein ousness of his crime, which he had done, vs. 16–19,

and was not to proceed to judge, or affirm, aught of God's secrets, such as his going to hell. And it is *St. Chrysostom's* observation on v. 16, *behold the wisdom of St. Luke, how he doth not reproach or insult, on Judas;* but simply sets down the matter of fact without any descant on it; and what he adds—*he discourses on the present vengeance*—belongs evidently to what befell him in this present world, and so excludes all enlarging to his future damnation." *(Hammond's Annotations on the place.)* GILPIN, PEARCE, and KNATCHBULL, offer similar views and arguments.

The phrase, *son of perdition*, which Jesus applied to Judas as the one lost to his apostleship, (John xvii. 12), is very justly explained by Wakefield, thus:—"*The son of mischief:* a Hebrew phrase for a destructive, pernicious person; upon which mode of speaking see my commentary on Matt. v. 9."

Dr. CLARKE, whom we have quoted so freely above, when he wrote his commentary on Matt. xxvi. 24, "It had been good for that man if he had not been born," treats this expression as proof of Judas' final damnation. He argues it in the following emphatic strain, as being proud of his point:—"Can this be said of any sinner if there be any redemption from hell's torments? If a sinner should suffer millions of millions of years in them, and get out at last into the enjoyment of heaven; then it was well for him that he had been born, for still he has an *eternity of blessedness* before him. Can the doctrine of the *non-eternity* of hell's torments stand in the presence of such a saying?" But when he had progressed in his

work to the first chapter of Acts, he had so far advanced in Biblical knowledge as to see that neither this saying of Jesus, *nor any other* Scripture testimony, means the endless damnation of Judas. In his commentary on the passage in this chapter which we have been considering, after showing that the words, *his own place*, cannot be reasonably understood as referring to a future state of misery, and presenting an honorable plea for the genuineness of Judas' repentance, and the probability of his salvation through the great mercy of God in Christ, he refers to that argument on the saying in Matthew, and thoroughly disposes of it, as follows:—"What renders his case most desperate, are the words of our Lord, Matt. xxvi. 24, 'Woe unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! It had been good for that man if he had not been born!' I have considered this saying in a *general* point of view, in my note on Matt. xxvi. 24, and were it not a *proverbial* form of speech among the Jews to express the state of any *flagrant* transgressor, I should be led to apply it, in all its *literal* import, to the case of Judas, as I have done in that note to the case of *any* damned soul; but when I find that it was a proverbial saying, and that it has been used in many cases where the fixing of the irreversible doom of a sinner is not implied, it may be capable of a more favorable interpretation than what is generally given to it." The learned Commentator then proceeds to present a catalogue of cases, from Jewish writers, where the same saying as this applied to Judas, *it had been good for that man if he had not*

been born, is used to denote, simply, that this earthly life, that is, living to manhood, would hardly be desirable viewed in connection with certain specified ignominy and suffering. He might have added to his catalogue several cases from the Old Testament Scriptures, such as Job's cursing the day of his birth because of the afflictions of his life,—and Solomon's saying that if a man live many years, and beget an hundred children, and sees not good in life, and has no burial, *an untimely birth is better than he.*

It is curious to observe how the amiable and learned Clarke, in this last extract from his pen, was the vacilating subject of a mighty struggle between his theology and his understanding. In his labor to release Judas from the doom to which he had, by his former construction, made this saying of Jesus consign him, he shows that its meaning in common usage was such, that it could not have been taken by the hearers of our Lord as referring to Judas' final state. Then of course it referred to nobody's final state, because it was said directlyof Judas, and nobody else. And yet Clarke, while explaining it of Judas as implying only temporal shame and anguish, so handles his words as to appear not to relinquish his former argument from the saying as applied to other "damned souls." Alas, how little does human greatness appear when striving against God's truth. But we rejoice that this great Christian scholar has brought out so much of the fruit of increased Biblical knowledge in the later portions of his Scripture Commentaries. His able exposition of Dr. Adams'

proof text, *that he might go to his own place*, is brought to this conclusion: "*And I contend further, that there is no positive evidence of the final damnation to Judas in the sacred text.*

Our readers have seen that our opponent, in the concluding division of his argument, brings forward the opinion of THEODORE PARKER, that the Evangelists in their reports of the discourses of Jesus, make him to teach the doctrine of endless punishment; and he regards this testimony, from one who rejects endless punishment, Bible and all, as being almost decisive in the settlement of the controversy. What is the case? Why, the good man, Parker, was educated in the belief of endless punishment, and in the association with that punishment of the sound of all those lists of Scripture phraseology which Dr. Adams has applied to it so laconically in his "Argument." He has great benevolence, not profound intellect, but clear intellectual and moral perceptions to see the opposition between this doctrine and the principle of honor and right in God. And, in his disgust of the dogma with which chimes the sound of the Scripture phraseology in the ear tuned by false education, and yet, too impatient to achieve the trial of eradicating the false impressions of the sense of Scripture phraseology by a thorough *de novo* Scripture study, and having but small reverence for what is old, he cuts the Gordian knot, throws the Bible away with its false interpretations *en masse*, and makes reason alone his revelator. And *his* testimony, Dr. Adams calls in, upon the meaning of Scripture. We scout it as "the idle winds, which we respect not."

But what have we here, upon our side of the question. Our opponent quotes the words spoken of Judas, "that he might go to his own place," as proof needing no comment, of future punishment—*for one man at least.* And we call in a host of the Doctors and Rabbis of his own school, wanting all the Bible proof they can get for his very doctrine of endless punishment, and educated in the very habit of applying this passage to that doom, who, by prayerful Biblical study in the exercise of reason, have been compelled to relinquish this passage as a testimony for such a doctrine, and become empowered to show, by able and learned argument, *that it has no such meaning.* Will not our learned friend perceive that his merely transcribing these few words from the Book, has no manner of weight against the opinions and labored *arguments* of his elder Biblical critics, and against the concurrent testimonies of the Scriptures, in proof of "Future, Endless Punishment?"

SECTION VIII.

Die in Your Sins — Cannot Come.

There are a few passages in the last cluster which we transcribed of our opponent's quotation as "teaching that the wicked are in misery after death," which we have not noticed, and which require no labored exposition. They are the following: "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness." Universalists, above all other Christians, urge and maintain that the

wicked are, by the very law of their moral nature, banished from true home and true good in life, that they are as lost sheep driven away from pasture, wandering from valley to hill, "and have forgotten their resting place." "There is no peace to the wicked, saith my God." But this does not prove that they will follow after iniquity in the spirit land. "The ungodly are like the chaff which the wind driveth away." Another important utterance of moral truth, of like import with the foregoing. "The men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before God exceedingly." Undoubtedly. "And the Lord rained fire and brimstone out of heaven and destroyed them all." We never doubted the truth of this piece of historical record, relating to the desolating tempest upon Sodom and Gomorrah. But how this record proves that men are in misery after death we are unable to understand, and our friend neglects to show us. And then, after the reference to the rich man in *hades*, and Judas to *his own place*, which we have quite fully considered, he finishes this cluster and closes the quotations of proof texts for the first division of his argument, with the following:

"*If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.*" "*And where I am, thither ye cannot come.*" This seems to have been designed to be a quotation of John viii. 21.

There is, though seemingly slight, yet really an essential error, in the Doctor's arrangement and wording of this quotation. He designed no wrong, for he is undoubtedly sincere in the belief that Jesus

intended to teach what his re-arrangement of parts and addition of a word is designed to favor. He takes the last member of the 24th verse and puts in place of the first member of the 21st verse; and then supplies the word, *and*, to connect with this the last member of the same verse. He desired to make the verity of the saying, "whither I go ye cannot come," depend on the condition of their dying in their sins. But such is not the fact. The true reading of verse 21st is as follows:—"Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way; and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins: Whither I go ye cannot come." Here are two distinct prophetic statements, the latter not depending on the former as a condition. 1st, "Ye shall die in your sins." 2d, "Whither I go ye cannot come."

1st. "Ye shall die in your sins." What is signified by this expression? It does not appear from the connections that Jesus spoke of individual natural death, and the state of mind and character in which individuals might die. And we will here take occasion to remark, that the inspired servants of God, under either dispensation, never sought to excite the dying with fear and terror as to what should become of them after death, nor to fill the minds of friends with distress in view of a final separation from each other, some to infinite bliss and others to endless woe. No instance of the kind can be found. In the Old Testament, the closing account of the subjects of its history, of diverse characters, is, that they slept with their fathers, and

were buried in their respective family grounds or sepulchres. And in the New Testament, in all the records of the ministry of Jesus and his apostles, and the experience and exhortations of converts, and the mourning of friends for the loss of friends, there is no intimation of anxiety and distress from the contemplation of an eternal separation. If any such thing had been believed and preached then, as it is now, the New Testament records must have had a sprinkling of it all through, just as the preaching, and exhortations, and experiences, and addresses to the sick, and dying, and mourners, among persons believing it, have at the present day. But there is nothing of it in the New Testament. Its ministers labored faithfully to teach men *how to live*, admonished them of the evils of a course of sin; and for their moral and spiritual regeneration and growth, they gave to man the revelation of a future life as a subject of grateful and purifying hope. In the spirit and purpose of this truth, how affectionately and persuasively Jesus conducted his intercourse with the ignorant and them who were out of the way. And St. Paul exhorted believers, whose deceased friends had generally died even in heathen idolatry, not to be ignorant concerning them who were asleep, that they should sorrow not even as others who have ho hope.*

The fact is, that many modern religious teachers, who have a Christianity adulterated with error, take up the denunciations of public and national judg-

*1 Thess. iv. 13.

ments which Jesus and his apostles denounced upon the most wicked though the most religious people in the world, who, under hypocritical pretences of godliness were persecuting the truth of God and his servants with a high hand, and they go with these denunciations as the bread of heaven for all classes of men, women, and children,—for the sick, even the most virtuous and lovely if not Orthodox, for the dying, and the mourning; and upon all these they palm them as descriptions of the general treatment of God to mankind, and of the general human condition, in the immortal world. It is a terrible mistake.

But to return to the question of the *dying in sin*, denoted by the denunciation of Jesus upon the Jews in the case before us.

Jesus in this place makes no reference to the views and feelings, or even the character, in which men ordinarily die. Nor does he here refer to individual physical death at all. By reading that whole chapter you will see that it is a direct and close conversation with the leaders of the Jews in relation to their concerted opposition to him, and their purpose to destroy him. And at the twenty-first verse, he does not speak of the character in which they would individually suffer physical death, but he announces the doom of that people which should be suffered in consequence of their moral corruptness and spiritual blindness, and their criminal persecution of him and his cause. "I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins." There is no *if* about it. It is

a direct denunciation of judgment which they had incurred, a national death in their blindness and persistent moral corruptness. Dying *to* sin is living *to* God; dying *in* sin is wandering from God. The *if* in verse 24th relates to the unbelief which was and would be the cause of their sinful opposition to him and his gospel. And this doom to a succeeding age of national blindness and desolation is repeatedly spoken of, in different terms and on different occasions, by our Lord. In relation to this same people on occasion of their persistent opposition, it is said, (Luke xix. 41–43.) "And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! But now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side."

In this case, as in the text under special consideration, the occasion was the vituperous opposition of the Jews, and the subject was the withdrawal from them for a season of the opportunities with which they had been favored, and their subjection to rational desolation. Again, (Matt. xxiii. 32, 33.) "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the punishment of Gehenna?" That is, as we explained in Section II. of this chapter, the judgment which was foretold by the prophets, that should make their city and land like unto Tophet in the valley of Hinnom.

And a little further on in the same chapter, he signified to the same people the same approaching desolation or death in their sins, as follows:—"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

Such then is the doom of the Jewish nation, denounced by the words of our Lord in the text under consideration, "Ye shall die in your sins." That very determined and violent hostility to him and the spirit of his mission, which was being displayed in that very instance, as they were reviling him and seeking to kill him, furnished the usual occasion for his admonishing them of the ruin upon which they were rushing.

The same moral and political death in one, as we have before seen in this discussion, is also represented by the unjust steward deposed from his stewardship, and by the rich man dead and in *hades*.

2d. And what of the other clause of the text, "*Whither I go ye cannot come?*" By the opposers of our faith it has been construed to denote an endless exclusion. Is it so? You must not insist upon this construction if it be not the necessary meaning of the language, because it would represent Christ, whose mission it was by the Father's appointment to

destroy all sin and death, and save the world, as standing up, when his work was but just begun, and declaring that he would not do it. We should not necessarily place THE SENT OF GOD in such an attitude of dishonor.

But look again. Will you yet insist that the words of Christ to the Jews, "Whither I go ye cannot come," necessarily import an endless exclusion? We take you at your word for a moment. Now turn over to the words of Jesus to his own disciples, John xiii. 33. "Little children, yet a little while I am 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." There, my opposing friend, if you are right, if you have proved anything by your definition of the words of Jesus to the Jews, you have proved the final banishment and endless exclusion of the faithful disciples. For you say that the proper and necessary sense of the saying to the Jews is an endless exclusion; and now Jesus applies the same words to his disciples, and is particular to certify them that it is precisely what he said to the Jews. "Ye shall seek me; and *as I said unto the Jews*, whither I go ye cannot come, *so now I say to you.*"

What will you do now? Will you, for the sake of your favorite construction of John viii. 21, give up as lost forever Christ's primitive disciples? "No," say you, "because Jesus said to the disciples when Peter asked him, 'Whither goest thou?' 'Whither I go thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow me afterward.'" Then you show conclusively

that the phrase addressed to the Jews *and* to the disciples, "whither I go ye cannot come," does *not* import a final exclusion,—does *not* signify but that they would come unto him afterward. And now, in this light of the subject, for you to go back and insist on your old construction of these same words to the Jews, as proving their final exclusion, will be inexcusably reckless of truth.

In both cases, the saying of Jesus, "Whither I go ye cannot come," had reference to his passing off from this field of labor, and going to the Father, where the Jews could not come to him as they were then seeking to do, with hostile intent, and where his disciples could not continue their familiar resort to him for personal intercourse. This is plainly the whole import of the language, as it was addressed to the two parties respectively.

It is seen now that there is no such condition expressed in this text, on which depended the inability of the Jews to come where Jesus was to be, as the frequent supply of the word *if* introduces, and that by our opponent in this discussion, *and* instead of *if*, was intended to imply. For to say, "*if* ye die in your sins whither I go ye cannot come," makes their dying in their sins the reason why they could not go to him. But no such thought is involved in the text. Each clause of the text announces a separate truth. "I go my way." This is a fact that did not depend on any other fact expressed in the passage. "And ye shall (or will) seek me." Another separate fact. They would still seek him or his representatives with

evil designs. "And ye shall (or will) die in your sins." This is yet another fact by itself. They would continue in their blindness and hardness of heart, unto their national desolation. "Whither I go ye cannot come." Another fact depending on no *if*. He was going to the Father, beyond the personal reach of the Jews to persecute him, or of the disciples to ask his counsel as they had been wont to do.

No, Jesus did not, in the case we have been studying, dishonor himself by the announcement of a recantation of his purpose and failure of his mission. As his saying to the disciples, the same which he had spoken to the Jews, did not contradict the saying that they should *follow him afterward*, so the same saying to the Jews was not a throwing up of the purpose of his mission, which was "to seek and save that which was lost," and with a fidelity and success equal to that of the shepherd who never gives up his pursuit until the last lost sheep is brought into the fold rejoicing.

This temporary alienation and deadness in sin of the Jews is, as we have shown, often spoken of by Jesus and his apostles. Jesus said to the Pharisees, "The publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." Again, "the first shall be last, and the last first;" meaning that the Jews, who were first in respect to privilege, would be later in their reception of the gospel than the Gentiles, who had been reckoned last. Yet it implies that the Jews were at last to come in. The same is denoted by the passage before quoted:—"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, ...

Your house is left unto you desolate, and ye shall not see me henceforth, until ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Here is implied an age of darkness and desolation to that people, and then a regeneration by the light of Christ. And St. Paul is full and instructive on this subject, in Rom. xi. "Blindness in part is happened unto Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved." Read the entire chapter, which is wholly devoted to the ways of God's providence through the devious windings and alternate ups and downs of human condition, coming out at such an enrapturing view of the glorious result in universal harmony and peace, as impelled this adoring exclamation: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to whom be glory forever. Amen.

NOTE.

In the last Section of this chapter, (p. 26,) on the Jew's dying in their sins, we spoke of Dr. Adams' quotations as presenting the subject matter of the 21st verse of John viii., but involving a re-arrangement and the supply of the word, *and*. His quotations stand thus:

"*If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.*" "*And where I am, thither ye cannot come.*"

But now, in looking over the record in surrounding chapters, having had our attention called to the case

by a note from Dr. A., we perceive that in chapter vii. v. 34, these words occur, "And where I am, thither ye cannot come." And this was the verse from which the Doctor culled those words in his quotation. This exonorates him from the interpolation of the word *and*, but makes it to appear a more labored and intentional "re-arrangement." While the dying in sin, and not coming where he was, were comprised in the 21st verse of chapter viii., in Jesus' own manner of expression, our friend searches out the last clause of viii. 24, and the last clause of vii. 34, and, though denoting them by quotation marks as separate fragments, places them in a relative position to appear as connected in the expression of a sentiment. Of course this wide search for fragments to combine in a quotation was for a purpose, and that purpose was to make out an expression in Scripture *words* by "re-arrangement," of a relation between the parts, which the single quotation of viii. 21, would not express.

This new discovery, which we take pains to notice here for the sake of accuracy, and of perfect justice to all parties, while it exonorates our friend from the supply of the word *and*, at the same time showing greater labor in the re-arrangement, helps us to an unquestionable testimony to the correctness of our view of the meaning of our Lord, by the saying, "Whither I go ye cannot come;" or, as in vii. 34, "And, where I am thither ye cannot come." The whole connection in which the latter phraseology occurs, is the following:—"And the Pharisees and

chief priests sent officers to take him. Then said Jesus unto them, Yet a little while am I with you, and then I go unto him that sent me. Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me; and where I am, thither ye cannot come." Here the words, "ye shall seek me," were suggested by the then present fact that the Pharisees and chief priests sent officers to take him. It was the extermination of his cause that they sought, and they would still seek this object. But Jesus, the source of all power in this cause and kingdom of his, returning to Him who sent him, would be beyond their reach, on a throne of power to which they could not have access, and where they could not come; and where, as in xiii. 33, neither could his disciples come. So then, the conjunction *and*, vii. 34, connects the saying, "where I am thither ye cannot come," with the saying that he should go to Him that sent him, and they should seek him and not find him. Whereas Dr. A.'s re-arrangement transports it to a place after the last clause of viii. 24, and thus makes it connect the idea of their not coming where he is, with their dying in their sins. It is an essential transpostion; yet, as we kindly said before, our friend meant no harm, for he honestly believed that the latter two ideas really depend on each other, and he clearly saw that such a transposition would compose a paragraph more suggestive of such dependency. *Fiat justitia, &c.*

CHAPTER II.

The second fundamental proposition of Dr. Adams, is in these words:

II. REDEMPTION BY CHRIST IS REPRESENTED AS HAVING FOR ITS OBJECT SALVATION FROM FINAL PERDITION.

This we shall lay over for the present, reserving it for our concluding Chapter, because it will lead us into the discussion and exploration of a subject which will form and complete with the whole a glorious CLIMAX. In accordance with this plan we pass now to the Doctor's third proposition, to wit:

III. THE FALL OF ANGELS AND OF MAN, IS A CONFIRMATORY PROOF OF FUTURE, ENDLESS RETRIBUTION.

His discussion of this point, the Doctor very considerately opens in the manner following:—

This will of course have weight only with those who believe in the existence and fall of angels, and in the fall of man. To prove either of these, here, would be out of place; and indeed the necessity of proving them would show that everything which has thus far been said in this article is superfluous, because it takes for granted many things generally believed, which rest, however, on the same kind of evidence with the existence of angels and their fall The Apostles, the Scribes and Pharisees, I have not thought it necessary to prove, had a real existence, and that they were not merely personified principles of good and evil. If the reader be

one who rejects the doctrine of fallen angels, and of the fall of man, he will read what is here said merely as showing the way in which those who believe these things are confirmed by them, in their belief of endless retribution.

Precisely so. We will look upon the matter in this light. But then, if the doctrine of endless punishment, with them who believe it, derives essential support from the hypothesis of holy angels having fallen and become metamorphosed into such a Satan, and such legions of devils, as Milton poetizes, it is of some interest to us to know on what ground this hypothesis is made to rest, on what testimony it is based.

But, in the outset, we will clear the Doctor's position of the confusion of ideas in which he has involved it. He puts into the statement of his hypothesis two ideas which have no relation to each other. He expects that his argument under this classification will "*have weight only with those who believe in the existence and fall of angels.* This is making the existence of angelic beings in the spiritual state, and their *fall*, in the orthodox sense, one proposition, as if the latter assumption were necessarily embraced in the former. This working of the matter into a false issue must have been an oversight of our friend; for we esteem him as above the practice of duplicity. But it is obvious to every mind, that to believe that the great and good Father has surrounded himself with sweet angelic spirits, pure and blessed immortals, is one thing; and to believe that any of these bright seraphs have, in the high courts of heaven, conceived

lust and brought forth sin, and subsided into a host of fiends and devils, is another and quite different thing. We believe the former, but not the latter. For the honor of God, and the love of heaven, we pronounce utterly fabulous the theory that sins, devils and satans, are the indigenous products of that spirit realm, that court of the Eternal, that heavenly Canaan, to which the Christian looks with hope as his safe, and blessed and final home.

But our learned friend gives us to understand, in the paragraph of his above quoted, that his faith in the real existence of such a diabolical progeny of heaven as historical persons, stands on the same ground as his belief in the personal existence of the Apostles, Scribes and Pharisees. With a significant implication, he says, "The Apostles, the Scribes and Pharisees, I have not thought it necessary to prove, had a real existence, and that they were not merely personified principles of good and evil." So, then, he would have it understood, that if we take the words devil and satan in the Scriptures, when not applied to human beings, as personifications of evil principles, we adopt a rule of interpretation which, carried out fairly, would turn all historic persons into mere personified principles.

Let us see if the Doctor will abide by his rule. If we take anything mentioned in the Scriptures or any other book, to be a literal historical person, we shall take any physiological description of his person, in the same history, to be also literal. For instance, when we read of Goliath, of Gath, that his height was

six cubits and a span, we understand that such was the real height of a real person, of the name aforesaid. When Jesus describes the dress of the Pharisees as being embellished with widened borders, and their habit of passing themselves off as eminently pious by making broad their phylacteries, we understand that these descriptions of dress and habit, being applied to real historical persons, are literally as stated. So likewise when St. Paul speaks of his reputation with some, as being mighty in his letters, but in his bodily presence weak, we naturally understand that the apostle was not reputed to be prepossessing in his personal appearance.

But we will now take our learned friend to a Bible description of the person of the devil and satan. See Rev. xii. "And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and, behold, a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads. And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth. . . . And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought, and his angels,—and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world; he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him."

Here, Doctor, is a description of the person of satan. He is a gentlemanly looking person, with seven heads, and ten horns; and a tail so long that

he can enfold with it a third part of the stars of heaven, as easily as the full grown Anaconda can enfold the horse and his rider. Just think, *upon your literal hypothesis* of the personality of satan, what a length of tail he has. The stars are countless millions of miles apart, and of these there are many thousands, and the devil, with his tail, drew, or, if you take it as a prophecy, is to draw a third part of them with one swoop to the earth! If all this is literal, as it must be if the devil is a real person, we should treat him civilly, lest, if we should offend him, he should take our earth as a very little thing in a single fold of his tail, and drag it in an instant beyond the verge of the solar system, and cast it off into void.

If you charge us here with ridiculing the Scriptures, we kindly and respectfully retort the charge. You force unnatural and ludicrous constructions upon the Scriptures, which turn them into ridicule. You concede that the service to which your theology puts the Scriptures has driven into semi-infidelity so good a man as Rev. Theodore Parker; and you are aware that he is but one of many thousands of instances of the like character. Yet you take no admonition from these terrible effects of such treatment of the sacred record, to study it anew, whether these things are so. *Our* earnest endeavor is, by exploding false interpretations, and promoting a just understanding of the Scriptures, to promote a devout love and enlightened reverence for their beautiful and heavenly teachings.

The writer of the book of Revelation had no apprehension that these visionary scenic descriptions, which all had a proper significance as such in relation to the operations of principles and powers among the kingdoms of the earth and in the kingdom of the Messiah, would ever be taken by any intellectual being as literal descriptions of real persons and things. Nor could any inspired speaker or writer, unless it were by an inspiration of the foresight of the lamentable defection of the church in later ages, have imagined that they should be understood in any case, except by way of epithet to human beings, as meaning by the devil and satan a personal being. Let us lay aside unworthy prejudice, and look for truth on this subject.

By fallen angels, the Doctor means, of course, personal devils, having one mighty leader, called by way of eminence, *the* Devil, Satan, and Beelzebub. For the fallen angels would be of but little service to the popular theology if they were not devils, tempters, and eternal tormentors. Our inquiry under this head must consequently be directed in the main to the Scripture teachings concerning the devil and satan. A brief notice, however, must be taken of the fall of angels, this being the phraseology in which our opponent puts the point, and in which the subject is couched in the one single passage of Scripture on which he rests his whole position. And we are brought here into very narrow quarters; for this passage in Peter, with the corresponding one in

Jude who is generally supposed to have copied from Peter, thus making both passages virtually one, is the only case in which the fall of angels is spoken of in the Scriptures. To be sure it may be urged that the passage just quoted from Revelation, of the dragon being cast out of heaven, and his angels with him, is another instance parallel with our opponent's quotation from Peter and Jude. But this does not relate to the same event. The angels in Peter are represented as having been recreant to some sacred trust; but the dragon and his angels are represented as having assaulted heaven from an already existing dragon character. Again, in Peter, the sinning angels were cast down to *Tartarus*, for this is the original word rendered *hell* in that place, and it is the only instance of its occurrence in the Bible;—but in the other case, the dragon and his angels were cast out of heaven into *the earth*. And yet again, when the dragon, the devil and satan, was cast out of heaven into the earth, he is said to have been overcome by the blood of the Lamb and the testimony of the saints, who shouted praise to God that the accuser of their brethren was cast down. All this involves the conditions, that when this expulsion from whatever is here meant by heaven took place, the earth was here, and was inhabited, and the blood of Christ had been shed, and his church militant was in being and in action. This event, therefore, was not the one which, in theological fable, transpired before the earth was made, to have a devil in readi-

ness to visit God's new made children on the earth the first day of their being, to circumvent their very infancy, and effectuate their ruin.

No, this scenic representation of the war, and the fall of the dragon, can afford our friend no support in his theory of the conversion of angels to devils. Where, then, do we find the history of such a fall? There is, I believe, but one other passage which has been appropriated to the use of supporting such a theory, and that we quoted in Section VI, of the preceding Chapter of this Reply, when discussing the Bible use of *hades*. It is Isa. xiv. 12. "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!" This has really been quoted, by Doctors and teachers in the church, as supporting the theological fable of the fall of the archangel of heaven, or, as Milton styles him, Generalissimo of heaven, into the estate of Generalissimo of devils. But the reading of the same verse out, spoils this magnificent falsehood. The next words are, "how art thou cut down to the ground which didst weaken the nations!" So this relates to the fall of some monarch who *had* weakened the nations before his fall, but could no more work mischief afterwards. Whereas our Doctor's mighty fallen angel does all his mischief since his fall. But the reading of verse 4th of this chapter sets the matter in its true light, and informs us who this fallen dignitary was. "Thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased!" It is a

prophetic description given before the event, of the fall of the king of Babylon, and of his realm.

Accordingly we find ourselves shut up to this passage in Peter, copied by Jude, for our information on the fall of angels. The following is the passage, as written in both Peter and Jude, and as quoted by my opponent, (and it is *all he has quoted)*, to his third great position:

Peter says (2 Pet. ii. 4), "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." Jude says, (6) "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."

Now as this is our opponent's only proof-text for his theory of fallen angels, he must make the most of it he fairly can. But, making the most of it possible, making *any* thing of it, either as a piece of sacred history, or as a quotation from a fabulous book, it cannot be made to apply to the Orthodox theory. For these angels referred to by Peter and Jude, on sinning, or leaving their own habitation or sphere of duty, were cast down into Tartarus, and *held there in chains*, unto the great judgment specified. This refers to an entirely different set of apostates from my opponent's fallen angels. For the latter, composing the family of devils with Satan at their head, while the Orthodox "judgment of the great day" is yet far in the future, have, ever since the morn of creation, had full possession and free range of all the earth, as uni-

versally present as the circumambient air, and as untrammelled as the winds. And not only so, but this Satan of my opponent, with his tribe, has been able to institute and conduct a successful warfare in this field of operation, against the Deity, for the government and possession of the human family, God's own children, — a warfare so successful as to have wrested from the great Father almost the entire kingdom, and, thus far, gained possession of almost the whole family, and secured his title to them as his, so effectually that the judgment of the great day shall pronounce and seal them his forever. It is certain, therefore, that, whatever the apostate angels of Peter and Jude were, they were not the Orthodox tribe of devils, because they were thrust down into Tartarus, and held there in chains unto the judgment.* So that our opponent is left without a single passage in all the Bible referring to his species of fallen angels, or to the origin of his Devil.

* Into this perfect wreck of ideas the amiable Dr. Watts falls, when he sings, Hymn 44, B. ii., speaking of the hell of "immortal pains," —

> "There Satan, the first sinner, lies,
> And roars, and bites his iron bands;
> In vain the rebel strives to rise,
> Crushed with the weight of both thy hands."

What a monstrosity of intellectual conception! Satan lying in the prison of hell, "far in the deep," held in "iron bands" which he bites but cannot break, and from the toils of which he vainly strives to rise, and, more than this, held and crushed down with the infinite weight of both the Almighty's hands; and yet this same Satan, all this while, roaming freely all over this world, and subverting God's government, defying his power, and capturing, and sealing as his own forever, God's children. How constantly we are reminded, in these investigations, of what we have repeatedly remarked in substance, that great and good men cannot do otherwise than make themselves perfect fools, when they commit themselves to the maintenance of the theological chimeras of the dark and semi-barbarous ages. Pardon this apparently uncouth expression of feeling; — how could we restrain it?

This is a sufficient reply to Dr. Adams on this point; but as we are interested to show what *is* true as well as what is *not* true, we will inquire, with brevity, concerning the probable meaning of this proof-text. And here we will recall the reader's mind to the fact, that the word *angel* applies to any messenger, whether human or spiritual. Newcomb's translation, and the London Improved Version of the New Testament, and these quoting from "Simpson's Essays," give the following rendering to this passage; — "The messengers who watched not duly over their own principalities, but deserted their proper habitation, he kept with perpetual chains under darkness (punished them with judicial blindness of mind) unto the judgment of a great day." And they add this note: "Alluding to the falsehood and punishment of the spies, Numbers xiv. See Simpson's Essays, p. 210. Perhaps, however, the writer may refer to some fanciful account of the fall of angels contained in the apocryphal book which lay before him, without meaning to vouch for that fact any more than for the incident mentioned in verse 9. He might introduce it merely to illustrate his argument. At any rate, a fact so important is not to be admitted upon such precarious evidence." See Newcomb's New Testament, and London Improved Version, *in loco.*

In confirmation of this general view taken by those learned translators and commentators, we call the reader's attention to the circumstance, that this is not offered by the apostle as an original historical entry, or a new revelation. It is a reference, for illustration

of the main subject of the chapter, to examples, either in history or story, with which the people were supposed to be familiar. He describes certain false teachers who had crept into the Christian church, who were depraved, self-willed, and disorderly,—treating with contempt all rules of order, and all authority in Church or State. He urges the consideration that, however they might contemn human authority, the Divine authority they could not invalidate. They should be holden to a strict accountability to the moral government and operative judgment of God. The whole tenure of the connection shows that the apostle had in mind the system of God's ever perfect moral government, and operative judgment as a branch of it, together with the certainty of accumulated evil in due time if sin is persisted in, which we so fully explained and illustrated in Sections I. and II. of our preceding Chapter. Speaking of those false teachers, he says, "And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you, whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation (condemnation or punishment) slumbereth not." What a direct expression we have here of the theory of judgment which we have explained as noted above. And he proceeds to illustrate:—"For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, *(Tartarus)*, and delivered them in chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment; and spared not the old world; . . . . and turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an

ensample unto those that after should live ungodly; and delivered just Lot;—the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished."

We have seen that the day of judgment, in this *special* sense, to any nation, city, or individual, is the time and occasion when a persistent course of wrong *eventuates* in special and aggravated calamity. The subject is fully explained in our discussion of the "treasuring up of wrath against the day of wrath," in the Sections above referred to.

From the foregoing quotation of the context it is seen that what is said of the sinning angels, is a reference to some record or story extant. Where is there a record of apostate angels or messengers, to which Peter may have made reference? If he referred to any event of Scripture record, that adduced by Simpson, Newcomb and others, the defection of the spies sent to Canaan, who were subsequently destroyed by a plague, is most probably the one. But, from the circumstance that the word *Tartarus* is here used as the prison of the false messengers, which is not an Old Testament word, and is in no other instance used in the New Testament, we are rather inclined to the opinion that the quotation was made from an apocryphal book, for the purpose of illustrating a principle by reference to the common sense of mankind, as developed in the very fabulous poetry of the age. The *principle* illustrated is that of the strict accountability of moral beings to the moral government of God, whose awards even then, and for those very false teachers

who were the subject of discourse, *lingered not for a long time.*

Seeing now that Dr. Adams finds no account of the origin of the Orthodox Devil and Satan, we will cast a look into the Bible with reference to his *existence.* Originate as he might, by transmutation of a good angel, or by immediate creation, or by self-existence, co-eternal with the good God, is there any Bible account of his existence at all?

There is no appearance of such a being in the history of the first human temptation. The serpent, the most subtle of all the beasts of the field, is there introduced as the agent of seduction. To say that there was a pre-existent Devil that concealed himself in the serpent and made him the medium of his communication, is entirely gratuitous. It is supposing the agency of a being that has no historical existence. And this gratuitous assumption makes the serpent the visible speaker to the woman. And it is supposing an inferiority of the female sex which we cannot admit, to assume that, while the man had discernment enough to name all the animals according to their respective natures, the woman was so stupid as to believe that the snake was a rational, social being, capable of being her teacher! The idea outrages common sense. There was never a writer, from Adam to this day, who would introduce a serpent as holding part in a conversation, without meaning to be understood, and knowing that he would be understood, as using a metaphor or allegory, just as obviously as Jotham's parable of the trees choosing them a king

was allegorical. As the serpent is an emblem of wisdom, and oftener of low mischievous cunning, it is here made a strong metaphor of that deceitful lust which lures to sin. St. James says, "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed."

With regard to the word *satan*, it is the Hebrew term untranslated, and in English, is *enmity* or an *adversary*. Hebrew scholars tell us that the word *Sitnah*, Gen. xxvi. 21, is a form of the same Hebrew word; and this is the first instance of its occurrence in the Bible. It is appropriated as the name of a well, because of the strife and hostility between different herdsmen about the well.

The next occurrence of the word satan in the Bible is in Num. xxii. 22; where it describes the good angel of the Lord who resisted Balaam, and is translated *adversary*. "And the angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary (a *satan*) against him."

