

BT
930
B55
1858



TUFTS COLLEGE.

FROM THE

LIBRARY

OF THE LATE


Rev. Thos. Whittemore, D. D.

Gift of Mrs. Whittemore,

March, 1877.

16664

Thomas Whittemore



DEATH NOT LIFE:

OR THE

DESTRUCTION OF THE WICKED

(COMMONLY CALLED ANNIHILATION,)

ESTABLISHED,

AND ENDLESS MISERY DISPROVED,

BY

A COLLECTION AND EXPLANATION OF ALL PASSAGES
ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT,

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A REVIEW OF DR. E. BEECHER'S

CONFLICT OF AGES,

AND JOHN FOSTER'S LETTER.

By JACOB BLAIN,

BAPTIST MINISTER OF BUFFALO, N. Y.

"For all the wicked will God *destroy*."—Ps. 145: 20.

"For yet a little while, and the *wicked shall not be*."—Ps. 37: 10.

"They shall be as though they *had not been*."—Obadiah 16.

For they "shall be *punished with everlasting destruction*."

2d Thess. 1: 9.

EIGHTH EDITION.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY JOHN P. JEWETT & CO.

NO. 20 WASHINGTON STREET.

1858.

BT
930
B55
1758

INDEX.

INTRODUCTION, page 3—8. Importance of the subject, p. 4. Brief history of the doctrine of destruction, 6. Objections to investigate removed, 7.

CHAP. I.—The doctrine of destruction proved, 9. 'Immortal soul,' not in the Bible, 10. Twenty terms, as "die, perish, destroy, burn up," &c., used 200 times to prove destruction, 10. Their Bible meaning, 20. Ten texts for restoration, as proving destruction, 21. *Life and death* not figurative, 24. What was lost by the fall, 26. Wholesale perversion, 28. All the Bible proof of immortality, 28. Error in our translation, 30. Meaning of soul and spirit, 30.

CHAP. II.—Metaphysical proof of immortality exploded, 33. Immortality assumed, 40.

CHAP. III.—HELL NOT A LOCAL PLACE TO CONTINUE ETERNALLY, 43. Meaning of the English word *hell*, 43. Prof. Stuart on the four terms *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Gehenna*, *Tartarus*, translated *Hell*, 44. *Gehenna* (*hell*) explained, 46. Corruption in translating *Gehenna* by *hell*, 48. Paul told of no *hell*, 49. *Hell* is to be ended, 50. Meaning of the English word *hell* has been corruptly changed, 51. Catholics the most honest in translating *hell*, 52. Errors in translation, 53.

CHAP. IV.—Texts supposed to teach endless woe explained, 57. Six classes of texts amounting to 284 to be left out, 57. The rich man in *hell* explained, 59. Unquenchable fire no proof of endless woe but of destruction, 62.

CHAP. V.—P. 66. All the remaining texts, being 15, explained—but 15 claimed by Prof. Stuart. All of them quoted, 66. General remarks on them, 67. All figurative, 67. *Aion* (for ever) explained, 68. All given up by different divines, 69. Dan. 12: 2, "everlasting contempt" explained, 71. "Everlasting fire," 73. "Everlasting punishment," 77.

CHAP. VI.—Smoke of torment, 85. For ever and ever explained, 88. The devil tormented, 93. Literal devil not meant, 94. Lake of fire, 96.

CHAP. VII.—*Review and Results*, texts perverted, 98. The Bible does not seem to teach endless woe, as the texts relied on prove destruction, 103. Universalism and orthodoxy contrasted, 104. They have the most texts, 106. Endless woe slanders all God's attributes, 111. Ministers oppose reform, 111. Reasons for endless woe, 115.

CONFLICT OF AGES.—Commendation of, p. 2. Great principles, 2. The Conflict stated, 5. Pre-existence, 8. Its proof, 10. Extracts, 10. Dr. Beecher's failure, 14. The origin of sin, 16. Reasons for eternal woe, 20. Woe to increase joy, 24. Destruction only can end the "Conflict," 26. Evils of the Conflict, 29. Are we punished for Adam's sin? 31. A horrible doctrine, 33.

March 1877.

Wm. H. Miller

INTRODUCTION.

DOES the doctrine of *endless misery* "commend itself to every man's conscience?" Like Paul, we wish, by a "*manifestation of the truth,*" to thus commend the doctrine of destruction.—2 Cor. 4: 2.

An argument often used to prevent research and reform of the re-examination of our creeds is, that new and delusive errors are constantly springing up in our day. Many patented inventions on trial are found to be useless, and when the patents for steamboats, the telegraph, &c., came out, if all had refused to try them, because most patents proved useless, much more good sense would have been manifested than is shown in this argument; for they could affect us but a few years, while Christ has said, to "break the least of his commands," will "make us the least in the kingdom of heaven." "Be not carried about with every wind of doctrine," is now perverted, (as was the one quoted on the pinnacle of the temple,) and made to mean, "alter not the creeds,"—"bring no new things out of the treasure-house" of God's Word,—“our creeds are two and three hundred years old, and were made when we half emerged from Popery, and “all new and old things” are in them!!! The motto of churches as to doctrines, seems to be :

“What has been always *customary,*
Legal becomes, and *necessary.*”

Ergo, it is legal and necessary to teach immortality, and an endless hell. Prof. Finney has been censured for teaching perfectionism in *practice*, but a far worse perfectionism is being manifested by all sects as to *doctrine.*’

I will here only suggest the *importance* of the subject examined in

these pages. (1.) The teaching of *endless woe*, is casting gloom over the church of God. (2.) Driving our land into Universalism and infidelity. (3.) If it is not in the Bible, *awfully slanders our Maker*. And (4.) The doctrine of *destruction*, if in the Bible, and understood, will remove these evils; or, at least would immensely lessen two of them, and entirely end the slander of the Almighty. For well-balanced minds would see that the "Judge of all the earth" would be just in such a penalty for rebellion and impenitence; while no one can see *endless misery* to be just.

It is not enough to say and believe God is *just* and *good*. We should seek to see and show *how* and *why* he is so; and this all have, and ever must fail to do, who hold to endless suffering for a failure in the short and poor probation man has on earth.*

What is to be the destiny of ourselves or of our race, beyond the brief period of this life, all must admit is a question of vast importance; and especially so, from the sad fact that we are conscious of being sinners, and knowing that sin merits and receives punishment

* The impossibility of showing God to be just and good, and the error in the common theory as to future punishment, and also the reasonableness and Bible proof of the doctrine of *destruction*, have been very ably exhibited in a large work of 482 pages, just out, by Prof. C. F. Hudson, of Ohio. Its title is, *DEBT AND GRACE, as related to the DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE LIFE*. It is the most learned work of this age. John P. Jewett & Co., No. 20 Washington-street, Boston, are the publishers. Price \$1.25.

I will give a sample of his reasoning. — "If evil be eternal, then, though good, in its very idea, ought to be universal, it must ever be in fact sectional. Its incursions into the domain of Evil must be limited by certain bounds and conditions. Two kingdoms, one of Christ and the other of Satan, will have their respective limits. Goodness can never fill all worlds. The law that curbs the raging sea becomes its law: 'Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther.' The wave of blessing must be stayed. God cannot be all in all. Angels and men, and we know not what other races of God's own creatures, must be shared by him with the Power which he abhors. Wide regions of the universe can never be his own; and whether he is dispossessed by a foreign power, or by an adverse necessity, the empire of eternity is a divided dominion; and the true doctrine of that empire is Dualism."

NOTICES OF THE PRESS. — "Far broader in its views than Beecher's 'Conflict of Ages,' more scriptural and thorough, though less impressive and eloquent, it will probably evoke as much criticism, and as greatly disturb the stream of religious controversy." — *Zion's Herald*.

"It is not merely a work of learning; it is full of thought; it every where bears the stamp of an acute and vigorous intellect. . . . I cannot help believing that it will be regarded by those capable of appreciating it as one of the most valuable contributions to our theological literature which has appeared for many years." — *Christian Register*.

"His work shows very careful and extensive research, and on many collateral points his suggestions will be found instructive and important. . . . The aim of the book is, by showing the limitation of evil, to vindicate the goodness of God." — *N. Y. Evangelist*.