Third instance, 1 Sam. xix. 4; where it is applied to David, whom the princess of the Philistines proposed to eject from amongst them, lest he should be an adversary (a *satan*) unto them.

Fourth instance, 2 Sam. xix. 22, in the plural number, and applied by David to the sons of Zeruiah, asking why they should be adversaries (satans) unto him.

In the same manner, descriptive of different men in their relations to other men, is the word used in 1 Kings v. 4; xi. 14, 23, 25; Ps. xxxviii. 20; lxxi. 13; cix. 4, 20, 29.

In 1 Chron. xxi. 1, it is said, "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel." We suppose the circumstance that our translators were pleased to leave the Hebrew word untranslated in this case, which is the first instance of their leaving it so, is not a circumstance which will weigh with minds disposed to treat the Scriptures seriously, to call up out of nonentity such a being as our Doctor figures in his mind for the canonical Satan. If the word had been here put into English as in other cases cited, it would have read, "And an adversary stood up against Israel," &c. The adversary may have been some member of David's court; or it may have been his own royal vanity.

Again the word stands in its Hebrew form in Zech. iii. 1, 2. "And he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto Satan, the Lord rebuke thee, O Satan." This describes a visionary scene, in which the prophet was shown an *adversary* at the right hand of Joshua, thus describing the method or order of the Jewish court of trial, where the adversary or accuser was placed at the right hand of the accused that he might be confronted by him.

This completes the catalogue of cases where the word satan occurs in the original of the Old Testament, except the book of Job. It is used as the name of a well, of the good angel of God, of David, of the sons of Zeruiah, of a member, probably, of David's court, and of an accuser in Zechariah's vision of a court scene. It is really calculated to try the

charity and weary the patience of one who loves God's word, to see the Orthodox theory of the Devil and Satan palmed upon the church, in this age of Bible reading, as a Bible doctrine.

By the way, speaking of the Devil, this word is only used in the Old Testament four times, always in the plural, and for idols. The places are Lev. xvii. 7; Deut. xxii. 17; 2 Chron. xi. 15; and Ps. cvi. 37.

But what is the Satan of the book of Job? Is there not proof here of the popular theory? No, it is all the reverse. Let any man of fair intellect read this Epic poem through with the critical attention with which he would read any other book put into his hand for perusal and review, and he will renounce the popular theory concerning Satan if he had held it before. He will see that theory to be full of irreverence and impiety. It makes the book of Job represent that a great and wise fallen angel, omnipresent, knowing the hearts of all men, so well as to be able to take the best advantage of their states of mind to wield his arts and tempt their souls all over the world the same moment, knowing of course that Job was an honest man, and knowing that God, of infinite prescience, could not be deceived, did really undertake to persuade God to believe that Job was a hypocrite. And it makes it represent that the allwise God, knowing the character of this fallen angel, and of Job, sent all those sore afflictions upon his righteous servant just for the sake of convincing that all-knowing adversary of what God knew that he knew perfectly well already, viz: that Job was *not* a

hypocrite. It makes the whole thing a stultifying farce.

But coming to the book of Job without the least Bible information of any such personage as the Satan of modern Orthodoxy, and of course bringing no such creature along in our minds, the book of Job is found to be rich in sentiment, harmonious in all its conceptions, and beautiful and reverent in its poetic personifications, which are common in all, and especially in ancient poetry.

What is the adversary that goes up and down in human nature, and breaks up the quiet of the virtuous and the peace of society? It is *envy*. It not unfrequently goes in even with worshippers when they appear before the Lord, or in the place of devotion. And it is especially active when it sees a neighbor in the enjoyment of a high reputation for excellence. It always suggests that all his reputed excellence is heartless and false, and that if he should be brought into such straightened circumstances as some other folks are placed in, his hypocrisy would be manifest to all. This is precisely the adversary of the book of Job. And it pleased the Lord, as it is sometimes his will, to so order his providence as to subject the good man to the very trials which envy had whispered would prove his defection; but he maintains his integrity, the mean spirit of envy is shamed, the same trials result in the good man's own welfare; so that all accords with the wisdom and goodness of God, and redounds to the praise of his glory. In this light the book of Job is a record of

wisdom and beauty; while, by making its Satan the Orthodox fallen Generalissimo of heaven, it is turned, as we have seen, into perfect nonsense. This personification of the evil spirit of envy, and giving it a part in colloquy with the Governor of the world as questioning his justice and accusing his servant, is in the same impressive style of instruction as that which makes the trees to hold an election, the valleys to sing, the hills to rejoice, and wisdom to build her house, provide her entertainment, and call in her guests.

With regard to the *New Testament* usage of the words devil and satan, it is unnecessary to undertake a notice of all the cases of their occurrence. The Greek *diabolos,* which is rendered devil in the New Testament, is synonymous with the Hebrew satan, denoting an impostor or enemy. Both words are used in the New Testament as the latter is in the Old, sometimes descriptive of a person, and sometimes personifying evil principles. Jesus said to Peter, when the latter betrayed views adverse to the spirit and purpose of his mission, "Get thee behind me, Satan." And of Judas he said to the twelve, "You twelve have I chosen, and one of you is a devil." Sometimes, however, Jesus, in conversation with the unbelieving Jews, uses the names Satan and Beelzebub, as in the character in which they existed in their heathenized opinions. They believed the air to be filled with demons, which are also rendered devils in the New Testament, which they thought to be the ghosts of wicked men, delighting to take up their

abode in the persons of mankind, and to inflict upon them various physical and mental disorders. And these had a prince called Beelzebub, and Satan. And Jesus, when arguing with them on their own ground in reference to powers they ascribed to their Satan, uses the name simply as you would use the names Neptune, Mars and Jupiter, in conversation with a people believing in and worshipping deities under those names. But as it respects the once heavenly archangel, and now omniscient and nearly omnipotent personal Devil of the endless punishment theory, such a being is never presented in the New Testament any more than in the Old. Take any passage in the Gospel histories, where the devil or a satan is represented as acting a part, and attempt to follow him through his part in the capacity of the canonical Satan, and the idea explodes itself as effectually as in the trial we made on the book of Job. Take, for instance, the account of the temptations of Jesus. The devil is represented as taking Jesus up, and placing him at one time on a high mountain, and at another time on the pinnacle of the temple, and making to him certain propositions. Who really believes that this account was intended to describe a personal being, with a long tail and cloven foot, such as the Puritan pulpits and mothers used to frighten children with, as taking up Jesus in his claws and bearing him away through the air, and placing him literally on the pinnacle of the temple, and there attempting to persuade him to worship himself, that is, the Devil. Why, if there were any such a wise and knowing

Devil, he would know better than to think of tempt ing you or me in such a way as this. When you glance at the affair in this light, the whole thing appears farcical and ludicrous. But take the account as embracing a personification of the principles of ambition and worldly fame, which his possession of miraculous powers would naturally present before his mind as available, just as they did the changing of stones into bread, and all is beautifully and consistently instructive. And so, all through the New Testament, take these words, when not applied to human beings as in Jesus' address to Peter and to Judas, as personifications of adverse and delusive suggestions or principles, and you find all clear and consistent.

To this conclusion the learned Professor Bush has come, after a mature re-examination of this whole subject. He has, until the recent development of sympathy with the Swedenborgians, held the highest position in the Orthodox School, and now his general theory would find it convenient to retain the Satan of that School. But the *de novo* criticism of the Bible teachings in relation to the subject has brought him out in this frank and decided avowal of opinion, *that the Satan of the Scriptures is a personification of the principle of evil.*

In the New Testament, when the word *devil* is used for beings supposed to take up their abode in living persons, the Greek term is *demon*, meant to designate the ghosts of wicked men deceased, infesting the atmosphere, and inflicting injuries upon

mankind. The inspired servants of God have given no sanction to this foolish superstition. It would not have comported with the highest success of their mission to be frittering away their time, and multiplying the entanglements of their labors, with petty disputes about all the foolish whims of the people, one by one. They made direct attacks upon the most prominent moral wrongs, and promulgated and established the great system of faith in God's universal and fatherly government, and purpose of grace, which should kill out these thousands of errors and superstitions, just as the effective panacea which puts the vital functions all in healthful order will kill out the cutaneous festers. Take any of the accounts of demoniacal possessions, and attempt to look at them in the light of a canonized theory, and it will make you laugh yourself out of that theory entirely. Take, for instance, that of the maniac that dwelt among the tombs. Just imagine that there were a legion of separate personal beings (we know not whether our friend regards them as of the tribe of his fallen angels) all living in the body of that man, as a swarm of bees in a hive, and all talking with Jesus out through his mouth, and nostrils, and ears, and the pores of his skin,—what an apparition! You don't believe that thing. You slide along, half asleep, in the impression that you believe in the heathen doctrine of demons, but have never opened your eyes to look at it. When you do so, it will vanish.

Deranged people usually entertain the opinions, especially on marvellous subjects, which are preva-

lent in their time. The maniac of course thought himself possessed of demons, and all his conversation with Jesus was consequently shaped accordingly. And it was *his* conversation that was ascribed to the demons. This was the common way of reporting. In Luke xi. 14, we read, "And he was casting out a demon, and it was dumb. And it came to pass when the demon was gone out, the dumb spake." Here the dumbness is ascribed to the demon; but it was the *man* that was dumb; and he it was that spake when the demon, or the infirmity, was removed.

The enlightened and reverent reader of the New Testament, sees Jesus in his work of love and power, healing all manner of diseases, without wrangling about the causes of the diseases, or the names by which they were commonly called. The writers of the Gospel histories set down the deeds performed in the language of the country. It was not their office as faithful and trust-worthy historians, to wander off and distract their narratives with discussions of those incidental questions of causes and cognomens. There is a disease amongst us called *St. Anthony's fire;* another called *St. Vitus' dance;* and another called *Lunacy*, i. e. *Moonstruck.* We familiarly use these names of diseases, without any explanation, and yet we have no apprehension of being understood to ascribe the diseases to St. Vitus, or St. Anthony, or the moon. Intellectual and learned men don't stultify themselves, except in matters of theology.

But, as it respects those heathenish doctrines of demons adopted by the Pharisees, they are not left

in the New Testament entirely to the *silent* operations of the Christian doctrines for their removal.

St. Paul directly condemns them. He connects the reception of "the doctrines of (or concerning) demons," with apostacy from the Christian faith.*

THE FALL OF MAN Dr. Adams associates with the *fall of angels*, as an argument for future endless punishment. There is no occasion for an extensive treatise on this point in the present discussion. Our friend does not explain what he means by the fall of man, nor is it easy to find any settled position in relation to it, at the present time, in the Trinitarian School. It is sufficient for us to say here, that if the fall of man involves the loss of his moral nature, so that he bears no moral relation to God on which to be based moral obligations, and that he is not susceptible of moral education, or capable of receiving right moral impressions and motives,—then our discussion may as well end here; for in such case, man is not a moral being; is not a subject of moral government, nor judgment, nor reward or punishment, either endless or limited. But it is not so. Man is everywhere treated in the Scriptures as a moral being, susceptible to moral influence by appropriate means, and capable of moral as well as of intellectual education.

But, as it respects the fall of man, we believe in all the fall which the Scriptures denote, a fall into sin, and into ten thousand errors and follies.

The Doctor's *argument*, however, from this fall, and from the fall of angels, appears to us to be entire-

* 1 Tim. iv. 1.

ly groundless and void. We have no occasion to follow him in his effort at argument from his assumed theory of the fall of angels, since we have found that there is no fact in the theory. And his argument against the hope of ultimate universal salvation, from the discouraging circumstance that the sufferings in hell of angels and men for six thousand years has not reformed them, is of the same weight that an argument would be if based on Gulliver's Geograpy of Lilliput. Yet, waving for the moment the incompetency of the argument for the want of fact for its basis, we will show that our friend's argument is faulty, even admitting his premises. On the assumption that God has permitted angels to fall, and men also, and to remain in a fallen state, some of them at least six thousand years, he infers that it is just as reasonable to believe that he will abandon them to an eternity of ruin. This is bad philosophy. Means and ends, though related, are radically different things. The parent inflicts a deprivation upon his child for his profitable discipline, which he could not, consistently with his love to his child, continue through life, as the end of his being. If there had been angels and human spirits in *hades* six thousand years, the fact would not have furnished the least argument against the hope of what reason would infer from the wisdom and love and power of God, and what we have seen God's word to promise, to wit, — the destruction of *hades* in due time, and the ultimate and universal victory of life and good.* But the reasoning of the

* Hos. xiii. 14. 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55. Eph. i. 9. 10.

Doctor on the adaptedness of six thousand years or more in the hell of his sort, as a purifying process, we turn over to the Papists. The Bible is clear of the charge of any such doctrine of discipline.

But here is one specimen of reasoning employed by the Doctor in this section of his "Argument," which we must notice as we pass. He says:

> If he allowed them (the angels) to fall with a view to some great good in their natures, suffering them in the progress of their experience, to ruin this world, and bring in such a fearful plague as sin has been to our race, all to be compensated for in the great sweep of ages by this beneficial knowledge of evil, we are led to the conclusion that sin and suffering are the necessary means of the greatest good. But what manner of Supreme Being have we here for a Universalist to love and worship? His government, it would seem, cannot proceed without suffering a host of angels falling from their thrones in heaven, to pass through centuries of sin and mischief. This seems neither benevolent nor wise.

What does this mean? Is not the Doctor inexcusably at fault when he undertakes to dictate to infinite wisdom as to the choice of the best means for the greatest ultimate good? We know that love, as a moral principle and affection, is the same in God and his children. "For he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him." And we know that love always seeks the best good of its objects. But we do not always know what are the best means for the good we wish. God knows. We know that God, who is love, seeks the best good of all his children. But we do not presume to decide as to the means. Now hear the Doctor on the subject of means. In presenting a God "for a Universalist to

love and worship," he ascribes to him a good and benevolent end, a regard to the highest ultimate good of all his rational creatures in all the purposes of his creation and government; but his chosen means are above the Doctor's comprehension. To him they "seem neither benevolent nor wise." What then seems to him benevolent and wise? He proceeds to inform us:

> If God foresaw that he must finally restore them, he would have kept them from falling, unless sin and misery are, under his government, the means of the greatest good. If so, this may be one of the cases in which if a little is good, more is better; and perhaps the best interest of the universe will be promoted by protracting this sin and suffering indefinitely.

Ah, here we have our friend's philosophy. Viewing it as the desire and purpose of the great and good Father to effectuate the highest ultimate good of all his children, for him to subject them all to a temporary discipline of evil, differing in duration and degree, to eventuate in the greater universal good of which every individual is to share, would not seem benevolent and wise. But to subject one portion of his children to endless and unimitigated suffering, as a means of enhancing the enjoyment of the other portion, that "the best interests of the universe may be promoted" by the infinite protraction of suffering with a part, this seems to him "benevolent and wise." The former governing for the good of all by means above the Doctor's comprehension, he concedes to us Universalists as the object of our love and reverence, and we accept and adore him. The other,

subjecting one portion to *infinite* suffering for the greater enjoyment of the other portion, he claims as the Orthodox God; and we concede him to them; though it is with sorrow we do it. We know it does not conduce to their happiness to worship such an ideal in their God. We know that a great many of them are benevolent people, and that they would cheerfully agree to forego all the additional enjoyment which they might derive from the infinite protraction of the misery of their neighbor, for the sake of having him come in too, and love and enjoy their Father and his Father, and their God and his God.

But leaving that part of the argument which relates to those beings of fable, whom our friend classifies under the head of *fallen angels*, we will close this chapter with a remark on *fallen men*. That men have fallen into error and sin, is a fact of universal observation and experience, and of course, of Scripture recognition. But to argue hence the eternity of evil, is to sweep away every vestige of hope and confidence in God. To say that, if a present evil is consistent with the wisdom and goodness of God, an eternity of evil must be alike consistent with his infinite wisdom and goodness, is to ignore every principle of argument by which to "vindicate the ways of God to men." It annihilates all ground of consolation in trouble, and of Christian trust in the government of the Infinite. And while it puts an end to reasoning by confounding reason, it ignores the whole Christian scheme of revelation. St. Paul says, (Rom. viii. 20, 21,) "For the creature (creation) was made subject

to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature (creation) itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God." And now we put the question, and we would sound it, if we could, to the uttermost borders of Christendom, IS the fact, that the creation was made subject to vanity by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, an argument that the same creation shall NOT "*be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God?*"

We leave this significant question to our learned friend, and to all our readers, while we pass on to his next proposition.

CHAPTER III.

Argument from the Resurrection.

We have passed over a few rather noteworthy expressions of Dr. A., thrown into the preceding division of his Argument, but not particularly related to his main subject, which we shall recur to for remark when we take up other points of his Argument which shall call them in. In this chapter we shall give due attention to his fourth Proposition, as follows:—

IV. THE TERMS USED WITH REGARD TO THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD, ARE PROOFS OF ENDLESS RETRIBUTION.

The argument under this head is opened by quotations from the Child's Catechism," by Rev. O. A. Skinner. Mr. Skinner explains to the inquiring child the condition of the future or resurrection state of mankind, by the quotation of Luke xx. 36. "Neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

On this Dr. A. remarks as follows:—

Here, it will be seen, it is assumed that Christ refers to all the dead, and that all when they are raised will be the Children of

God. This, it is understood, is the prevailing belief of Universalists. We read that "no Scripture is of any private interpretation;" in other words, that the meaning must be ascertained by comparing the Scriptures one with another. The whole passage in Luke (xx. 35, 36) reads, "But they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God being the children of the resurrection." Our esteemed friend, Mr. Skinner, it seems to me, is led into a mistake by regarding the expression, "Children of the resurrection," as meaning all who have part in the resurrection; and since Jesus declares "the children of the resurrection" to be synonymous with "children of God," Mr. S. naturally concludes that all who rise from the dead will be the children of God.

The Doctor proceeds to say,—

Now, allowing me, for the sake of the argument, that the wicked are raised from the dead in their sins, they are not, in the Scripural sense, "the children of the resurrection."

Ah, but we don't allow you any such thing. That those who were accounted the wicked on earth, will be raised from the dead in their sins, our friend has not shown, nor can it be shown by any argument, Scriptural or philosophical. The contrary will appear before we close this chapter. But what is the argument? It is this;—that "rising from the dead does not make us children of the resurrection." The phrase, *children of the resurrection*, he assumes, denotes those who died righteous, and not all who shall have part in the resurrection. And further down he argues,—

This meaning of the phrase is also illustrated by the expression, "children of this world." Good people are, in one sense, "chil-

dren of this world," equally with the bad; that is, they are *natives* of this world; and yet we read,—"*the children of this world* are wiser in their generation than *the children of light*." Thus, the good only are "children of the resurrection," though all are raised, as the wicked only are "children of this world," though bad and good live here together.

In this argument we think the Doctor misapprehends the meaning of the phrase "children of this world;" and the restriction he places on the application of the phrase, "children of the resurrection," is singularly arbitrary, and compels him to a vacillating course, while it forces harmonious passages of Scripture into jarring discord.

With regard to the phrase, "children of this world," it does not imply viciousness or criminality in the persons it describes. It does not describe moral character at all. We have before had occasion to recognize the fact, that those who are noted for any quality or trait, are called the children of that quality or trait. The occasion on which Jesus introduced the comparison between the children of this world and the children of light, was not a discourse on the wickedness of the former, but on their vigilance and forecast in their business. The saying, "The children of this world are wiser in their generetion than the children of light," obviously means that men devoted to worldly or secular business, are usually more attentive and earnest in their pursuit of those interests, than his disciples were in regard to the interests of religion. And if men in that regard in which they are involved in worldly

business are called the children of this world, then, by the same manner of description, are they who are subjects of the resurrection from the dead, children of the resurrection.

We admire Dr. A.'s principle of Scripture interpretation, which he deduces from the saying that "no Scripture is of any private interpretation," — to wit, "that the meaning will be ascertained by comparing the Scriptures one with another." We respectfully invite him to put to use this excellent rule. He says, "rising from the dead does not make us children of the resurrection." Luke reports Jesus to have said, "They that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, ... are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." All who shall obtain the resurrection from the dead, are children of the resurrection, and children of God of course. And who are they? Who shall obtain the resurrection from the dead? St. Paul answers, and his answer is quoted by our friend in this very connection, seemingly without careful attention to its bearing upon the subject. He says, Acts xxiv. 14, 15,—"But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they (the Pharisees) call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets; and have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." All classes of the human race, then, shall obtain the resurrection from the dead; and, according to the passage which

the Doctor has placed before us from Luke, all who obtain the resurrection from the dead, i. e. all men of all classes, shall be children of God, being children of the resurrection.

And here is an infinitely important idea in that testimony of St. Paul, which Dr. A. neglects to notice, and avoids quoting. The apostle had *hope* towards God, not towards any fallible agency, but *towards God*, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. This resurrection even of the unjust, was, with the apostle, a subject of *hope*. And it was the statement of the subject matter of the great Christian hope that constituted the chief aim of this address of his to Felix. How, then, the reader will ask, did Dr. Adams contrive to bring forward a quotation from this address of the apostle, so as to omit the *hope?* He quoted it in this form:

Paul said before Felix, and declared that the Jews "themselves also allow" it, (for the Sadducees were small in number though high in rank and power,) "*that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.*"

This is not strictly correct. Paul did not say before Felix, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead. He said *he had hope toward God* that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. We wouldn't exchange this Christian record for our friend's version of it, for all the world. This *hope*, standing in the connection which it occupies here, is richly big with meaning. It gives us a world of instruction as to the nature and result of the universal resurrection. He *hoped* for it all. Of course it is de-

sirable as well as expected. Hope includes the ideas of desire and expectation united. We may desire that for which we have no hope, not having an expectation of it. And we may expect that for which we have no hope, having no desire for it. Now if we should hear a man say that he desires the resurrection of a large portion of his friends and neighbors into a state of endless and excruciating torments, we should either believe that a tight pinch in argument had forced his lips to belie his heart, or else that he was a fiend, fit only to be hunted out from human society, and *not* fit to dwell with the brutes. The *Christian* "hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." But a hope for the resurrection of our neighbors to endless pain, which no moral being could ever cherish but in a furious gust of fiendish passion, would make ashamed. When I was a youth, an impulsive man once said to me in a religious controversy, speaking of the wicked, "They ought to be eternally damned, and I *hope* they will be." I reported his remark, and some of his religious brethren, surprised at it, undertook to give him a reprimand;—and he was so utterly ashamed of it that he denied having said it. But the *Christian* hope maketh not ashamed, because the *love of God* is shed abroad in our hearts,* — that love which was attested by the blood of Christ, who, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man.† This hope abideth with charity or love. "Now abideth faith, hope, charity."‡ A

*Rom v. 5. †Heb. ii. 9. ‡1 Cor. xiii. 13.

blessed trinity, all blending in one perfect sympathy. The *love* embracing all of human kind;* the *hope* assured of all which love desires; and "*faith* the substance of things hoped for."† He who has a faith looking for a result of the Divine administration which is undesirable, has so much of a belief which is foreign to the Christian faith.

No man can hope for his own rising from the sleep of death into a life of "immortal pains." To be sure some old theologians, in their agony to make their theory practical, used to talk of being willing to be finally damned, as a prerequisite to salvation. But, poor souls, whenever any one of them has lost all hope for himself, he has become a maniac. But even those hard-headed theologians never went so far as to require that any should *hope* for their own damnation. And if a Christian, in his love for himself, cannot hope for his own damnation, he cannot, in his love to his neighbor, hope for his neighbor's final ruin. St. Paul had no such hope. To charge him with hoping that his neighbors should be raised up from death's deep sleep into a life of never-ending agony, would be to cast a foul stigma on his character, which the rankest infidelity would never venture.

But Paul *hoped* for the resurrection of all men from the dead, because he believed that it was to be an infinite good to all. And so the fact of a future immortal life for man is always represented in the Scriptures,—a subject of grateful and joyful hope. The life and immortality which is brought to light

*Matt. v. 44. †Heb. xi. 1.

through the gospel, was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, "according to the purpose and grace of God." That mankind shall live again, and never die, is not merely a *purpose* to be *believed*, but a *grace* also to be *hoped for*.

So it is represented in the passage, the Doctor's comments upon which have led us into this course of argument. "They that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world (that is, the future state of being) and the resurrection from the dead, ... are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

But our opponent fastens upon the words, *they that shall be accounted* WORTHY to obtain that world. In his effort to make this single expression the ground-work of a theory in opposition to the great leading thought of the gospel ministry of the life immortal everywhere, he evinces talent and skill, which, in a good cause, would pre-eminently shine. But to force upon an incidental expression an unnecessary meaning which shall make it ignore and break up the main sentiment of the discourse in which it stands, is not wise. And now, we invite our friend and all our readers, to his own excellent rule prescribed for Scripture exposition,—that is, "comparing the Scriptures one with another," and consulting their surroundings.

What are the surroundings, and what is the leading thought, of this conversation of Jesus? We will first take the report of it given by St. Matthew, himself an apostle, and an ear-witness of the conversa-

tion. The Pharisees had schemed to entangle Jesus in his talk, and for this purpose put to him the question about paying tribute to Cæsar. When they were confounded by the profound wisdom of his reply, the Sadducees tried their hand at confounding him on his well-known leading and fundamental doctrine, that of a future immortal life for mankind, or the resurrection of the human dead. So Matthew proceeds with the record: (Matt. xxii. 23–30.) "The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection." They then presented to him the case of the woman who had in succession seven brothers for husbands, and asked him whose wife, of the seven, she should be in the resurrection." "Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven."

Here let it be observed, that according to this record, Jesus was noted and distinguished as the teacher of the resurrection of the dead. He preached this doctrine in the familiar labors of his personal ministry, of which we have no record. Mark well, that the doctrine which he was understood by the people to preach, was that of the resurrection of the human dead, without limitation; the future life of mankind as a family, a species, a grade of beings. This is as certain as that he was understood to teach any future existence for any of the human race at all. As a means of ascertaining the sentiment of a public

teacher on a prominent point of doctrine, next to hearing him ourselves, is the having of access to the universal understanding of it by his hearers, friends and foes, by himself not contradicted even when confronted on the subject, but admitted and maintained. The fact stands out in the record, in so unmistakable a light that to the mind that will dispute it no record can be of any account, that the Sadducees understood Jesus to teach the resurrection of mankind, as a species, from the state of the dead. Their case presented with the view of entangling him, was conceived in this understanding of his sentiment. The seven husbands were presented in the case, without any reference to their characters, but simply as human beings, without any proviso intimating the least occasion to doubt that, according to the doctrine of Jesus, they would all be raised from death, and into the same state of being. And Jesus in his reply gives them no intimation that he had been misunderstood on this point. He does not tell them that if the woman and her seven husbands should all go to *Tartarus*, as they doubtless would if they were Sadducees, the quarrel of the seven husbands for one wife would be a fit means of adding to the severity of their just punishment; or that, if the woman should be so fortunate as to attain to Elysium, the average proportion of the saved to the lost would not probably warrant the expectation that more than one of the husbands would be there with her. Nothing of this sort. He proceeds directly and ingenuously to answer them, on the ground of

their just understanding of his doctrine. "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven." If there are any of mankind who are not included in this testimony and description of the resurrection, they are to have no resurrection at all, but are to be left, perished like the brutes. For this is the whole of Jesus' doctrine of the resurrection. But it leaves none out. It is the doctrine of *the resurrection of the dead.*

We pass on to the second record of this conversation, that made by St. Mark, xii. 18–27. Here the same circumstances introductory to the conversation are noted, the same case proposed, and the same question,—"In the resurrection, therefore, when they rise, whose wife shall she be of them?" And Mark's record of Jesus' answer is substantially the same as that of Matthew;—"For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven."

And now we have another record of the same conversation, Luke xx. 27–38. The occasion and the question are the same, and the answer of Jesus, which of course is the same, is entered by St. Luke in the following form:—"But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

And now, I demand — pardon my earnestness, anc my change of style to the more direct first perso singular,—I demand reverent attention to the inquiry does this report of Luke introduce any new anc differing sentiment from the reports just read fron Matthew and Mark? What authority has any man tc impute to Luke the ascription to Jesus of an inf nitely different sentiment from that ascribed to hin by the other Evangelists in their record of the sam breath of his discourse? I call on my opponent tc respect his own law of interpretation, comparin Scripture with Scripture. Especially should this b done in the study of the records made by differen reporters of the same thing. If three faithful wit nesses hear a discourse from a reverend teacher on subject of deepest interest to mankind, and report it while they may vary in some of their expressions and one may report some incidental remark whicl the others omit, they will all represent the leadin and essential thought or thoughts and sentiments Now if the doctrine of the resurrection as taught b Jesus was the offer of a future existence to then who might *earn* it, this characteristic of it would con stitute its main feature, and must always have bee put in front view whenever the subject was presented Indeed, there would have been in this case no sucl doctrine, no such Christian truth as a subject of gos pel testimony, as *the resurrection of the dead.* I would have been an *offer* of a future life to such a should create themselves a claim to it by their merit marks. In such a case the propounding of *the resur*

rection of the dead, in these general terms, as a doctrine of revealed truth, would have been a falsehood. The ministry of Jesus and his apostles in relation to a resurrection, would, everywhere, have been the proclamation of a *chance* for men, who might be favorably situated for the experiment, to purchase a claim to another life. This idea each of the three Evangelists who have recorded the conversation between Jesus and the Sadducees, would have made prominent in their record. And what is the fact?

Matthew is the earliest writer of the Christian history, being generally supposed to have written his Gospel in Hebrew, within about eight years after Christ's ascension. And Dr. Clarke truly remarks of him, that, "As Matthew was one of the twelve disciples, his history is an account of what he heard and saw, being a constant attendant on our blessed Lord." Consequently, though all the Evangelists were qualified to report faithfully the true *thought* of our Lord, Matthew was most likely to give the very *words* of the Master. For it must be known to all, that when three Evangelists have reported one expression of their Master in language somewhat different, they have not *all* employed, throughout, his own identical words. And it will be by all conceded that, in the case before us, we have reason to presume that *Matthew* reported, most nearly, the *expressions* of Jesus. And his record represents Jesus as reaffirming the doctrine which had given him public notoriety, that of the resurrection of the human dead; and propounding it as the truth of God's purpose of grace,

that through the resurrection, mankind, that is, the human race as a species, shall be raised into a state of equality with "the angels of God in heaven." And this general view of the subject, as appertaining to the destiny of man as man, that is, of mankind universally, is confirmed by the summing up by Luke of the argument for a future life from the showing of God to Abraham,— declaring, with reference to the relation in which mankind all stand to God's purpose of life immortal, "For all live unto him."

The record of Mark is almost verbally the same as that of Matthew. Luke employs a phrase out of which my opponent has created the doctrine — of what? The resurrection of a *part* only, leaving the greater portion in what the French Infidels call death, "*an eternal sleep?*" This is all he can make of it, if he limits the number here meant by them "that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead." The question between Jesus and the Sadducees was, *whether mankind shall exist hereafter or not.* Jesus had the affirmative of the question, and his affirmative was comprised in the *resurrection of the dead.* If, therefore, there are any who shall not be sharers in *the resurrection from the dead* here spoken of, they will not exist beyond death.. You can make nothing else of it. And Dr. Adams, not being willing to have the wicked, or rather the *unevangelical,* left in endless nonentity, thus robbing endless torment of its prey, talks about their not having a resurrection worthy to be called such, or rather, about the favored class "being worthy to

obtain that world, and afterwards such a resurrection as is worthy of the name;" thus confusing and frittering away what the sacred record presents in a light simple and plain. Jesus said nothing here of two resurrections, first raising all men into "that world," and *afterwards* granting a worthy portion "the resurrection from the dead," or "such a resurrection as is worthy of the name." It seems to us that our friend owes to God and the Christian public an acknowledgment for this effort at corrupting and mystifying the simple record of Christian truth. There is but one resurrection here spoken of, and that is the *resurrection from the dead.* And the obtaining of "that world" is the obtaining of the resurrection state. As we shall directly find it to be the case with St. Paul, so with Jesus, he knows of but two states of being, the present state and the resurrection state, the mortal and the immortal, the earthly and the heavenly. "The children of this world (or state of being) marry and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world," or state of being—What state of being? The resurrection state, of course, the life after death, "the resurrection from the dead," "are equal unto the angels," &c.

It is now clear that Luke uses the word *worthy*, not for moral desert, but for the honor, dignity, or value, with which God has invested his moral creatures in their relation to himself and his purposes. To construe it otherwise would make it to give the doctrine of the resurrection an entirely different character,

which could not have been left in the back-ground, as we before said, in any case, especially not by the other reporters of this discourse of the Master. CAMPBELL renders the passage, *They which shall be honored to share in the resurrection and the other world.* The phrase, *accounted worthy to obtain*, or, as Campbell translates it, *honored to share*, refers, not to moral desert, but to the estimate which God sets upon his intelligent offspring. In the same sense the word *value* is used, in another place. "Ye are of more value than many sparrows." This had no reference to moral desert, because, in that respect, there could be no comparison between men and sparrows. It refers to the dignity of their being, in the estimation of the Creator. And the force of the argument for the Divine care for man, rests upon this estimate of the Creator. So in the case before us. God's estimate of man as his moral child, made after the image of his intelligence, is the reason of his honoring him with a resurrection to another life. And this idea Luke throws into his record of the Master's doctrine. He did not hear the discourse of Jesus, as Matthew did. He opens his history with the statement that he received information of these things from those who were eye-witnesses from the beginning. His mind was possessed of the same great thought of Jesus, as delivered to the Sadducees, of which Matthew's mind was possessed. But he had superior education, and employed more florid style. And the record of the same great thought he put down with more embellishment. The case proposed by the

Sadducees betrayed low conceptions of the future life, admitting there should be such a life. And Luke presents the doctrine of Jesus against their degraded thought, in a manner more emphatically to ignore and denounce it;—as if he had said,—"Why! how low and beastly are your conceptions of this subject! The class of beings that God has constituted in the image of his intelligence, and heirs of immortality, to be crowned with his eternity, he will raise into a superior life, in which they shall never die any more, but shall be equal unto the angels, and shall be the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." And who are they? Answer:—they are the human race, "the just and the unjust." This is shown, not only by the whole aspect of the subject in this case and all its surroundings, but directly and explicitly, as before noted, by the conclusion which Luke's own record gives to the argument of Jesus from the word of God to Abraham, touching his purpose of immortal life for man,—"for all live unto him." And that their being *the children of God* involves an inheritance of blessedness with him, our opponent justly concedes.

We will remark as we pass, that the Doctor's paraphrase, in which he represents Jesus as revolving in his mind, but purposely concealing from the Sadducees, his doctrine of endless woe as the estate into which the resurrection will introduce most of mankind, and into which it might introduce most or all of the family connections in the case they presented, —is not a paraphrase, because there is nothing in the

case out of which to make it. It is the spinning of a thread out of the Doctor's own mind entirely.

And now, as the doctrine of a future life for man is the burden of the gospel, and the soul of Christianity, we will extend our examination on the subject as it stands in the Scriptures, that our minds may be clear, and our faith sure and steadfast.