"This is unquestionably the most candid and the most able work yet produced in our theological literature against the doctrine of eternal suffering. . . . The book can not fail to make a stir among theologians, and we hope to see it elaborately answered in our critical periodicals." — *Christian Advocate and Journal*.

"That the author is henceforth to hold a prominent place among the thinkers and writers of the country we feel well assured." — *Universalist Quarterly*.

In a greater or less degree and extent. Reason prompts us to learn, if possible, what the ultimate penalty of God's broken law is to be. We are prospective beings, living more on the future than on the present and past.

"Hope springs eternal in the human breast,
Man never *is*, but always *to be* bless'd."

Thoughtless and unfeeling indeed must he be who thinks not of, and is not moved by a view of an endless duration beyond the grave. It is true that all are not sure of an endless existence, neither from reason, nor yet from the Bible, as I shall endeavor to show; but it is a *truth* that there must be an endless future, and a *truth* that all *desire* existence in that future, provided it can be a happy existence. It is also a soul-cheering *truth* that God has fully promised such an existence to all who come to Christ as the Bible directs; or in other words, to all it denominates the righteous.

But what will be the final doom of those the Bible denominates the wicked, is far from being settled in the theories and minds of men. Scores of volumes have been written, and thousands of sermons preached on their destiny. But what have been the theories proposed and discussed? Why, taking for granted, as all creeds have done, that *all men are immortal*, one party has contended that the wicked must exist in endless misery: and the other that they will ultimately be restored to holiness and happiness in some way, and at some period. Neither party are correct in my humble opinion.

The issue has been wrong, and with it confusion does and ever must exist, while it is continued. The only plain penalty revealed in the Bible, our only guide, is *literal death* to the wicked: extinction of being, soul and body, "at the judgment of the great day:" "the wages of sin is DEATH."—Rom. 6 : 23.

A few have contended for this doctrine for ages, as may be seen by the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, article *destruction*; but the tradition of centuries, and the power of popular opinion, have prevented general investigation. But about 1842, Rev. George Storrs, then of Albany, N. Y., wrote a small work on the subject, entitled: "AN INQUIRY—ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL? In six sermons." Some 25,000 of this work were soon (mostly gratuitously) scattered through the States and Canada, and reprinted and spread in

England.* This awakened an inquiry, and convinced thousands of the truth of the doctrine. In 1846, Rev. H. H. Dobney, and Rev. E. White, of England, published larger works, the former of which has been extensively spread in both countries. Soon after, Rev. Wm Glen Moncrieff, of Scotland, followed with some small works. The churches of these ministers adopted their views. Of late, Rev. J Panton Ham, of Bristol, England, has written largely, and two periodicals have been started, one by Ham, and one by Moncrieff. Three of these ministers I have named in England, are Congregational, and one a Baptist; all literary men. More than twenty different writers have published works in the United States and Canada; and several periodicals are published, which warmly advocate *Life only through Christ*, and the utter destruction of the wicked. The *Bible Examiner*, by George Storrs, of New York, is nearly exclusively devoted to this one subject.

Some two hundred ministers in the United States advocate the doctrine, and their numbers are constantly increasing. Most of the Advent Societies hold to it, and I know of three Baptist churches which fellowship it. A large number in the different churches believe the doctrine, who say but little about it, except to its open advocates. In brief, the number who now hold the view is so large, and so decided in spreading light, that all efforts to stop its progress must be vain, and a general investigation must soon take place: at least in the United States and Canada. When that comes, the doctrine of endless woe must soon fall, for it can no more stand before the light of God's word, than Dagon before the ark of God. It shows either great weakness or ignorance of the theological book-world, to say this doctrine has been investigated. Had it been in the field of controversy as Universalism has, it would have triumphed long since.

Many ask, and often sneeringly, "Why this doctrine was not discovered and embraced before?" The opposers of Luther, az. temperance, &c., often asked the same question, and in the same spirit.

* About 100,000 of this work have now been spread in this country, and still the demand for it continues. I would honor it as the work which first aroused my own mind to this great subject. I have good reasons for commending it. for all the gold of California would not have given me the joy I have found in the *one* truth it advocates.

“Numbers are no mark,
That we shall right be found;
A few were saved in the ark,
For many millions drowned.”

Many also refuse to read our works, and say, “*We have the Bible.*” I ask, then, why hear preaching if they need no aid to learn the connection of the Bible on any doctrine and duty? I should have saved a year’s hard study, had I possessed a work like the one I here present; that is, with all the texts on future punishment, collected and arranged, and their connection with other texts shown, by which their meaning is ascertained. The reader will see, too, that much time is required to look up good authorities for their meaning in the original.

Another common objection to further research and change is, that the preaching of endless woe has been blessed to the salvation of millions. This I deny; I will briefly give my reasons for so doing: Paul was “determined to know nothing among the people, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.” The orthodox have ever preached this grand central truth, and also depravity, faith, repentance, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit; and these truths are blessed, while error mixed with them is forgiven. Luther preached the absurdity that prayer changed the bread and wine into the real body and blood of Christ! and I ask if it was this, or “justification by faith alone,” that God blessed? Orthodox Quakers are blessed, and I ask if it is for preaching against baptism and the Lord’s supper?

President Edwards is often referred to as an example on this point, as great revivals attended his preaching. All acquainted with his writings, know he was powerful in convincing of sin, (the Spirit’s great work,) and in presenting Christ; and could not his “*sovereign God*” bless these truths, even with great error by their side? And further, most now admit that Edwards greatly erred in preaching *literal fire* for the sinner’s home, and that, “*immensely worse than a glowing furnace, an oven, or a brick-kiln!*” I ask if this was also blessed? All will say no, but it was forgiven. On the same ground then, and with equal authority, I affirm, that preaching the horrid doctrine of endless torment was never *blessed*, but *forgiven*. “Christ must have a seed to serve him,” and as all sects err more or less, those which preach Christ must gather them.

It is a sad fact too, that more *millions* of Universalists, and what is far worse, of infidels, deists, and atheists, have been made by the popular doctrine, than of real saints. The church too, has been crowded with "stony-ground hearers" by it.

There is meaning and truth in the following seemingly harsh anecdote: At a public convention, Prof. Finney requested to introduce a certain doctrine, and was opposed by Dr. Beecher, who remarked, "When the devil has any dirty work to do, he always obtains *good men* to do it."

Dr. E. Beecher in speaking of the present theory as to punishment, says, "it involves God, his whole administration, and his eternal kingdom in the deepest dishonor that the mind of man or angel can conceive. The human mind cannot be held back from abhorring such a theory, except by the most unnatural violence to its divinely inspired convictions of honor and right."—*Conflict of Ages*, pp. 225 and 306. And is there no relief from this gloomy theory? Yes, for "certainly the destruction of sinners is not an impossible process, or offensive to our ideas of equity. Is it not infinitely preferable, if we decide by our moral instincts, that the wicked should expire all their miserable breath into the night, when the sun-set of hope arrives, than that they should be kept in bitter and everlasting woe and sin?"—*Rev. T. S. King's Review of Dr. Beecher*, pp. 17.

I affirm, with full confidence of being right, that a reëxamination of this great subject is imperiously demanded, and when light from God's word is offered, it is sin to refuse it, either for want of *time*, as is a common excuse, especially with ministers, or because *popular opinion* enables most Christians to float along in comparative ignorance of the Bible, as to the *true penalty of God's law*.

DEATH NOT LIFE.

CHAPTER I.

"There are, I know, persons who speak concerning future punishment with an air of cool self-complacency, as being, in their view, easy of investigation and free from embarrassment. I am inclined, perhaps uncharitably, to give them little credit for candor, clearness of intellect, or soundness of character; and greatly doubt whether it has been investigated by them.—*Dr. Dwight*, v. 4, p. 457.

THE PENALTY OF GOD'S LAW IS DEATH; THAT IS, THE LITERAL DESTRUCTION OF THE WICKED AT THE JUDGMENT, AND NOT THEIR ENDLESS EXISTENCE IN MISERY.

THOSE who hold this doctrine are charged, by what are called orthodox churches, with not knowing, or not understanding the Bible; and also with forsaking it, and taking reason for their guide. Being fully convinced that the Bible has not been sufficiently examined on this great subject, I purpose giving the result of four years' study of that precious book, with special reference to this doctrine, and draw a full and faithful *map*, so to speak, of the Bible, on the penalty of the law, by quoting every text for and against the views I advocate. Such an exhibition of passages has not been made, to my knowledge, and I have long felt that it should be done, to aid those who wish to know the truth, but have not time to examine the whole Bible for this purpose. When a decisive battle is to be fought, generals bring all their forces into the field, and we should imitate them in our contest for truth.

This controversy not being with Universalists, I shall of course not pay special attention to all the texts on which they rely for their views; yet I will devote a section to them, and quote their

strongest Bible proofs. Should they honor this little work with a perusal, let me kindly ask them to first read this section.—(See the index.)

To see the force or positiveness of proof in the passages I quote to sustain my views, which I will give first, and then present the opposing texts, let the *rule* of Bible critics be well considered. Andrew Fuller gives it thus: “Every *term* is to be taken in its *proper* or *primary* sense, except there be something in the subject or connection which requires it to be taken otherwise.”

When this rule is applied to *terms* for destruction, we are met with the assertion—“man is immortal, and therefore these terms must not be taken in their primary sense.” I only answer at present, that this is purely an assumption; for not a text in the Bible says man is immortal, or has an *immortal soul*, or *deathless spirit*. These, and many like expressions, are men’s *additions* to the Bible; and their very frequent use by teachers, should arouse hearers to *suspect* they are not being taught from the Bible, but by men’s inventions. “Mortal man,”—“God *only* hath immortality,” is the language of the Bible. Of course the wicked are not *immortal*, if the Bible declares they are to be literally destroyed as the beasts, and finally burned up. Most of the texts I proceed to quote, or refer to, may be seen to be in plain language; and are selected and judged to refer to the final doom of the wicked. A few of them *may* be construed to mean only earthly judgments, but as they have been used as proof of the common doctrine, it is necessary to examine them.

I will give first, direct, and then a few strong inferential proofs of my views.

The limits I propose, will permit me to draw off only a part of the passages, and give a concordance of the rest.

DIRECT PROOF OF DESTRUCTION.

I.—DIE.

Gen. 2: 17; “Thou shalt surely die.”

John Locke, the great mental philosopher and Christian, says: “It seems a strange way of understanding a law which requires the plainest and directest words, that by ‘*death*,’ should be meant eternal life in misery.” If this was meant, then no redemption has been made; for Christ did not thus die. The Bible is plain “that he died for our sins.” “Christ hath redeemed

us from the curse of the law, being made a *curse* for us.”—Gal. 3: 13. His death then tells what the threatening was, and that *eternal woe* could not be included. The plea that the greatness of his character made up for this endless misery, is adding to the Bible, or arguing from its silence, just as do the Catholics. These two thoughts alone are enough to overturn all our systems of divinity on this point.

How can we know brutes die, if “to die” is not the extinction of conscious existence? Ecc. 3: 19—20, tells us they die alike. Again, an endless life in misery, is *more* and *worse* than *death*; therefore God, and all the Bible writers used deception if that was meant, for they nowhere explain death to mean it. Prov. 15: 10; 19: 16; Jer 31: 30; 2 Chron. 25: 4; Ez. 3: 18, 19, 20; 18: 4, 17, 21, 24, 26, 31, 32; 33: 8, 11, 13, 18.

“The soul that sinneth it shall *die*.” If death means separation of soul and body as men (not the Bible) say, I ask, what is the death of a soul? Has that got two parts so as to be separated?

John 11: 26; 6: 50; “Bread (Christ) may eat thereof and *not die*.” Rom. 8: 13; “If ye live after the flesh ye shall *die*.” Did not Paul know how to say “be tormented forever” as well as we? Of course *final* death is meant, as those who “walk after the spirit” die a temporal death.—(*Twenty Texts.*)

II.—DEATH.

Deut. 30: 15, 19; “I set before you *life* and *death*.” Of course Moses did not mean the obedient would not die a temporal death; hence final death was intended. Ps. 7: 11, 12; “If he turn not, he hath prepared for him the instruments of *death*.” Prov. 2: 18; 5: 5; 7: 27; 8: 36; 14: 12;

It is serious business to say all the prophets were combined to keep the people blind as to what is meant by DEATH; as no intimation is found that it was eternal misery in the Old Testament.

Matth. 4: 16; John 5: 24; 8: 51; “If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death.” Temporal death, of course, is not here meant; and does he mean *misery*, or the “second” and final *death*?

Rom. 5: 21; 6: 16, 21; “For the end of these things is death.” 6: 23; “For the *wages* of sin is *death*; but the gift of God is eternal *life*.” Note the contrast. Rom. 7: 5, 10, 13;

8: 6; 1: 32; 2 Cor. 2: 16; 7: 10; Heb. 2: 15; James 1: 15; "Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth *death*;" 5: 20.

The *second death*: Rev 2: 11; 20: 6, 14; 21: 8; "Unbelievers, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the *second death*."*—(*Thirty-three texts.*)

McKnight and Whitby, noted commentators, say, "in the second death, the body will *die* again, and the soul live on in misery." If such assumptions do not deserve ridicule instead of an answer, I know of nothing in catholic expositions that do. But they were *the great and good*, whom ministers now take as their guides.

III.—DESTROY.

Ps. 5: 6; 52: 5; "God shall also *destroy* thee *forever*, and root thee out of the land of the *living*."

Ps. 145: 20; "The Lord preserveth all them that love him: but all the wicked will he *destroy*."

Ps. 9: 5; 37: 38; "The transgressors shall be *destroyed* together." 92: 7; "When the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be *destroyed forever*."

Prov. 1: 32; 11: 3; * * 13: 13; and 29: 1; "He that being often reprov'd, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be *destroyed*, and that *without remedy*." Matth. 10: 28; 1 Cor. 3: 17; James 4: 12; "Who is able to save and to *destroy*."

Acts 3: 23; "And it shall come to pass, that every *soul* which will not hear that prophet, (Christ,) shall be *destroyed* from among the people." This threat has not yet been fulfilled; and of course the finishing of Christ's work, as king, is referred to. Notice, the soul (psuche) is to be destroyed. The proper rendering of the Greek is, "shall be *utterly destroyed*" How would it sound to say "be tormented from among the people?"

Luke 6: 49; "The house fell, and became a great heap of *ruins*.—*Geo. Campbell*. When a brick house falls, it is no more a *house*; and though the materials of which it was built are not annihilated, *the house* is. Thus we see men are guilty of quibbling, when they say "nothing can be annihilated."

* Our title, "*Death not Life*," may need an explanation to some. The popular theology makes the *final death*, threatened in the Bible, mean *life in misery*, or a *miserable life*; and the caption is intended to deny this meaning.

2 Peter 2: 12; "But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and *destroyed*." 1 John 3: 8; "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might *destroy* the works of the devil." Not so, say our creeds; they must be preserved forever, and be greater after "the Son of God" has finished his work than ever before!!—more misery, and more hatred and cursing!

Rev. 11: 18; "That thou shouldst *destroy* them that destroy the earth"—of course the devil is included. Why not say, "Shut them up in *hell*," as divines now do?

Destruction.—Job 31: 3, 23; "Is not *destruction* to the wicked?" 21: 30; "The wicked is reserved to the day of *destruction*." Ps. 73: 18; 103: 4; Prov. 10: 29; 21: 15; Isa. 1: 28; "The *destruction* of the transgressors—and of the sinners shall be together; and they that forsake the Lord shall be *consumed*." That time has not yet come, so it predicts the judgment. Matth. 7: 13; "Broad is the way that leadeth to *destruction*." Rom. 9: 22; "Vessels of wrath fitted for *destruction*." 1 Thes. 5: 3; 2 Thes. 1: 9; "Be punished with everlasting *destruction*." Why not say, *torment*, Paul? See Acts 3: 19; "from the presence" &c. 1 Tim. 6: 9; 2 Peter 2: 1; "Bring upon themselves swift *destruction*." 3: 16; "Wrest the scriptures to their own *destruction*."—(*Forty-two texts*.)

These terms are used five hundred times, and to learn their meaning we must go to the *Bible facts* where they are used, and not to theologians. When applied to men and beasts, they are synonymous with death, except in a few cases where the context shows they are, like all words, used figuratively. For *facts* see Jude.—God destroyed in the wilderness all who "came out of Egypt over twenty," &c. What became of them? Was their *happiness* only destroyed, as we are told this term means? No, it was their lives. What became of Sodom, Pharaoh's army, &c.?