The most labored, extended, argumentative and explanatory treatise of the gospel doctrine of the resurrection, in the inspired Record, is in 1 Cor. xv. The great apostle had, by his personal ministry, reared a church at Corinth; but soon after he had left them he was informed of schisms amongst them, and of diversity of opinion as to the fact of a future life. They all admitted the Messiahship of Jesus, and his personal resurrection, but some of them disbelieved the resurrection of mankind as a species. Hence the manner in which this particular subject is opened with the fifteenth chapter:—"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel, which I preached unto you, ... by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures. . . . . Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? . . . . For if the dead rise not, then is not

Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep, in Christ are perished." Here let it be remarked as we pass, that the subject of the apostle is not the calling down of millions of living, conscious, acting and happy persons from heaven, and of other millions alike conscious and active, up from hell, to put upon them a clothing of the old ashes of their mortal and dissolved bodies. That dust differs not from other dust, and has no concern with the resurrection, as we shall see presently. The question is, between a future existence, and no future existence, to man. Hence all my opponent's hypothetical argument for the continuance of punishment eternally, upon those who had been many thousands of years punished in hell, without being reformed, before the resurrection of those old ashes, falls to nothing for the want of the least shadow of truth as a ground for the hypothesis. When the spirit of man, beyond its service in this mortal body, is clothed upon with a spiritual body, so as to possess a personal conscious existence, that man has become a subject of the resurrection. When the worm has passed into a butterfly there is an old carcass left which never becomes a component of the new creature. When the kernel of grain dies, (and this is one of the illustrations employed by the apostle in this chapter), and the germ springs up and bears new grain with a new body, that old dead kernel is never re-united with the new grain. So with the resurrection; it clothes not the spirit with the old dust, but with a spiritual body.

So the apostle represents it in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, v. 1–4. "For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven . . . . For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." This obviously describes the same fact which is described in the chapter before us, (1 Cor. xv.) at verse 54th. "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." That just quoted from 2 Cor. v., clearly represents the work of the resurrection, like that of propagation and death in the earthly or Adamic nature, to be a progressive work. The work of life never stops. When the spirit goes out at death, to Him who gave it, safe in the bosom of the Father's love, the working of his omnific power effectuates the re-organization in a spiritual, heavenly, glorious person, that can never die any more. And if any falter here, it is because they "know not the Scriptures nor *the power of God.*" To be sure the argumentative strain of the apostle in the chapter now mainly before us, embodies the resurrection as if into one simultaneous event, altogether future. This form of treating the subject in this set argument, as a whole subject, was the most convenient. And then, as a consummation, and as a subject

of hope to the living, it *is* future. But our purpose in this digression is, to show, that the question of the resurrection as presented in the gospel, is not that of my opponent, the calling of immortals from heaven and hell to clothe them with mortal dust, but the question of life from the state of death.

To resume the argumentative testimony of the apostle:—"But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. . . . . For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." It is impossible that any man should misunderstand this. The universality of the relation of the human race to the earthly Adam is recognized and affirmed, and their participation of mortality and death in that relation; and the equal universality of the divinely purposed relation of mankind to Christ, the heavenly man, and their participation of life and immortality in that relation. He who will say that this verse, and this chapter, relates to the resurrection only of a fraction of the human family, places himself in a position in which he cannot be addressed as a rational being on the subject of Bible testimony or religion. To such a man it can make no difference as to what the Bible says. I am glad that my opponent was wise enough not to run into this chapter, to impose upon himself the necessity of such a handling of God's word, to the stultification of himself. How lamentable is the condition of thousands of learned men, whose theological prejudices and relations impose upon them the necessity of infinitely magnifying and multiplying all the evil, and infinitesimally fritter-

ing away the good, provided for God's children in the purpose of his government, and revealed in his word. If we found any such necessity of expanding here, and frittering there, in supporting our cause from the Bible, though a more noble and heavenly cause, we would give up in despair.

Yes, if there is anything to be understood by human language, in its most direct and simple expression, we have here the explicit testimony to the resurrection of all of Adam's race, in Christ the heavenly man.

"But every man in his own order." *Not* every man in his own former character. That would make up a motley society in the future world, even if separate apartments were given to the several sects. This "order" relates to primacy and subordination. It has reference to the method in the Mosaic ceremonials. There were two orders in the harvest, the first fruits, and the general harvest. These included the whole. And that this order is the matter of reference in this last quotation from Paul, is shown by the words following it. "But every man in his own order. Christ the first fruits;* afterward they that are Christ's, at his coming." That is, they that are Christ's, all the members of the body of him who is "the head of every man;" (1 Cor. xi. 3;) all who are given him, by the Father who "hath given all things into his

* Though mankind may have been progressively rising since the work of physical death commenced in our world, Christ is "the resurrection and the life," he being the impersonation and representative of the second life, and being the head of the human creation in that heavenly state as Adam is of the earthy; and he is "the first fruits of them that slept," as being the exemplar of the resurrection in God's scheme of revelation to men on the earth.

hands;" (John iii. 35;) all whom he hath bought with a price, having given himself a ransom for all, (1 Tim. ii. 6,) shall be made alive in Christ at his coming. And this coming of his to every man will be in that embrace of his love and power which shall bring them to life from the dead.

The apostle continues:—"Then cometh the end, (the ultimatum of the gospel plan,) when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power." Jesus will not present himself before the Father, saying, "Thou didst give me a kingdom, and dominion and glory, that I might subdue and reconcile all things unto myself and thee,* destroying the works of the devil,† which are sin and its evils, and destroying him that hath the power of death, that is the devil;‡ but thou seest these countless millions of thine offspring whom thou didst give me to redeem,—Satan's kingdom has so fast a hold upon them that I cannot reach their moral natures. I give them up, and resign back to thee my kingdom." No, never thus. When he resigns his commission, when he delivers up the kingdom to the Father, he will have accomplished the purpose for which it was given him; he will have put down, destroyed, all rule, that is, all but his own, and all authority and power in opposition to his spiritual reign; there shall be no Satan's kingdom then, vaunting itself in unbroken rule and dominion over a full moiety of God's moral creation, co-eternal with the kingdom of God. Uni-

*Dan. vii. 14; Eph. i. 9, 10; Col. i. 20. †1 John iii. 8. ‡Heb. ii. 14.

versal harmony in love shall constitute the moral beauty of God's intelligent creation, world without end.

"The last enemy shall be destroyed, (which is) death. . . . . And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself (as the head of every man) be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

And so the great apostle, his mind beaming with the light, and his whole soul glowing with the spirit of Heaven, piles up testimony upon testimony, covering every phase of the subject, to build up and establish our faith in a better life for man by a resurrection from the dead, and the ultimate triumphant and universal victory of life and good over death and evil. *How do you think our Doctors will appear, when we come over to the spot where we shall inspect them in their assertion, that there is the same evidence of the eternity of sin and satan, and death and evil, as of* GOD *and* TRUTH, *and* LIFE, *and* GOOD?

But our apostle, as if he would yet make more perfect an already seemingly perfect testimony to the excellence of the future life, returns to the subject of the resurrection with additional testimonies and illustrations. Speaking of different kinds and grades of bodies, terrestrial and celestial, the glory of the different bodies differing from one another, he adds, "So also is the resurrection of the dead." That is, so also does the resurrection state differ from this present. "It (that is, man represented by grain sown, as in verses 36–38,) is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in

glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. . . . The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy, and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

This, it will be observed, is the same subject continued for further illustration, the subject of the universal resurrection. It is a more particular description of the character and condition of that state of being into which the resurrection introduces our race. It amplifies the argument drawn from Christ as the first-fruits, offered in Rom. xi. 16; "For if the first-fruits be holy, the lump is also holy." If any will contend for a corrupt, inglorious, sinful, and miserable resurrection state, let them show us a sample or first-fruits of such a resurrection. They cannot do this. Christ is the only first-fruits of the resurrection from the dead, given to the gospel teacher of life and immortality for exhibition as an ensample. There is no other life and immortality brought to light through the gospel than this which we have now seen, with grateful admiration, exhibited by the spirit of revelation. Will my opponent exclaim in his wonder, How can this thing be? "Ye do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God." It is not his physical so much as his moral power that you misapprehend.

But notwithstanding the great apostle has risen so

high, and made the light of his testimony on this sublimely glorious subject advance us seemingly, into perfect day, his CLIMAX is yet before and above us. He has testified of the resurrection of Christ as the head of every man and first-fruits of the human race from the dead; of the resurrection of all men in him into a state and organism spiritual, heavenly and glorious; of the destruction of all opposing principles and powers in the moral system, and the subjection of all things to Christ; and now he exclaims in rapture: "*Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory! O death, where is thy sting? O* HADES, *where is thy victory?*"

But since it was the business of my opponent to maintain another doctrine in relation to the resurrection, it was judicious in him to avoid this full blaze of gospel day, and search out some incidental expression of Scripture which is more susceptible of a "private interpretation." Speaking of his opinion that "the children of the resurrection" are only a portion of mankind who earn a resurrection which alone is worthy of the name, he says, "This is confirmed, it seems to me, beyond all question, by one word of the apostle Paul, (Phil. iii. 8–11,) 'I count all things but loss, &c., *if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.*'" The Doctor continues,—"If, on being raised from the dead, all men are to be fit for heaven, Paul need not have used such 'means' to 'attain' to it,—nor, indeed, any 'means' whatever; for he was sure of being

raised, like the rest of mankind." Here we will remark as we pass, that he uses the phrase, "resurrection of the dead," even when applied to the event of raising men to the life immortal, in so vacillating and dubious a sense as to give the mind pain in its effort to understand him. It means one thing or another, just as caprice may select. At one time it means, in his usage, the raising of all men from the dead into another life; and anon he has it to signify the passing of *some* men into heaven after all men are raised from the dead. But letting this confusion of thought pass, the Doctor is clearly in error in his interpretation of the words last quoted from St. Paul. They cannot, without utter violence to the immediate connection, and to all the teachings of the same apostle in relation to the subject, be construed as applying to the actual event of the resurrection from the state of death. Let us read with care from the 7th verse.

"But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless; and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung that I may win Christ." Now nothing could be plainer than that Paul is here treating on the superior value of Christianity as a life possession, over all which the world calls wealth, and over all worldly honor. He continues,—"And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the

righteousness which is of God by faith; that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; *if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.*" Altogether this relates to the present life of faith in Jesus Christ, and the extent to which spiritual advancement was attainable. When he speaks of being made conformable unto Christ's death, he does not mean that it was the high object of his efforts to be literally put to death as Jesus was. My opponent himself will agree with me in the judgment that he means by this, that he desired to attain to the self-sacrificing spirit which Jesus exercised even unto death, and to a deadness of the governing power of the flesh. The same idea is expressed in Rom. vi. 6; "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.' (We would that the Doctor was at liberty to *use* his written rule, explaining Scripture by Scripture.) Now as this being "made conformable unto his death," verse 10, is the crucifixion of the lusts of the flesh and the power of sin in the present life of Christian faith, of course the next words, "if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead," signify a conformity, in like manner, to the likeness of Christ's resurrection, which is the likeness of the resurrection of the dead for which he hoped. And his next words are, "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which

also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." To make Paul here say to his brethren that he had not yet really and literally died and been raised from the dead into the life immortal, would be inflicting upon him as ludicrous a truism as anecdote tells of the greenest sons of Erin. He designed to caution his brethren not to understand him as claiming yet to have attained to the spiritual perfection which he had described, and to which he aspired; but he was passing on towards it.

The precise sentiment of the saying, "Being made conformable unto his death, if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead," is often and variously expressed by the same apostle. For another instance, see Rom. vi. 1–5. "What shall we say then? shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection."

All this is clear and unmistakable in its meaning. The actual event of the resurrection into another state of being beyond physical death, St. Paul never speaks of as laboring to earn or striving to procure. But, to the victory of faith, and the spiritual advance-

ment which should constitute in his life a transcript of that resurrection state of glory which was the object of the Christian hope, he did faithfully labor to attain.

Though we may have spent more time than was necessary on this effort of our opponent to make the resurrection an uncertain thing of barter, yet we must call the attention of our readers to one other point of view, in which its futility is strikingly visible. This *attaining to the resurrection of the dead*, (Phil. iii. 11,) is what the apostle was not assured of. He was striving, *if by any means* he might *attain* to it. See into what a dubious position our learned friend, and that with seeming unconsciousness, throws the great apostle, who has so boldly and lucidly declared, as a great fact in the counsel of God, and as the burden of the gospel revelation, the resurrection of all men from the dead into a state of incorruption and glory, now to represent him as doubtful whether there will be any resurrection of the dead at all—barely deeming it possible that he might, for himself, *earn* a future existence! No; the apostle has never committed himself to any such contradiction. In respect to the spiritual elevation for which he was laboring in the present sphere, after the likeness of the heavenly man of the immortal resurrection, he could not be assured as to what degree he should attain, because in this rudimental state he found another law in his members warring against the law of his mind, sometimes bringing him into captivity to the law of sin which was in his mem-

bers.* He could only say that he would work on, "press forward" to that high aim. But with regard to the result of God's revealed purpose of Grace, the resurrection of the dead into the life and immortality brought to light through the gospel, he was in no doubt or uncertainty. His soul filled with the burning light of this truth, he joyously exclaims,—"For *we* KNOW, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

Resurrection to Damnation.

We come now to Dr. A.'s only remaining Scripture proof of his position before us,—to wit, that "THE TERMS USED WITH REGARD TO THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD, ARE PROOFS OF ENDLESS RETRIBUTION." He introduces it, in connection with comments, thus:

"Christ said, 'The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.' This he said to illustrate his commission to bestow spiritual life on those who are dead in sin. Then he proceeds at once to assert a power in confirmation of this, in the way of miracle. 'Marvel not at this'—(at my power to regenerate the soul), for the hour is coming (notice that he does not here add—'and now is') when all that are in their graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth, they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation." (John v. 25–29.)

Here, as in the other case, our friend has turned away from the full, clear, and unquestionable testi-

*Rom. vii. 23.

monies of the real resurrection of the literally dead, and searched out a passage whose terms of expression and entire surroundings show it to be figurative, referring to another matter.

1. The very terms of this passage suggest to the careful and reverent reader that it must refer to a different event from that of the literal and universal resurrection from the dead. The description is entirely unlike all the unquestionable descriptions of the ultimate resurrection.

2. There is a slight error in the Doctor's quotation. He substitutes, unawares, the pronoun *their* for the article *the*. It may at first view seem that the mistake is unessential; but on careful consideration the Bible student will perceive that Jesus used the phraseology as it is in the record for good reason. *All that are in the graves*, is a better expression in view of the term graves being used figuratively, than *their* graves would have been.

3. These words were uttered, as my opponent also allows, on an occasion when the subject in hand was not the literal resurrection from the dead, but events figuratively called resurrections, and the Messianic authority of Judgment. Having just spoken of the derivation of his authority from the Father, and the power of his word to give life to them who receive it, he makes a more formal announcement of the principle, thus: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." He continues,—"For as the Father hath

life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man." And because the people might regard him as assuming too much in this last remark, he immediately adds,—"Marvel not at this." Marvel not at what? Dr. Adams explains, "at my power to regenerate the soul." But this is wrong. It was particularly at his claim of *authority to execute judgment*, that he bade them not to marvel. And he proceeded immediately to assure them that the time was near when this authority to execute judgment would, like his power to spiritually quicken the soul in that present time, be attested by fact. "For the hour is coming"—"notice," says the Doctor, "that he does not here add, *and now is*." No, for it was not true that the execution of judgment which he proceeded to predict, *then was*. It was *about* to be. "For the hour is coming, when all that are in the graves shall hear his voice." It was an event about to be.

The phrase *erchetai hora*, which is here rendered *the hour is coming*, occurs in six other instances in John's Gospel, in all of which it applies to events which were then approaching. See chap. iv. verses 21 and 23; and chap. xvi. verses 2, 4, 25, and 32. These passages relate to the more perfect establishment of spiritual gospel worship, the persecutions to be endured by the Christian disciples, their dispersion at the time of his crucifixion, and his afterwards showing them more plainly of the gracious counsels of God. These were all *approaching* events, and ac-

cordingly Jesus said of them, as of the event before us, *erchetai hora*, the *hour is coming*. Thus in every other case where John's Gospel has the phrase which in this passage is rendered, *the hour is coming*, it is used in reference to an event which was *approaching*. And the Scriptures generally, perhaps we may say invariably, when they say of anything that it *is coming*, or it *cometh*, mean that it *approacheth*, or that it is next in order of time to something else spoken of.

And now, what remarkable execution of judgment, Scripturally ascribed to the Son of man, was then approaching? To this we will look, after one other consideration.

4. The circumstance that the *coming forth* here spoken of is from the *graves*,—*mnemeiois*, the *tombs* or *sepulchres*, is a weighty, and we think a conclusive argument, against its being understood of the immortal resurrection. This latter is never spoken of in the Scriptures as a coming forth from *mnemeiois*, the sepulchres or graves. It is from *hades*, the state of death, never used in the plural. St. Paul's exclamation, in view of the victory of life through the resurrection of the dead, is not, *O mnemeiois*, graves,—but "O *hades*, (state of death) where is thy victory?"

Dr. Adams says, "All that are in their (the) graves," includes all who die, from Abel to the "last victim of death." It is not so. Millions of the human race, i. e., their bodies, have been sunk in the sea, burned to ashes, and left to decay on the surface of the ground. They have no graves or sepulchres; but all go to *hades*, and thence the literal resurrection bears them into life immortal.

5. But though the *mnemeiois*, or sepulchres, are not used in the Scriptures in description of the state from which the immortal resurrection delivers our race, because, as we showed before, that resurrection has nothing to do with the ashes in the tombs, yet they are familiarly employed in the way of figurative descriptions of a state of degradation and despondency. And the redemption of persons from this low state of trouble, is called their being *brought up out of their graves.* See Ezek. xxxvii. 11, 12, 13; "Then he said unto me, son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel; behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost:—we are cut off for our parts. Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, and brought you up out of your graves, . . . and shall place you in your own land." Here the redemption of the Jews from their seventy years Babylonish captivity, was signified to them by the promise of God, that he would cause them to come up out of their graves, to inherit the land of Israel.

6. The prophet Daniel (chap. xii.) testifies of a judgment, his description of which enables us to identify it with certainty, in terms so similar to those employed by Jesus in the passage before us, that the two have been universally regarded by theologians and commentators as parallel passages. "And 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 unto 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."

This Scripture, as we have said, learned divines of all denominations have considered, and that with the greatest propriety, to be parallel with John v. 28, 29. *The awakening from the dust of the earth, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt,* in Daniel; and *the coming forth from the graves, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, &c.*, in John — are evidently spoken of as the same event. And since Jesus so clearly informs us in what event this prophecy of Daniel was to have its fulfilment, *this,* paralleled with the other, explains that.

Jesus, in discoursing to his disciples on the destruction of Jerusalem and events connected therewith, referred to this very chapter in Daniel, saying, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, — then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains; for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." * Here Jesus speaks of the same time of trouble of which Daniel spoke; and he then fixes the time to that generation.

*Matt. xxiv. 15-21. Mark xiii. 14-19. Luke xxi. 20-24.

In the generation in which Christ was on earth, therefore, was that fulfilled which Daniel spoke; "And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time. And many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." And I cannot see the least shadow of reason to doubt that Jesus in the passage in question spoke of the same event. We should very naturally have supposed, that when Jesus was addressing the people to whom the prophets spoke, and on a particular judgment which they had predicted, he would sometimes use the language which they had employed on the same subject. And this event, the judgment of that age, was in the time very naturally implied by the phrase, *the hour* is *coming*, which we have seen to denote an approaching time. And furthermore, this is the judgment which is uniformly represented in the New Testament as verifying the authority of Christ "to execute judgment," which he announced in the passage before us.

It is plain that events did take place in the time of that judgment, which, considering the ancient mode of speaking and writing, justified the strong language of Daniel and Jesus, as spoken with reference to it. When Jesus was here, he used to address the Jews as the most wicked people on earth. Yet he found them hiding under false pretensions of piety: and calculating to escape the divine threatenings, to which their works so clearly proved them to

be subject. And, according to Josephus, though, after this time, succeeding and increasing calamities came upon them, yet they slept on still. They appeared to be blind to the enormity of their sins, and deaf to all the threatenings of God, — until they began to experience this "great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world, no, nor ever shall be." When these terrible calamities began to break forth upon them, then they were waked from the dust; they were called forth from the graves, or the secret places, in which they had been sleeping, — they were roused from their dormancy. They came forth to a sense of their own shame, *to the resurrection of condemnation*, and suffered that dreadful punishment, of which Moses and the prophets, and the Son of God, had so repeatedly forewarned them.

And this judgment did not affect the wicked alone; it affected the faithful disciples of Jesus, too. It called *them* forth into a more full enjoyment of life and happiness. They had been pressed down under grievous persecutions, and the calamities of war prevailed in the land. And when every thing in the natural world appeared blackness and darkness, no doubt considerable darkness brooded over *their* minds. We know that some things which Christ said to his disciples when he was with them, they did not understand until after they were fulfilled. For instance, though he had repeatedly told them that he should be put to death, and should rise again on the third day, yet when he was crucified they were disconsolate, and understood not what he had told them, until

"*The Lord had risen indeed.*" So, likewise, notwithstanding Jesus had given his disciples frequent instructions concerning this most dreadful judgment, and had engaged that they should meet deliverance, even as Daniel said, "Then shall thy people be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book," yet we may reasonably conclude that when the terrible calamities of war, pestilence and famine, were added to the grievous persecutions they were experiencing from the hands of the Jews, they were, for a time, in great darkness and trouble. But they were all delivered from the calamities of this war; and likewise from the persecutions of the Jews. This explained and fulfilled the promises of Jesus relating to their salvation in this judgment,—and at the same time that it saved them from the principal of their temporal distresses, it of course cleared away the clouds which these evils had spread over their minds, confirmed their faith and confidence in him, raised them into *more light*, and renewed and advanced their enjoyment of gospel life and peace.

Now this important change in the condition of the disciples, so wonderfully wrought, was as properly called their *coming forth from the graves*, through the authority of Christ, *to the resurrection of life*, as the redemption of the Jews from Babylonish captivity into their own land, was called of the Lord by Ezekiel, *the bringing of them up from their graves to inherit the land of Israel.* And equally striking is the declaration, *They that have done evil shall come forth to the resurrection of condemnation*, to express this

effectual arousing of the wicked and unbelieving from the *graves* of secrecy and *refuge* of lies, to misery, "shame and contempt."

Since I published in pamphlet form, more than thirty years ago, the same exposition which I here give, (but more extensively elucidated) of John v. 28, 29, I have had the privilege of reading the works of Newcomb Cappe, an English Divine, in which I find the same explanation given this Scripture that I have here given it, As he was a believer in the doctrine of future punishment, his prejudices would have inclined him to apply this Scripture to that subject were it not that he felt obliged by the clear evidence in the case to apply it otherwise. And I think it must have been the clear evidence in the case, that led two persons, of different sentiment on the subject of future punishment, residing in distant parts of the world, and having no knowledge of each other's writings, to give this Scripture so precisely the same sense, and in a *manner* so similar. The following is his paraphrase of these two verses, including that on the 27th, and referring to the verses preceding:

Nevertheless, it is not for such gracious purposes alone, that I am ordained unto a kingdom: though I am a *Son of man*, low as I now am, and undistinguished from among the common of mankind, I am appointed also to judge, and to execute judgment upon this untoward generation. (28, 29.) Let not what I say amaze you; suffer not yourselves to be lost in groundless hesitating and unprofitable wonder: believe me, for it is true, not only that the hour is very near at hand, when some who are now perfectly inattentive, and insensible to my call, shall hear the voice in which I will address them, from my approaching state of exaltation, and being

obedient thereto, shall live; but it is alike true, that though farther off, yet the time is at no great distance, within the compass of this present generation, when all that now are in the graves, who at present sit in darkness and the shadow of death, the whole body of the Jewish people, shall hear the voice of the Son of God, summoning them to judgment; and being then at length awakened to perceive who and what he is, shall come forth out of their present state of darkness and ignorance, to a new state of mind, to a resurrection, which, to those who have been obedient to the calls of Providence, shall issue in the preservation of their lives, amidst the calamities which shall overwhelm their country; to those who have refused to hearken to them, shall issue in their condemnation to fall among them that fall, and to take their share in all the bitterness of the calamities that are hastening to involve this country.

Such is the agreement of Cappe's opinion with the view we have offered on this Scripture. We call to it the most rigid scrutiny; and such scrutiny will prove its correctness. Blessed be God that he has given the revelation of his great purpose of "grace and truth," his purpose of life and immortality for man, in such full and determinate expressions, and in such a flow of spirit and power, that no human ingenuity can cloud or obscure it, even by the perversion of incidentals and figures.

There is one other Scripture expression in which the word resurrection occurs, which, though Dr. Adams does not quote it, we will briefly notice, because some of our readers of inquiring minds may think of it as favoring his argument from the term *worthy*, in Luke xx. 35. It is Luke xiv. 14. "For thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." But the careful reader will observe at a glance

that this is not the *anasasis*, resurrection or rising of the dead. There is nothing in this connection to suggest the thought of the immortal resurrection. The above written Greek word, though it is the word usually employed when the rising from the state of death is the subject, is used in relation to other risings. The word is defined by Parkhurst to signify,—

"1. A standing on the feet again, or rising as opposed to falling." This sense of the word, which he sets down as its primary meaning, he illustrates by reference to Luke ii. 34. "And Simeon blessed them, and said unto Mary his mother, Behold, this child is set for the fall and *rising* again of many in Israel." He says the word occurs twice in the Greek of the Old Testament, "in both which it signifies to *rise, to stand up.*" These two cases are Sam. iii. 62; "The lips of those that *rose* up against me;" and Zeph. iii. 8; "Until the day that I *rise* up to the prey."

We have said that there is nothing in this connection which suggests the subject of the rising of the dead. Jesus was commending the practice of making entertainments for the poor rather than the rich, because, though they were not able at present to reciprocate the favor, they should be recompensed at the rising up of the just. To so construe this as to make Jesus refer to the resurrection state for a motive on the score of reward for all their little acts of courtesy and kindness, even the inviting of poor neighbors to a feast, is to belittle the great Teacher, and to degrade his religion by making its highest

motives to be rattles and rock-horses. The aim of Jesus in this case was the suggestion of a judicious system of social intercourse and kindness, not original with him, but commended by wise men of old. There are changes and revolutions in the affairs of human life; and especially when the wise and good, the pure and just, are contemned and oppressed, a speedy revolution of events shall bring them up, and cast down the oppressors. And they who remember and bless the poor in their depression, while they have that sublime blessedness in their souls which is a large reward, are sure to be remembered with favor at the rising of the poor and oppressed into power. This idea is often presented in the Scriptures. Solomon says, in respect to deeds of charity, "Cast thy bread upon the waters; for thou shalt find it after many days. Give a portion to seven, and also to eight, for thou knowest not what evil shall be upon the earth." That is, we know not how soon we shall need the favor of those we now relieve. And, when Jesus was in the work of his ministry on earth, he often spoke of an approaching revolution, when there should be a special and extensive rising up of those who practised the charities of his religion.

Dr. Adams throws into this division of his "Argument" several other fragments of Scripture passages, as descriptive, he says, of the character and condition of men in the immortal resurrection state, which we need not tarry here to consider, having already explained them all, as we came to them in earlier parts of his production. He says,—

It seems to us unaccountable that any should adopt the idea that all who are raised from the dead will be the children of God, if they have ever read the parables of Christ in Matt. xiii. How does he there say it shall be in the end of the world?

"The end of *this* world," it reads in the Book;—that is, as we have shown, the end of that present *age*. But the Doctor proceeds to reiterate, here, certain words which occur at the conclusion of the parables of the tares and the net, of casting into a furnace of fire, just as if his having copied these words into his first division settled their meaning in his way. We assure our friend that his wonder at our not regarding these words as descriptive of human condition in the resurrection state, cannot half equal our astonishment that a man of his education and moral principle, knowing that the word written by the pen of the Evangelist where *world* is used in our version, signifies "an age or periodical dispensation of providence," should so studiously keep dark this fact, and so cooly quote and reiterate the passage as if it unquestionably described the end of the material world, and events of succeeding eternity.

And now it is refreshing to find our esteemed friend to throw himself into the attitude of reasoning. He is a good reasoner when he has materials to reason with, and he has the milk of kindness flowing about his heart. He seems to have some just conceptions of what is good and right, but the rudiments of his theology are so fraught with the spirit of cruelty and unreason, that when he starts with reason and runs into his theology, his reasoning

becomes wrecked and scattered. The following are specimens:

"When the soul after death finds itself on the way to hell, can we suppose that an opportunity to escape by repentance, if it were offered, would be rejected?" This question is put in a form to imply in the Doctor's mind the opinion that the very sight of hell would induce repentance in every soul that needed it, if permitted. This may be very reasonable; and the repentance induced by the sight of hell after death, would probably be worth as much as that induced by the fear of hell before death. But he supposes that God will not permit them to repent. Is this reasonable? Our friend, as we are about to see, presumes to appeal to the principles which govern a father's conduct towards his children. Will a father, who punishes a child for disobedience, prohibit, or render impossible, the child's repentance? The hypothesis, however, from which our friend sets out with his reasoning, that of the soul's seeing itself on the way to hell after death, we have shown to be romance. We will hear the Doctor further:

"If the only object of God is to reclaim the sinner, he will release him the first moment he repents. It is so in this world. 'And when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him and had compassion and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him.' If the soul, at the sight of its punishment, relents and agrees to the terms of pardon, does a Universalist believe that God will say, 'No; you must suffer in hell for your sins, even though you have now repented? Would an earthly father inflict punishment in such a case?"

No, indeed! What does our worthy friend think Universalism is? Does he suppose that Universalists believe in a future hell in which men will be punished *after they repent*, in order to make up a given quantity of suffering? Why, Dear Sir, you are looking into Universalism through Orthodox spectacles. Orthodoxy makes the law of God to regard, primarily, its own honor rather than the good of its subjects. It requires so much infliction of suffering for so much sin, length and breadth; and, however the sinner may have reformed, the law can never be satisfied but by the infliction of just that measure of vengeance, either upon the sinner, *or upon a substitute.* This is Orthodoxy; but it is not Christianity, and of course it is not Universalism. God's law, given to man, is the law of a father, adapted to the dearest interests of his children. No other law would be honorable in itself, or honorable to its author. The penalties of God's law are in its own spirit, designed to promote its own aim, as preventive and remedial agents. Accordingly it cannot continue punishment after reformation, nor seek satisfaction in the torture of a substitute. The punishment of the innocent would be the greatest conceivable violation of all the principles of God's law. And however one may have been far astray in the paths of sin, when he comes out of those ways by genuine repentance, there is no law that *can* condemn him. Accordingly the apostle says,—"There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." Why?

Is it because Christ has satiated the Divine vengeance by being punished as a substitute? No,—and nothing of the kind ever happened. Paul proceeds to inform us why there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit:—"For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made man free from the law of sin and death."

No, the curse or condemnation of the law ceases, when the love and power of sin are thrown off. There is a rich and harmonious system of principles here in Universalism, which we would that our friend might come to understand. We know, morally, of no hell beyond or outside of sin. The salvation of the gospel is a spiritual work, and not a letting off from an extraneous and foreign vengeance by the expedient of killing a substitute. Therefore it appears to us a strange question to be put from so intelligent a source at this late day, "If the soul relents, and agrees to the terms of pardon, does a Universalist believe that God will say, No; you must suffer in hell for your sins?" He adds, "Would an earthly father inflict punishment in such a case?" We answer, no. Neither would an earthly father *ever* punish but with reference to the ultimate correction and benefit of his child. But do you, Sir, design this reference to the earthly parent for illustration of the principles of the Divine government? In this way our blessed *Master* improves his appeals to the affections of the father and the principles of his family government. "*Much more*" than earthly

parents will our heavenly Father seek the good of his offspring. But your purpose, generally, in your appeals to the parental affection and policy, is to present an *antagonism* to the principles of the Divine government. How must your benevolent soul agonize in this dire necessity, imposed upon you by an iron creed.

Here is one other attempted Bible argument in this division, which we deem it expedient to notice. It is in these words, Argument, page 58:

"Peter tells us that there were "spirits" in his day "in prison," to whom Christ preached by the Spirit in the days of Noah, that is at least three thousand years before. That is a long time for sin to be punished, or even for a sinner to be detained, under the government of a good God."

No, my dear Sir, asking your pardon for contradicting the word of one I so highly esteem, but my esteem for Christ and his truth is first of all,—but Peter tells us no such thing. He tells us that Christ was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which some time were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." Here are several things in succession; 1st, put to death in the flesh; 2d, quickened by the spirit; 3d, going in the spirit and preaching to the spirits in prison. It was to the spirits in prison that Jesus by the spirit preached when he had been quickened by it, and not to spirits before they became prisoners. If the Doctor takes these spirits

in prison to be the spirits of deceased men in hell, as he assuredly does, he has ventured to tamper with a passage which, taking its connected expression with this application of his, explodes his whole theory of no grace, no mercy, no change after death, proving that the blessed Saviour, since his resurrection, visits that dark abode, and preaches there the gospel of love, grace and salvation.

But we do not avail ourself of this argument for the abolition of our opponent's hell. We have shown it never to have been.

We have several reasons for discrediting the idea that Peter here spoke of deceased men, then in prison, or in the heathen fabulous under-world.

1st. No such thing is revealed in any other part of the Bible; and Peter does not introduce the idea which he meant here to express, as a new revelation, nor as the main subject of discourse. He was urging upon his brethren the example of Christ, who attested the faithfulness of his love to men even by his death; and who, being raised from the dead, pursued their interests still, by enlightening the prisoners of darkness.

2d. If Peter designed to teach that all who had died in unbelief before the death of Christ were then in prison, it is unaccountable that he should have singled out the persons in particular who were drowned in the flood. The reference to the antediluvians, and the *few* of them who were saved upon the water by the influence of Noah, indicates a comparison between this as a historical incident, and

something in the ministry of Christ which was the main subject of discourse.

3d. As this ministry to prisoners is introduced as a reference to some familiar fact, we are led to inquire, what is the fact referred to? What information do we gather from the Scriptures, in relation to the mission of Christ to prisoners after his death and resurrection? On this subject we have much and diversified information. The prophets had variously foretold that Christ should be a covenant of Israel and light of the Gentiles. And the latter were usually described as in darkness and the prison-house. "I will give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house." But this ministry of light to the Gentiles could not be carried out until after the death and resurrection of Christ. He charged his disciples, while he was yet with them, not to go in the way of the Gentiles, but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But when he was risen from the dead, he commissioned his ambassadors to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. But in all their gospel labors the disciples went out in the spirit and power of Christ. Thus it was the spirit of Christ which wrought in and through them, in all the gospel ministry to the Gentiles, or to the spirits, or, as Wakefield renders it, *the minds of men in prison.* And the wonderful success of the ministry of the gospel to the Gentiles now, by the spirit of the risen Jesus, is made to appear noteworthy

by a strong contrast, referring to the *few* who were influenced by the preaching of a servant of God of old, that is, Noah. Wakefield gives the passage a rendering which directly expresses this comparison, —thus: "By which he went and preached to the minds of men in prison, who were disobedient *as* those upon whom the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." But the sense appears to us as clear without the supply of the comparative *as*. There is a sense in which people of one *class*, in different generations, are called the same people. So were the Jews, and so are they to this day, the people to whom God spoke by the prophets. And so were the heathen to whom Christ's ambassadors preached by his spirit in Peter's time, the same people characteristically as were the heathen in Noah's time.