IV.—PERISH.

Ps. 2: 12; "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye *perish* from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little." Ps. 49: 12; "Man being in honor, abideth not: he is like the beasts that *perish*." V. 20; "And understandeth not, is like the beasts that *perish*." V. 19; "He shall go to the generation of his fathers;

they shall never see light." V. 14, 15; "Like sheep they are laid in the grave...death shall feed on them...but God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave; for he shall receive me." These verses in their connection, show that a final doom is intended, and to "*perish* like the beasts," is to cease to be, as they do—to remain under "the power of the grave, or of death"—"the second death." Job 20: 5—7; "The triumphing of the wicked is short...he shall *perish* forever like his own dung." V. 9; "The eye also which saw him shall see him no more." Ps. 10: 16; 92: 9; 37: 20; see v. 18; "The Lord knoweth the days of the upright: and their *inheritance* shall be forever. But the wicked shall *perish*, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall *consume*, into smoke shall they *consume* away." Ps. 37: 22; "For such as be blessed of him shall inherit the earth; and they that be cursed of him shall be *cut off*." We see a *final* doom is told in these texts; as the wicked are no more "cut off" nor "perish" than the saints, as yet, but are to be "the many who go in the broad way to (final) destruction," till Christ comes.

Ps. 68: 2; "As wax melteth before the fire, so let the wicked *perish* at the presence of God." Remember the Psalms are predictions, and often the prayers of Christ. They are inspired prayers too. It is absurd to say the prophets for four thousand years did not know what future punishment would be.

Ps. 73: 27; 112: 10; Prov. 10: 28; 11: 7; 19: 9; 21: 28; Isa. 41: 11; "They that strive with thee shall *perish*...be as nothing, and as a thing of nought." Surely if they groan and curse forever, they will not be "as nothing," and they are *something* while on earth. Job 6: 18; "They go to *nothing and perish*."

Matth. 18: 14; Luke 13: 3—5; John 3: 15, 16; 11: 50; "It is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation *perish* not." The "whole nation perished" (died) on the earth, but "the election" will not "perish" eternally.

John 10: 28; Rom. 2: 12; "For as many as have sinned without law, shall also *perish* without law." Acts 13: 41; 1 Cor. 1: 18; 2 Cor. 2: 15; 2 Thes. 2: 10; 2 Peter 3: 9; 2: 12; "Shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption."

If *perish* and *destroy* means *loss of life* in this world, it is folly to *guess* they do not mean the same in the world to come. A specimen of blindness or perversion is heard in quoting Isa.

57: 1; "The righteous perisheth," to prove perish cannot mean death. If men read the Bible with any care, they would see by the whole verse that temporal *death* is meant.—(*Thirty-one texts.*)

V.—PERDITION.

John 17: 12; "Lost none but the son of *perdition*," (Judas.) Phil. 1: 28; 2 Thes. 2: 3; "Man of sin, the son of *perdition*." It is admitted that the "man of sin," (popery,) is to be ended, and this proves the wicked must be; for 2 Peter 3: 7, says: "The present world is reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and *perdition* of ungodly men." 1 Tim. 6: 9; Heb. 10: 39; "We are not of them who draw back unto *perdition*." Rev. 17: 8—11.—(*Eight texts.*)

VI.—CONSUME.

Ps. 37: 19, 20; "The wicked * * * into smoke shall they *consume* away." 49: 14; Isa. 1: 28; "They that forsake the Lord shall be *consumed*." Ps. 104: 35; "Let the sinners be *consumed*, and let the wicked *be no more*." Good critics tell us that many of David's prayers are predictions, and are the words of Christ; but why did the Spirit inspire David to pray, if this be only a prayer, for what he did not mean to grant? Ps. 59: 13, "*Consume* them in wrath; *consume* them, that they may not be." Certainly if they are only *shut up* somewhere they "*will be*."—(*Six texts.*)

VII.—DEVOUR.

Ps. 21: 9; "The Lord shall swallow them up in his wrath, and the fire shall *devour* them. This Psalm is evidently Christ's words, and tells a final doom.

Heb. 10: 27; "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of *judgment* and fiery indignation, which shall *devour* the adversaries." Here and in 2 Pet. 3: 7, we learn *where* Gehenna (hell) is to be, and *what* it is, as Lev. 10: 2; and Num. 26: 10, tell us what *devour* means.—(*Two texts.*)

VIII.—SLAY, SLAIN, KILL.

Ps. 34: 21; 62: 3; 139: 19; "Surely thou wilt *slay* the wicked, O. God; ye shall be *slain*, all of you." When? They have not been slain yet; but Luke 19: 27, tells when they will

be. "But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and *slay* them before me." V. 15, tells the time — the judgment. Prov. 1: 32; Isa. 11: 4; "With the breath of his lips shall he (Christ) *slay* the wicked." Matth. 10: 28, and Luke 12: 4, tells us it is to be done in *Ge-henna*, denoting a place of slaughter at the judgment. Amos 8: 14; "They that swear, &c., even they shall *fall*, and never *rise up* again." When is this fall to be? If only temporal death be meant, they will "rise up again" in the resurrection.— (*Eight texts.*)

IX.—BLOT OUT.

Ps. 69: 28; "Let them be *blotted out* of the book of the *living*, and not be written with the righteous." V. 11 and 26 show these are Christ's words, and so says Dr. Lord, of Buffalo. This text harmonizes with Rev. 3: 5; "I will not *blot out* his name out of the *book of life*." Again we say the final doom of the wicked was revealed to the prophets of the O. T. It is foolish to say these expressions only mean "*blotting out*" *happiness*. But perhaps I should forbear such remarks till I show there is not a text demanding such a change. Ps. 9: 5; "Thou hast *destroyed* the wicked, thou hast *put out* their name forever and ever." Predictions are often put in the past tense. Prov. 10: 25; "As the whirlwind passeth, so are the wicked *no more*; but the righteous are an everlasting foundation.— (*Four texts.*)

X.—HEWN DOWN.

Matth. 3: 10; 7: 19; "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire." Do we cast trees into the *fire* to *preserve* them? Did Christ aim to deceive? — (*Two texts.*)

XI.—LOSE LIFE.

Matth. 10: 39; 16: 25, 26; Mark 8: 35—37; John 12: 25. The import of these seven texts is alike and seen in the last. "He that loveth his *life* shall *lose it*, and he that hateth his *life* in this world, shall keep it unto *eternal life*."

No doctrine of the Bible is made more plain than the loss of existence to the sinner is here. The repetitions and the comparison shows that Christ meant to be emphatic, and put it beyond

the possibility of being misunderstood. The original word *psuche* (life) is used thirteen times in these texts, but the translators have put it *soul* four times in Matth. 16: 26; and Mark 8: 36, 37. *Perhaps* they translated it *soul* to prevent repetition, and it is only our *expounders* who dissemble by pretending that *life* and *soul* in these texts mean two things. Let those who dare, say losing *life* for Christ's sake, in this world, means literal *death*, but losing *life* in "the world to come" means only the loss of *happiness*. I pity those who do so, whether their motives be pure or not.

John 3: 36; "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting *life*; and he that believeth not the Son *shall not see life*." 1 John 5: 12; "He that hath the Son hath *life*; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not *life*." Creeds say they have *life*! Saints have "the Spirit which is the earnest and seal of their inheritance;" and in this sense they have *life* now. Eph. 1: 13, 14; 2 Cor. 1: 22. How would this text sound, to say, "he that hath not the Son, hath not happiness?" They (the wicked,) have more than heart could wish. Ps. 73: 7.—(*Eight texts.*)

XII.—END.

Ps. 7; 9; "O, let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end." Will wickedness be ended, if the wicked *live* to hate God?

Heb. 6: 8; "Whose *end* is to be burned."

Ps. 37: 38; "The end of the wicked shall be *cut off*."

Phil. 3: 19; "Whose *end* is *destruction*;" Nah. 1: 9.

If the wicked are immortal, then they have *no end*, and this language is absurd. If we had not become accustomed to absurdities, just as the Catholics have, we should see that the common theory makes the Bible the most contradictory book ever written.—(*Five texts.*)

XIII.—NOT BE.

Ps. 37: 10; "For yet a little while and the wicked shall *not be*; yea thou shalt diligently consider his *place*, and it shall *not be*." Where is hell then? Prov. 12: 7; Obad. 16, "They (the heathen,) shall be as though they had not been." 1 Sam. 2: 9; "He shall keep the feet of his saints, and the wicked shall be *silent* in darkness." Job. 8: 22; "The *dwelling-place* of the wicked shall come to nought." *Margin*, "not be." (*Five texts.*)

XIV.—CUT OFF.

Ps. 37: 9, "For evil doers shall be *cut off*; but those that wait upon the Lord shall inherit the earth." When? "The new heaven and earth." V. 22: 28, "His saints are *preserved* forever; but the seed of the wicked shall be *cut off*;" v. 38. Ps. 34: 16, "The face of the Lord is against them that do evil, to *cut off* the remembrance of them from the earth."—Cut *them* off, not their *happiness*.—(*Five texts.*)

XV.—CORRUPTION.

Gal. 6: 8, "For he that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap *corruption*; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap *life* everlasting." Note the contrast.—(*One text.*)

XVI.—GROUND TO POWDER.

Matth. 21: 44; Luke 20: 18, "On whomsoever it (the stone, Christ,) shall fall, it will *grind* him to *powder*."—"Crush him to *pieces*."—*Geo. Campbell*. Crush *him*, not his peace.

XVII.—TEAR IN PIECES.

Ps. 50: 22, "Now consider this ye that forget God, lest I tear you in *pieces*, and there be none to deliver." 1 Sam. 2: 10, "The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces."—(*Two texts.*)

XVIII.—PUT AWAY AS DROSS.

Ps. 119: 119, "Thou puttest away all the wicked of the earth like *dross*." This is not yet done, so it must refer to the judgment.—(*One text.*)

XIX.—NOTHING AND NOUGHT.

Isa. 41: 11, 12, "They that war against thee shall be as *nothing*, and as a thing of *nought*; and they that strive with thee shall *perish*." Jer. 10: 24, "Correct me, but not in thine anger, lest thou bring me to *nothing*."—(*Three texts.*)

XX.—BURN AND BURN UP.

Mal. 4: 1, "For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be

as stubble; and the day that cometh *shall burn them up*, saith the Lord of Hosts, that it shall leave them neither *root* nor *branch*." V. 3, "The wicked shall be *ashes* under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this." Thus the O. T. begins with the threatening of *death*, and ends with the doom of being "*burned up root and branch*;" and this tells what "*to die*" means.

By the above *map* of the O. T. we find eighty-five threatenings for utter destruction; and as I shall show, not *one* for *endless suffering*.

In the same *map* we have seventy-seven promises of "*life*" to the righteous. Surely God did not leave his people 4,000 years without the *motives* of *fear* and *hope* as to the *endless future*. In contrasting the fate of saints and sinners, many other terms are applied to saints, such as, "be preserved for ever,"—"inherit the earth"—"redeem me from the power of the grave," &c., and these terms show that the promise of *life* means *existence*, and not mere *happiness*, as we are vainly taught. Such promises fully taught the Jew a resurrection.

But how does the N. T. begin, as to the penalty? Matth. 3:12, "Whose fan is in his hand, and he shall thoroughly purge his floor, and gather the *wheat* into his garner; but he will *burn up the chaff* with unquenchable fire"—wrath, vengeance, which never will be quenched. "Our God is a *consuming fire*." If single texts could confirm a doctrine, ours is confirmed here; for a stronger comparison cannot be made. Chaff put into fire to be preserved! So say our creeds. Matth. 13:30, 38, 42, 48, 50, "As therefore, the *tares* are gathered and *burned* in the *fire*; so shall it be in the end of this world," &c.

It is well worthy of notice, that in all Christ's symbolic representations of the final doom of sinners, the disciples never ask an explanation only in this one, and in Luke 12:41, 46; and here the explanation is so plain that it *must* settle his meaning in all the rest. The answer in Luke agrees with this as having a "portion with unbelievers," is this—"I will *cut him in sunder*." It is a double expression of the same thing, as is common in Christ's teaching. Why did they never ask him what he meant by being "cast into the fire of Gehenna (hell)?" The answer is, they were Jews, and knew a disgraceful *death* at the judgment was meant.

John 15: 6, "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch—cast into the *fire* and they are *burned*." Heb. 6: 8, "Whose end is to be *burned*."

Ps. 21: 9, "And the *fire*, (*anger, wrath*) shall devour them." 97: 3, "A fire goeth before him, and *burneth up* his enemies." Ps. 14: 10. — (*Nine texts.*)

Where in the Bible, have men learned that "*burn up*," when applied to man, the whole man (for no dividing him is named,) at the judgment, means just the reverse of what it does in this world?

Here are twenty terms and phrases used 200 times. As I have said, to learn the meaning of Bible words and phrases, we have greatly erred in going to preachers and books. *Historical facts* in the Bible should guide us. When I read that all who came out of Egypt over twenty years of age — of the fate of Sodom and Pharaoh's army — of the 2,000 swine which ran into the sea, I shall not go to the learned to find out whether they *died*, or were only made *miserable*, when it is said they "*perished*" and were "*destroyed*." If perish and destroy means to *live* in misery, as preachers say, then beasts live in endless woe, for the terms are often applied to them. It is a perfect contradiction in language to say a thing is to be "*consumed*," "*devoured*," "*burned up*," &c., if it is indestructible, as divines say the *soul* is, or the resurrected *man* will be.

The people are often told that destructionists do not know Hebrew and Greek, and so cannot know the meaning of the terms they use; and this passes for good logic with many who are too stupid, or too idle to think and search for themselves. Be it remembered, brethren, that God has not said — "go to others to search the Scriptures for you;" yet most act as if this was very plainly commanded. But it is false that we have not learned men advocating our views. All can, however, see by the English Bible, that to make all these 200 words mean only a *destruction of happiness*, is adding to and perverting that sacred book. Universalists have been derided for saying these terms mean only the destruction of *sin* and *evil*, mere nonentities; but they are less absurd than the orthodox, because they try to apply these threatenings to earthly judgments. They offer plausible reasons for applying a few of them there.

Look over the fifty-three texts I have quoted, where the Holy Spirit has said the final doom of the sinner is *death*, and to *die*, and ask yourself if he only meant that he should be *miserable eternally!!* Do the same with the other nineteen terms. If perish means eternal woe in the Bible, then 1 Cor. 15: 18, must mean that "they who sleep in Jesus," are in eternal woe.

If destroy is sometimes applied to calamities on earth, it still means the *ending* of a thing, as of prosperity, liberty, country, character, &c.; so to say it does not mean the ending of the thing to which it refers, is false. So when God says the *man* — *the wicked* shall be destroyed and perish, it is evasion, or “adding to his words,” to say the wicked themselves are not meant.

ANOTHER CLASS OF TEXTS PROVING DESTRUCTION.

As I am arguing with the orthodox and not Universalists and Restorationists, I bring another class of texts as positive proof of *destruction*, viz., those which tell of the cleanings of the universe from “the last enemy,” or all evil. If governments have the *power*, they put an end to rebellion, by killing off some of the rebels, and then it is properly said, *peace* and “*reconciliation*” are *restored*. I kindly ask Universalists to keep in mind this idea while I take from them these strong texts on which they rely, and apply them to prove my views.

Acts 3:21, “Whom the heavens must receive until the times of *restitution* of all things.”

It will be a strange “*restitution*” if more misery and sin is produced when Christ comes than ever existed before! This *must* be, if the popular theory be correct; for *all* sinners are not *now* miserable nor *very* bad — in their *hell* they would *all* be so.

1 Cor. 15:25, 26, “For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be *destroyed* is death.” Are sinners and sin enemies to Christ? If so, they will be “destroyed.” Christ is said to “put enemies under his feet.” To have eternal groaning and cursing in a “footstool” would not *seem* to be pleasant.* This is a Bible expression for utter destruction of enemies; see Mal. 4:3; Rom. 16:20, and when men say it means only to “*shut them up*” they add to God’s word.

Heb. 2:8; 1:13, are similar. Eph. 1:10, “That in the fullness 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.