Not only the learned and orthodox Wakefield, but Newcomb, and Lindsey, and the London Improved Version, take the same view of this passage. These all agree in the following exposition:

By which, "i. e. by the Holy Spirit, which, after his ascension (see v. 22), he communicated to his apostles, he preached to spirits, i. e, to persons in prison, to idolatrous heathen, the slaves of ignorance and vice; he thus proclaimed liberty to the captives; Isa. xlii. 6, 7; xlix. 9." "He preached, not to the same individual persons, but to men like them, in the same circumstances, to the race of the Gentiles, to the descendants of those who had formerly been disobedient, and refused the call of the spirit in Noah's

time. But it was now very different. Many had been obedient. The apostle is contrasting the success of the gospel with the unsuccessfulness of Noah's preaching under the direction of the same spirit of God." Newcomb, and London Im. Ver. *in loco*—Lindsey's Sequel, p. 288.

We cannot doubt the correctness of this view of the passage. But if our opponent insists on having the "prison" here to be the Orthodox hell, he gives the passage a force which abolishes his own hell, by the introduction there of the gospel of grace and salvation. For, chop and transpose as he will, he cannot expunge the fact that it was *to the spirits in prison*, whoever they might be, by the spirit of Christ *after he was quickened*, that this ministry of grace was given.

This brings us to the close of Dr. A.'s ingeniously conducted argument for endless punishment, from "*the terms used with regard to the resurrection of the dead.*" But we find that even his great learning and practised skill in theological tactics, are utterly futile, in the attempt, by the handling of a few incidental metonomies, and figurative expressions in connection with entirely different subjects, to mar or obscure the glorious gospel doctrine of life and immortality for the dying family of man, "according to the purpose and grace of God." We would that all might be brought to an enlightened faith in this Gospel of God, that they might live and breathe and act in the elevating consciousness that they are children of God and brothers of angels, being heirs of a blessed immortality.

CHAPTER IV.

The Curse of the Law.

We now come to Dr. Adams' fifth great proposition, to wit:

V. THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THE LAW OF GOD HAS A CURSE:—WHICH IT HAS NOT IF FUTURE PUNISHMENT BE DISCIPLINARY.

This position he proceeds to argue thus:

"The punishment, however long and severe, which shall result in restoring a soul to holiness and an endless heaven, under the kind and faithful administration of its heavenly Father, it would be unsuitable to call 'a curse.'"

The implication in this paragraph, that we hold it to be the mission of punishment "to restore the soul to holiness and an endless heaven," is simply chimerical. We do not think the Doctor intended to misrepresent, but it has not entered into his mind to see, nor into his heart to conceive, of the beauties and harmonies of Universalism. If his mind could emerge from the artificial and discordant theory of Calvinism, into the sweet and beautiful light of Bible Evangelism, he would feel to be born again, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever.

We do not regard it as the mission of punishment to restore the soul to holiness and heaven. This work can only be effected by the spirit and power of Christian truth in the soul, through knowledge and faith and love. Nevertheless punishment is disciplinary, tending to check the career of sin, and to bring the sinner to reflection in a state of mind to ask after the better way, and thus become conditioned to be acted upon by the saving power of truth. Such, as we shall presently show, is always the Scripture definition of the purpose of punishment, whenever its purpose is explained at all. And how otherwise could it be, without transmuting the government of God into a Pandemonium of fiends? To say that it is one purpose of punishment upon transgressors to exert an admonitory influence upon the whole community, does not change the principle at all. This tendency results from the social nature and relations of man. For this cause all individual experience, good or evil, exerts a social influence. But the primary design of punishment is the correction of its subjects. The learned Dr. Priestly calls particular attention to the fact that the Greek word *kolasin*, rendered punishment in Matt. xxv. 46,—"And these shall go away into *aionion* punishment,"—was primitively applied to the pruning of trees, and radically signifies *correction*. And by this single argument he explodes the idea that the punishment denoted in that passage is endless. Newcomb, and the London Improved Version, note the same fact, and attach to it the same weight in argument. But more of this

shen we come to our opponent's argument from the terms of duration.

Before taking this fifth argument of the Doctor directly in hand, we must take leave to expunge from his proposition the adjective *future*, prefixed to punishment. It is a remarkable stroke of ingenuity in him, to be continually slipping into his sentences qualifying terms which shall somnambulize the unwary mind into the dream that the immortal world is the field of our operation when we are discussing rewards and punishments. The advantage he seeks by this means is in the stand-point from which he would have you join with him in viewing the subject of retribution. Standing in the eternal world, and looking upon rewards and punishments as dispensations of that world, and presuming that you will admit that the *rewards* of that world are endless happiness, he thinks to effectually spring upon you the inference that the other side of the antithesis, the *punishments*, must be endless misery. The argument would not hold, even allowing him his stand-point, for the reason that, as he also admits, the extent of duration denoted by *aionion* is determined by the nature of the subject to which it is applied. And everybody knows that the kingdom of sin and misery is a very different affair from the kingdom of God and his righteousness. It is the very revealed purpose of the latter, which "shall never be destroyed," to "make an end" of the former. But then our opponent has no business with this subject at that stand-point. His getting into eternity with his sin,

and guilt, and judgment; and his punishment, and curse, and lake of fire, and furnace of fire, and wailing and gnashing of teeth,—is really, though not so designed, a *ruse-de-guerre.* There is no Bible authority for it. We have already, in our part of this discussion, examined our friend's Bible arguments for this broad assumption, sufficiently to be satisfied, if there is anything certain from the plainest expression of human language, that there is no Bible authority for introducing satan, and sin, and corruption, and misery, upon a foot-hold in the immortal resurrection world.

> "The world to come, redeemed from all
> The mis'ries that attend the fall,
> New-made and glorious, shall submit
> At our exalted Saviour's feet."

So, then, as by *future* in this connection, our friend means to denote the future state of being, we rub out this word from his proposition as a subject of present debate. For he and I are not discussing the duration of *future-world* punishment, but the purpose and duration of *punishment*, as a Divine dispensation.

And now the Doctor's argument is, that as the punishment denounced by the law is called, sometimes, a "curse," it cannot be limited and disciplinary, because then "it would be unsuitable to call it a 'curse.'" A few words will show the unsoundness of this argument, both philologically and Scripturally.

1st. PHILOLOGICALLY. The Doctor's argument, carried out, would take from us the use of all words descriptive of things as they are in themselves. It

would require us to name all events and things for what we may regard as an ultimate use to which Providence will over-rule them. For instance, if a person who has a lurking disease in the system, falls seriously and distressingly sick, and that sickness induces the appliance of remedies which root out the old infirmity and place the patient in better health than was enjoyed before, this argument would not admit that the distressing sickness was sickness, or that the pain suffered in it was pain. It was all health and pleasure, because it was at length made a means of conducing to improved health and pleasure! Dr. A. says,—"Men are stripped of property, family, health, reputation, and finally they turn to the hand that smites them, grateful that God did not spare the rod for their crying: and they testify that through the loss of all things they have gained eternal bliss. Do they call their affliction their 'curse?' Have they suffered 'the curse of the law?'" Yes, most certainly. The loss of property, family, health and reputation, by reason of their vices, was indeed the suffering of a great curse. And if their great tribulations made them sin-sick, and they turned to Christ, and by the efficiency of his truth and love became freed from the love and power of sin, they praised and adored the grace of God in Christ Jesus, but this did not change their views of sin and its miseries. "Have they suffered the curse of the law?" Of course they have, and they are thankful to be redeemed from it.

The Doctor continues,—"He," the physician, "am-

putates the limb, and thus prolongs a life. Did he *curse* the man, in doing so?" Answer, the amputation of the limb was the interposition of a lesser evil to prevent a greater. But the circumstance which required the amputation of the limb was an evil, and the loss of the limb is an evil or curse for life.

Once more the Doctor:—"'Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us:'—No, he has only redeemed us from a further dispensation of infinite mercy, if punishment be only for discipline; indeed, he prevents the bestowment of a greater proof of love than he himself gave us in dying on the cross." Omitting the rest of the sentence (p. 62,) because it relates to that "discipline in hell" which is a piece of uninteresting romance to which we have given sufficient attention already, we will frankly confess that this is the sharpest argument of all which our opponent has produced. It is confessedly an effort of genius. It is so handsomely done that it seems to be a pity to disturb it. But after all, it is a mere fallacy which must be exposed. The argument is, that if punishment is disciplinary, Christ only redeems us from a further dispensation of mercy by saving us from the necessity of its continuance. The idea involved in this argument is, that if punishment is disciplinary, it would be the greatest good of the sufferer to have sin and punishment continue to all eternity. An *endless* disciplinary punishment! It must have cost our friend a great intellectual effort to conceive of the idea. We suppose it is the common sense of mankind that punish-

ment, to be disciplinary or corrective, must be limited of course,—being not an end, but a means to an end, to issue in correction. Well, when the soul is wearied in suffering, and sick of sin, and has turned to Christ, received his light and risen into the life of his truth and love, his spirit assimilated to the spirit of the Eternal, needing punitive discipline no more, Dr. A. thinks he will then desire to go back into darkness and sin, and the consequent suffering of punishment, for the sake of being disciplined back again to sin-sickness and to Christ!

Well, this argument is not original with my worthy friend. It was wielded against the doctrines of St. Paul in his day. Because he held that God over-rules evil for good, it was slanderously reported of him that he said, "Let us do evil that good may come.' (Rom. iii. 8.) And because he taught that, "where sin abounded grace did much more abound," it was charged to be the tendency of his doctrine to lead men to continue in sin that grace might abound. But the apostle disposes of the opposing argument thus: —"Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein." (Rom. v. 20; vi. 1.) The Christian religion, in all its principles of faith and practice, is so beautiful, so lovely and glorious, that when it is received by the believing soul, it captivates and assimilates to itself all the affections, produces a deadness to sin, a detestation of it, and renders impossible the desire to go back into it for the sake of some more corrective punishment. And thus vanish-

es the force of our friend's ingenious argument from the hypothesis of punishment being corrective.

"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." He could not have redeemed us from the curse of the law unless we had been under that curse. All were under the curse of the law, all having sinned, for "cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." "Being made a curse for us." How? Is Christ doomed to suffer future endless punishment for us? Never. And that is not "the curse of the law." The apostle explains the sense in which he spoke in this instance of Christ's being made a curse for us. And how is it? If he was, as a substitute for sinners, plunged into the infernal deep,

> "The land of horror and despair,"—

into the suffering of

> "Eternal plagues and heavy chains,
> Tormenting racks and fiery coals,
> And darts t' inflict immortal pains,
> Dipt in the blood of damned souls,"—

if this is the curse of the law, borne by Christ for us, here is the place where we may expect to find it stated. How is it? Read—(Gal. iii. 13,) "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, *Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.*" There—where is the Endless-miserian argument from the death of Christ? Where is the vicarious, the substitutional infliction of "future endless punishment" upon Jesus, as the scape-

goat for sinners? Not in the Bible — nowhere but in human creeds.

"Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." The extreme curse of the Mosaic law was an ignominious death. And Jesus Christ the righteous, by submitting to this death in the prosecution of a work of infinite love in our behalf, was made a curse, not in our stead, but for us; and as a ritual sacrifice, the antitype of the legal types, terminated the necessity of our subjection to the legal rites; but, above all, attesting with his blood the indissolubility of Heaven's love to man, gives us a strong filial faith which works by love and purifies the heart, and thus redeems us from the greater curse, that of the moral law, by delivering us from the love and power of sin. For, "there is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit. For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Ah, this is the manner of Christ's redeeming us from the curse or condemnation of the moral law, not by a commercial substitution, satiating God's vengeance by receiving punishment from his hand in our stead! but by *making us free from the law* (the power) *of sin and death, by the law* (the power) *of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus.*

2d. SCRIPTURALLY. It is but an easy and brief work to show the unsoundness of our opponent's argument from "the curse of the law," *Scripturally.* Indeed we know not how to account for his position in this case, but by supposing that his life-long famili-

iarity with the terms of his theology on the matter here in question, produced such an unquestioning assurance of his being right, that he did not deem it needful to consult the Scriptures in relation to the question. The book of the law itself variously and conclusively decides the question, whether its curses are future, revengeful, and endless punishments, or whether they are temporary, and designed for restraint and correction.

Read the 28th and 29th chapters of Deuteronomy, from which we will here transcribe a few brief sentences. "But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee; cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field." "And the heaven that is over thy head shall be brass, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron." "Thy sons and thy daughters shall be given unto another people." "And thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a by-word, among all the nations whither the Lord shall lead thee." "So that the generation to come of your children that shall rise up after you, and the stranger that shall come from a far land, shall say, when they see the plagues of that land, and the sickness which the Lord hath laid upon it; . . . . even all nations shall say, Wherefore hath the Lord done thus unto this land? What meaneth the heat of this great anger? Then men shall say, Because they have forsaken the cove-

nant of the Lord God of their fathers,—and the anger of the Lord was kindled against this land, to bring upon it all the curses that are written in this book."

Here you have no assertion of mine, no explanation of mine, but the direct asseveration of the book of the law itself, that *all its curses* should be suffered by the transgressors in the land of their transgression, and in their dispersion among other nations. And now, what will you ask of me, who know nothing on these subjects but what I can learn from the sacred record? Will you ask of me that I keep back such Bible testimonies as these, and manufacture a theory, or sell myself a minister to a theory of other manufacturers, which shall be better for the morals of the people? Ah, we have seen the injuries which have accrued to poor humanity from religious leaders presuming to do better for the people than to study and preach God's plain, simple truth. Ours be the motto of the prophet:—"To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

But there is another question. Notwithstanding *all the curses of the law* are fulfilled in temporal evils, are they not purely revengeful, and never intended to be corrective? Dr. Adams thinks they must be so, whether in this world or the next. See the closing words of this division of his "Argument;"—"But we cannot find that curse, neither here nor hereafter, unless there be punishment which is not intended for the recovery of the sinner."

Now turn to Lev. xxvi., and there you will find a discriminative specification of the series of evils, or judgments, which are recorded in Deut. xxviii. and xxix. and generally in the same language. There they are called *curses*, and here, *punishments*. And all through the chapter you will find interspersed the explanation, that the purpose of these punishments is corrective. "But if ye will not hearken unto me,—and if ye shall despise my statutes,—I will do this unto you; I will set my face against you, and ye shall be slain before your enemies: they that hate you shall reign over you, and ye shall flee when none pursueth. *And if ye will not yet for all this hearken unto me*, then I will punish you seven times more for your sins." (v. 18) "And if ye walk contrary unto me, and will not hearken unto me, I will bring seven times more plagues upon you according to your sins." (v. 21.) "And if ye will not be reformed by me by these things, but will walk contrary unto me; then will I also walk contrary unto you, and will punish you yet seven times for your sins." (vs. 23, 24.) "And if ye will not for all this hearken unto me, but walk contrary unto me; then I will walk contrary unto you also in fury; and I, even I, will chastise you seven times for your sins." (vs. 27, 28.) And here Moses proceeds to the description of what is set down in the other place for the last and greatest of all the curses of the law,—making their city waste and their sanctuaries desolate, and their land a desolation, and their people to be scattered in their enemies' lands, becoming an astonishment to all

nations. And yet, after all this, the extreme of all the curses written in the book of the law, which are expressly called, (v. 28) *chastisements*, the design of which, as they progressed from stage to stage, is explained to be that the people should be "reformed," after all this, the word of God proceeds, (vs. 40–46,) "If they shall confess their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers,—if then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity; then will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember; and I will remember the land."

Finally, in all points of view, philological and Scriptural, the argument of our learned friend from "the curse of the law," is what Sawyer's New Translation makes Mark iii. 29 to read, "an eternal mistake."

CHAPTER V.

The Sentence passed upon the Wicked.

THE sixth of Dr. Adams' seven great positions, in his comprehensive "Argument for Future, Endless Punishment," is the following:—

VI. THE SENTENCE PASSED UPON THE WICKED INDISCRIMINATELY, FORBIDS THE IDEA OF DISCIPLINE IN FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

By way of argument under this head, speaking of the great variety of character among the impenitent at death and in eternity, and yet the same indiscriminate doom which shall be pronounced upon them, the Doctor says:—

"The last sentence evidently regards none of them as probationers; there is no forbearance in it toward the more hopeful; they are all addressed as "ye cursed." We are considering the testimony of the Scriptures. What evidence do they afford of any discrimination in the treatment of the finally impenitent, notwithstanding the vast variety which must exist among them? I answer, not any. But the following passages among others, teach plainly that the doom of the wicked will be indiscriminate without regard to hopeful diversities of character. (Rev. xx. 12–15.)

'And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened, and another book was opened which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of the things which

were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works.' Then follows this declaration: 'And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.' Some say death and hell are annihilated. But this is not the idea intended, unless the wicked also are then to be annihilated; for the next verse concluding the subject says, 'And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.' The obvious meaning is, Death and hell, whatever they represent, will then be added to the lake of fire, whatever that is, as new ingredients, and to constitute 'the second death,' and as a final gathering together of all the elements of sorrow and pain, with all the wicked, into one place. With this passage agree the words of Daniel: '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.' The parables of Christ relating to the end of the world recognize only two great divisions of men at the last day. Wheat and tares only are to be in the 'field;' good and bad, only, in the 'net.' The wheat is saved, the tares are burned; 'the good' in the net are gathered into vessels, 'the bad' are none of them dismissed for amendment, or growth, but are 'cast away.' And Christ tells us that every human being will stand at his right hand or left hand, 'blessed' or 'cursed.'"

For the sake of convenience we have here reprinted the entire argument of the Doctor's sixth proposition. Several of the passages which he summons for the third, fourth or fifth time to his aid, we have sufficiently explained before.

1st. The awaking of many of them that slept in the dust of the earth, some to shame and everlasting contempt, spoken of in Dan. xii., we showed in Chapter iii., page 331, to be explained by Daniel and Jesus in connection, to be an incident in the judg-

ment which should be more severe than any before or after it, which took place in the generation in which Jesus was on earth. The reader, if he opens to this place casually, or does not distinctly remember that exposition, will please turn back to the page referred to.

2d. The "wheat and tares," and the "net," we have seen to be prominent metaphors in parables, the fulfilment of which our Lord expressly assigned to the end of the then present or Jewish age. (See pp. 193–203.

3d. The assertion that "Christ tells us that every human being will stand at his right hand or left hand, 'blessed' or 'cursed'," spoken as the Doctor has here spoken it, with reference to any simultaneous arraignment, or single dispensation of judgment, is an entire mistake. This we shall have occasion to show in our next Chapter, when we shall have under consideration Matt. xxv., which is the Scripture to which he makes allusion.

4th. The phraseology employed in the foregoing extract, and elsewhere throughout our opponent's argument, such as "the last sentence," "the finally impenitent," etc., is without the least Scripture warrant. The phrase "finally impenitent" we disposed of in the opening of Chapter I. of our Reply; and with regard to "the last sentence," implying a final retributive doom as the ultimate disposal of man, the Scriptures will show us, as we shall call in their testimonies in the remaining two chapters of this Reply, that the idea is not only without Scripture warrant,

but is utterly subversive of the fundamental principles and purposes of the government of God, as revealed in his word. The appellation, "Ye cursed," which our opponent reiterates so often and with such significant emphasis, is easy to be understood by the light developed in our preceding Chapter, on "the curse of the law." Surely they who were made the subjects of "all the curses written in the book of the law," were the "cursed;" but these curses were not a final doom, were not an ultimate end, but disciplinary means. See Chapter IV. of this Reply; and the Scripture records appealed to, Deut. xxviii. and xxix; and Lev. xxvi.

5th. *The lake of fire*, which Dr. A. calls up again in this place, we have already seen explained by the Revelator's guiding angel himself, to be a metaphor of certain national calamities in the earth. For the record informs us that the great beast, with seven heads and ten horns, representing certain kings and kingdoms of the earth, *was in the lake of fire.* Of course the lake of fire was in the earth. (See Chapter I. of this Reply, pp. 204–208.) We also exposed, in the same connection, the misgiving of the learned Doctor's mind, as betrayed in the paragraph quoted above, in respect to his own interpretation of Scripture phraseology which he here again has called into use. Like the victim of an enchantment he is drawn into a predicament of great discomfort. He had assumed that the "lake of fire" is a place of endless punishment, and that "hell" is a place of endless punishment; and now he rushes upon the Scripture

declaration that "hell" is "cast into the lake of fire." What can it mean? One place of endless punishment cast into another place of endless punishment! He starts back from this crash of his infernal worlds, and becomes doubtful as to the meaning of the terms which he had delighted to employ in a sense assumed to be unquestionable. In his dilemma he says, "The obvious meaning is, Death and hell, whatever they represent, will then be added to the lake of fire, whatever that is." Well, so much we think is indeed "obvious." And *whatever the lake of fire may represent*, we have seen it to figure forth extensive national calamities in the earth. (See p. 206.) But, in treating these metaphors as far as the point then under consideration required, we put over the full explanation of the saying, that "Death and *hades* were cast into the lake of fire," to the stage of the discussion at which we have now arrived, where the Doctor attempts his principal *argument* from this portion of the book of Revelation. Preparatory to this work, we will inquire into the general subject of this portion of Scripture, Rev. xx. 11–15.

The Dead, Small and Great in the Judgment.

The Revelator narrates a vision of a notable and widely effective judgment. Let us come to this subject as worthy Christian scholars, seeking truth only.

What is the judgment seen by the Revelator in this vision? A candid notice of the general terms of the narrative shows us that the subject of this vision is not the immortal resurrection, and a subsequent

judgment in the spiritual state of being. There is no mention here of a resurrection; and we have seen that "the lake of fire," which is introduced into the vision of this judgment, is a metaphorical representation of temporal and national calamities. This fact notifies us that the judgment which is the subject of this vision is a temporal judgment. And we are confident that a fair exegetical study of this vision with its explanatory correlatives will reveal to our understandings the particular temporal judgment to which it relates.

And here, in entering upon this investigation, let it be duly noted, that the visions of the book of Revelation are, to a considerable extent, repetitions of those of some of the prophets, especially Daniel. By *repetitions* I do not mean plagiaristic copyings on the part of John, but repeated developments by the holy Spirit, when the time of their fulfilment drew near.

Take, for instance, the 12th of Daniel, denoting a judgment in which many of them that slept in the dust of the earth should awake, to which Dr. Adams has repeatedly called our attention in this discussion. We have shown that Jesus, in his last discourse delivered to his diciples on the Mount of Olives, refers to the prophecy of this chapter of Daniel, and shows that the fulfilment was to take place within the compass of that generation. And now we are to see the same thing appear through another course of inquiry which has just opened up before us, in this resemblance of a portion of John's visions to those of Daniel. So beautifully true it is, that when we have

obtained to the true principle of Scripture interpretation, and to the right application of any given passage, harmonious confirmations come in from all directions whither we explore.

At the close of this vision of Daniel, concluding with his 12th and last chapter, his guiding angel said, "Go thy way, Daniel; for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end." "But go thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." If it would not carry us too far out of the direct course before us here, we would show that St. John, in his Revelation, personated Daniel, just as John the Baptist personated Elias; that as the essential subject-matters of Daniel's visions were caused to pass before the mind of John in vision, and he developed them when the time of their fulfilment drew near, in this was fulfilled what the angel said to Daniel, "for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days."

But here is the matter we would bring to notice. While to Daniel, at the close of his series of visions, it was said, "the words are closed up and the book is sealed till the time of the end," to John, at the close of his series of visions, the guiding angel says, "Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book; for the time is at hand."

Now all this is turned into nonsense by the popular assumption in respect to the time and nature of the principal judgment which is the burden of both Daniel's and John's visions. "Orthodoxy" has neither eyes nor ears;—it must stop both and reiterate bold

assumptions. On the hypothesis that this judgment is an adjudication to take place at the end of this mundane system, in the yet unknown distant future, what sense is there in the instruction to Daniel, that the words of his prophecy of this judgment were sealed and closed up till the time of the end,—and the charge to John, to *seal not* the sayings of the prophecy of his book, because *the time was at hand?* It was only about six hundred years from Daniel to John, and it has now been nearly two thousand years since John; and if the prominent event of their respective visions is yet in the distant future, why should Daniel's be represented as being sealed, to imply a lying over for some time to its fulfilment, and John's be forbidden to be sealed, because the time was at hand? "Orthodoxy" must shut her eyes to this question; but the truth is clear. Jesus, as we have seen, referred to the 12th of Daniel, and identified its leading subject with the events of the judgment which should take place within the compass of that generation. John, in the place of Daniel, stood in his lot at the end of the days, and the same things were passed before his mind in vision as they were about to be fulfilled. Therefore his vision was not to be sealed over to a distant future fulfilment, because the events of its forshadowings were about being practically developed. How beautifully clear is the light and harmony of the Scriptures to the free, reverent Bible student.

Let us take another lesson, from John, through Daniel, back to John, starting from the leading por-

tion of the passage now before us. "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the books according to their works." Now turn to the first edition of the same vision, Dan. vii. 9. 10. "And I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened." This appears to be a vision of the same judgment as this in Rev. xx. And we will read Daniel further, for information on the time of this judgment. "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom that all people, nations and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

This is a prophecy of the coming of Christ, and the setting up of his kingdom in the world. The judgment, therefore, which should sit, when the books should be opened, and as it is added in the repetition

of the vision to John, the dead be judged out of the things written in the books, is a judgment that was to take place, not at the end of Christ's Mediatorial reign, but at its beginning. It was at the time when this judgment should sit, and the books be opened, that the one like the Son of man, coming with the clouds of heaven, should have *given him a kingdom*, that all people should be brought to serve him. And this is the idea presented all through the Scriptures, that the most notable judgment of prophecy was to take place, not at the end of the Messianic reign, but at the end of the old covenant dispensation, and the setting up of the reign of Christ. And the capital mistake of popular theologians has been, in the taking of the end of the old dispensation to be the end of the material world, and the accompanying judgment to be a final disposition of human destiny, at the end of the gospel dispensation. The mistake is of infinite consequence, and could never have been committed but by the clamorous demands of an invented and petted theology. This matter will be fully exhibited in our seventh, or closing Chapter. But we will make one quotation from the teachings of our Lord, parallel with those in Rev. xx. and Dan. vii. See Matt. xvi. 27, 28. "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall 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."

This, like Dan. vii. 9–14, describes a notable judg-

ment as associated with the event of the Son of man's coming to set up his kingdom; and this was to come to pass during the life-time of some who were the attendants on Christ's personal ministry. And so the Revelator puts in the same judgment with the things which must then *shortly come to pass.*

In the present light of the subject, we perceive that the dead, small and great, seen in vision as standing before God, were the enemies of Christ, of high and low degree, dead in trespasses and sins. "The books" were the various corrupt theories of faith and practice in which the enemies of Christianity were involved, (for there are various schemes of wrong,) and they were judged according to their errors, which were all open before God. But there is only one right way, one book of life, and happy were they whose names were there.

"And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell gave up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works." This is a positive form of expressing what the prophets expressed hypothetically, in various places which we noticed in earlier parts of this discussion. Amos, for instance, describing the severity and unescapable prevalence of a judgment which should come upon Israel, said, (ix. 2-4,) "Though they dig into hell, thence shall mine hand take them; — and though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence will I command the serpent, and he shall bite them." And Isaiah; (xxviii. 17, 18;) "Judgment also will I lay to the line, and right-

eousness to the plummet; and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow the hiding place. And your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand: when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it."

Now the view of any people which regards them as inhabiting "death and hades," regards them as "the dead." And the vision of John, which views the scene as actually passing before him, so that the record of it emphatically declares, "and death and hades delivered up the dead which were in them," represents no other than the same idea expressed by Isaiah in the saying, "Your covenant with death and agreement with hell shall be disannulled." The idea is, that no secret hiding place, no scheme of hypocrisy, no deep counsel of darkness, should avail them as a screen from the terrible and protracted calamities that were impending. The refuge of lies, as Isaiah expresses it, should be swept away: or death and hades, as John has it, should be cast into the lake of fire,—all together, they and their vain machinations, should be found powerless in those raging judgments, represented by the lake of fire.

"And whosoever was not found written in the book of life," that is the dead, small and great, the enemies of the gospel of all ranks, "were cast into the lake of fire," were made sufferers in those calamities.

"This is the second death." The second, in successive order, implies a first bearing a relation to it. To call the natural death of the body the first death,

and endless punishment the second death, would be talking like one insane. Moral death, or that of sin, is first. And if one raised from that moral death by faith in Christ were to relapse into unbelief and sin, that would be a second death. But *that* were not eternal death, for the work of the Saviour's mission will ultimately destroy *all* death, so that there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying. But "the second death," mentioned in the passage before us, we take to be the second national destruction of God's chosen people, Israel. Their first national desolation was in the Babylonish captivity. And that was figuratively denominated death, and burial. Ezekiel's vision, which shadowed their restoration, recognised them as in their graves, and promised their resurrection from their graves, to the inheritance of their own land. This prophecy was fulfilled and Israel lived, and prospered again, as a people. But the prophecy of the book of Revelation, which we have before us, recognized as near at hand the second national dissolution of Israel; — and this was "the second death."

But they who had part in the first resurrection should not be hurt by the second death. These were the true disciples of Jesus, who had spiritually passed from death into life, and, according to both prophetical and historical testimony, were preserved from the desolation that came upon the unbelieving of their nation.* "Whoso readeth, let him understand."

* See Matt. xxiv. 13, 16. Luke xxi. 18, 28, and our exposition, and that of Newcomb Cappe, of John v. 28, 29; particularly on pp. 331-342 of this Discussion:

CHAPTER VI.

Terms of Duration.

We come now to Dr. Adams' last great proposition, to wit:

VII. THE DURATION OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT IS EXPRESSED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT BY THE TERMS EMPLOYED TO DENOTE ABSOLUTE ETERNITY.

Here, again, before entering upon the discussion of this proposition, we must, as in the preceding division, strike out the word *future* prefixed to punishment, because it has no Scripture grant for being there. We shall not discuss with our friend the duration of *future punishment*, in the popular sense of the phrase, until he furnishes some sort of Scripture warrant for its use. But the question before us is the *duration of punishment*. And now, in the outset, against the Doctor's assumption, we file our own, viz:—That the terms employed to express the duration of punishment, are never employed to denote, of their own force, absolute eternity. The Doctor continues:—

"There is, we all admit, such a thing as *forever*. If the Bible speaks of the natural attributes of God, his eternity is of course brought to view, and there must be a term or terms to convey the idea."

On this we have to remark, that the fact of God's eternity being associated with the considerate thought of his being, does not involve the certainty that the ancient languages had any one term literally to express the idea. And we shall find that the Greeks had not any one word in familiar usage which expressed this idea of its own single force. The word *akatalutos* comes nearer to that import than any other; but that denotes *quality* rather than *duration*, literally signifying *indissoluble*, or *that which cannot be dissolved.* It occurs but once in the Scriptures, (Heb. vii. 16,) and is rendered *endless.* Speaking of Christ in his spiritual priesthood, it is said, he is "made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless (properly, indissoluble) life."

But *aion* and *aionios*, rendered forever, everlasting and eternal in the Scriptures, do not, of their own force, when applied to any subject, "denote absolute eternity." And if it were not that many great and good men have overpowering foreign motives for repeating and perpetuating the counter assumption, this question could not be considered debatable. It is not a question of opinion, but of literal, tangible fact.

And now, what are the facts? What is the natural and proper meaning of *aion* and its derivatives? Some, in order to throw the burden of proof upon those who believe the punishment to be limited to which this word is applied, assert that it primarily and properly signifies unlimited duration. We are willing always to bear the burden of proof, by argu-

ment from the nature of the subject, that *aionion punishment* is of limited duration; but we do not admit this definition of the word in question, because it is not true.

Though Professor Stuart, in his Exegetical Essays, *assumes* that the *proper* signification of *aion* and *aionios*, as used by the Greek writers of the Septuagint and New Testament, is *eternity* and *eternal*, and that when they are used in a limited sense it is a *catachrestic*, or *forced* and *unnatural* use, yet he has presented no *facts* to support such an assumption. He has given us no authority for departing from the following definition of *aion*, by the learned Orthodox lexicographer, Parkhurst. "*Aion*, from *aei*, always, and *on*, being, *always being*. It denotes *duration*, or *continuance of time*, but with great variety." *This* he gives as the *proper* and *radical* meaning of the word, "*duration*, or *continuance of time*;" and then adds, "but with great variety." He then gives examples of different uses of the word, by reference to certain places of Scripture, of which places every reader of the Bible is to judge for himself.

Donegan, defining the word in its *classical* usage, gives it thus:—"*Aion*—time; a space of time; lifetime." Such is its proper meaning.

But you will say that if *aion* is compounded of *aei*, always, and *on*, being, the *radical* meaning of the word is *endless duration*, or *eternity*. Let us look then at the signification of the word *aei*, which is the component part of *aion* that applies to *duration*, and is rendered *always*. "*Aei*, from *a*, intensive, and *eo*,

to be. 1. *Always, ever.* Acts ii. 51: "Ye do *always* resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye." 2 Cor. vi. 10: "As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing." These are the only cases which Parkhurst brings to support his *strongest* sense of the Greek *aei;* and in these, the reader perceives that the word means no more than *continual.* His second definition is "*Always, ever,* in a *restrained sense,* i. e. at some stated times." And third, "*Very frequently, continually.*" And to these definitions he quotes Mark xv. 8—"And the multitude, crying aloud, began to desire him (Pilate) to do as he had *ever* done unto them." And 2 Cor. iv. 11—"For we which live are *always* delivered unto death for Jesus' sake." And 2 Peter i. 12—"Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you *always* in remembrance of these things." Such is the signification, and such the Scripture use, of the word *aei,* which with the word *on, being,* makes *aion,* the Greek term under consideration. It is plain, therefore, that the proper and radical meaning of this word is, as Parkhurst has defined it, simply *duration,* or *continuance of time; indefinite duration.* When therefore we undertake to *define* the duration expressed by it, we must do this by arguing from the nature of the subject to which it is applied. The same remarks will apply to the *adjective aionios,* which, as Professor Stuart remarks in his Essays, p. 39, corresponds in meaning with *aion,* the *substantive.*

Thus much I have thought proper to present with regard to *aion* and *aionios,* to show that when my opponent assumes that the *proper* signification of

these words is *eternity* and *eternal*, he assumes a false position; that the *proper* signification of these words is *duration indefinite;* and that consequently whoever asserts that either *aion* or *aionios* does in any given case apply to *endless* duration, is bound to support his assertion by argument from the connection, or the nature of the subject.

I admit, however, that a word may become gradually changed by use, until it comes to be commonly employed in a sense quite different from its radical meaning. If any assert that this was the case with *aion* in the time of the Greek writers of the Scriptures, that it had then come into use to signify, properly, or by its own force, *eternity*, or *endless duration*, let the assertion be judged by the fact which appears in the Scripture use of this word. I have taken time to examine, for myself, 351 cases of the use of *aion* and *aionios* in the Septuagint, which are nearly all the cases of their occurrence in the Old Testament. In those cases which I have examined, they are rendered by the English words *ever, forever, everlasting*, and *eternal*. In 220 of these cases the words are applied to the duration of times, things, and events, unquestionably of a temporal nature, *in the earth*. In the remaining 131 cases, the words are applied to God, his attributes, his praise, the kingdom of the Messiah, and of the Saints, &c. Thus in nearly two-thirds of the instances of the use of *aion* and *aionios* in the Greek of the Old Testament, they are used in application to the duration of transient times and things on earth. Does this

look like these words having come into use to signify, by their own force, *eternity* and *eternal?* Far from it. Their Scripture use is according to their radical meaning, *duration*, or *continuance of time*, the extent of which is to be determined in each case from the subject. And in many of the remaining 131 cases of the use of *aion* and *aionios* in the Old Testament, it does not appear that the sacred writers in using them grasped the idea of *eternity*. When applied to the *praise of God*, and the *displays of his goodness*, though these will continue eternally, it does not appear that the sacred writers by the use of *aion* meant to express any thing more than *continual, perpetual*, or *from age to age*. The phrase, *from generation to generation*, is sometimes used as a repetition of the same idea that had just been expressed by *aion, forever*. As in Lam. v. 19—"Thou, O Lord, remainest *forever;* thy throne *from generation to generation*." Now we may as well argue that the phrase, *from generation to generation*, expresses by its own proper force eternal duration, because it is applied to the continuance of God's throne, as that *aion* expresses by its own proper force eternal duration, because it is applied to the continuance of God's existence. And with as much propriety might it be said that the proper signification of the adjective *great*, is *infinite*, because it is so often applied to the divine being. Indeed, it has often, and with perfect truth, been said by the learned, that *aionios* in reference to time, exactly corresponds with *great* in respect to magnitude. So that the adjective *aionios*

applied to God, no more proves his eternity, than the adjective *great* proves his infinity. Both these properties belong to the very idea of his self-existent and independent being; and when expressed, they are expressed by circumlocution.

And because the word *aion* did not, with the Greek writers of the Scriptures, properly signify *eternity*, they would frequently *repeat* the word, when they would express great extent of duration, and sometimes in the plural number, and add in some cases the adverb *eti*, which signifies *yet*, *still*, or *farther*. As in Exo. xiv. 18, "The Lord shall reign (*ton aiona*, *kai ep aiona*, *kai eti*) age upon age, or forever and ever, and farther." And Dan. xii. 3: "They shall shine as the stars, (*eis ton aiona*, *kai eti*) to the age, or forever, and farther." And Micah iv. 5—"*We will walk in the name of the Lord our God*, (*eis ton aion*, *kai epekeina*,) *forever*, *and beyond it*." Now to substitute the word *eternity* for *aion* in such cases, reading, *from eternity to eternity*, *and farther*, would make perfect nonsense. The Scripture writers expressed the idea of *God's eternity* by different methods, speaking of him as *self existent*, *immortal*, *unchangeable*, of *whose years there shall be no end.* And so is the endless continuance of the future state of human existence in purity and happiness expressed, by its immortality, incorruptibility, spirituality, heavenliness, 1 Cor. xv. 42–49; the saying that they *shall not die any more;* Luke xx. 36; and shall be made alive in and with him who is made after the power of *akatalutou*, endless or indissoluble life. Heb. vii.

16. But is has been sufficiently shown that this idea of God's eternity, and the endless continuance of the future happy existence of men, is not expressed by the natural force of the words *aion* and *aionios*. The word *aionios*, therefore, connected with the *punishment of the wicked, is not the least* proof of its *endless duration*. Neither in the *nature and design* of punishment, is there any thing from which you can argue its unlimited duration. There are frequent mentions made in the Scriptures of cases in which God had then, already, judged and punished the wicked according to their doings, even *according to all their abominations*. Psl. ix. 4; lxxvi. 8, 9. Isa. xl. 2. Ezek. vii. 9; xxxvi. 19. It is manifest, therefore, that the punishing of the wicked according to their doings is not an *endless*, an *unlimited* work; and the word *aionios cannot* make it so.

Dr. Adams says in his argument,—

"Now it is apparent to all, that the words *eternal, everlasting forever*, never of themselves signify a limited duration. No one ever learns *from these words*, that the duration to which they refer is less than infinite. The idea of limitation, if it be obtained, always is derived from the context."

This sentence is quite artfully framed. It begins with a show of fairness, but is designed to carry over the unwary mind into a wrong conclusion. It is based on the idea that the word or words in question must either signify definitely a limited, or definitely an unlimited duration, insomuch that, if it were conceded that it does not of itself signify a limited

duration, it must be admitted to signify, of itself, unlimited duration. But the premises on which this argument is based are inadmissible. It is not true that the word under consideration signifies, of itself, duration either definitively limited, or definitively unlimited. It denotes "duration, or continuance of time, *indefinite*." But because it is most commonly applied to ages and periodical dispensations of providence, it would make a sentence more strictly true, to amend that of our opponent by striking out the words *less than*, and for the word *limited* substitute *un*limited,—and read thus: "Now it is apparent to all, that the words *eternal*, *everlasting*, *forever*, (as synonymes of *aion* and *aionios*) never of themselves signify an *unlimited* duration. No one ever learns *from these words* that the duration to which they refer is infinite. The idea of infinite, if it be obtained, always is derived from the context."

Dr. A. continues,—

"It is moreover true beyond the possibility of dispute that the words *eternal*, *everlasting* and *forever*, always mean *the whole* of something. There is no instance in which they are used to denote a part of a thing's duration. It is always the entire period for which that thing is to last. This no one will call in question."

It is really gratifying to find our esteemed friend right, for once, on so important a matter. As the original term denotes "duration or continuance of time," (see Parkhurst), and is often used in the sense of *continual or unceasing*, it is fair to regard it as usually implying a continuity through the whole of the day, age or sphere which naturally belongs to the subject.

Our friend, then, in order to maintain his position, must show that the sphere of sin and misery is, in its nature and mission, as immortal and abiding as the sphere of truth and holiness; that the kingdom of Satan is co-equal and co-eternal with the kingdom of God. While the old prophet honored God as the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity,—Dr. A. must exalt *satan*, also, as the high and lofty one that inhabiteth eternity. Can he do this? We trow not.

But here our friend will rally with his argument from the word *everlasting*, as being alike applied to the kingdom of God and the kingdom of evil. Ah but he has cut himself off from this argument. He has settled down upon the concession that *everlasting* always means *the whole of something*, whether it be of short or long duration, and that whether short or long we must determine from "the nature of the thing spoken of." And now for him to run back again with this word to prove the unlimited nature of the thing spoken of, in reference to punishment, or sin and suffering, is perpetrating what logicians call "an argument in a circle." Dr. Watts, in his work on the mind, illustrates this worthless form of argument, by reference to the Papal method of proving the infallibility of the Papal church. They prove the infallibility of the church by their authorized construction of the Bible,—and they prove their authorized construction of the Bible by the infallible church. (We do not here quote from Watts verbally, but give the idea from memory.) And so our learned Doctor proves the unlimited signification of *aionios* applied to punishment by the eternity of the subject in its

own nature,—and then he proves the eternity of the subject by the word *aionios.* This logic is, by the unanimous judgment of scholars, null and void.

No; our friend must, if he will get on another step with his cause, before determining the sense of *aionios* in that way, show the *natural eternity* of falsehood and evil, sin and punishment. What an undertaking! The word of God declares that *the Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head.* The bruising of the head denotes complete destruction. As the serpent here emblemizes the reign of evil which had just entered the moral system, this declaration pronounces the utter extermination, in due time of the reign of evil. But our friend must try the task of making evil co-eternal with His existence who pledged its destruction. The word of God says, "For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil," which are sin and evil. But it is the undertaking of our friend to perpetuate the works of the Devil through God's eternity. We admonish him that his undertaking must prove a failure. This of course; because, satan shall fail, and Christ "shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied."

But Dr. A., with his accustomed ingenuity, attempts to establish the eternity of punishment by the following process.

Two things are beyond dispute. 1, *Forever* and *everlasting* are applied to future retributions. 2, These terms always mean *the whole,* as to duration, of that with which they stand connected.

Well, we will look at this. But the first position, the main premise assumed in this case, is not true. *Forever* and *everlasting* are *not*, in the Scriptures applied to future retribution. Our opponent has all along labored to thrust himself upon this position, as a stand-point from which to view and debate the subject of retribution. But he has failed to adduce a single Scripture expression which warrants or permits him that stand-point. But let this pass for a moment. Suppose the word everlasting were applied to future retribution. What then is the argument? Why, "2. This term always means *the whole*, as to duration, of that with which it stands connected." What then? With what does it stand connected, even if such a passage as Matt. xxv. 46 were transported to the future world? With the term of future existence? No, for that is not the subject of discourse. The word is connected with a dispensation of punishment. So the question returns upon the nature and design of punishment, which we have sufficiently proved to be a corrective dispensation, limited of course. And, as we have shown before, the very word *kolasin*, rendered punishment in the passage last referred to, signifying discipline, as the pruning of trees, shows that the punishment is a limited dispensation, to be succeeded by good.

But neither this passage, nor any other denouncing punishment, belongs to the future world. Dr. A. discovers a wise degree of caution in confining his argument in this division to abstract propositions without committing himself to any particular passage

of Scripture as connecting *aionios* with rewards and punishments in the future world. But his phraseology evinces that he had in his mind Matt. xxv. 46; and he quotes from that connection the phrase, "ye cursed," as if it were addressed to immortals beyond the resurrection. Therefore, that we may not leave the discussion of this branch of the "Argument" incomplete, we will faithfully consult the record for the correct application of the passage just referred to; "*And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.*"

WHEN AND WHERE WAS THIS JUDGMENT TO BE EFFECTUATED? Answer, *When the Son of man should come in his glory.* (v. 36.) And when should the event occur denoted by this language? For information on this question, we will reverently attend to the great Teacher himself. Can the reader throw aside all mean and irreverent sectarian will, and come, sit and learn at Jesus' feet?

The words above quoted, "These shall go away into *aionion* punishment, but the righteous into life *aionion*," are the conclusion of a discourse of our Lord, which commences with the preceding chapter. Jesus and his disciples were on the Mount of Olives, which commanded a full view of the temple in Jerusalem. The disciples spoke with admiration of the magnificent buildings of the temple; "And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? Verily I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." This excited in the disciples a desire to receive more full

information concerning that judgment to which this declaration of their Lord referred, and to know the *signs* on which they might rely as monitors of its approach. Accordingly they inquired, "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" Some have supposed that, though the disciples in asking, "When shall these things be?" had reference to the subject then before them, yet in concluding their inquiry with the same breath, "And what shall be the *sign* of thy coming," &c., they had flown off to a totally different and distant subject, inquiring for the *signs* of the literal dissolution of the material world, and events subsequent to that. But this is forcing a construction on the disciples, inquiries, which does them injustice. Their conversation with their Master was on the subject of that judgment which should raze to the ground the temple of Jerusalem. It appears that they had associated in their minds with this event a certain coming of Christ, and the end of that *aion* or age. Accordingly, when they inquired, with reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, "When shall these things be?" and then asked, And what shall be the *sign* of thy coming, (that is to execute these things), and of the end of the world, *aionos*, or age? they had not run off from their subject, but inquired after the *sign* of the coming of the same event which was the subject of their conversation.

That I am right here is *certain*, from the record of the same inquiries of the disciples given by Mark

and Luke. See Mark xiii. 4; "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the *sign* when all *these things* shall be fulfilled?" And Luke xxi. 7; "And they asked him, saying, Master, but tell us, when shall these things be? and what *sign* will there be when *these things* shall come to pass?" Hence it is certain that the disciples' inquiries in this case aimed at nothing else, but 1st, to know the *time* of these things which their Lord referred to in speaking of the destruction of the temple; and 2d, to know the *signs*, not of an infinitely different affair, but of *these same things* of which they had just asked for the *time*.

This clear understanding of the disciples' *questions*, will aid us much in understanding our Lord's *answer*, which runs to the end of the 25th chapter. For we may safely calculate that his answer is appropriate, and treats on the subject of their inquiries, which were elicited by his own preceding declaration.

We will attend now to Jesus' answer. After naming many signs and circumstances, and giving the disciples directions concerning their escape, which, as you will see by reading on in chapter 24th, from the 4th verse, would be without meaning if applied to the destruction of the material world, but are appropriate as applied to the end of the Jewish age,—he thus proceeds; "Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light," &c. This language is very eastern, and highly figurative. The Jews well understood it, as the prophetic description of the fall and ruin of some city or nation. For instances

of such use of similar language, see Isa. xiii. 9–13. Ezek. xxxii. 7, 8. Now it is as evident that this language of our Lord is applied to the destruction of Jerusalem, as it is that the language referred to in Isaiah and Ezekiel, is applied to the fall of Babylon, and the destruction of Pharaoh and Egypt.

Jesus proceeds, "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 forth his angels," &c. "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled."

Now we inquire, what *coming of the Son of man in glory* is here meant? Most certainly it is that coming after which the disciples inquired; for Christ is here engaged in answering their inquiries. They asked for the *time* and the *signs* of his coming, to execute that judgment which should destroy Jerusalem and terminate the Jewish age. And now, when Jesus, in answer to their questions, after pointing out the *signs* of his coming, says, "Then shall they see the Son of man *coming* in the clouds of heaven," he of course speaks of the same coming concerning which they inquired, and of which he had just given them the *signs*. And in answer to the question, "When shall these things be?" he expressly limits the whole to *that generation*.

Dr. Scott, whom Dr. Adams no doubt accredits as soundly *Orthodox*, in his Commentary, gives the same view of this subject, so far, as I have here given. In

remarking on verse 29, Dr. Scott says, "The expression, 'immediately after the tribulation of those days,' must restrict the primary sense of these words to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the events consequent on it. The darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars, and the shaking of the powers of the heavens, denote the utter extinction of the light of prosperity and privilege to the Jewish nation, the unhinging of the whole constitution of their church and state." Dr. Scott also understands that the Son of man's coming in the clouds of heaven, and sending forth his angels, in verses 30, 31, was fulfilled in the display of divine power at that time, in preserving the disciples, and destroying the enemies of Jesus. And how could he avoid seeing this, since the language of the three succeeding verses is so plain that it obliged him to say, "This absolutely restricts our primary interpretation of the prophecy to the destruction of Jerusalem, which took place within forty years." Nor has Dr. Scott courage enough to deny, and so he admits, that the saying in verse 36, "But of that *day* and *hour* knoweth no man"— refers "to the precise day and hour of Jerusalem's destruction." He tells occasionally of another judgment to which he thinks some of this language *applicable*, but is forced to admit that the "primary" application, i. e. the original application intended by the speaker of these prophecies, *is to the judgment of that generation.*

To proceed with the examination of our Lord's discourse. As he could not tell the precise day and hour when it would be necessary for "the elect" to

flee from the city to escape the destruction which was the subject of his discourse, he charged them to watch for the *signs*. And he assured them that if any of his professed servants should abandon his cause, and eat and drink with the drunken, they should be "cut asunder, and have their portion with the hypocrites," or unbelieving Jews.

To illustrate this last saying, he speaks the following parable: "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins:—five wise, and five foolish." *When* was the kingdom of heaven to be thus likened? Suppose you write a letter to your absent son, and say, "I will visit you before this month passes away; and *then* will we adjust our unsettled concerns." *When* would your son understand you to propose adjusting said concerns? *Some time after the general resurrection?* No. Before this month passes away. He could not misunderstand you if he should try. The subject before us is equally plain. Jesus has just been describing events, all of which he has limited to that generation. And now, continuing his discourse unbroken, he says, "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins," &c. When? At the time just designated, which was to be before that generation passed away. The kingdom of heaven in this place cannot mean the heaven of immortal glory, for that is never *half foolish*. But it evidently means the visible church of that age, some of whom would be foolish enough to abandon Christ's cause, and would suffer as mentioned in the last verse of chapter 24th.*

*See pp. 196-202 of this Discussion.

After finishing this parable, and speaking the parable of the talents, further to illustrate and justify the dealings of God with the people of that age, our Lord closes his discourse with the paragraph which begins as follows:—"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," &c. And the concluding section is, "*These shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal.*"

When was this to be? Ans. *When the Son of man should come in his glory.* And when was this to take place? Jesus did not repeat the time here, for he had just spoken to them in the same discourse of his coming in his glory, with his angels, and plainly told them when it should be. And he knew that he was addressing people who were willing to keep the connections of his discourse, and to remember one minute what he had spoken the minute before. Consequently, without repeating the *time* over and over again, he proceeded to illustrate further the events connected with that *coming* of his, which he had just *timed* to *that generation;*—and of which he had spoken in Matt. xvi. 27, 28: "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."

Finally, I can find no more reason for applying this

last paragraph of the 25th of Matthew, as my opponent's theory of interpretation applies it, to a judgment in the *future world*, than I can for applying the history of the American Revolution to such a judgment. And there is another circumstance, which I think sufficient to satisfy any person who will duly consider it, that Jesus did *not* introduce any such new subject in the last part of his discourse, which is recorded in Matt. 25th, as common opinion has alleged. The circumstance I refer to is this:—Mark and Luke have made a record of a part of the same discourse of Christ, which stands recorded in Matt. 24th and 25th. They have written as much as they deemed essential to hand down to after ages. But they have not written that portion of it which is included in Matt. 25th. I presume that no person of common understanding in the present day would attempt to prove the doctrine of endless torments from Matt. 24th; and this is all of the discourse of Christ on the mount of Olives which Mark and Luke have recorded. See Mark xiii. and Luke xxi. It appears evident from this, that they understood the last part of their Lord's discourse to be only a further illustration of the subject of the first part, and not necessary to be recorded for posterity.

If Mark and Luke understood that the last part of their Master's discourse introduced a new subject, and gave an account of a judgment in the resurrection state, at which all men of all ages, as well as those of that generation, are to be arraigned and have their final states fixed according to their works on

earth, they could not, without a culpable breach of faithfulness, have neglected to record it. They would not have merely recorded that which related to the destruction of Jerusalem, to be handed down to posterity, and withheld that part which they considered of infinite concern to all men of *all ages*. And *Matthew*, instead of applying it all to the time of Christ's coming in that generation, as he has done, would have enabled his readers to find out where the supposed new subject should be understood as commencing.

But so it is, that no man has ever succeeded, and I have given up all expectation of any man's ever succeeding, or even *attempting*, to produce any reason for applying any part of this discourse of Christ to a judgment in the future world. Theologians and commentators, commencing with the discourse of Jesus at the beginning of Matt. 24th, and being imperiously commanded by their mother, "Orthodoxy," to get away from his subject somewhere before reaching the last paragraph of chapter 25th, are at a loss to select at what point to make the transition. Dr. Scott, as we have seen, makes his opportunity at the beginning of chapter 25th,—very rudely, however, since our Lord, by the adverb *then*, connects what follows with the preceding. Dr. Clarke follows the example of Scott. Others go farther over before they abandon the connection of Christ's discourse. The learned Professor Stuart, in maturity of age and Biblical study, in a long article in the *Bibliothica Sacra* for April and July, 1852,

shows by an extensive and masterly argument, that the whole of the 24th chapter of Matthew refers to the destruction of Jerusalem and connected events. Nor has he the termity to break away from the subject until he gets quite up to xxv. 31. The following is the language of the venerable Professor, in his application of the parable of the ten virgins, in the 25th chapter:

"At the close of the parable of the ten virgins, (Matt. xxv. 23,) Christ says to his disciples, 'Watch, therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man *cometh*.' If now this exhortation was addressed to the disciples as having respect to practical duty, and was uttered for the reason assigned, then it follows, that the *coming* of Christ here must be some other coming than the final one to the general judgment. If not, then Christ, as it would seem, was himself mistaken, and also led his disciples into error. How could he speak of their living on the watch and in constant expectation of his coming, when that coming was to take place some thousands of years at least, and perhaps thousands of ages, after they were all dead? There is no other alternative here. Either the Saviour was mistaken, and led his disciples into error, or else the *coming* in question was different from the final one. A pious fraud, for the sake of making his disciples watchful, is inadmissible, and utterly incompatible with the character of him 'who knew no guile.'"

In respect to the abrupt and unauthorized change of subject in this case, Professor Stuart, in the able article before referred to, has some most apt and pointed remarks, which are equally as applicable to his and your change of the subject at Matt. xxv. 31, as to the change made by others at xxiv. 29. In respect to the application of that and the 30th and 31st verses, to a future final judgment, he says:—

"It seems difficult of supposition that any attentive and well informed reader should not be impressed with such palpable defects and lack of congruity and symmetry as the verses before us exhibit, in case the general judgment be the subject of them. It would be like breaking off the Illiad before the slaying of Hector, and the subjugation of Troy. In what other part of the New Testament can be found such an abruption, and transition to another subject before the main object of any passage is developed, as takes place in the passage now under consideration, in case it relates to the general judgment."

Again, on the same changing of the subject by theologians, he says:—

"This whole scheme, then, is full of crudities and incongruities. It maintains impossibilities. It insists on having pictures half made, or an abrupt desertion of them in that state. *It introduces matter which the subject urged on the attention of our Lord, by the questions of the disciples, did not comprise.* And if there were no other reasons, these are enough of themselves to justify the abandonment of such a scheme of exegesis.

"But there are other reasons, and if possible weightier ones still, for abandoning it. These are comprised in the *limitations of time* which precede and follow verses 29, 31."

The learned Professor then takes into consideration the sayings, "immediately after the tribulation of those days," and "this generation shall not pass away,' &c., and by the most conclusive argument annihilates all the labors and assumptions that have been devoted to making the intervening line between the "tribulation of those days," and the "coming of the Son of man," extend through the indefinite coming ages.

Yet the Professor applies the last paragraph of Matt. xxv., to the popular doctrine of a future simul-

taneous judgment of the whole race, and a final separation and endless retribution. It is a remarkable instance of the power of name and place, over even great and ingenuous minds. The Professor walked fearlessly along, gathering the rich treasures of truth from the ingenuous Scripture exegeses, until he saw himself so near the verge of the "Orthodox" sphere, that another step onward would bear him out of the "Orthodox" name, relation, and sympathy,—and he took a sudden leap from his exploration, into the old family cradle.

And here I will address to Dr. Adams the appeal I addressed to Rev. Edward Beecher, D. D., on the same point, in my Review of his "Conflict of Ages." "Where is the reason for changing the subject of our Lord's discourse at Matt. xxv. 31? You are bound by your professions of reverence for the Scriptures, by your injunctions upon your brethren to study them with the eye of reason, and to take care not to force upon them, or continue to sanction, any unnecessary interpretation which shall set them in conflict with the principles of honor and right,—you are bound to give a reason, or abandon the habit as a sinful perversion. You cannot innocently trifle with this subject, nor treat it with indifference."

Since Jesus applies the whole of this discourse to the events of the then present generation, we are obliged to understand the *gathering of all nations* here spoken of, to denote the widely prevailing effect of this judgment on the earth. See similar language used in this sense, *the gathering of the nations, and as-*

sembling of the kingdoms of the earth being spoken of to denote the means and extent of some temporal judgment, in Zeph. iii. 8. Joel iii. 9–16. Micah iv. 11. Zech. xiv. 1–3.

The *life eternal* in this case, being mentioned as the blessing which the believers should enjoy in that generation, is the renewed and confirmed enjoyment of the life of the gospel, into which the faithful disciples entered when they found themselves preserved from the destruction of the wicked, and saw so exact a fulfillment of all their Lord had spoken on this subject.* The enjoyment of the gospel in this world is often denominated in the Scriptures, "life," and "everlasting life."—See John iii. 16; and v. 24; and vi. 47, 54; 1 John iii. 14, 15; and many other places.

The "*everlasting punishment*," here declared to be the portion of the enemies of Christ in that generation, is of course that temporal calamity which history shows us *did* come as Christ had predicted. *Jeremiah*, speaking of the same punishment, calls it "an *everlasting reproach* and *perpetual shame*." See Jer. xxiii. 40. And the same prophet, (Jer. vii. 20, and xvii. 27,) also calls it "*a fire that shall not be quenched*," kindled, not in the resurrection world, but "in the gates of Jerusalem." The same figure of fire is used in this discourse of Christ; "Depart from me ye cursed into *everlasting fire*, prepared for the devil and his angels." That is, the calamities here represented by *fire*, were particularly designed for the *diabolos*, or *impostor*, referring to the Jewish hierarchy, and his emissaries.

*See pp. 338–341 of this Discussion.

But this subject, we find, has nothing to do with the future world, where *all who die in Adam shall be made alive in Christ, death shall be swallowed up in victory, and tears be wiped away from off all faces.*

The subject of Matt. 24th and 25th throughout, is now perfectly obvious; and we hardly know how to exonerate any educated man from the charge of disrespect to the Master, who will, in this age of Biblical criticism, wrench off the last part of this continuous discourse of his, and apply it to a foreign, and an unscriptural subject. And we suppose it to be the common sense even of Endless-miserians, that if they must drop Matt. xxv. 46, from their catalogue of proofs for a great day of judgment in the morn of eternity, which shall adjudicate and execute final and endless retributions, they have no reliable proof of this Augustinian theory in the inspired word. And sure enough they have not. *God be praised!* his holy Word be revered.

Impromptu. Every body knows that derivative adjectives and the nouns from which they are derived bear a relation to each other in signification. For example,—*day* and *daily*, *week* and *weekly*, *year* and *yearly*, exhibit the relation we refer to between the substantive and the adjective derived from it. Whether you say your workmen receive wages by the *day*, or *daily* wages, you mean the same thing. Now *aionios* or *aionion*, is an adjective from the substantive *aion* or *aionos*. Therefore, if *aionos*, Matt. xxiv. 3 means *world*, then *aionion*, Matt. xxv. 46, means *worldly*. There is no escaping this conclusion. So the very ingenious argument of my opponent for the end-

lessness of punishment from this adjective, which I have shown to be in fault by other ample evidence, is exploded by his own use of words, and the eternal punishment is only a *worldly* punishment.

Again, *vice versa*, if *aionion*, the adjective, in the latter instance means strictly *eternal*, then the substantive, in the former instance, means *eternity*. So we stultify the disciples by making them ask their Master when shall be *the end of eternity!*

I repeat what I have said in substance before. Error, if it will stand, must shut its eyes and ears, and hold still. Every effort it makes to escape its difficulties multiplies them. But, with regard to truth, in every new channel by which you trace her bearings, you find multiplying developments of richness, harmony and beauty. The end of that *aionos*, was the end of an age or periodical dispensation of providence, which was then approaching. The *aionion kolasin*, or chastisement, is an age or periodical dispensation to the enemies of the gospel, which was then to follow. In this clear light of the subject we can see that there is good sense in St. Paul's words, Heb. ix. 26; "but now, once, in the end of the world, (aionos) hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

Presuming that he had proved the eternity of punishment by the word *aionios*, Dr. A. proceeds to strengthen himself by reference to the prevalent opinion on the subject. He says, p. 68:—

"Such multitudes of the best of men and women are still firmly persuaded of its truth, that we are led to say, There must be a

foundation for it in the word of God,—and for this reason: If mankind could have divested themselves of the conviction that it is not found in the word of God, it is reasonable to think that it would long since have been discarded. Nay, rather who would have invented such a doctrine? Good men would not have palmed it upon the world, for more reasons than one. Besides, many an error has been exploded; it is unaccountable, if this be error, that it should have kept its hold upon the human mind. No Protestant, it would seem, would quote a belief in purgatory as a parallel case. We have no coercion, nor any kind of motive to bias our minds towards this article of faith."

On the question, "Who would have invented such a doctrine?" there is no difficulty whatever, no more than there is in relation to all the other ten thousand monstrous fabrications of error in the world. Will the Doctor admit the validity of this interrogatory argument in relation to every false doctrine that is put forth,—"Who could have invented it?" But he probably means to imply that this doctrine is of such a nature that it is incredible that it should have been invented by man. No, indeed; it is just the scheme which, of all others imaginable, would be, as a matter of course, invented of men. Man, universally, has a religious nature, and constitutional wants, which inspire visions of a future life. But this want is blind, and its visions partake of the complexion of the minds indulging them, until they come to see that life and immortality which is brought to light through the gospel. And who does not know that poetic fancy and genius, in all ages, has been fruitful of romance, creating and peopling worlds and institutions in every conceivable locality and condition? It was

a matter of course that this genius should erect despotisms, and judgments, and prisons, in the spirit land, and that, too, in the spirit of the despotisms in the atmosphere of which it was nourished.* It was so. All the learned know it; and they know, also, that the doctrine of future endless punishment originated from that source. The learned Orthodox Campbell, as we had occasion to note before, in his "Preliminary Dissertations," shows that this doctrine was borrowed by the Jews from the heathen, in their captivity among them and intercourse with them, between the time of their prophets and the coming of Christ, finding it not in their Scriptures. And it came into the Christian church, some time after the apostolic age, by the adulteration of the Christian doctrines with the Oriental philosophies. And it is a fact worthy of grave consideration, that in the conflicts which at length prevailed, by the strivings of the doctrine of endless punishment to establish itself in the church, this effort came from the western churches, characterized extensively by barbarism and despotism, while the eastern Bishops and churches, occupying the field of the more general apostolic labors, were on the side of Universalism.

In respect to the character of the influence, and the satanic force, by which Augustinianism, including the doctrine of endless punishment, was at length established as the Orthodoxy of the church universal,

* Le Clerc, in his Religion of the Ancients, says that the doctrine of future punishment was invented by heathen rulers, as a restraint upon the multitude. That it was *adopted* by the rulers for this purpose, is unquestionable; but we think it more reasonable to suppose that its *invention* came of mere poetic romance, as here remarked.

harine Beecher is full and to the point, as we n our "Preliminary Observations." But Dr. ers how the doctrine could have continued hurch as it has, if it were false. He bethinks however, that the Catholics, who are a numeri- rity, and number many learned and good men, this day some monstrous errors, and so he plea for Protestant Endless-miserians, thus, have no coercion nor any kind of motive to minds towards this article of faith." A sur- statement. In hundreds and hundreds of cases, e have conversed with members of his school, and unlearned, and they have seen that their argument was insufficient, they have turned acks upon the argument, and set up their own to what is needed for the *morals* of the com- y, as a sufficient reason for persisting in the nance of this dogma. But of the influence Protestant sectarians, on a wider scale, Miss rine Beecher, who has had great observation xperience of it, speaks in language so much eloquent, and direct to the point, than we could and, that we adopt her description. She is ng of another dogma, but the remarks are applicable to this. After describing the various inery of influence, but little less potent than racks and flames, she says:

"Now it is a fact that this vast array of wealth, position, influence, and ecclesiastical power is actually combined to sustain these theological theories. So much so is this the case, that a minister, theological professor, president of a college, secretary of

a benevolent society, or editor of a periodical or newspaper, could not openly deny the Augustinian tenet but under the penalty of the loss of reputation, position, influence, and the income that sustains himself and family. Our largest and best theological seminaries demand an avowal of belief in this dogma as a condition of holding any professorship, and in some of them it must be renewed by all the professors every few years. At the same time, this dogma of a depraved mental constitution transmitted from Adam, [much more this of endless punishment,] is inwrought into all the standard works of theology, the sermons, the prayers, the sacred poetry, the popular literature, and even the Sunday School and family literature of childhood." [*Common Sense and Religion*, p. 312.]

As it respects our learned friend, good man as he is, and we say it with great personal respect, the manner of his using Scripture throughout his lengthy "Argument," clearly evinces to the careful reader that he comes to the Bible with the dogma he advocates all in his mind, imbibed from these other sources described by Miss Beecher.

The New Witness.

We come now in course to our friend's call to the witness stand of Rev. Theodore Parker, whose witness is in these words:—

"*To me it is quite clear that Jesus taught the doctrine of eternal damnation*, if the Evangelists—the first three I mean—are to be treated as inspired."

We have commented already, somewhat, on this expression of opinion by Mr. Parker, and Dr. Adams' use of it. We do not think the latter evinces his accustomed wisdom in this device. He acknow-

edges that Mr. Parker was driven to reject the Bible partly for the very reason that he supposed it contained the doctrine of endless punishment. Here then is a good man, with large benevolence, but not much reverence, accustomed from childhood to a jingle of certain Bible phraseology in connection with the notion of an after death judgment, and endless punishment, and the doctrine outrages all his rational and moral conceptions of honor and right in God, and represents him as a Being unworthy of confidence, reverence or love. He concludes that a book fraught with such doctrines cannot have come from the teachings of God's spirit; and having not much reverence for mere antiquity and old authority, he spares himself the labor of a *de novo* study of the Bible to disentangle it of that horrible doctrine, by the short cut of throwing it all away together. And now our friend calls in the false educational opinion of this wronged and injured man, in proof of the truth of that very oppugnant theory.

But where, my esteemed friend, will the testimony of your chosen witness carry you? If his mere uncriticised educational opinion on the meaning of certain Scripture phraseology, with the prevalent usage of which he has floated along, is evidence of the correctness of that usage, much more is his deliberate moral judgment, formed against the prejudices of his education, of the moral corruptness and falsehood of the sentiment which such usage palms upon that phraseology, and of the book which contains it, to be accredited by you as having the weight of evi-

dence. Will you put in the testimony of your witness on these points? If not, then permit him to leave the stand altogether.

But you will say that, while human judgment may be legitimately exercised on the meaning of language, it has nothing to do in the way of judging on the principles of honor and right in God, or with what purpose it is proper for him to govern. How then are we to appreciate and adore the moral principles of Jehovah's government, if we are to excercise no moral judgment as to the rectitude of his ways and works? But it is within the province of our manhood, and our relations to God as his moral creatures, to exercise such judgment, and this according to your own showing. You present yourself as an example of it. Supposing that certain Bible language which you had quoted *means* future endless punishment, and objecting to the more comfortable hypothesis of some Christian divines whom the moral aspect of the affair had repelled from the belief of it as a reality, and who have suggested the thought that though God had threatened it for a present wholesome influence, he will contrive some way hereafter to deliver all his children from it, you speak thus freely:—

"But I now respectfully ask the attention of the reader when I say, that if I did not believe in there being a state of future punishment which justifies such language, I fear that I could not stop short of the boldest infidelity. I might even assail the Bible as unfit to be read. It is no relief to tell me that the language does not mean all which it would seem to convey. I should reply,

this is bad language, unless there be something which language of this sort only can express. But if it be an exaggeration of a truth, or if, for the sake of impression, an idea is conveyed which is false, a man may as well apologize to me for a profane blasphemer, saying that his oaths do not really mean all which they express, as try to reconcile me to the belief that such words as these are inspired. It is not the *truth* which offends me, but the *untruthfulness* of the language. The words are not decorous, my moral sense is abused, when I read such expressions, unless substantial truth requires them. The sin is not against my faith, but against my understanding."—*Argument*, pp. 29, 30.

Here, dear Sir, you assume for your own practice Mr. Parker's position in full. You state certain conditions affecting the character of the Bible teachings in their relation to God's government, which should lead you to reject the Bible as Infidels do, for the reason that it would *abuse your moral sense, and do violence to your understanding.*

Well, Sir, your theological system, from beginning to end, presents the threatenings of the Bible, in relation to actual intentions and facts of the Divine government, in the same farcical attitude which you allege, in the foregoing extract, should be cause for your rejecting the Bible. It represents that God published his law to man, with the penalty or threat of endless punishment for all or any sin; and that yet he meant no such thing in relation to an elect portion, designing to punish himself as their substitute, and thus nullify the threat as it applies to them. Again, in relation to the other and major portion of his offspring, it construes the Bible as pretending that God has made provision for their salvation, and

calls and desires them all to come and be saved, while it also represents that there is no way of salvation but through a preternatural conversion by the Holy Spirit, which shall never be wrought on this non-elect mass of humanity, for whom, of course, there is no possible way of salvation provided. And it furthermore represents that God will not judge and punish his children during the day of grace, or time when reformation is possible, but puts retribution off until the door of reformation shall be barred forever, when punishment shall be made the means of increasing wickedness and woe to all eternity. And so, throughout, your theory makes the teachings of the Bible delusive and farcical, and the spirit of the Divine government to be fiendish. Thus your theory presents a vastly stronger case of indecorum of sentiment and untruthfulness of language, than the hypothesis on which you presume to justify a rejection of the Scriptures.