Phil. 2:10, 11, “That at the name of Jesus every knee should

* The American Tract Society published a tract, No. 277, by James Saurin, which says — “The wicked (in the fire of hell) utter as many blasphemies against God, as the happy souls in heaven shout hallelujahs to his praise.” A certain king ordered a servant to cry at his door daily — “*thou art mortal*” — will God need these “*cursees*,” to keep him humble? He adds — “This threatening is a mortal poison, diffusing itself into every period of life, and making life itself a bitter.” I wish to remove such bitterness.

low, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth. And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Col. 1: 19, 20, "For it pleased the Father, that in him should all fullness (power) dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to *reconcile all things* unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be *things in earth*, or *things in heaven*.

Rev. 5:13, "And every creature which is in *heaven*, and on the *earth*, and *under the earth* * * all that are in them, heard I, saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever."

Rev. 21: 4, "And there shall be *no more death*, neither *sorrow* nor *crying* * * nor any more pain, for the former things are passed away." V. 5, "And he that sat upon the throne, said, *Behold I make all things new*."

Ps. 2: 9 "Thou (Christ) shalt break them with a rod of iron; (all the wicked of the earth) thou shalt dash them in *pieces* like a potter's vessel."

1 John 3: 8, puts in the keystone of this class of texts. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might *destroy the works of the devil* — *he that committeth sin is of the devil*." See also Rom. 14: 11, and 2 Cor. 5: 19.—(Ten texts.)

These ten texts, and others quoted by Universalists, would fully confirm their doctrine, were they not *overwhelmed* by the previous 200 for destruction. The fact is, and Universalists see it — if the wicked are *immortal*, their doctrine is true.

I can only notice briefly some of the expressions in these ten texts. "Heaven and earth," Prof. Stuart says, "was a Hebrew phrase for the universe," and it is seen to be so from their views of *astronomy*, and the fact that Bible language is accommodated to their views.

I ask (1.) where the wicked and devils will be when "*all things* (in the universe) are reconciled to God?" Col. 1: 20. Where when "every creature (in the universe) give *glory* and *honor*," &c., Rev. 5: 13? (2.) When God "makes *all things new*," what will *hell* be? Rev. 21: 5. (3.) Divines tell us "death" and "second death," mean "*to be tormented*," and Rev. 21: 4, says, "There shall be no more *death*, — how then can there be *torment*, if death and torment be synonymous? O, Consistency, thou art a jewel.

(4.) We are told by teachers that there "being no more sorrow nor pain," means, "there will be *none in heaven*:" but why then does the Bible not say so? "Add not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Prov. 30:6.

(5.) Creed makers say, "Bowling the knee and confessing to the glory of God," "may be done by the wicked;" does it not look like a strange "glory" to confess God is a *powerful tyrant*? Certainly this must be the confession, unless the wicked are reconciled to God's character, and if so reconciled, and they have "a gnawing conscience," as is told of, why will God keep them in *hell*? Is he to change his character, and like the devil, delight in torment?

(6.) "All things in the universe are to be *gathered in one*, and *in Christ*."—Eph. 1:10. What expounder can tell us how our modern *hell*, with its legions, is to be "gathered with *all things in Christ*?"

By reading these ten texts over, it is plainly seen that they all refer to the final result of Christ's mediatorial work; and, of course, we might expect to learn from them what the consequences of sin will be, and what the state of the universe will be when "the kingdom is given up to the Father." The finishing work of Christ, and the state of things that follow, are here told over and over, as if the Spirit designed to make them perfectly plain, in order to reconcile and cheer saints under the woes of *temporary evil*.

A plain common sense explanation of them all, is briefly given by Melville, of England, an able orthodox divine. In a sermon on 1 Cor. 15:28, entitled the "Termination of the Mediatorial Kingdom," on page 147, he says: "The grand design of redemption has all along been the extermination of evil from the universe, and the restoration of harmony throughout God's disorganized empire. It was the main purpose of the Almighty to counteract evil; to obliterate the stains from his workmanship and to reinstate and confirm the universe in its original purity. To effect this, his Son assumed our nature, (Heb. 2:14;) and in working out the reconciliation of an alienated tribe, results must extend themselves to every department of creation: (to things in heaven and things in earth,"); page 148, "Christ is appointed to subdue principalities and powers. He must reign till all enemies are destroyed. Then will evil be finally expelled from the universe: and God may again look forth on his unlimited empire, and declare it not defiled by a solitary stain; then will

be the 'restitution of all things,' * * Christ *must master evil under its every form, and in its every consequence.* * * At last, death itself being 'swallowed up in victory' — the universe purged from all pollution, and glowing with a richer than a pristine beauty — this will be evidence that there has been a mediatorial kingdom, and that nothing could withstand the mediator's sovereignty." Page 149, "When the conquest of satan, and extirpation of evil are accomplished; and no possibility existing that evil may again re-enter the universe, the mediatorial kingdom may be expected to cease — God will be *worshipped by the whole intelligent creation.*"

I know that many will, even sneeringly say, "this is a Universalist explanation;" but it is the only one that can be given without using jesuistic sophistry, and murdering "the king's English." But Melville was not a Universalist; for on page 53 he says, "The *original curse* was a *curse of death* on the *whole man.*" This and other remarks show he held to *destruction*. He also shows that Christ is now the only "tree of *life*," not a "tree" of refuge from *hell* torments.

INFERENCEAL TEXTS.

Another class of texts which indirectly but strongly prove destruction, are those that promise *life* to the righteous. All know that *life* is the opposite of *death*. *Life* and *live* are applied to the believer 214 times in the Bible. Its primary meaning is existence; but suppose we call it *happiness*, and try how it would sound. That man has a *happy life*; — that is, he has a *happy happiness!* Another man has a *miserable life*; — that is to say, he has a *miserable happiness!*

Job asks, "Why is *life* given to the bitter in soul?" Did he mean, "Why give *happiness* to the bitter," &c.? "Oh, no, it means existence, except where it interferes with the darling system of immortal soulism," seems to be the answer. The seven texts I have quoted would annihilate this system, unless *life* was wrested from its proper sense — "lose *life* in the world to come * * not see *life*," &c. John 3: 36.

Why did Christ not say, "Ye will not come to me that ye might have *happiness*" — "I give unto them eternal *happiness*, and they shall never be *miserable*." He knew the word *makarios* (happy) as well as *zoe* (life), and uses it nine times in Matth. 5, translated "blessed." "I set before you *life* and *death*," is the

theme of both Testaments. Why did Christ promise eternal "life" forty-two times, and everlasting *happiness* not once? "The glory that shall be revealed," and like expressions show plainly this life will be a happy one; and of course "heirs with Christ" will be so. "Christ came to give life," and why promise it so often, if all men had it by creation?" "Mr. Blindman says, I see plainly why."—*Bunyan*.

As then these 214 texts promise, and tell of literal life, the penalty was final literal *death*. As I have said, if this was not the penalty, but life in woe, then Christ has not "given life" to the believer, nor paid the penalty, as he did not suffer endless woe. Did the "*tree of life*" mean a tree of happiness? Since Adam was driven from that tree, Christ takes its place, and we must "eat his flesh," &c., or die.

In the few texts where *life* and *death* are used figuratively, the context shows they are so used. "We know we *have* passed from *death* unto *life*," is made plain by the one, "he that believeth not is condemned already" — condemned to die. The murderer is in a *state* of *death*, doomed to die, but if forgiven, he passes to a state of life — so with the forgiven sinner. Glory to God for this state. Paul says, "I was alive without the law, but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died" — died to all hope from, and dependence on the law and his own works or righteousness. Eph. 2:1, "You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins;" v. 3, "Were children of wrath," explains this verse: *i. e.*, they were in a state of death, "condemned (to die) already," and were "in sin," were sinners and doomed to die. Divines make the people believe that *death* and *sin* here is one thing, and that to be dead is only to be in a *sinful state*; and then cry out, death does not mean loss of life or existence. Let us see how correct they are. "*Sin* entered into the world, and *death* by *sin*: and so *death* passed upon all men, for (*because*) that all have sinned." Rom. 5:12; v. 17, "By one man's *offence*, *death* reigned;" v. 21, "Sin hath reigned unto death, so grace reigns * * unto *eternal life*." We see here the Bible and men do not agree — sin and death are two things.