But our case is a happy one; for it is only your untruthful and farcical theology, and not the Bible, by which "our moral sense is abused," and the sin perpetrated "against our understanding." We reject the corrupt theology, and hold, and love, and revere the Scriptures.

> "O may these heavenly pages be
> My study and delight;
> And still new beauties may I see,
> And still increasing light."

Dr. Adams quotes the words of John Foster, the celebrated English Baptist divine who embraced Uni-

versalism late in life, saying that "the language of Scripture is formidably strong, (on the duration of punishment,) so strong that it must be an argument of extreme cogency that would authorize a limitation of it." But he knows that Mr. Foster uttered merely his long life impressions from common usage in respect to the strength of the language of Scripture referred to, and that, after all, he *found* to his satisfaction, arguments of sufficient cogency to limit them.

The association of Rev. T. S. King with Rev. T. Parker, (Argument, p. 82,) as "seeing the doctrine of endless punishment in the literal speech of the Bible," and hence "rejecting its inspiration," is, as we said before, unwarranted and unjust.

In respect to Mr. King's admission that he did "not find the doctrine of the ultimate salvation of all souls clearly stated in any text" in the four Gospels, great injustice has been done him by the partial manner in which it has been presented. The connection in his sermons, (pp. 5–7,) explains clearly that he referred only to the idea of an argumentative and verbal statement of result. He says explicitly, "but all the *principles* glow there, vivid as the sunlight, that are required to give us the most consoling trust in God through eternity, and the most cheering hope for man." He barely raises the question, whether our hope of the final universal triumph of good is mainly based on direct textual statements of the result, or on *the vivid sunlight glow of principles which insure the result.* For ourself, while we differ with

Mr. King in our estimate of the former, we fully and joyfully agree with him in giving the greater prominence to the latter. And we insist that Dr. Adams, having called this witness upon the stand, is bound in justice to hear and accredit his whole testimony. *The principles of Universalism glow in the four Gospels, vivid as the sunlight.* My dear Doctor, please pass this along from your chosen witness.

And now, as my opponent has seen fit to call in a human witness to his interpretation of the language of the Scriptures, I will do a little in that line, and of a character which has valid weight. Hundreds of thousands who were educated in the habit of using the Scripture texts which he has adduced as teaching endless punishment, have, by a careful study of the sacred volume, corrected and renounced that error. A gentleman of our former acquaintance by the name of Whitmore, a layman of strong intellect and eminent Christian character, has often told us of his conversion to Universalism. He was a member of an Orthodox church. A brother church member who had moved into another State became a Universalist, and the circumstance was a great grief to Mr. Whitmore. He resolved to write his friend a letter, filled with such passages of Scripture as would bring him back to Orthodoxy. He took pen, and paper, and Bible, selected a leading passage for his purpose,—but bethought himself that he would look carefully into the connections to see whether there was any way for his honorable friend fairly to explain it consistently with his new faith. This put him

upon a new method of studying the Bible. And he readily saw not only how his friend *might* explain it, but how he *must* explain it if he were to study it as *he* was then doing. He saw that it would not answer his purpose. "But there are enough that will," he said to himself; and at his next leisure he selected another strong passage, and went at studying it in the same way, and with the same result; and so on, until he found it to be his business to write his friend, informing him of his happy conversion, by the study of the Scriptures for the opposite purpose, to his own blessed faith in Christ, as the impartial and efficient Saviour of the world.

Rev. A. St. John Chambre, the talented and worthy pastor of the First Universalist Church in Newark, N. J., was educated in a Presbyterian College in the West, and commenced preaching in that order. He conceived the purpose of a course of revival lectures, in the Presbyterian sense of a revival, and for this purpose designed to season his discourses thoroughly with the terrific in his theology. He took his Septuagint and Greek Testament, and went at the work of making selections of the desired class of passages, but soon found that they were not there. He perceived that the doctrine of endless punishment is alone sustained by a perversion of certain English phraseology. Thus his search of the Scriptures for the express purpose of finding support for this doctrine, revealed to him the fact that it was not there.

There is an instructive case to this point related, of his own experience, by the able and learned Rev.

Theodore Clapp, in his Auto-Biography, pp. 157–160. Dr. Clapp had been preaching on a Sabbath, in his pulpit at New Orleans, a zealous sermon for endless punishment. Among his hearers was Judge W., an eminent scholar, who studied for the Episcopal ministry, but relinquished his purpose because he could not find in the Scriptures the doctrine of endless punishment and kindred dogmas, required by the Episcopal church. The Judge lingered after the benediction, and walked a little way with Dr. Clapp in familiar conversation. Dr. Clapp thus narrates what followed from this interview:—

"When parting with me that morning, he said 'Mr. Clapp, I have a particular favor to ask. You told us in the sermon just delivered that there are hundreds of texts in the Bible which affirm, in the most unqualified terms, that all those who die in their sins will remain impenitent and unholy through the ages of eternity. I will thank you to make me out a list of those texts in the original Hebrew and Greek. That some of such an import occur in our English version is undeniable; but I think they are mistranslations. I do not wish to put you to the trouble of multiplying Scripture proofs touching this point. Two, five or ten, will be amply sufficient.' I replied, 'Judge, it will give me great pleasure to grant your request. I can furnish you with scores of them before next Sunday.' He smiled, saying, 'I do not deny it,' and politely bade me good morning. I was perfectly confident that the judge would be convinced that he had most egregiously misunderstood and misinterpreted the word of God. I rejoiced in the thought of his speedy discomfiture.

"For fools rush in where angels fear to tread;
Distrustful sense with modest caution speaks;
It still looks home, and short excursions makes;
But rattling nonsense in full volleys breaks,
And never shocked, and never turned aside,
Bursts out, resistless, with a thundering tide."

"The very next day, Monday, before going out, I made, as I thought, the best arrangements for collecting the *proof texts* which had been solicited. A table was set in one corner of my study, well furnished with the appropriate books—lexicons, Hebrew and Greek, concordances, commentaries, English, Latin, and German, with standard works on the Pentateuch, the history and antiquities of the Jewish nation. I had no authorities in my library but those which were of the highest repute among Trinitarians of every denomination. With the help of Gaston's Collections and the references in the Larger Catechism of the Presbyterian Church, the access was easy to all the passages of Scripture which are relied on to prove the doctrine of endless sin and sorrow.

"I began with the Old Testament in Hebrew, comparing it as I went along with the Septuagint and English version. I hardly ever devoted less than an hour each day to this branch of my studies, and often I gave a whole morning to it. Having been elected to the presidency of the New Orleans college, I was in the enjoyment of constant intercourse with Judge W. Almost every week he inquired, 'Have you discovered yet the *proof texts* which you promised to give me?' I replied, 'No, judge, I am doing my best to find them, and will accommodate you at as early a period as possible.' During that and the succeeding year I read critically every chapter and verse of the Hebrew Scriptures, from Genesis to Malachi. My investigations were as thorough and complete as I could possibly make them. Yet I was unable to find therein so much as an allusion to any sufferings at all after death. In the dictionary of the Hebrew language I could not discover a word signifying *hell*, or a place of punishment for the wicked in a future state. In the Old Testament Scriptures there is not, as I believe, a single text, in any form of phraseology, which holds out to the finally impenitent threats of retribution beyond the grave. To my utter astonishment, it turned out that Orthodox critics of the greatest celebrity were perfectly familiar with these facts. I was compelled to confess to my friend that I could not adduce any Hebrew exegesis in support of the sentiment that evil is eternal.

"Still, I was sanguine in my expectations that the New Testament would furnish me with the argument which I had sought for

without success in the writings of Moses and the prophets. I scrutinized, time and again, whatever in the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles, are supposed to have any bearings upon the topic, for the space of eight years. The result was, that I could not name a portion of New Testament Scripture, from the first verse of Matthew to the last of the Apocalypse, which, fairly interpreted, affirms that a part of mankind will be eternally miserable. But the opposite doctrine, that all men will be ultimately saved, is taught in scores of texts, which no art of disingenuous interpretation can explain away. Here I should say that at the time above mentioned I had never seen or read any of the writings of the Unitarian or Universalist divines, not even those of Dr. Channing, with the exception, perhaps, of one or two occasional discourses that had been sent to me through the post office. During the whole ten years my studies were confined to the original Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, and the various subsidiary works which are required for their elucidation. My simple, only object, was to ascertain what "*saith the Lord*" concerning the final destination of the wicked. It is an important, most instructive fact, that I was brought into my present state of mind by the instrumentality of the Bible only—a state of mind running counter to all the prejudices of early life, of parental precept, of school, college, theological seminary, and professional caste."

There, this witness, in all its bearings, is worth more than a million such as Rev. Theodore Parker, whom Dr. Adams calls to his aid. And this we say with all due respect to that benevolent man.

But our ultimate appeal is the Bible direct. Thither have we gone, and thither will we go in our next and closing Chapter of this Discussion.

CHAPTER. VII.

Argument from the Scheme of Redemption.

We passed over Dr. Adams' second proposition, reserving it to our concluding Chapter, because the subject of it, appropriately treated, will make a grand climax to this protracted labor. The proposition is as follows :—

II. REDEMPTION BY CHRIST IS REPRESENTED AS HAVING FOR ITS OBJECT SALVATION FROM FINAL PERDITION.

In replying to this position, we must receive the terms in the sense in which he employs them. In the Scriptural sense, a state of sin is a state of perdition. And it follows of course that if sin were the final state of man, or, in other words, if man were to continue eternally in the love and practice of sin, his perdition would be final. And as the plan of grace revealed in the gospel is a scheme of salvation from sin, in this sense it "has for its object salvation from final perdition," it being salvation from continued sin. In this view of the subject, however, the Scripture phraseology is to be preferred :—"He shall save his people from their sins." And saving from sin saves from all the concomitant evils of sin, just as healing of sickness saves from the concomitant evils of a state of disease.

But Dr. A. means by "final perdition," an irrevocable doom to hell for the sins on earth. In this sense of the phrase there is no intimation in the Scriptures of its being the object of Christ's mission to save men from final perdition, even as there is no revelation of any such fact in the economy of the Divine government, which should constitute an occasion for such an interposition.

It is no part of the mission of Jesus, as it is represented in the Scriptures, to remedy any former mistake of the Creator and Law-Giver, or to relieve him of any embarrassment. The semi-barbarians who framed the Augustinian creed, have not in that creed reflected the wisdom of Heaven. It represents the great Father of mankind, when he gave a law to his children, as attaching to it, like a rash, inconsiderate parent, a threat of utter and endless misery as the penalty of all and any transgression. But his weak and feeble children are overcome by temptation, and disobey. Then the great Father relents, he sees that it is too bad that, of his rational children, none should ever love and enjoy him, but all should wear eternity away in cursing him, their Maker, and in howlings of infinite torments! — and what shall be done? The threat has gone out, and he must not stand before his family as false to his word; — and yet it is too bad,—and what shall be done? Why this. The Father inflicts the punishment upon himself as a substitute, (for the creed makes Christ to be the essential God) and so he takes out from the mass a chosen number, regenerates them by his spirit,

and exonerates them from the punishment he had threatened, telling them that he had verified the word of his threat by inflicting the punishment on himself. (Everybody knows that this would not be verifying the threat, but those scions of heathenism could think of no better way to word it; and they apprehended no difficulty with the minds of the people as to their reception of this fabrication, because religion with the heathen was all mysticism, and the expedient of substitution was in vogue among them, even in cases of capital punishment and deadly revenge. Nor whether Christ actually suffered endless punishment instead of men, none could have the temerity to ask, when the scheme was actually inaugurated as canonical.) But then there must be human samples, after all, of the terrible truth of the original threat of endless vengeance. And when the chosen ones shall look down upon their hopelessly suffering kindred,

> "Struggling with vengeance and rolling in their pain,"

they will see the "final perdition" from which *they* were redeemed by Christ.

It is in the shadow of this theological fabrication that our esteemed friend makes it his great position, that *Redemption by Christ is represented as having for its object salvation from final perdition.* Such is the wisdom of the world as it was.

But the wisdom of God is rich in harmony and beauty. It represents the great Father as giving to his children laws adapted to their dearest interests, and incorporating penalties, such only as are suitable

for a wise and good father to execute when incurred. So it was not necessary for God to provide a Saviour to intercept the regular administration of his moral government, and screen men from incurred punishment,—but to save them from ignorance and sin, and conform them to the spirit of holiness and heaven. And in this light the whole Scripture, Old Testament and New, represents the purpose of Christ's mission. It is the mission of the woman's Seed to bruise the serpent's head;—not to kill off the principles of the Divine law, but to exterminate the reign of evil, by conforming all men *to* the law. Thus is the law not destroyed, but fulfilled. In him shall all kindreds and families of the earth be blessed. This blessing in Christ is not a mere dodge from a future pit of fire but a spiritual good permeating the whole being. "I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness, and will give thee for a covenant of the people, and a light to lighten the Gentiles,—to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." It is not to appease his own wrath by punishing himself, thus to make it consistent with his justice to refrain from casting his children into an endless prison of torture at his own hand. It is to bring out the prisoners of darkness and sin, from their own state of spiritual bondage. He is the good Shepherd who, not needing self-punishment to cure him of a disposition to cast his sheep into the lion's den, goes after the lost sheep even until the last wanderer is brought home with joy, into the fold of righteousness and peace.

For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, not that he might nullify the just demands of the law, but that he might destroy the works of the devil, sin and its evils. He hath committed unto us the ministry of reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ, not pacifying his own wrath, and reconciling himself to men, but reconciling the world unto himself. (2 Cor. v. 19.) And of this character is the Scripture representation of the Saviour's mission, from beginning to end. Our friend finds one passage which speaks of being saved from wrath through Christ. This relates to individual experience, through the efficacy of a living faith in the blood of Christ, or in his love which is attested by his blood. The whole passage reads thus, (Rom. v. 8, 9,) "But God commendeth his love towards us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Much more now being justified by his blood, (that is by his love,) we shall be saved from wrath through him." We have shown before, that the word wrath applied to the Deity does not signify madness, but sometimes denotes a visible afflictive providence, and sometimes the condemnatory operation of the divine law against transgressors. In the former sense the apostle, speaking of a calamity which had even then been suffered by a certain persecuting community of Jews says, (1 Thess. ii. 16,) "For the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost." In the latter sense of wrath, the same apostle speaks of himself and the brethren whom he addressed, (Eph. ii. 3,) as having been "children of wrath, even as others." Salvation from

this wrath, this condemnatory operation of the law, the apostle would have understood to be a concomitant of justification by that faith which works by love. Hence he says in another place in the same epistle, which we have repeatedly quoted, "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." Of the same salvation of Christian faith our apostle writes to his Corinthian brethren, (1 Cor. xv. 1, 2.) "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain." This is an example witnessing to the verity of Christ's words to the disciples just before his ascension, (Mark xvi. 16,) "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Dr. A. quotes this passage in proof of final perdition. But the reader perceives it to refer solely to the fruits or effects of belief and unbelief. The disciples had been with Jesus three years, and he had instructed them into the principles of his gospel. But he had bidden them not to go, with the ministry of that gospel, in the way of the Gentiles, but only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. (Matt. x. 16.) But now he had been put to death, and was raised from the dead, and had broken down the middle wall between Jews and Gentiles; and he enlarged the field of ministerial labor for his disciples, saying, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to

every creature." Then he proceeded to describe, not what the gospel was, for that he had committed to them through three years schooling, but what the effects should be of the different treatments which their message should receive. He that should believe the gospel should be saved by that faith; just as St. Paul testified to his brethren, "I declare unto you the gospel, which I preached unto you, . . . and which ye have received;—by which also ye are saved, unless ye have believed in vain." And so of the jailor's family; when the gospel was received by them, salvation had come into that house. But he that should reject the gospel, should be damned, or condemned; (for Dr. A. knows that both these words are from the same original,) that is, he would remain under the darkness and condemnation of the heathen state. Jesus uttered the same sentiment when he said, (John iii. 18, 19,) "He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, (or, to follow the other translation, this is the damnation,) that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."

And so we may go through the whole Bible, and we shall find, everywhere, that the life, the blessedness, the salvation, which is the fruit or reward of faith and virtue, is possessed when and where faith and virtue are exercised. And the death, condemnation, or wrath, which is the fruit or reward of unbe-

lief and sin, is suffered when and where unbelief and sin prevail. Just as it is said in another passage which our opponent adduces; "He that believeth on the Son HATH aionion life; but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." Of course as all this light and life is in Christ, or in his gospel, while any remain in unbelief they cannot see it. And at the same time the wrath of God abideth on them, even as it did on Paul and his brethren, when, in their unbelief, they were "children of wrath, even as others."

But unbelief is not eternal, for that is falsehood. Falsehood is not eternal, even as clouds are not eternal. Truth is eternal; and in the consummation of the truth of the gospel, all unbelief will be destroyed by the fruition of the fact.

The Infinite Mistake.

Having shown that there is no Scripture warrant for the assumption that redemption by Christ has for its object *salvation from final perdition*, in the sense of our opponent's proposition, we will proceed to expose the utter and radical mistake which he has committed in his estimate of the spirit and purpose of the Messiah's mission compared with that of Moses, or of the gospel compared with the law. In this second proposition, Dr. Adams labors at considerable length to exhibit the Messiah, in his work as a whole, as more terribly severe than the God of the Old Testament; more unrelenting,—nay, even mercilessly deaf to the pleadings of weakness, suffering and want. He makes the gospel an infinitely more

fearful ministration of wrath than the law. The following are striking specimens of his sentiment on the subject:—

"If upon the failure of all which is done in redemption to save men, they are to be subjected to another probation after death, there are powerful reasons to think that the surest way to effect their recovery, is, to let them know beforehand that God will give them a second trial.

"For this is manifestly the way in which God proceeded with the Hebrew people whose reformation in this world, and whose allegiance he was seeking to secure. In foresight of their apostacy and punishment, they were told beforehand that they should have a second probation. . . . . It might have been argued with much plausibleness, that such an announcement would be inexpedient; that it would have a direct effect to make men careless and presumptuous. But infinite wisdom judged otherwise, and proceeded at different times to say; 'If his children forsake my law, then will I visit their transgression with the rod; nevertheless my loving kindness will I not take utterly from him.' . . . . . What principle in moral natures is there which makes this announcement, to sinners, of future clemency and restoration, wise and expedient? The obvious answer is, Hope. Whether or not there can ever be repentance without hope, it is certain that hope is a powerful means of repentance. . . . . We therefore say, that if no such foretokens of far distant mercy and forgiveness are now made to those who reject Christ, it cannot properly be argued that it would be unsuitable, and that wisdom and prudence forbid. On the contrary, such promises would be in accordance with those former dealings of God with men in which he has manifested the most peculiar love for transgressors.

"We can imagine how Christ would have drawn the picture of retribution had he followed the Old Testament, in doing so, in its hopeful and prophetic intermingling of light with the darkness. Making the prospect terrific, at first, beyond all human power of description, to enforce the duty of immediate repentance, and to

deter from sin, then, appealing to our sense of propriety, our magnanimity, our shame, he would have told us how in the future, more or less remote, God would visit his erring and perverse children with his remonstrances; how he himself would weep over them and repeat the offers of pardon; and in view of all this we can imagine how he would expostulate. Such a procedure would accord with the principles of human nature and of the divine government as illustrated in the history of Israel. Is the Saviour less compassionate and ready to forgive than the God of the Old Testament? for we see God listening to catch the first sigh of repentance. . . . . Is that Old Testament, which is represented by scoffers as 'cruel,' 'sanguinary,' 'vindictive,' actually more merciful in its expressions toward rebellious Israel than the New Testament is toward men who died in their sins."

And the Doctor assumes that it is so; that the last and final act of the Mediator of the new covenant will be, to doom countless millions of the human race to an eternal necessity of sinning and suffering, to bar the door of mercy and of reformation against them forever, and make their endless being an infinite calamity.

Now this is what we denominate an *infinite mistake.* In the first place, it reverses the contrast presented in the Scriptures between the two covenants; and in the second place, it ascribes to the second covenant a spirit and a work which belongs to neither. The prophecies, as we have seen, in describing the work of Messiah's mission, *even in his judgment,* represent it to be, not to seal forever the eyes found blind, but to open the blind eyes; not to bar forever the doors of the poor prisoners found in prison, but to break open the prison doors, and to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of

the prison house. And the New Testament everywhere represents the mission of Christ to be one of love, unconquerable love, love which never faileth. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," (John i. 17.) "For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." (2 Tim. i. 17.) "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." (Rom. viii. 15.) "For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, ... but ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem." (Heb. xii. 18–24.) But if our opponent's doctrine is to be accredited as gospel, the contrast is reversed. For I would leave this mountain of "Orthodox" divinity, and go and cast myself down at the foot of mount Sinai with pleasure. And Sinai's cloud, which, compared with Paul's gospel, was so black and portentous, should, in comparison with this other gospel, appear as the soft cloud of spring which sails along the blue sky; and Sinai's thunder, which, compared with Paul's gospel, was so fearfully terrific, should, in comparison with this other gospel, be as the gentle zephyrs which play along the green meadows. For there was no thunder on Sinai's summit, our opposers themselves being judges, by a million times multiplied without end so terrible, as the doctrine of entire and endless torments.

"The law was given by Moses." The Mosaic cove-

nant was one of statutes and rewards and punishments. Here, then, if endless retributions were true, we should have found them. But no man of respectable information and candor will assert that such retributions are among the provisions of that covenant. "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." It is the revelation of a purpose of grace, according to God's own good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ. (Eph. i. 9, 10.) And my learned friend is inspired with the wisdom of heaven when he so ably argues, that, on the supposition that this "grace" *is* "truth," it is morally good and profitable to preach it. This is a valuable and unreserved testimony to the moral virtue and superior spiritual influence of the full and affectionate ministry of Universalism, *if it be true.* He shows that it is adapted, as a wholesome moral influence, to an essential principle in our moral nature. Herein he harmonizes with the wisdom of God. For Paul says that God hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence in making known this benignant purpose of his grace. (Eph i. 8.)

He, indeed, who apprehends moral harm from the affectionate and faithful ministry to mankind of the universal and never-failing love of God to the children of men, impeaches the wisdom of God in the Gospel. For it is the first aim and effort of the Christian ministry and mission, to commend the love of God to men. "Herein is love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the

propitiation for our sins." And every Christian knows that this love is a spirit which can never fail to desire and seek the ultimate best good of its objects. For God's love is the same spirit which glows in the Christian's heart, when he prays for the redemption, happiness and glory of the great intelligent family of which he is a member. We know that it is so, for "he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him, for God is love." He, therefore, who calculates about being happy in view of the endless sufferings of his neighbors hereafter, because he will then be like God, is mistaking the satanic for the godly spirit. God is love; and the more of his spirit we have in our souls, the more tenderly affectioned we are towards one another.

Another Infinite Mistake.

Associated with the capital error noticed in the foregoing section, is that of mistaking the end of the Mosaic or Jewish age, and the setting up of the Messiah's reign, for the end of the material world, and the close of the reign of Christ. To take those descriptions of events which are associated in the Scriptures with the opening of Christ's mediatorial kingdom, and apply them to its close, is surely an infinite mistake. And this is the mistake of our opponent and his school.

This matter is presented in so clear a light in the Scriptures, that men must read with averted eyes not to see it. The dissolution of the Jewish economy and the introduction of the Christian economy or

Messianic age, is the subject of much prophecy, and prophecy associating with it great convulsions, and a notable judgment. We have had occasion to bring out much of the evidence of this fact in former parts of this discussion. Daniel describes the books opened, and the judgment set, and one like the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, when there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him. Of this coming to set up his kingdom, and the termination of the old economy in judgment, Jesus himself speaks emphatically, (Matt. xvi. 27, 28;) "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall 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." Then, in Matt. 24th and 25th, so extensively considered in our preceding chapter, when Jesus spoke to the disciples of the utter dissolution of the magnificent temple which towered up before them, suggesting to them, of course, a most terrible convulsion terminating the Jewish state and polity, and more perfectly opening the Christian dispensation,—and they asked him when these things should be, and what signs they should look for as betokening his coming and the end of that age, he told them that all these things should be in that generation. And to silence all cavil on the meaning of the word *generation* in this case, we only need recall the terms of the last quotation above, where the same time is describ-

ed by the saying that some present should live to see it. And so in the application of the parable of the tares, Jesus said, so shall it be at the end of *this aionos*, or *age*.

True, the translators, who, working for the church, thought it more likely that the Evangelists used the word *aionos* in a strange latitude of meaning, than that the church was radically wrong in its fundamental doctrines, and so rendered it *world*,—and, to preserve consistency rendered it *world* in Heb. ix. 26, "But now once in the end of the *world*, (*ton aionon*) nath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself,"—where everybody knows that the end of the Mosaic age is meant. And so in 1 Cor. x. 11; "These things are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world, (*ton aionon*, the *ages*) are come." But in this time of general religious study and Biblical criticism, I am unable to find an excuse for the conduct of learned divines in quoting those passages which speak of the end of *aionos*, with the cool unquestioning presumption that they refer to the end of this mundane system.

With regard to *the coming of the Son of man* in connection with that judgment and the change of dispensations, bearing in mind that we are listening to eastern style, this description of it is beautifully truthful and expressive. Just remember that the kingdom of Christ "cometh not with observation," that is, with outward pomp and show, but that it is a spiritual kingdom, — and then contemplate the more visible and practical establishment of his kingdom in

the world through the operation of those convulsions and revolutions which attended the dissolution of the Old dispensation and the inauguration of the New, and you will see the perfect fulfilment of what those passages declare of the coming of the Son of man, not in bodily person, but *in his kingdom, and in power and great glory.*

In respect to this coming of the Son of man, Professor Stuart, in his able article on Matt. 24th and part of 25th, referred to in our preceding Chapter, presents a clear and unquestionable exposition of it. He says, "The language of the Bible respecting the *coming* of God or of Christ, is sufficiently frequent and intelligible to enable us rightly to understand it. In Scripture language, God *comes,* whenever he proceeds to do or execute any purpose of his will in respect to men." And this general statement of fact the Professor sustains and elucidates by ample quotations from Old Testament and New. Among his quotations is one from Jesus to this same coming which is our present subject of remark. When Peter asked him concerning John, Jesus answered, "if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" John was one of those who should not taste of death until they should see the coming in his kingdom of which he spoke.

And here I wish to call particular attention to the occasion there was for Jesus and his apostles to speak often and emphatically of these things, this coming of the Son of man, and the attendant judgment, convulsions, and change of dispensations. It was here

that an important portion of the Old Testament prophecies were to have their fulfilment, and also a great deal of the minute prophetic description by Jesus Christ; and it was out of these convulsions that the church of Christ was to emerge, tried, schooled, cemented, and qualified for the work in the world, which has rolled down to us these Christian privileges and blessings. But they must needs have been instructed over and over in relation to these things, and encouraged, and strengthened, or they could not have kept together, and borne themselves through all these trials and convulsions. In this light of the circumstances, how natural was the earnest admonition and vivid description of Peter, which our opponent quotes to his contrary purpose in this division. Having spoken of the perishing of the old world, i. e. its inhabitants, by the flood of water, he says, (2 Peter iii. 7,) "But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the (a*) day of judgment, and perdition (destruction) of ungodly men." And further this apostle proceeds to describe the approaching convulsions as a dissolution of the heavens, &c., the same figurative style in which our Lord had described them, and the prophets also these and other civil commotions, as abundantly shown by Prof. Stuart in his work before quoted. And that Peter did here refer to the convulsions of that age is evident, from the use which he made of the subject in admonishing

*Here the article is omitted in the Greek, in which case the indefinite article, a, is implied. It is so in numbers of other cases where *a* judgment is spoken of, and our common version uses *the*.

the Christians of the imperious necessity of watchfulness which the consideration of it imposed upon them. "Seeing, then, that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God," &c. To assume that Peter had reference to a literal dissolution of the material world, even yet, after nearly two thousand years, in the distant future, (an event of which the Bible testifies not,) is to make Peter a mere trifler. The reading of this Scripture with care, must impress every mind with the conviction that the apostle was treating on judgments and convulsions then approaching, to pass through which in safety the Christians must needs be ever on their guard, and exercise great circumspection. And the circumstances brought into consideration are all visible to our perception in our present understanding of the general subject.

So with regard to another passage which our opponent quotes in this connection:

"The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all them that believe, for our testimony among you was believed, in that day."

Dr. A. adds:

That this does not apply to the destruction of Jerusalem, as the Papists and some Protestants would have us think, appears from the next chapter, in which the Thessalonians are told that "that day" is not "at hand," because "the man of sin" was first to be revealed.

Our friend puts in this argument against the application of the passage to the judgment which involved the destruction of Jerusalem, with unsuitable haste. The apostle still treats the subject in a manner implying that the day spoken of was to come in their life time. But, from what he says of the church of Thessalonica being troubled by epistle, as from him, it appears that there had a letter been sent them purporting to be apostolical, asserting that the day of the Son of man, of which there had been so much said as being an event to transpire in that generation, was then instantly coming. If this false report were suffered to exert its influence, causing the church to neglect their necessary avocations, and to suffer disappointment and derision, it would conduce to much harm. St. Paul therefore informed them that all the preparatory signs were not yet fulfilled, and they must not be thrown out of their propriety by unauthorized predictions. It proved, indeed, to be about fourteen years after the writing of this epistle to the destruction of Jerusalem.

But that the passage quoted by Dr. A., from the first chapter of this Epistle, refers to the judgment of that generation, is made obvious by the whole connection. The experience of Paul in Thessalonica, recorded in Acts xvii., acquainted him with the fact that there was a powerful synagogue of the Jews in that city who were violent enemies of the Christian church, and stirred up the baser sort of people as instruments of persecution. Referring to this, he says to this church, "We ourselves glory in you in

the churches of God, for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations that ye endure; which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God; . . . . seeing it is a righteous thing with God, to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels," &c. How directly and certainly does this relate to the judgment which was soon to recompense tribulation to the Jews who were the instigators of all the persecutions of that church, and which should give rest to the church; the judgment of the approach of which the very persecutions they were then suffering were manifestly the tokens which their Lord had described. The punishment of that persecuting people with aionion destruction from the presence of the Lord, is paralleled and explained by Jer. xxiii. 39, 40. "Therefore, behold, I, even I, will utterly forget you, and will forsake you, and the city that I gave you and your fathers, and cast you out of my presence; and I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and a perpetual shame which shall not be forgotten." As the temple where dwelt the symbols of the Divine presence was in Jerusalem, and God promised to meet them and manifest his presence to them there, this place became, by way of eminence, to be called the presence of the Lord. Accordingly, by the same metonomy of speech, the dispersion of the people and the destruction of the temple is represented as casting them out from his presence. And so the apostle represents it

as "aionion destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power."

Jesus, (Matt. xxii. 32, and Mark iii. 29,) represents this age of desolation to that people as a state of non-forgiveness. This, too, Dr. Adams includes in his collect of passages in this division. "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, (*aionos*), nor in the aionos to come." "This aionos," as we have seen, was the then present Jewish age. But what was the next coming age? It was the periodical dispensation of the gospel to the Gentiles. When the Jews resisted the word, contradicting and blaspheming, "Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of aionion life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." So, then, the Jews as a people, having contemptuously treated the strongest Christian evidence which God designed to give them in that and the next succeeding age, even ascribing the works of the Holy Spirit to demoniacal agency, which is what is meant by the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, as explained Mark iii. 30, they were to remain in their dark unbelieving state as above described. Forgiveness, in the gospel sense, is deliverance from. The idea is that the people spoken of would not be favored with deliverance from unbelief and sin, during the ages specified.

The same idea is expressed by Mark's record of the same saying of Jesus. Our translators make it

read, "hath never forgiveness; but is in danger of eternal damnation." But the original reads, hath not forgiveness *eis ton aiona*, (to the age) but is in danger of *aionion kriseos*, age-lasting condemnation. Thus the records made by Matthew and Mark agree. Matthew uses the noun, hath not forgiveness in this nor the coming *aionos;* and Mark employs the noun and adjective both; hath not forgiveness to the age, (*eis ton aiona*) but is in danger of *aionion* condemnation.

This unforgiven, unliberated state of darkness to that people, during the age next succeeding the Mosaic, the particular dispensation of the gospel to the Gentiles, is definitely treated by St. Paul, Rom. xi., "What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded,"—to "bow down their back alway. I say then, have they stumbled that they should fall?" or that they should be ultimately lost? "God forbid." "Blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved."

We are here brought to the point where we can profitably criticise the assumption of our opponent, that there is no mingling of merciful consideration, as in the threatenings of the Old Testament dispensation, no gleaming of light and hope from beyond, in connection with the judgment of the Son of man, as propounded by him and his apostles. What an enormous mistake.

In the first place, we find these very denunciations of judgment in the New Testament, which our opponent miscalls the *final* sentence upon the wicked, to be the announcements of the near approach of the very threatenings of the law and the prophets. When Jesus spoke of the severest judgment that ever was or ever should be, he referred to the prophet Daniel's testimony of the same judgment. On the same judgment he says, (Luke xxi. 20–22,) "And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judea flee into the mountains;—for these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled." This is a plain and comprehensive statement of the fact, that all the denunciations of the law and the prophets against that people for their manifold sins, were to have their fulfilment in this train of calamities. There are great principles of duty, and of responsibility to the same perfect government of God, laid down in the Scriptures, alike for all men and all ages. But the distinct denunciations of special and specific judgments in the Scriptures do not extend beyond this, which should terminate the old, and initiate the new economy. These were the days of vengeance, when all things which were written should be fulfilled. But, as St. Paul said of earlier records of judgments on the wicked, "These things happened unto them for ensamples, and they are written for our admonition, on whom the ends of the ages are come."

And here, entirely against the assertion of our

opponent, with regard to this sorest of all judgments denounced in both Testaments, there is a gleam of light, and love, and hope from beyond. In announcing this judgment to Israel, Matt. xxiii. 37–39, which closed the last discourse Jesus ever delivered to that people, this hope is brought to view. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, ... Your house is left unto you desolate; for I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." This is the ascription of praise which the lovers of Jesus rendered him when he rode into Jerusalem, "Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." And this blessed Jesus, who proved himself the friend of universal man, and is the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever, though the law which he honored pronounced a curse upon this corrupt people, and he wept in consideration of the stage of suffering through which they must pass, looked over with serene pleasure to that turn of affairs which was in the future, when these very enemies of his gospel should bless and praise him, as the Sent of the Lord.

And, as we have shown before, the very everlasting punishment for the same people, announced by Jesus in his last discourse to his disciples before his crucifixion, is an *aionion kolosin*, a process of correction which suggests the hope of ultimate good. And in St. Paul's description of the same age-lasting blindness and condemnation of Israel, he does not admit that they have stumbled to a final fall, but proclaims the gospel tidings, that the fulness of the Gentiles shall be brought in and all Israel be saved.

Dr. Adams says, under his seventh proposition, and we reserved the saying for this appropriate connection:—

"I have always been struck by the consideration that the passages from which Universalists infer the final happiness of all men, do not occur in the Bible in connection with the punishment of the wicked. This is of the utmost importance. It is one presumptive proof that, occurring as they do apart from any mention of the punishment of the wicked, they belong to other subjects. And so we find them, in connection with the blessedness of the righteous, the ultimate victories of Christ over his enemies, his final reign, and the happiness of heaven. But we look in vain for passages where promises, prophecies, hints, of ultimate restoration occur in connection with the subject of future punishment."

We are happy to agree with our friend in the position that we do not find the promises of the gospel in connection with the subject of future punishment, there being no such subject, in his sense of the language, in the Bible. And we regard it also as a true saying that, as a general rule, the passages on which we ground our faith in the victory of Christ over all evil, do not occur in connection with the punishment of the wicked.

This remark, however, is not true in the unqualified language in which he has couched it. We have seen that, in various cases, the good design of a favorable issue is declared in connection with the assurances and descriptions of punishment. And in all cases, where the design of punishment is explained, it is shown to be in the spirit of God's universal fatherhood, and his desire for the best ultimate good of his children. But it is gloriously true, that the broad gospel testimonies of the work and the purpose of the

Saviour's mission, are not associated with the subject of punishment; and that for the plain reason, that it is not the design of his mission to save men from deserved punishment. The church in its defection from the purity of the gospel, has been chiefly concerned, not for purification from sin, but for dodging its consequences. *Salvation from punishment* is the leading thought; and they have shaped a theory of gospel redemption in accordance with this thought. In the Catholic Church there are convenient devices to this end, of penances, auricular confessions, absolution, &c., all to facilitate the enjoyment (!) of sin and the shirking of the punishment. There is, however, some little expense attached to these expedients, and the Protestants who retain the substance of Romanism while changing the form, calculate upon the substitution of the sufferings of Christ, made available to them by their faith in the same, as exonerating them from the punishment of their sins. And it is because the mind of our learned friend has been so habitually occupied with this theory of salvation from our just deserts, that it appears to him so note-worthy that the passages which Universalists look to as proofs of their faith do not treat of salvation from punishment.

But the question will be pressed, and, Dr. A. has so frequently made reference to it in his "Argument," we deem it expedient to give it a passing notice, whether the vicarious atonement, or substitutional suffering of Christ, is not a Scriptural doctrine. If not, what mean such Scripture testimonies as these?

"All we, like sheep, have gone astray, but the Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all;" "He died for us, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God;" "He bore our sins in his own body on the tree." What mean these Scriptures? I answer, they mean what they say. Christ bore our sins, he suffered and died for us. But there is an utter difference in principle between one's suffering for another in the prosecution of a work for the other's good, and being punished instead of another as a vicar or substitute. Washington suffered for his country. He bore his country's sufferings and sorrows. And if he had died in battle at the hand of the enemy in prosecuting his country's cause, he would have died for his country. But this would have been utterly different in principle from what it would have been for Washington to have been taken by his own government, the American Congress, and hanged as a spy instead of Major Andre, to let the guilty one go clear. (Such a transaction would have honored no law, human or Divine. It would have been a supreme violation and contempt of all true law.) And there is the same difference in principle between the sense in which Christ suffered for us according to the Scriptures, and that assumed by the vicarious theology. "He suffered for us," not that he might purchase for us impunity for sin, but "that he might bring us to God." It was the purpose of his mission to draw, or reconcile, all men to God; to raise them out of ignorance, darkness, unreconciliation, sin and death, and elevate them in

spirit to the communion and likeness of God. And that love which is attested and sealed by his sufferings and death, is the attracting and assimilating power by which this recovery and spiritual elevation shall be effected. So it is every where represented in the Scriptures.

But there is a key text at hand, which opens to view the sense in which Jesus bore our sins. See Matt. viii. 16, 17. "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed of demons; and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." *How* did Jesus fulfil the saying, "Himself bare our sicknesses?" Was it by becoming sick in their stead? When he met persons sick of a fever, did he have the fever transferred to his own body, and become sick of a fever as a substitute? When he found the blind, deaf, dumb, lame, epileptic and insane, did he become blind, deaf, dumb, lame, epileptic and insane in their stead? Is this the manner in which he fulfilled the saying, "Himself bare our sicknesses?" Never. How then? Our key text explains it. "He *healed* all that were sick, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." He bore their sicknesses by love and sympathy, and taking on himself the charge of the case, and the mission of healing. The mother bears the sickness of her child;—not by becoming

sick in the child's stead. That would do the child no good. She would not be able to bear the sickness of the child if she were not well herself. She bears the child's sickness in sympathy, and care, and the appliance of means for its restoration.

Now as the saying was fulfilled, "Himself bare our sicknesses," by healing their sicknesses, so he fulfils the saying, "He bore our sins," or our spiritual disorders, by healing us of sin. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." And all his labors and sufferings, even unto death, in the prosecution of this great work, are for us, performed and borne on our account. But he gives us no impunity for sin. We must ourselves bear the condemnation and all the evils of sin while we continue in sin. And Jesus saves us from continued condemnation, only by leading us out of the moral condition which involves condemnation. "He shall save his people from their sins." "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." And, speculate ever so much about substitutions, there is no way to become free from condemnation, but to be made free from the law or power of sin and death, by the law or power of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. And when this conformity to the law of the spirit of life takes place, there is no law that can condemn us. The law is then honored and fulfilled in and by us, and there is no demand for a substitute to receive the strokes of vengeance in our stead for the satisfaction of the law.

But when our opponent represents this theory, which shows all the perfections of God in beautiful harmony, and the scheme of Christian salvation in harmony with all, as involving the idea that we procure salvation by our own merits or sufferings, he speaks without clear perceptions of the subject. And this he does allege. He says,

> There is no adequate necessity for a divine Saviour with his vicarious sacrifice, if there be no penalty annexed to the law of God. Every man is then his own redeemer, either by obedience or by suffering.

By penalty he means endless punishment; but he should not seek covertly to give the impression to his readers, that by denying *endless* punishment, we deny *all* punishment, and thus annul the penalty of the law. But it is true that our view of the Divine government as prosecuting a wise and benevolent system of law and judgment, and promise and grace, does not present a necessity for a *vicarious* sacrifice, in the trinitarian sense of the word. Nevertheless, the Doctor's inference is not correct, that "every man is then his own redeemer, either by obedience or by suffering." We often hear substantially the same objection flippantly urged to our theory of God's perfect retributive government rendering to every man according to his deserts,—in words like these,—"Then salvation is not of grace; the sinner will demand admittance to heaven as a right, having served out his term of punishment." These arguments appear exceedingly puerile to one who is well read in the Scripture teachings of the work and

purpose of grace in Christ Jesus. The mistake all proceeds from the fabricated theory above exploded, that Christian salvation is salvation from incurred punishment. When the mind is saturated with this error, knowing nothing of the scheme of grace but salvation from punishment, it appears to be a matter of course that if sinners are made to suffer the punishment of their sins, there is nothing for them to be saved from, they work out their claim to heaven by punishment.

In the same false view of the Divine administration, the question is emphatically propounded, "If men must suffer the punishment of their own sins, of what use is a Saviour?" Permit me to reflect the wisdom of this question in another application. If the sick man must suffer the pain and inconvenience of his own sickness, of what use is a physician? Why, you will answer, this circumstance renders the service of the physician, or some means of healing, of the greater importance to the patient. If he could be sick, and some other person suffer all the pain in his stead, being selfish, he might be indifferent about being healed. But the fact that he must suffer the evil of his own sickness, renders it the more important to him to have his disease removed, that he may be freed from his sufferings. So the fact that men must suffer the punishment of their own sins, renders it a matter of peculiar personal interest to them to be healed. And every religious teacher ought to understand that sin is the curse of human life; that it is a lost estate, a state of poverty, perishing, famine,

drought, disease, death. And he who is raised from this degradation, and delivered from this curse, by the spirit of truth and love through Jesus Christ, feels even more deeply impressed with the merits of that grace which has saved him, for the realization of the fact that when he was in unbelief and sin he suffered its evils.

But they who ignore the perfection of God's moral government to the rendering of every man according to his work, in order to find place for their artificial scheme of salvation by grace, making it to be absolution from punishment, must strike out a large portion of the sacred record. This doctrine of strict moral accountability is prominent in the Bible from beginning to end, and it is in perfect harmony with the gospel doctrine of grace. For the things which are inflicted or bestowed as the reward of our works, are not the things which are "not according to our works, but according to the purpose and grace of God given us in Christ Jesus before the world began," and "brought to light through the gospel." The subject is a simple one. If a father governs his children in part by means of rewards and chastisements, and in due time puts them in possession of the gift of a life estate, will they say that this estate is not a gift, because they received chastisements in their childhood? Verily, "the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God."

In further proof of the doctrine that judgment is put off to the end of Messiah's reign, and that its decisions shall bind sinners to an eternal neces-

sity of sinning, Dr. A. quotes and comments as follows:—

At the very close of the Bible, we read, "He that is unjust let him be unjust still, and he that 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." As the "unjust" and "filthy" never could be directed to refrain, in this world, from efforts to become good, (unless their day of grace were past) these words are obviously a declaration that character is unchangeable after death.

The Doctor goes on, not to explain, but to declaim, on the absence of all intimation of mercy and salvation beyond the judgment announced by these "closing words of the Bible."

Now this is an instance in which duty requires us to be fraternally faithful, and "reprove and rebuke with long-suffering and doctrine." When we shall have acquainted our readers with all the circumstances connected with the introduction of this passage here, and the manner of it, they will see it to be a remarkable specimen of forensic *sang froid.* The circumstances to which we refer are the following:—Dr. Adams, last spring, delivered and published a sermon on the "Reasonableness of Future, Endless Punishment." We reviewed that sermon in our columns, and at the close addressed a note to the Doctor which originated this discussion of the "Scripturalness of Future, Endless Punishment." In that sermon he brought forward this passage from the last chapter of Revelation, in the same manner and application as above. In our review of the sermon, which he of course read, we treated his use of this passage in the following manner:

"We have seen how extremely reckless he is in his use of the other passage, Eccl. ix. 10, making it deny all human immortality; and now we shall see that his use of Rev. xxii. 11, is no less faulty. And it is hardly enough to say that it is faulty. It is reprehensible. In some men such a use of this passage would be no more than faulty. But it is difficult to conceive that a gentleman of the talent, education, and theological enterprise of Dr. Adams, could innocently, and without guile, make the use he does of this and the other passage of the sacred record. In the case now before us he attempts, in the outset, to impose on his hearers the impression that the idea of its announcing a *finality* is involved in the place which this passage occupies in the Bible, it being among its "closing words." There is not, in any point of view, any weight in this argument, if argument it may be called. The sense of the passage is to be gathered, not from its locality in the compilation of sacred books, but from its expression, and the subject to which it refers. But as a matter of fact we will say, that it is not a settled point among the learned, that the book of Revelation was the latest written of the books of the New Testament. Dr. Adam Clarke, who is second to no one in profundity of Biblical lore, assures us that "the most respectable" external evidence assigns the date of Revelation to a time before the destruction of Jerusalem; that is, before the year 70. Whereas some of the Christian critics of the early ages assign to the *Gospel* of John as late a date as A. D. 98. But we will not multiply words on this point. The fact

that the Council which compiled the books of the New Testament placed revelation at the last end of the volume affects not the meaning of any passage in it. We will look at the passage in its expression, and its connections.

Dr. Adams gives out the words of the passage in question, as the words which shall announce the final decision of the final judgment, announcing the ultimate doom of mankind. Is it so? It seems almost like children's play to be in a colloquy which requires the starting of such a question. The passage does not admit of any such construction. It is an outright *wresting* of the Scripture to drag it into such an application. The following is the passage entire:—"And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book; for the time is at hand. 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 behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be."

Now, whatever may be the time and occasion of this coming of the Son of man to judgment, it is seen that the words, "He that is unjust let him be unjust still," are not here written as the award of that judgment, but as descriptive of a state of things to precede it. "Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book; *for the time is at hand.*—He that is unjust let him be unjust still, and behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me." What that reward should be

is not here defined. But the fact described by the saying, "he that is unjust let him be unjust still," is the continuance of things as they were *until* he should come in the judgment referred to.

Suppose a father has been sometime absent from his family in a distant land, having left the children with certain rules of order. He hears that there is insubordination and evil in the family, and he writes to his son whom he has appointed supervisor, enjoining upon him not to employ undue rashness in his efforts to subdue the unruly. "If," he says, "any will be unruly, in spite of your reasonable efforts, you should let it be so; and let the obedient be obedient; and I shall come home quickly and discipline the offenders, and establish order." Then suppose one of the *would be* leaders among the children should get hold of that letter, and of this clause in particular, and thus harrangue the family: —"Our father is coming home shortly, and he says that it will be his judgment that the children who have been disorderly *shall be always disorderly*, shall never love or obey him, but shall make disorder and crime their life-employment." This interpretation of the father's letter does not set the father before the family in a very honorable light, and they demand to read the letter for themselves. With what a look of contempt would they frown upon the arrant expounder on perusing the document; and if he had a sense of propriety left, with what shame would he shrink away." (See *Christian Freeman* of June 25th, 1858.)

And now, after all this, our friend comes to us with

an article written expressly for our paper, thrusting forward this passage in the same way and manner, without deigning to attempt any sort of argument, just as if his use of it were unquestionably correct. He pays no attention to the fact which we adduced, that John was directed, and that over again here at the close of his series of visions, not to seal the sayings of the prophecies of this book, because the time of their fulfilment was *at hand*—the scenes represented in the visions being about to open in the line of fulfilment; and that the saying, "He that is unjust let him be unjust still," related to a suspension of effective gospel operations for a time before the coming of Christ in the judgment referred to in verse 12. His course reminds us of what the sacred historian says of Gallio on a different occasion, that he "cared for none of these things." Does he presume that his hearers and readers, generally, "care for none of these things?"

But, in respect to our former reply to our worthy friend's use of this passage, we do not ascribe his utter inattention to its facts and reasonings to intentional discourtesy toward us, or disrespect toward the Scriptures, but rather to a consciousness of danger to his argument in case of his turning aside from his accustomed way, to attend to new considerations.

With regard to the announcement in this place, that the Lord had "sent his angel to show unto his servants the things that must shortly be done;" that the prophecies of this book were not to be sealed because "the time was at hand;" and that he that was

unjust should be unjust still, and the Lord would *come quickly;* we see not how any attentive Bible student can fail to perceive that it all refers to the coming of Christ, and the concomitant judgment, at the end of the Jewish age, of which the Scriptures have so fully informed us. With regard to the unjust, and the righteous also, remaining for the time being as they were, it is a very impressive description of the facts of that period of time. On pages 208–211 of this Discussion, we have adduced the "most respectable testimony" of ecclesiastical historians and Biblical critics for this book's having been written just before the destruction of Jerusalem; and we have brought to view the internal evidence of the book itself to concur with the external evidence in making it a settled question. And with regard to the continuance of the determined enemies of the gospel, as a general rule, in their blindness and perversity, through the events of that period, the inspired teachers repeatedly mentioned it, earlier than the date of the book of Revelation. Jesus said to the Jews, "O that thou hadst known, even thou at least in this thy day, the things that belong to thy peace; but now they are hid from thine eyes." And St. Paul said, "Blindness in part is happened unto Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." And especially when the Revelator had his visions, as the dissolution of their church and polity was just at hand, the prevalence of war, persecution, and ten thousand evils, was such, that the most which could be expected was to hold the true servants of Jesus in

their fidelity; there could not be any new conversions made to the Christian cause from the banded foes of the truth. This is clearly the fact signified by the words of the angel, "the time is at hand:—he that is unjust let him be unjust still; and he that is righteous let him be righteous still; and behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me to give every man according as his work shall be." (See again Matt. xvi. 27, 28; xxiv. 29–34; Luke xxi. 20–32.) But it is not the purpose of Messiah's judgment, to sanctify, immortalize, and eternize the reign of darkness and sin. To "make an end of sin" is the purpose of his mission.

Dr. A. proceeds to another collect of fragmentary Scripture quotations with the view to favor his position. Most of these scraps of texts we have had in other parts of his "Argument," and have explained them by their connections. This collect of isolated phrases he introduces in these words;—"Mark the altered language, and different tone and manner, of the Saviour toward the wicked in the other world." The new selections are these: "Shut to the door;" "Depart from me;" "Bind him hand and foot;" "Thrust out;" "Be cast away;" "Salted with fire," which is a part of a passage before explained, referring to the fire of the valley of Hinnom; "Grind him to powder;" "Slay them before me." Of course the Doctor might as well have quoted any other isolated phrases and parts of phrases as spoken of the wicked in the other world;—such as, "Let him that is on the house top not come down;" "Cast him forth into

the sea;" "We are cut off for our parts;" "Hide thy face from us;" "Much more the wicked and the sinner" "shall be recompensed in the earth;" "They have rebelled against me;" "Go and do thou likewise;" "These (when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, Luke xxi. 22,) be the days of vengeance." Acres of paper might be covered with this sort of promiscuous reprint of detached Scripture phraseology to no edification. These quotations transcribed above from the Doctor's "Argument," the reader will find by perusing them in their connections, are abstracted from parables which relate to the coming of the Gentiles into the gospel kingdom while the Jews, as a people, would be outcasts; and in general to the same vengeance spoken of in the last quoted passage, "These be the days of vengeance."

And here are the rest of the Doctor's new selections in this department:—"Wrath to come." This was spoken to the Pharisees and Sadducees by John the Baptist, when he saw them coming to his baptism; "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" Dr. Clarke justly explains this wrath to come, or *about to come*, as follows; "The desolation which was about to fall on the Jewish nation for their wickedness, and threatened in the last words of their own Scriptures." It is described more definitely by our Lord, in the passage which we quoted above in part; "For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But wo unto them that are with child, and

to them that give suck in those days; for there shall be great distress in that land, and *wrath upon this people.*" But our friend finds the words, "wrath to come," and he cares not to look farther. And his next fragment is, "Torment us before the time;" a part of the words used by the maniac among the tombs, speaking for the demons that he imagined dwelt in him, saying to Jesus, "Art thou come to torment us before the time?" obviously referring to periodical turns of severer paroxysms of mania and suffering, which he was fearful that the presence of Jesus would hasten before the usual time. Next, "Reap corruption." This is a part of a sentence from Paul, "He that soweth to the flesh shall *of the flesh* reap corruption;" proving that men, while in the flesh, reap the bitter fruits of their service of fleshly lusts,—as the same apostle describes it in Rom. i. 27, "receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet." But our friend wanted this testimony for the next world; and what law of Scripture exegesis does he recognize which should restrain him from so using it? Again, the Doctor;—"The wages of sin is death." Indeed, but there is deliverance from this death; for John says, "We know that we have passed from death (in sin) unto life, because we love the brethren." "You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." Yet again; "More tolerable for Sodom in the day of judgment." This phraseology was spoken by our Lord, (Matt. x. 15, and other places,) of those cities of Israel which should reject his gospel and persecute

his disciples. It shall be more tolerable for the *land of Sodom* than for *that city*. Of course temporal judgments were referred to, for lands and cities are not to be raised in the resurrection. Both in prophecy and history the calamities on Jerusalem and the cities of Judea, are represented as exceeding in severity all that had befallen any other city, or nation. This appears to be the sentiment of our Lord's words before us. Dr. Clarke on this passage, notwithstanding he needed Dr. Adams' use of it for his creed's sake, could not shut his eyes to the plain truth in the case, and he comments thus:—"*In the day of judgment*, or *punishment*, *kriseos*. Perhaps not meaning *the day of general judgment*, nor the day of the *destruction of the Jewish state by the Romans*, but a day on which God should send *punishment* on that particular city, or on the person, for their crimes. So the *day of judgment* of *Sodom and Gomorrah*, was the time when the Lord destroyed them by fire and brimstone from the Lord out of heaven." The future tense employed by our Lord, "it *shall* be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for that city," was the most convenient method of throwing the calamities of Sodom into contrast with those which were to come on the other cities spoken of; as if he had said, so much more terrible shall be the judgment from God upon the cities of Israel, that the judgment which desolated Sodom shall appear more tolerable in comparison.

And yet another Scripture fragment from Dr. A.—"I will laugh at your calamity; I will mock

when your fear cometh." This is the address of wisdom personified, to the foolish, written in Prov. i. How true is it that when a young man disregards the counsels of wisdom, and gives himself up to vice and folly, or to the indulgence of any appetite or passion in a hurtful manner, until he finds himself experimentally a victim of suffering, he can not at his own pleasure will himself into a state of freedom from the long accumulating evils. His desires for the serene comforts and enjoyments which habitual temperance and virtue should have yielded are for a time unavailing, which fact is expressed by the saying of the slighted wisdom personified, "I will laugh at your calamity." The idea is further developed in verses 30, 31;—"They would none of my counsel; they despised all my reproof. Therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices." This is a principle of common observation and experience under the Divine administration. Nevertheless, a long and faithful course of reform will gradually extirpate the evil, and supplant it with good. But they must experience the painful necessity of eating the fruit of their own devices.

It is far from a harmless error, to give such a passage as this, "I will laugh at your calamity," a literal construction, with a personal application to our heavenly Father, as expressing his spirit and conduct towards his children in distress, and that even through eternity. And the same irreverence and dishonor towards God is involved in the use made by our friend of the words of Paul, "It is a

fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God;"—"For our God is a consuming fire." The application of this to the event of falling into God's more immediate presence beyond death, to make that a dreadful and fearful thing, has been a cruel source of agony to millions of sick and dying men, women and children, even of the best characters, when Christian truth would have enabled them to cast themselves confidingly upon the bosom of the Father's love. Literally, we are in the hand of God always. "In him we live, and move, and have our being." St. Paul, in the chapter in which those words occur, Heb. x., was treating on a temporal calamity, which was seen to be then "approaching." (Verse 25.) The obvious meaning is, that it was a fearful thing to fall under the retributive judgment of God. The chapter explains itself.

Two passages more complete the list of Dr. A.'s proof texts adduced in this division; two more, we mean, which have not been found and explained in other parts of the discussion. "Who have fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us." (Heb. vi. 18.) The saints of old familiarily spoke of God as their "refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble." And the soul of every enlightened believer in the gospel now, thrills to the description given by St. Paul in connection with the above quoted fragment, of the permanency of the Christian faith, resting on "two immutable things," the promise and oath, "in which it was impossible for God to lie," so that "we might have strong consolation who have

fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us; which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast." But neither through this promise, nor oath, nor steadfast hope, does the enlightened Christian see anything of Future, Endless Punishment."

One text more :—" What shall it profit a man, if he should gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" (Matt. xvi. 26; Mark viii. 36. 37.) We have long entertained and expressed the conviction, that no educated man can, in this time of extensive Biblical discussion and criticism, innocently use this text as a proof of future endless punishment. And now what shall we say? We feel grieved. We are sorry that the Doctor has used the passage in this manner, for we are pained to think of a Christian teacher whom we respect so sincerely, as trifling with the Scriptures, and with the understandings of men. He knows that the same original word is twice used in the preceding verse, with which this is expressly or grammatically connected by the conjunction *for*, where it is rendered *life*, and cannot be taken to mean anything but the animal life ;—thus :—" For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life (*psuke*) for my sake and the gospels', shall save it. For what shall it profit a man, if he should gain the whole world and lose his own (*psuke*) life?" None will assume that the word *psuke* in the 26th verse means the immortal resurrection state of man,—that whosoever will seek to save his immortal

existence shall lose it. All will agree that Jesus designed to teach his disciples that if, in the approaching critical times, any of them should seek to save their lives, or escape temporal dangers, by apostacy, they would by this very means be thrown into the greatest dangers, and expose themselves to the loss even of life. And then this verse quoted by the Doctor is simply a quotation made by Jesus of a common Jewish maxim, for illustrating the importance of the admonition of the preceding verse. It was a common saying among the Jews, against the folly of rashness, "What is a man profited if he gain the whole world, and lose his own life?" The idea is, that as it is the leading object of men's labors to provide for the support and comfort of life, to throw away their lives by rash exposure is extremely unwise. And surely, by quoting this Jewish saying to illustrate the point of his own admonition to his disciples against an expedient for saving their life which would more likely expose them to the loss of it, Jesus did not change the sense of the maxim.

There is no need of our referring to any learned authority to confirm our position here, for it rests on the simple facts of the record, which every educated man knows, and almost every uneducated man also, so familiarly have these facts been brought out in religious discussion. But we will, nevertheless, quote the words of comment on Matt. xvi. 26, by that Biblical critic of eminent learning, Dr. Adam Clarke. He says, "On what authority many have translated the word ψυχη in the 25th verse, *life*, and in this verse,

soul, I know not; but am certain it means *life* in both places. If a man should gain the whole world, its riches, honors and pleasures, and lose his *life*, what would all these things profit him, seeing that they can only be enjoyed during *life*?"

Dr. Adams, in a place responded to by us on pages 405-8 of this discussion, expresses wonder that, if the doctrine of endless punishment is not taught in the Scriptures, it should have got into the church, and especially that it should be retained by so many good and learned men to this day. But I think that most of our readers will agree in the remark, that when one good and learned man has seriously advanced *such* Scripture texts in proof of "Future, Endless Punishment," there is no longer any wonder that thousands of others should do likewise.

"*After this the Judgment.*"

There is one passage which Dr. Adams has not quoted, but which, nevertheless, we will briefly notice here, because, by force of popular usage, it has obtained a place in many minds as a proof of a post mortem day of judgment. By this means we shall also accommodate a friend who has written us a request that we explain this text. The passage referred to is Heb. ix. 27. "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." But this is only a part of the sentence, and makes no sense of itself. It is only the first factor of a comparison. "And, *as* it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this

the judgment"—well, *what* is *as* it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment? It is this, viz: "so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." What death, and the death of what men, has Paul been speaking of in this connection, and what entering into judgment after this,—as figurative of Christ's being once offered to bear the sins of many, and then entering into heaven itself, and thence appearing without a sin-offering unto salvation? Read the whole chapter with care, and you will see that the subject of the apostle throughout is the Mosaic sacrifices, particularly the high priest entering once a year into the holy of holies with the blood of sprinkling, as prefiguring Christ's offering himself once for all, and with his own blood entering into heaven itself, there to appear in the presence of God for us. And the holy of holies into which those men officiating in the priestly office entered after the sacrifice in the outer court, is what is here meant by the judgment. Turn to Exodus xxviii. 29, 30. "And Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel in the breast-plate of judgment upon his heart, when he goeth in unto the holy place; . . . . and Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the Lord continually." Hence it is seen that the men unto whom it was appointed once to die (that is, to die by proxy in the sacrifice slain in the outer court, which was accepted as the death of these men, and who after this entered into the place of judgment, bearing the judgment of the children of Israel,) were the men in the priestly office. And in

the original of this passage in Hebrews, as our friend well knows, the *article* is placed before *men*. "And as it is appointed (*tois anthropois*) unto *the* men," thus designating the particular men of whom he had been speaking as offering the blood of sprinkling typically,— as it is appointed by arrangement of the ceremonial law, unto these men to die once every time, which was once a year, to represent their own death in that of the sacrifice, and after this go for the people into the place of judgment, and thence appear again unto the people with the announcement of their ceremonial justification, *so Christ was once offered*, not by the proxies of bulls and goats (v. 12,) but in person, with his own blood, to bear the sins of the many, and to them that look for him, to them who seek unto him, will he appear a second time, spiritually, without a sin-offering, (as the word here rendered *sin* often means) unto salvation. This is the privilege of the true believer, to enjoy communion with the presence of our high Priest above, "who knows how to be touched with the feelings of our infirmities."

Such, we think, every candid and attentive Bible student, on studying this chapter, will see to be the sentiment of the passage in question. He will see that the natural death of man as a species, and a judgment after that for adjudication, are not matters introduced here at all, as they are never denoted as figures of Christ's sacrificial death, and subsequent exaltation.

Extent of Gospel Provision.

In an ingenious effort to give a quietus to the question, "How, allowing endless retribution to be a Scriptural doctrine, can you have peace of mind in your belief?" Dr. Adams answers as follows:

> We believe that no one will perish who does not reject the Saviour of the world; or, if he be a heathen, does not sin against light and conviction sufficient to save him.
>
> It has an effect to quiet our minds when we reflect that our thoughts and feelings at the loss of the soul were surpassed in Him whose soul for us was exceeding sorrowful even unto death. Tears were shed by him over sinners: "God hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." If the thought of endless retribution is so terrible to us who know so little about it, we are constrained to think that there was never any sorrow like unto the sorrow of him who loved us and gave himself for us, when he sees that he must, nevertheless, pronounce upon any for whom he died, the sentence of that everlasting punishment from which he became incarnate and died to save us.

In an earlier part of the "Argument" he had said:

> "If God does not use all proper means here to save men, how is he infinitely merciful?"

Here we pause to inquire, What does our learned friend mean by all this? What, in his view, *is* the Divine method of salvation? In the economy of grace through Jesus Christ, which is the only revealed economy of salvation, what *are* "the proper means to save men?"

On this question the Doctor has more recently given the public an exposition through another

medium, more full and explicit than he deigned to give us in the "Argument" for our columns. On Tuesday evening, Feb. 8th, 1859, he delivered in the Vestry of his own Church a "Doctrinal Lecture," on "The Certain Perseverance of the Regenerate." In this lecture, as reported for the *Boston Daily Transcript*, he holds the following sentiments:—

We read in the Bible of a book which is older than the Bible itself. It is mentioned seven times in Revelation, and once in Philippians. It is called "The Lamb's Book of Life." It is said to have been "written from the foundation of the world." When it is called "The *Lamb's* book," the meaning is, it contains the results of the work of redemption. The Lamb is said to be "slain from the foundation of the world;" that is, the government of the world began with the atonement in view. It was the same as though Christ had been crucified from the beginning; sins were forgiven, from the first, on the ground of his sufferings and death.

Some of the passages which speak of this Book of Life distinctly assert that all will not be saved. Now, is this record of those who will be saved a mere historical record, or is it a decretive enactment? Plainly the latter. The mere record of those who were, of their own unassisted choice, to be saved, would not amount to anything. The book might as well be written the day after the judgment as from the beginning of time, if it were a mere historical account.

In the universal aberrance of man from God, he has proposed to make many willing—a multitude which no man can number. He will effect their salvation. But how? First—Through regeneration; and secondly—By warnings, promises, threatenings—treating them as subjects of motives, not of force. Though "another book was opened" at the judgment, before the seer's eye, "which is the book of life," yet he says, "the dead were judged out of the things which were written in *the books according to their works*." The book of life, *though written first*, will correspond

exactly to the reports of the historical records of men's lives, as a ledger contains the exact summing up of entries made in a day-book through years.

This is explicit. The method, and the only method of salvation is, God's regenerating men by his spirit, and making them willing, and holding them by his power within the circle of such influences as shall infallibly carry them through to the final heaven. All whom, before the world was, he wrote in the book of life, he will thus save. For the others, of course, there is no way of salvation. Consequently the Doctor accuses God, by his own showing, of unmerciful dealing with his children. For he says, "If God does not use all proper means here to save men," speaking of the class of men who, he supposes, are to be ultimately cast off, "how is he infinitely merciful?" The only "proper means to save men," according to his showing, is the exertion upon them of God's regenerating spirit as above described. There is no such means employed in relation to the non-elect, and of course no proper means at all. Nor has our friend, in point of fact, any such expedient as he has propounded, for molifying his own grief for the finally lost, viz: the contrast of it with the greater grief of the Son of God for their rejection of his provisions of grace for them,—seeing that there never was any provision of grace in him for those whose names were not written before the world was, in the Lamb's book of life. And this same theory of salvation, though seldom propounded of late with the boldness of Dr. Adams, is necessarily involved in the

Confession of Faith of all the reputed Orthodox churches. Consequently the honied words which we hear from the ministers of those churches, of God's love to all men as manifested in Christ Jesus, and the provisions of grace in him for the salvation of all, and his yearning over them with a Father's solicitude for their ultimate good,—these loving words, I say, while they indicate what these teachers think the gospel *should* be, yet come from the bosom of the creed as incongruously as tropical breezes from the frigid zone.

What does our esteemed friend mean by saying, that no one will perish, that is, finally, even if he be a heathen, "who does not sin against light and conviction sufficient to save him?" Does he believe that any person will attain to the inheritance of heaven by the cultivation and improvement merely of his own natural and moral faculties? Not he. He says in his lecture as quoted above, "The mere recording of those who were, of their own unassisted choice, to be saved, would not amount to any thing." Suppose that a company of heathens should present themselves at the gate of heaven, asking admission on the ground that they had done respectably well in the way of observing the laws of their physical nature, and as far as they understood them, the laws of their social relations,—and that the Judge should refer the case to a council of Augustinian or Calvinistic Doctors of Divinity. Would they decide that these temperate and virtuous heathen were proper subjects, according to the accepted Canons, for admission to the blessed abode? Not they. They

would as certainly decide that those heathen moralists should be excluded from the company of the redeemed in heaven, as the council of "The World's Evangelical Alliance" decided to exclude from their conclave Unitarians and Universalists. No; according to our opponent's theory, there is no way provided for the salvation of those whom God shall not be pleased to regenerate and save. We can see exposed here and there, all through his protracted "Argument," the contortions and writhings of our benevolent friend's sensitive soul, at the grating contact with his moral nature of this iron theory. The idea that God has created countless millions of immortals with helpless moral natures, and a determination not to help them,—and with a hereditary disease which shall be an endless protracted agony,—this idea, I say, manifestly troubles him. But he labors to bend his "natural feelings" to it, and he hopes that, when he comes to be like God, and see as *he* sees, his moral nature will be toned to the spirit of the terrible economy. But it will be unto him and his kindred theologians a joy unspeakable and full of glory, to see and know as there they will, that as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are God's ways higher than their ways, and his thoughts than their thoughts.

Method and Consummation of Messiah's Mission.

We spoke, in the early part of this Chapter, of the INFINITE MISTAKE, of taking the end of the Jewish age, in the numerous and explicit Bible

descriptions of that event, to be the end of the material world; and the events associated with the simultaneous setting up of Messiah's kingdom, to be concomitants of the end of his reign. The first branch of this hideous mistake, relating to the end of the Jewish age, we then proceeded to correct by authority of the record; and now, in bringing this protracted discussion to a close, we will correct, by the same authority, the other branch of the mistake. The two branches, however, are really one mistake; for as the end of the material world and that of the mediatorial reign have been taken to be simultaneous events, the transfer to the end of the material world of the judgments and commotions associated in the Scriptures with the termination of the Jewish church and polity, and the connection of the same events with the termination of the Messianic age, are one and the same error.