Let me see if I can make this text plain:—The murderer is *dead* in law, and is "in sin" — is a transgressor, but he finds to his sorrow, that *sin* and *dying* are two very different things, though *sin* *causes* his death. So the threatening "thou shalt die," is perverted to mean *moral death*. How does it sound? "If you *sin*, you shall be a *sinner*!" Adam became a *sinner*,

when he transgressed, but that was not the penalty — the *penalty* was *death*. Thus the Bible is “wrested” to make out that *life* and *death* are *figurative*, and do not mean *existence*, when they tell our final doom. Thus all the texts where life and death are used figuratively can be easily explained, without murdering language.

But now turn to the 214 texts where life tells the state and final reward of the righteous; and to the fifty-three where *die* and *death* apply to the sinner’s final doom, and you will see they must be taken in their literal sense. Mystifying these words has thrown *dust* into the eyes of Christians long enough. These 214 texts then, are strong inferential proof of destruction.

Since writing the above, I have read with care, Prof. Stuart’s ten pages (page 94—104) in which he labors to make *life* and *death* figurative when applied to our final reward, and I pronounce his argument a “cunningly devised fable.” 2 Pet. 1: 16. But he held to immortality, and was opposing Universalists, and had no other way to meet them, nor to harmonize immortality with the threatening of death, than by making it mean *life in misery*. He says, “Should one range the whole compass of human language, he could find no two terms so significant as these, (life and death,) in order to designate the joys of heaven, or the pains of hell. To do this, they must indeed be *figuratively* employed. But the same is true of all other words that are or could be used for the same purpose.” I ask if “joy, glory, peace, rest, blessed,” &c., are used “*figuratively*” when they are applied to the heavenly state? Are they not more “significant” than *life*? “Christ came to give us *life*,” so that we could have glory, joy, &c.; but *the life*, and the *joy* and *glory* are two very different things.

Again, I ask if “pain, torment,” &c., are not more “significant terms” to tell a state of woe, than “death” is? I ask too if “they *must* be *figurative*, as he says, when used to “designate” such a state?

With my scanty knowledge, I think Stuart had need to “range the compass of human language” again. If the threatening of death to Adam meant “loss of holiness, or spiritual death,” then what will “the second death” be? Will they only become sinners the second time? If “eating of the tree of *life*,” did not mean the obtaining of *existence*, then it meant the obtaining of holiness or *spiritual life*. Did God wish to prevent this by shutting out of the garden? The same thing lost by the first

tree, was to be gained by the second. The truth is, God did not mean to have man *live forever* in a state of sin, and thanks to his name, he will accomplish his object.

The argument or doctrine that the *death* threatened to Adam, implied a COMPOUND of spiritual, temporal and eternal *death*, — the latter implying *life in torment*, is a COMPOUND of *consume mate folly!!*

I am aware, Universalist friends, that this remark hits you in *part*, as *you* too say the threatening implied *spiritual death*, though not eternal woe. But it is good to be right in part.

A BRIEF REVIEW.

First.—Do not these 210 passages afford moral demonstration that the wicked are *mortal*, soul and body, and will cease to be when the sentence of the judgment is executed as is the sentence of the judge on the capital offender? I affirm that no doctrine of the Bible is as *clearly* and *abundantly* proved, except the being and attributes of the Deity, and the assurance of eternal life to the righteous. No doctrines but these have as large a number of texts on which to rest. Reason would dictate that the *penalty* of God's law would be made as full and plain as its *promises*. The semi-civilized Chinese seem to understand the importance of this principle, as it is said they cause their *penal code* to be read to all the people yearly.

I am often met with the remark, that we cannot found a doctrine on particular terms, and so the above terms fail to help me. This is false, where words are plain, numerous and to one point. How do we prove the atonement except by the terms "Christ died for our sins,"—"gave his life for us," &c.? These terms are plain, and so are those for destruction. The papal doctrine of the power of the pope and priests, founded on the terms "*key* of the kingdom of heaven," and "what ye bind on earth," &c., is a specimen of relying on a few terms—and mind too these *are* figurative. Besides, comparisons help these terms, as "chaff," "tares," "destroyed as beasts," &c.

I remark *secondly*, I have quoted about twenty words and phrases, which are about 400 times used, one-half giving *positive*, and the other half strong inferential proof of destruction; and all these expressions by the Holy Spirit, are, and must be changed from their primary, to a figurative sense to disprove the

doctrine, and sustain the popular penalty. Ponder them well, dear reader, and you will see I am not mistaken; God's book is before you.

I assert, without fear of refutation, that another such a wholesale perversion of God's word cannot be found, and was never made in Christendom. Other truths have been cried down, and other errors held up, by changing the common-sense meaning of a few texts, or terms, but here is wholesale work with a vengeance. I am giving facts, and not opinions.

It is a notorious fact, that in our theological works, a *non-descript dictionary* is made, with definitions as follows: To *be dead*, means to be more conscious; to *die*, is to live on in woe. To *lose life*, is to preserve a miserable existence. *Life* means happiness. To *burn up*, to make a *living salamander*. To *destroy*, is to preserve whole. To *devour, perish, consume, &c.*, means to make *indestructible* and *immortal*. *Not to be*, to be without end.

Of course, reasons are assigned, and excuses made for asking the people to accept this dictionary, and approve its definitions.

The *sum* of all the reasons is, that the wicked are immortal, and so these terms *must* be wrested from their literal meaning.

But how is this immortality proved?

I will notice briefly in this and the next chapter the main arguments, except the one that the wicked are to *suffer forever*, leaving this for the following chapters.

THE RESORT TO THE BIBLE TO PROVE IMMORTALITY.

Two texts are commonly quoted to prove we were *created immortal*. Gen. 1: 27, "So God created man in his own image." Dr. Dwight, in sermon 22, says, "Being made in the *image* of God," means being so in *knowledge* and *holiness*, and quotes as proof Col. 3: 10, "And have put on the new man, which is renewed in *knowledge* after the *image* of him that created him." Eph. 4: 24, "Put on the new man, which after God is *created* in *righteousness* and true *holiness*." Here we are plainly told what was meant by the *image* of God, and *immortality* happens not to be the quality or likeness.

The idea is, God had created animals, and now wished to create one out of the same "*dust* of the earth," with knowledge sufficient to possess a moral character, like himself. Dr. Dwight says, "This is the *broad distinction between men and animals*." Ser. 22

We have found out, by experience, that we were not made in God's *image* or *likeness*, as to *power, omnipotence, &c.*, but we will have to live through *eternity*, before we learn we were made *immortal*, unless he tells us so; which he certainly has not done in the Bible; that promises it to those "who seek for it." Rom. 2: 7.

Bishop Whately justly says, "The words *life* and *immortality* are never applied to the condition of the wicked in the Scriptures." Weak or deluded must be the head which can see the least particle of proof for immortality in this text; yet a college-learned (not Bible) Baptist minister lately referred me to this text as proof of immortality, and it is a common refuge. Verily, "drowning men catch at a straw." The "dark ages" are not past.

The other text to prove that man was made immortal, or with an immortal soul, is Gen. 2: 7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives, (plural); and man became a living soul," (*creature*, as the original signifies.) Note—"Man was made of the *dust*;" so if "breath" meant a *soul* or living entity, another part, that was not "*the man*," for the *man* was "*dust*" — "*dust thou art*," not "*thy body is dust*," as divines make it mean, by adding to what is written. But *soul* has become a *great* word in the 19th century. Let us see what it meant in Bible times. In this text it is said, "And man became a (*nephesh chayiah*) living soul." Gen. 1: 24 reads, "Let the earth bring forth the (*nephesh chayiah*) living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping things." Gen. 2: 19, "The Lord formed every beast * * and brought them unto Adam * * and whatsoever Adam called every (*nephesh chayiah*) living creature, that was the name thereof." Gen. 6: 19, "And of every (*nephesh chayiah*) living thing of all flesh * * shalt thou bring into the ark to keep them alive with thee." Here, and in more than twenty other places, the same words translated "*living soul*," are applied to beasts; but the translators have them *living creatures*, or *thing, &c.* *Chayiah* is *living*, so man became a "living creature," or living *soul*; and if this means an *immortal soul*, then all beasts and creeping things have such. Thus we see the unlearned are kept in ignorance by careless translators, and the *learned* expounders keep up the darkness, and will not make "the vision plain."

But as I have thus censured, and the subject is of importance, it is necessary to add something more.

ERRORS IN OUR TRANSLATION.