We have shown that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments abundantly testify of a notable judgment, and of great convulsions affecting the world, and especially the Jewish people, in connection with the change of dispensations; the termination of the Old and the inauguration of the New; the dissolution of the Mosaic and the setting up of the Messianic reign. We will now call attention to the fact, that *there is nowhere in the Scriptures any retributive judgment, and dispensation of rewards and punishments,* associated with the closing up of the work of Christ's mission, or the consummation of the Messianic age. In all cases where the Saviour's mission is spoken of

as a whole, in its specific purpose and its full consummation, it is described, not as tearing dear friends asunder and thrusting them apart forever, some to endless wickedness and woe,—but as terminating all divisions, all alienations, all unreconciliation and sin, and uniting, harmonizing, beatifying, gathering together in one, and in harmony with the spirit of God, all rational beings. As we have seen, he was to bruise the serpent's head. (Gen. iii. 15.) The consummation of this work will exterminate the reign of moral evil, and leave universal good in harmony. In the covenant of his grace, the Lord God purposed to swallow up death in victory, and wipe away tears from off all faces. (Isa. xxv. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 54.) Then there will be no more death, nor sorrow, nor crying; no more wailing and gnashing of teeth. Of him who gave himself a ransom for all, it is written that he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied. (1 Tim. ii. 6; Isa. liii. 41.) And to see of the travail of one's soul to entire satisfaction, is to accomplish his purpose and realize his wishes. Jesus declared that he came to seek and to save that which was lost, and represents his faithfulness to be as that of the shepherd who will never abandon his pursuit until the last lost sheep is brought home. (Luke xix. 10; xv. 3–6.) St. John declares, (1 John iii. 8,) "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." On the consummation of this purpose sin will cease to be, to alienate men from God or from one another. St. Paul says, (Eph. i. 9, 10,) that God hath "made known unto us the

mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him." Here is the revelation of a purpose of God, which he hath purposed, not in any fallible agency which should leave it at loose ends, but *in himself;* that is, in a reliance on his own efficiency for its consummation. And this purpose is, the gathering together in one in due time, of all things, or moral beings, in the light and spirit of Christ.

But not unduly to protract this labor by the multiplication of Scripture testimonies to this point, we will make it suffice to adduce one other which was of course brought to notice in our Chapter on the resurrection, pages 323–4. When all who die in Adam shall be made alive in Christ, in spiritual bodies, in incorruption, in power, in glory, "Then cometh the end," not the end of the Jewish age, but of the Messianic age, the ultimatum of the Saviour's mission,—" when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power." No Satan's kingdom then, holding rule, authority and power, over a full moiety of the moral universe. When Christ resigns the mediatorial reign, he will have accomplished its purpose, and put down, destroyed, all rule but his own, and all authority and power, leaving no vestige of truth in Dr. A.'s assumption, " that some proportion of pain and misery will

forever exist under the government of God." Blessed be God, no: Christ will make no compromise with evil. He will not share with Satan the throne of eternity; but he will resign to the Father a victorious reign, and he himself, as the Head of every man, be subject to him who put all things under him, that God may be all in all. (1 Cor. xv.)

Dr. Adams, having enumerated certain descriptions of vile persons, says under his first proposition, "He who will say that such persons as are here described meet in death with a change of character which prepares them at once for happiness, may as well assert, once for all, that delusion is practised upon us by the representations of the Bible." My dear friend; we do not ascribe to *death* the power to work this glorious moral regeneration. Death dissolves the "earthly house of this tabernacle," with its appetites and acquired habits. It is "by the power of God," (Mark xii. 24,) through him who is "the resurrection and the life," that we shall be raised into a higher life, in spiritual bodies, all whose passions and affections shall be pure. And it shall be by the knowledge of God's glorious power, which will have been effectively realized in the process of our translation, and of his love, which shall shine to our clearer spiritual vision with effulgence in the face of Jesus Christ, and with which the atmosphere of that spirit-world shall be fragrant, that our hearts will be so filled with reverence and love as to yield no room for unreconciliation and sin, but glow and expand in adoration and praise.

If our friend wishes to philosophize on this subject, and raise difficulties from the nature and relations of things in the moral system, we are prepared to meet him. If he will explain to us how, on principles of moral philosophy, the different wings of the "Orthodox" church, whose religious journals are bitterly accusing each other of "falsehood," "treachery," "spite," "malice," and all the nameable moral obliquities, can be prepared, through death and the resurrection, and the light and spirit of the better world, to constitute a harmonious and happy society there, we will undertake to explain for all the rest on the same principles. For it will require a greater effort of grace to eradicate those intellectual and religious animosities which are ingrained in the soul, than to remove the vicious propensities of the vulgar herd, who are miserable slaves to sensual and fleshly appetites and passions which they unceasingly deplore, and which cannot obtain in the new man in Christ through the resurrection of the dead.

But while we are always willing to subject every principle of our faith to the strictest scrutiny of philosophy, our main reliance is on the "Scriptures and the power of God," leaning upon the staff of him who "*Believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness.*" And, in respect to its regenerating and practical moral influence, we will trust and glory in this faith of God's universal Fatherhood, and of a pure immortality for our race through Christ, in connection with the harmonious and beautiful system of Divine moral government and human accountability, which we have exhibited in this discussion.

Recapitulation.

It is unnecessary for us to burden our book or the patience of our readers with a reprint of the recapitulation which Dr. Adams appends to his "Argument," and a repetition of comments on each item, inasmuch as it is but a catalogue of "the principal topics" which he had introduced, all of which we have presented and thoroughly disposed of in consecutive order — *all but one.* This one, which he recapitulates here, was comprised in the closing paragraph of his fourth proposition, and stands there in these words :—

It being frequently argued that the sins of a finite creature cannot be punished forever, because a finite creature cannot merit infinite punishment, it will be enough to meet this, in passing, with a single remark, viz : That if this be so, then, even if the whole universe should sin forever, the whole universe cannot be punished forever, because the whole universe, after all, is but finite."

In putting forth this argument, our friend must have had some confused thought in his mind which was without form and void. We can discover no point to it. It was never argued that if a finite creature should sin forever, he could not be punished forever. The position which he aimed to strike but failed to conceive, is this,— That a finite creature, for an act of disobedience in the infancy of his being, does not justly merit endless punishment. And this Dr. A., and his fraternity generally, now concede, in that they assume endless sinning as the ground of endless punishment. The argument, therefore, from

the consideration of disproportion and injustice, against perpetuating punishment endlessly in the future for a present misdeed of a finite creature, is not touched at all by the remark which our friend thinks is "enough to meet it," viz: "That if this be so, then, even if the whole universe should sin forever, the whole universe cannot be punished forever, because the whole universe after all is but finite." Nothing in all this discussion has affected us so unpleasantly, as this strange lack of perception, on the part of our learned friend, of the relation of ideas. Because sin, being a moral disease and death, must involve the misery of its subject as long as he continues in it, even if it were eternally, it does not follow as a legitimate inference that for the mere fact of being in sin to-day, an eternity of inflicted misery is incurred. And this very improvement in "Orthodoxy" of which we have spoken, making endless sinning the plea for endless punishment, virtually explodes the theory of a day of judgment at the end of time, to adjudicate endless punishment on men for the sins of this life. Light is breaking in upon the minds of those whom ecclesiastical authority has long imprisoned, and is verifying the beautiful language of prophecy; "The people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up."

APPENDIX.

SINCE the closing up of the "Discussion," which occupies the foregoing pages, the conduct of Dr. Adams has been such in relation to it as subjects our deep seated respect for his motives, and confidence in his religious integrity, to a severe and unpleasant test. He declined making any rejoinder to our Reply. He would not attempt to prove in fault any of our argumentative disproofs of his uses of the sacred Word, — expositions and arguments which are judged by great numbers of the most learned and pious theologians in our country to show conclusively that the doctrine of endless punishment is not taught in the Bible. Though his *Argument for Endless Punishment* was written expressly at our request, for our columns as a part of a discussion with us, and he was not ignorant that the publication of the whole together in book form would furnish the reading public in all future time with more ample means for judging understandingly of the relative merits of our labors and our theories, and the evidence and nature of Christian truth, —yet he employed the menaces of a worthless *expost facto* copy-right, and his earnest personal remonstrances, to deter us from binding up the two parts of the Discussion together, to the latter of which in our delicate regard for his feelings, we wrongly yielded in the publication of our own edition of the book; yet he forthwith published his part in

a separate tract, and has since procured it, with others of his tracts, to be published by Gould and Lincoln in book form, just as if he regarded it unquestionably true, when he knows that he has not the power to vindicate a single position in it from the annulling force of the arguments in reply.

We are aware that this style of expression, to one who will take no pains to acquaint himself with the facts in the case, may appear egotistical; but we appeal to all men who care sufficiently for the truth to examine this Discussion with care, that we speak only in the modesty of reverence for God's word. We put in no claim of self-ability; but we do know that holy men of old, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, have used language which is susceptible of being understood, and we speak for the simplicity and force of truth.

Turn, for instance, to Dr. A's fifth Proposition, on the *Curse of the Law*, and then to Chap. iv. of the Reply. When we read his proposition and argument on this point, we were confident that he had entirely overlooked the language of Moses in Deut. xxix., and Lev. xxvi., describing certain temporal calamities and declaring them to comprise *all the curses written in the book of the Law*, and to be reformatory in their designs; and we believed, in our charity, that, on having his attention called to these Scriptures, and to the philological argument, he would withdraw that proposition from any subsequent edition of his document. But he cares for none of these things. He republishes, in different forms, and sends abroad as widely as possible, his bold position, knowing that it

directly gives the lie to the explicit declarations of God's word. It pains us to make these statements; but duty to our opponent, respect for the Bible, and a sincere regard for the religious interests of the community, compel us to do so. It is a plain case, and we challenge the severest scrutiny.

Besides this persistent disregard of the facts and arguments of the negative part of the Discussion, in the republication of his decisively revealed errors without correction, the same willingness to mislead the public in respect to these matters is clearly evinced in the following, which we transfer from the columns ot the *Christian Freeman* of April 8th, 1859.

DR. ADAMS AT HOME.

Our respected friend, Rev. Dr. Adams, as our readers have seen, chooses not to make, in our columns, any rejoinder to our part of the late discussion between him and us, — that is, our "Review" of his "Argument for the Scripturalness of Future, Endless Punishment." But it will be interesting to the public to be posted up in his outside movements in relation to this matter.

Well, on Tuesday evening, March 8th, Dr. Adams delivered in his Vestry a "Doctrinal Lecture," which, throughout, had reference to this discussion, though it does not appear from the report of it in the papers that he made direct quotation from us but in one instance. The report in the *Boston Evening Transcript*, of March 10th, represents him as thus opening and proceeding to prosecute the business of his lecture:

"Coming now, in course, to the subject of *Future Retribution*, the lecturer said that, instead of repeating the familiar arguments on the subject, he would show the manner in which those arguments are sometimes answered. Using many of the common replies against endless retribution, he would undertake to show that there could not be, and that there was not, a Deluge, such as we find described in Genesis.

First, he quoted the express declarations of Scripture, predicting, and then describing, Noah's deluge; then, the Saviour's allusion to it, and two express declarations of it by Peter. Quoting John Foster's words about the proof texts of endless punishment, he said, "it must be admitted that these passages are *formidably strong*,—so strong that it must be an argument of extreme cogency that would authorize a limited interpretation." But adopting the Universalist's argument against endless punishment, he would show that *the paternal character of God* made it impossible that he should destroy the whole human family, (except eight.) Would a human father do so?

Think of pictures in our shop windows of a father destroying his whole family, except two or three, whom with partiality he saves. People could not endure such a sight.

It will be seen by this that Dr. A. has been goaded up, by what has recently transpired, into a state of feeling which seeks relief to itself in an effort at irony. We think that we know how to appreciate and enjoy a fitting and well directed stroke of irony, even if we be made the butt of it. But when one, in such an effort, must begin by misrepresenting the position of his opponent, and proceed by utterly changing the issue, his satire degenerates into mockery. And such is decidedly the character of our friend's home-effort before us.

1. That his parallelism affected to be drawn from the account of the deluge, may have any applicability to our theory of Moral and Scriptural argument ex-

hibited in the "Discussion," it must be shown that we have adopted a position which assumes or implies that men are competent judges of the best *means* to be employed by the great and good Father for the highest ultimate good of his children, — that if God is a *father*, he must employ just such a *manner* of government, just such *incidents* of providence, just such *forms* of discipline, as an earthly parent would employ in his dealings with his children. And Dr. Adams, in imposing upon his people this affected *argumentum ad absurdum*, this pretended *parallel* of our theory of Scripture exposition, virtually ascribes to us such a position, and thus raises, in toto, a false issue. And this he does knowingly. We convicted him of this *ruse* in our "Discussion," and set forth in a distinct and comprehensible manner what is the real point at issue between him and us; that it is not a question of *means*, but of *ends* :—that we assume not to judge, and hold no sentiment which involves so absurd an assumption as to judge, what *means* infinite wisdom may choose for the promotion and ultimate accomplishment of his good purposes. But of moral principles, involving the nature of final results, we do assume to be judges. And without such judgment we are utterly incapable of forming a true moral character, or of praising and worshipping God in spirit, for his moral perfections.

And it seems that our Doctor has got himself into so desperate a fervor for his favorite theology, that he boldly enforces love and worship without moral approbation. He says in the "Discussion," after presenting the character of God in the most odious light, not as he is represented by the Scriptures, but by the

Doctor's misinterpretation of Scripture, he says, "And we have our choice to love and serve such a God as this, or to reject him and take the consequences." This love and worship which the Doctor would thus enforce, is just as good as that which the Hindoos devoted to their *Siva*, or the Mexicans to their idols, which are thus described by the historian: "They represented their gods under the most detestable forms which create horror. Serpents, crocodiles and tigers decorate their temples." The devotions of such religionists are the worship of power from the impulse of dread. No, dear Doctor, we will ever hate the satanic spirit, in whatever form you may present it, and with whatever power you may clothe it, and love only the justice of wisdom and goodness; — and we will "take the consequences," which are the sweet approval and rich communion of the spirit of Jesus, who teaches us that "the hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth."

We repeat, the controversy between us is not on means, but ends; not on the specific and preparatory forms of the Divine administration, but on the principles and purposes of the Divine government. And these, God has made it our duty to study and judge, that we may be reconciled to him, and love and praise him in the spirit and understanding.

Of the nature of moral qualities we must judge, or we cannot live and act as moral beings. Love, as a moral principle and affection, necessarily involves an interest and desire for the good of its objects. This we know. And this moral affection of love is the

same moral quality in God and man. So says the apostle. "He that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God, for God is love." "He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him." Therefore, knowing that our love to our children, and to others, involves a desire and insures a purpose and work on our part, to the extent of our wisdom and power, for their good, we know that the infinite love of God, by the fellowship of which our love is inspired and enlarged, involves a desire, and a purpose, and work, to the extent of his infinite wisdom and power, for the highest good of all its objects, which are all his offspring. We do not say that this infinite love of the Father must confer the highest enjoyment on all men, or any man, at the present moment, which might be now conferred as a single and independent aim,—but the greatest ultimate good, comprehending the whole sphere of existence which he controls. The earthly father, in the fulness of his love, sometimes subjects his children to trial, discipline and pupilage, with reference to the best good of their whole life, which does not contribute to their immediate happiness; and which even the children at the time regard as a hard lot. It is only a narrow sphere of the life of his children, however, that the earthly parent has within his disposing power. But God holds all nature in his hand, and all the forces of the universe, and the whole sphere of human existence for time and eternity. "With him are the issues of life," and he "has the keys of death and hades." It is the choice of his infinite goodness and the plan of his infinite wisdom,

that his human family should have their infantile and initiatory being in a rudimental state like this, in a compound existence, comprising the animal and spiritual, the lower and higher natures. And for Dr. Adams to daguerreotype any event or class of events in this rudimental state, such for instance as the deluge, and to assume that a "*father*," if he had all the wisdom and power of God to comprehend and control time and eternity, would not "do so"—that he would not, in his love, subject his children to such dispensations of his providence, is a piece of presumption disrespectful to God, and without authority of truth or reason. But to say that a father would not "do so" with his limited capacities and powers, is to say nothing that has the most distant or feeble bearing upon the real question at issue between us and the Doctor, which is the benevolent *purpose* of God in these and all the dispensations of his government.

Dr. Adams derives no help to his attempted burlesque by his use of the deluge, more than he may find in any and all physical death. By the constitution of things established of God, all men must die, the virtuous and vicious. But an earthly father will not kill his children. "Therefore," this is the rule of our opponent's logic, "no person can draw any assurance from the parental character of God, that his government aims at the ultimate good of any soul he has made." This single sentence comprises the sum and substance of the whole of this scheme of nullifying the Universalist moral argument against the doctrine of endless and malignant punishment, by

offsetting it with a like argument against the fact of the deluge. In the first place, as we have shown, it raises a false issue, by substituting means for ends; and in the second place it assumes what neither he nor any other man can shew to be otherwise than false and impious, in respect to the character and design of those means. It assumes that the drowning of the antediluvians was *not* consistent with the goodness of God toward the same individuals,— that is, with his purpose of ultimate good for them with regard to the whole sphere of existence allotted them.

Dr. Adams says, as quoted above, "Think of pictures in our shop windows, of a father destroying his whole family except two or three, whom with partiality he saves. People could not endure such a sight." Such is the effort of tearing down faith in God, by one to whose office it belongs to "vindicate the ways of God to man." Let us imagine our learned opponent in the sick room of a lovely child, who is looking for the approach of death with a peaceful trust in God. The dying child says to the Doctor, "I know I shall soon die. But I regard this event as the order of God's wise providence. God is my Father; it is all right; and I trust in his fatherly love." "Ah," responds the grave Doctor to the dying child, "you say the event of death for which you are looking, is an order of God's providence, and yet you draw assurance of ultimate good from your view of God as a Father. Would a father kill his child? How would you endure to see in a shop win-

dow the picture of a father killing his child? A fig for your trust in God as a father." And with these words the Doctor turns upon his heels and leaves the dying child to himself, or to better comforters. Let him then retire.

But our opponent has no reason for saying that a wise and good father would not pass his child into the sleep of death, *provided he held the keys of death and hades*, including of course the power of giving him life again, and that in a better state and constitution. But men cannot wisely or innocently employ any remedial agents but what are within their own limited sphere of control. God, within the compass of whose knowledge and control are all means and all ends for time and eternity, can and does rightly and benevolently employ means in the administration of his government the wisdom of which we comprehend not. But to say that the issue shall not be such as to attest the wisdom and goodness of God, is to "charge God foolishly."

The report of the Doctor's Lecture proceeds to say,—

The allowed disproportionateness of sin to the punishment, was next used as an argument against the flood. A youth, twenty years old, who might have lived as long as Methuselah, is, for sins committed in his most thoughtless moments, deprived of his eight or nine hundred years of life. Is this just?

The lecturer might have added, that thousands of innocent infants and children were also drowned in that flood; and that generally, in the destruction of

cities and communities in consequence of the general corruptness of the people, innocent children and some virtuous people share in the common physical calamity. What then? Are we to adopt it as good argument, that because, owing to the mutual relations and dependencies among the members of a community in this rudimental state, it must needs be that the virtuous minority and irresponsible children share in the general calamity induced by the vicious majority, therefore they may all be eternally punished together?

II But all this labored and ingenious device of parallels — parallels, we mean, between the Universalist argument against endless punishment, and Dr. A.'s hypothetical argument against the literal truth of the history of the deluge, is built upon an utter misrepresentation of the Universalist's position. It is on the ground that we admit that the Scriptures, taken in the literal and natural force of their language, assert future endless punishment; and that then we go at work, upon the plea that such doctrine is inconsistent with the parental character of God, and, by unnatural and illegitimate constructions and far fetched definitions, resolve all these Bible testimonies into "flame pictures" and "figures." Nothing can be farther from the truth than this representation. Yet, as we have said, it is upon this misstatement of our position that he has reared the cunning workmanship of all this would-be scathing sermon. And whence does he draw his authority for

placing us in such a position? In this instance he passes over even his brother Theodore Parker, whom he foisted as a witness into his part of the "Discussion," and imports John Foster again, whom also he there introduced to the same point, and whose testimony we showed has no weight in the case. His reporter gives us his effort in this direction thus:—

"Quoting John Foster's words about the proof texts of endless punishment, he said, "it must be admitted that these passages are *formidably strong*,—so strong that it must be an argument of extreme cogency that would authorize a limited interpretation.'"

Look at this management of the case. Here is a denomination of Christians ranking in numbers as the fifth or sixth denomination in the United States. The land is full of publications, doctrinal and practical, and extensively expository of their theory of Scripture interpretation. And the writer of this has just closed a labor covering more than four hundred duodecimo pages, as his part of a mutual discussion with this Doctor, comprising expositions of the whole extensive collection, made by him, of Scripture passages in proof of endless punishment; and now he wants to place us before his people as engaged in the work of proving unscriptural, a doctrine which we are conscious that the Scriptures literally declare. And what does he do? What! why, he quotes from *John Foster* a concession that certain passages of Scripture are *formidably strong* in the way of indicating endless punishment. And who was this John

Foster? Not a professed, studied, and systematized Universalist, but a learned and eminent Baptist divine of England. In an advanced stage of life he was forced by the *moral* argument to question the endlessness of punishment, but the *language* of certain Scripture phrases lay in his mind as it was rooted there by false education in childhood, and as it had engrained itself there by life-long usage. Such were the circumstances under which he made the remark which Dr. Adams used in our "Discussion," and persists in using, notwithstanding our faithful exposure of its unfairness. But the moral considerations inspired by the spirit of the gospel in his soul, urged upon Foster's attention a train of Scripture testimonies, which were in his mature judgment of such *extreme cogency* as to limit the interpretation of those *formidably strong* expressions on the duration of punishment. But he was placed in no circumstances, and had no opportunity to get his mind entirely righted from that old crook received in the twig from false education, with regard to the *seeming* force of certain Scripture phraseology in an isolated position. He did not even make an open announcement of his late happy discoveries,—such were the strong denominational ties by which he was bound. His enlarged knowledge and faith was only divulged in some private letters; and these it was the intention and effort of his denominational guardians to suppress, and they would have been suppressed after his decease, if it were not for the integrity of the American publisher of his life and writings.

We repeat, this use which our opponent persists in making of a few detached words of that great man, circumstanced as he was, with the intent to pass off the impression that Universalists are conscious that the literal import of the Scriptures is the endlessness of punishment, is unjust to Mr. Foster himself, and inexcusably unjust to the Universalist denomination.

Why, what are the present facts? Here Dr. A. has, directly before his eyes, an examination by our humble self, in a manner which meets the hearty approval of our Denomination in general, of the whole Bible in-so-far as he has arrayed it on his side in support of his theory of punishment; and he knows that, in every case, our course has been to seek out the natural and obvious meaning of the passage, by the same rule of exegesis as we would employ in the study and interpretation of any other book. In no case, that we recollect, have we resorted to the moral argument to bend any passage of Scripture from its natural meaning, as evinced by the force of the language, in consideration of the occasion and subject of discourse. The extract which we gave from Rev. Dr. Clapp, of the thoroughness with which his mind became disabused of the doctrine of endless punishment by a critical study of the *language of the Bible*, which he had misused in support of it, presents a *fac simile* of our manner of treating the discussion with Dr. A., and of the Universalist manner of Scripture argument always.

How utterly unworthy of himself, then, and of his

responsibility before God to his people to deal with them honestly and without guile, to impose upon them the representation that we pursue a course of frittering away the obvious sense of the Scripture records, by resolving them into figures, by the like of which "he would undertake to show that there could not be, and that there was not, a deluge. *Figurative?!!* Why, dear Doctor, take our respective parts of the protracted discussion just closed, lay them side by side, and go through with them step by step, and I challenge you to point out in my part one half the latitude of figurative construction which I will show in yours. Why, sir, the whole superstructure of doctrine which mainly distinguishes your theory, the post mortem hell of endless torment, is, by your own showing, a figure in toto. You know and acknowledge that neither the word *hades* nor *gehenna* literally signifies any such place or state. To be sure, in your part of our "Discussion," you in a few cases quote the word hell where the original is hades, without explanation, as if the mere occurrence of the word in the Bible were proof of such post mortem torment; and there also you call it a place. But in your Lecture on *the intermediate state*, as reported in the *Transcript* a few weeks before this which I am reviewing, you show that you have learned something from some source since the Discussion was commenced. You are reported to have said,—

Hades is not, in its original acceptation, a *place*, but a *state*. It is derived from the primitive *Alpha* (Greek,) corresponding to *non* in Latin, and *ado*, to see; i. e. *invisibility*. The state of being

dead, therefore, was called *Hades*. The word is applied to the state of all the dead, good and bad. Then, it is applied to the grave and to deep places; then, to a state of punishment.

Thus you show that *hades* does not in its original acceptation, and of its own force, express the idea of punishment, and of course, when you apply it to punishment, you give it a secondary or figurative sense. So Professor Stuart explains. And then, *gehenna*, you concede in your "Argument" written for my columns, is literally the valley of Hinnom, and by a figurative use denotes punishment or suffering.

So, then, you manufacture your entire world of hopeless woe out of "figure" and "flame picture;" and nearly all the passages you force into application to it, you do so by the figurative construction of such words as "wrath," "fire," "destruction," "furnace of fire," and so on without limit. And you, who assume figurative constructions of Scripture everywhere, and strain the figures all out of place and proportion and make them monstrous, are the man to attempt a burlesque upon me for my sometimes finding a metaphor in the Bible. And yet you dared not present my own position as the basis of the burlesque, but went to England and got it from an isolated expression of an eminent Baptist.

I agree with you, however, that the words *hades*, *gehenna*, *furnace of fire*, *&c.*, are sometimes used figuratively to denote punishment. And you must agree with me, that, these words not expressing the idea of punishment of their own literal sense, but only by a figurative use, we can assume nothing, by the mere

force of the words, as to when and where and what this punishment is. These points must in every case be ascertained by studying the occasion, connection, and subject of discourse. And this is the method of Scripture exegesis to which I have adhered in all my part of our controversy, and to which I have striven in vain to draw your respectful consideration.

But you do attempt, by one direct quotation from my Reply to your Argument, to justify your parallel of the Universalist theory of Scripture exposition with an ironical play upon the history of the deluge. Your reporter says:

Thus, said the Lecturer, let any man form a theory, and he can bend the Scriptures to support it; and here and there some "Orthodox" divine can be quoted in its favor. He would now read a piece of Biblical criticism from a religious paper in Massachusetts, a few weeks since, which was equal to anything which he had said about the deluge.

"Judas uttered the strongest dying testimony of the purity of Jesus, and gave practical proof of the sincerity of his repentance, by throwing down the price of his perfidy at the feet of his seducers; and either they or he purchased with it a field: and so severe was his anguish, that he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out—or his heart broke, as the word bowels is sometimes used in the Scriptures for heart. With this agrees a fair rendering of Matt. xxvii. 5; reading, instead of "hanged himself," *choked of anguish*. Thus are the records of Matthew and Luke, which in the Common Version are contradictory, seen to be in harmony,—both implying the death of Judas by internal rupture from excessive anguish on account of his sin. His repentance was as real as that of the thief on the cross—'Good for that man if he had not been born'—i. e., living to manhood would hardly be desirable."

Adam Clarke (who also taught that the serpent in Paradise was

probably an ape,) and others, are quoted to sustain this interpretation. Any thing which God ever said or wrote can be confuted, in this way.

This, then, is the fittest case in all my continuous Scripture warfare against the doctrine of endless punishment, extending through more than four hundred pages, following you in your whole catalogue of textual quotations, — this is the fittest case which your keen discerning eye can discover as a justification of your pleasant feat of satire. And what is there here which you will dispute? Criticise every sentence.

But first take note of the fact, that you do me injustice by quoting me as you quote Scripture, in a disjointed form, not giving your hearers any idea of the point to which I applied the language quoted. You present the extract as if it were designed to express my own ground of hope for the final salvation of Judas. Whereas in my "Reply" it was designed to show that your own ground of hope for man's final salvation, that for instance which you assign for your hope for the thief on the cross, to wit, his repentance before death, utterly forbids your bold assumption that Judas' place "was not heaven." To this point was the language addressed which you have partially quoted.

And now, as I said, let us criticise every sentence. 1. Judas "uttered the strongest dying testimony of the purity of Jesus." Do you deny this, Rev. Sir? Did he not say, (Matt. xxvii. 4,) "I have sinned, in that I have betrayed innocent blood."? 2. "And

gave practical proof of the sincerity of his penitence by throwing down the price of his perfidy at the feet of his seducers." Do you contradict this statement? The record is, verses 3–5,—"Then Judas, ... when he saw that he (Jesus) was condemned, *repented* himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders," *&c.* 3. "And either he or they purchased with it a field." Is not this literally accurate. Matthew says, (xxvii. 7,) "And they (the chief priests) took counsel, and bought with them (the pieces of silver) the Potter's field." Luke says, (Acts i. 18,) "Now this man (Judas) purchased a field with the reward of iniquity." So it is as we said, "either he or they purchased with it a field." 4. "He burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out." Such, as you will not deny, is the record. 5. "Or his heart broke, as the word bowels is sometimes used in the Scriptures for heart." It is so that the word bowels is often used in the Scriptures, not for the intestines, but for the heart, or the seat of the affections. Accordingly we read of the *bowels of compassion*, and the *yearning of the bowels* over the objects of love. Our English Dictionaries also define the word *bowels* as sometimes meaning "the heart," "the seat of pity and kindness." But this criticism is of no consequence as affecting the manner of Judas' death. The record of Luke, "he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out," literally describes a death by rupture, occasioned by the violent commotion of excessive grief and anguish of heart. And such was

Judas' case. 6. "With this agrees a fair rendering of Matt. xxvii. 5, reading, instead of 'hanged himself,' '*choked of anguish.*'" This, dear Sir, is no attempt to dodge into a figure. It treats ingenuously and fairly a fair question of the true rendering of a Greek word in a given case. I offer the judgment of such eminent scholars and Biblical critics of the Orthodox school, as Dr. Adam Clarke, Rev. John Jones, Mr. Wakefield, and "the very best critics" referred to by Clarke. When the learning of such Greek scholars renders the account of Matthew so as to make it perfectly agree with that of Luke, it might do for a small man, but it does not become one of your talent and position, to attempt the disposal of the matter by a sneer. 7. You close this quotation from me with these words: "good were it for that man if he had not been born, that is, living to manhood." This is another jerk of a few words out of their connection, for snatching which you skip over five pages, and bring it into a connection denoting that it was my argument, when the words occur in my statement of the construction which Dr. Clarke gives the words, "good were it for that man if he had not been born." Neither Dr. Clarke, nor your humble servant, alleges that this language is *figurative.* We regard it, as it most surely is, a Jewish proverbial form of speech, concerning which it is proper to inquire what idea was imported by its usage. Dr. Clarke shows from Rabbinical writings, and we might add largely to his proofs from Scripture examples, that it was used, not with reference to man's immortal existence, but

with reference to some signal disgrace or calamity attached to the earthly life. This argument, respected Sir, you can never invalidate.

And this, then, out of all my protracted Review of your Argument, is the case you have seized upon as justifying your burlesque of the Universalist theory of Scripture interpretation, by affecting to show by the same method of argument that there could not have been a deluge.

But you attempt to belittle Dr. Clarke by the saying, that he thought the serpent that tempted Eve was an ape! I quoted Clarke, not for his philosophy, but for his acknowledged learning, and world of fact. But his suggestion that the serpent referred to may have been an ape, was a judicious effort to save the Bible account of the temptation from the ridicule to which the popular construction subjects it. He did not like the idea that our mother Eve was persuaded to transgression by the conversation of a snake. Taking that account as a divine allegory, the representation is neat and beautiful. But to suppose that, while Adam knew enough to name all the beasts of the earth according to their natures, Eve was so idiotic as to believe that a snake was capable of giving her instruction, is a little worse than a touch of the figurative. I suppose you do understand some things in the Bible to be figurative. Jotham's account of the trees meeting to choose a king, you probably regard as parabolical. Whether you still believe that the devil and satan, with seven heads and ten horns, and a tail sweeping a third part of the

stars of heaven, is a literal person, you do not inform me ;— nor whether you have espoused the Papal use of the phrase, "This is my body," as proof of transubstantiation. But you do construe some, aye much Scripture as figurative ; indeed, as I have shown, nearly all which you apply as descriptive of endless punishment. I agree with you that most of the passages which you so misuse are figurative, and I have solicited you in vain, that you do try to show some reason why you apply them as you do.

III. The last argument which you are reported to have employed in your Lecture in support of your theory, and one which I should think might be your last, is in these words :—

> But this doctrine of future punishment is written on the human heart and conscience. *Profane swearing* illustrates this. Passion seeks for something infinite to help it vent itself. The names of God, Christ, the Holy Ghost, are employed. If "go to hell," and "damn you," were not derived from a deep, native conviction of some infinite thing conveyed by the words, would they be used? You never hear one, in his wrath, say, "go to jail," "you be dead."

This, my dear Sir, is coming to the point. I am glad that you have said it ; for if I had alleged this as the moral character of your doctrine I should have been censured for incivility. But it is nearly so. I have long understood that the doctrine of endless revengeful punishment finds its affinity only in the lowest and most brutish passions of the human

heart, and then only when these passions are so excited as to quench, for the time being, all the better feelings of the moral and affectional nature. It is indeed true, that a burst of malignant passion seeks for some great swelling words of terrible import by which to vent and display itself. But it is not true that the mind naturally conceives the idea of *future endless torment.* It learns this from the schools. You will recollect the anecdote published in some of your religious papers lately, of a missionary returning home with a son in his teens who was born in India, who, on hearing a sailor G—d d—n something, reproved him, saying, "This, my son, was born and reared in a heathen land, and this is the first profane oath he ever heard." So, it seems, that though the heathen have some sort of speculations about future punishment of some sort and duration, they have no such machinery for damning one another to hell as has been sublimated by Christian creed makers out of the old heathen Tartarus. Accordingly your worthy brother M'Clure is right in his claim that these profane belchings are "Orthodox oaths," and that Universalists are shamefully "insincere" and "inconsistent" if they ever employ them.

But then these profane swearers, even in their wrath, do not conceive in their hearts the wish for all which the language theologically imports, to be executed upon any one. They imprecate the same vengeance upon their ox, or horse, or broken wagon, or unwieldy stick of timber. It is a mere straining for the most terrible expression of a bad passion. I

could hope that my learned friend might ere long read himself into that blessed Christian theology, which should find its spiritual affinities, not in the basest passions, but in those refined Christian affections which "bless and curse not."

In conclusion of this brotherly review, permit me to express sincere regret that you should, in your labored and ingenious lecture to your own Christian people, commit these three essential errors:—

1st. Representing me and my religious fraternity in a false light, in regard to our estimate of the *language* of the Bible.

2d. Changing the issue from principles and ends to instrumentalities and means.

3d. Quoting me in a snatch manner, to give a wrong impression as to the point to which my remarks partially quoted were addressed. I believe that, in my extended review of your Argument, I have, in all cases, presented fairly the points to which you quoted Scripture, and the issue to which you argued. If I have failed to do this in any case it will afford me the greatest pleasure to make correction on being shown the error.

And now, Rev. Sir, you and I occupy positions of great responsibility. Old human authorities are breaking up, and many people are as scattered sheep. They need to be made acquainted with the richness, and beauty, and Divine authority of the Christian religion. They are looking toward the Christian teachers, and when they see in them a disposition to trifle with the Scriptures, and with the Divine char-

acter,—and to treat unfairly the arguments of each other,—they are driven farther into their scepticism. You are possessed of principles and culture too high to design such things. But the strength of your denominational ties, and the largeness of your constitutional sarcasm, are a force impelling you. Will the great Father help us, that we win sinners, in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God.

INDEX OF TEXTS.

For the convenience of the biblical student, we frame this Index in double columns. The left-hand column, under the head of Argument, refers to the texts quoted by Dr. Adams in proof of "Future Endless Punishment." The right-hand column, under the head of Reply, directs to the pages where the same texts are explained by Mr. Cobb.

20