Error has been practised by the translators, and especially by learned expounders, in relation to the five original words translated *soul* and *spirit*. The learned tell us *soul* and *spirit* means a *part* of man which is *immortal*, and so cannot *die, perish, &c.* Let us see briefly what faithful learned critics and the Bible teaches as to the words *nesme, nephesh, ruach*, Hebrew, and *psuche and pneuma*, Greek, translated *soul* and *spirit*.

(1.) *Nesme*.—Taylor, in his Hebrew Concordance, says, “*Nesme* signifies the chameleon, a kind of lizard, which always has its mouth open, gaping for the air, upon which it is said to live.” In 1 Kings 17: 17, we read, “His sickness was so sore, that there was no *breath (nesme)* left in him.” In v. 21, “Elijah cried, let this child’s *soul (nephesh, same as nesme)* come in him again.

“Here,” say divines, “is proof that man has a *soul* which leaves the body when he dies.” If this is not perverting God’s word, both by the translators and expounders, I ask what is?

(2.) *Nephesh*.—Parkhurst says, “As a noun, it has been supposed to signify the *spiritual part* of man, or what is called his *soul*. I must, for myself, confess that I can find no passage where it hath undoubtedly this meaning.” Taylor says, “*Nephesh* signifies the animal life, or that principle by which every animal lives.” He does not even intimate that it ever signifies an *immortal soul*, which survives the death of the body.” Yet this Hebrew word is translated *soul* 471 times, and *life* and *live* about 150 times; also *man, person, self, they, him me, breath, heart, mind, appetite, the body, lust, creature*, and twenty-eight times applied to *beasts, and every creeping thing*. Thus we see how easy it is for the unlearned to be deceived about the meaning of the word *soul*.

(3.) *Ruach*.—Taylor says, “It first and properly signifies the *wind, air, breath*.” Corruption in its translation and explanation, is seen in Ecc. 3: 19—21. “They (men and beasts) have all one *breath (ruach)*.” V. 21, It is, “who knoweth the *spirit (ruach)* of men that goeth upward, and the *spirit (ruach)* of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?” Here again we see how the church is kept in the dark, by being taught that *breath* and *spirit* mean two things, in such texts. Here, too, we

see how absurdly men reason, or think; if *spirit* means an immortal part of creatures on earth, then *beasts* have such a part, and it "goeth downward."

(4.) The Greek word *psuche* has the same meaning as *nep-hesh* in Hebrew; and Parkhurst's first sense of it is, "*breath, animal life, a living animal that lives by breathing,*" &c. It is used 105 times in the N. T., and translated *soul* fifty-nine times, and *life* forty; also, *mind, us, heart*, and twice applied to beasts. Rev. 8:9; 16:3.

One error in translating it *soul* instead of *life* is seen plainly in Matthew 16:25, 26, and Mark 8:36, 37, where it is rendered four times *life* and four times *soul*. V. 25 is, "For whosoever will save his *life* (*psuche*) shall lose it." V. 26, "For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul (*psuche*)?" The learned tell the people that *psuche* (*life*) in v. 25, means literal *life*, and we should lose it, if need be, in persecutions; but in v. 26 they say, the same word, *psuche*, (*life*), means an immortal *soul* which cannot lose life or *die*. But they are careful not to tell us the original words are the same;

Had *psuche* been rightly rendered in these texts, no one would have thought of going to them to prove that men have immortal *souls* to lose in the world to come. They will have resurrected *lives* to lose there; and Christ says, positively, that those who will not bear persecution for his sake, shall lose them there.

(5.) The Greek word *pneuma* is the same as the Hebrew word *ruach*: see its meaning above. It is rendered both *spirit* and *life*. Rev. 13:15, "And he had power to give *pneuma, life*, unto the image, &c. James, 2:26, "For as the body without the *pneuma, spirit*, is dead," &c. In both these texts the translators put it *breath* in the margin, as being as right as *spirit* and *life*; and why do they do it if *pneuma* meant an immortal part of man? Butterworth gives *spirit* seventeen meanings in the Bible, and we should think it rather a changeable word upon which to found proof of man's immortality.

Here we have all the *Bible* proofs that man was made with an immortal soul — even *two* texts, and the uncertain words *soul* and *spirit* — rather an airy foundation, good sense will say, even if there were no opposing texts.

I need quote but three opposing texts out of many, to show

NOTICE.—The meaning of these five Hebrew and Greek terms I have extracted from a work by H. Grew, of Philadelphia, and "Bible vs. Tradition."

the folly of popular expositions: Job 4: 17, Shall *mortal man* be more just than God?" At your peril "add not to the words of the book," and say it only means a "*mortal body.*" Rom. 2: 7, tells us that those who "*seek for immortality*" will have "eternal life." 1 Tim. 6: 16, "*God only hath immortality.*"

If one quarter the time had been spent in examining the doctrine of destruction, which has been spent on the far less important matters of Baptism, Armenianism, Calvinism, church order, &c., endless misery would now be "among the things that *were.*"

But I turn to another reason for changing terms for destruction from their literal sense.

CHAPTER II.

METAPHYSICAL REASONS FOR IMMORTALITY.

THAT the light of reason shows man to be immortal, is being given up by all deep thinkers, as an absurdity; but as the mass of ministers are still using the by-gone arguments, and Christians have learned the lesson, and are repeating it, I will glance at the subject.

The great cry against us is *materialism!!* A few writers of late, such as Rev. L. Lee, of New York, Rev. J. G. Stearns, of Western New York, and a learned Baptist editor of our State, have sounded this alarm, and repeated the old story, that man has a *soul* or *spirit* which is a simple substance, indivisible, immaterial, uncompounded, and so indestructible. I ask, why undertake to describe what they know nothing about? and of which all other men are equally ignorant?

Mr. George Combe, on *materialism*, says, "The question is a vain and trivial one. Nothing can be more unphilosophical than the clamor about the danger attending it. A manly intellect will dissipate this clamor, by showing the question is altogether an illusion. The solution of the question as to the essence of the soul, appears to be completely beyond our reach. No idea can be more erroneous than to suppose man is an *immortal* being on account of the *substance* of which he is made." Syst. of Phren., pp. 595—7.

Says Dr. Spurzheim, "Nature has denied to man powers to discover, as a *matter of direct perception*, either the *beginning* or *end*, or *essence* of anything under the sun; they are interdicted regions." On these statements a learned writer remarks: "Modern philosophers are aware of this, but fear to confess it, lest they should be branded with the name of *materialists*."

Watson, the great Methodist writer, says, "Some suppose.

consciousness is an essential attribute of spirit; and the soul is *naturally* immortal; the former of which cannot be proved, while the latter is contradicted by the Bible, which makes our immortality a gift, dependent on the will of the giver."—*Institutes*, v. 2, p. 82, 83.

Dr. Dwight *assumes* that the soul is immortal, but was compelled to say, "Whatever has been created, can certainly be annihilated. The continuance of the soul, must, therefore, depend absolutely on the will of God."—Vol. 1, pp. 163.

Dr. J. Lock, Esq., the great mental philosopher and Christian, who held to *destruction*, says, "It is as difficult to conceive how *any created substance* should *think and feel*, as it is that our brain should think and feel." This is good sense, for God can superadd to *any* substance, any quality he pleases. But it was easy for weaker heads than Dr. Lock's to put down his theory, because he introduced something *NEW* — not found in any old theological creed!! Matter is a *substance*, and what divines call a *soul* must be a created *substance*, or it is nothing — a nonentity.

The plea that *analogy* shows nothing is annihilated, and therefore the wicked cannot be, is a full-grown absurdity: for mark, it is *life*, or *conscious* existence, we say is to cease; not matter or substance of any kind. And besides, it denies the Bible and God's power, to say he can "create" but *cannot* "destroy."—James 4: 12. When an ox or a man is dead, *life* is annihilated, but not matter. All men of sense say they know not what *life* is; and to tell of a "*principle of life*, which continues when man is dead," is only nonsense.

Some I find, even in our boasted day of knowledge, yet hold the heathen dogma, that our souls are a part of God, "breathed into us." Of course then he is divided, and sinning, and suffering in every polluted child of Adam! Yes, and he means to send a part of himself to eternal flames! But we are told "that which *thinks*, remembers, &c., cannot be matter, therefore man *must* have a *soul*, composed of some other *substance*." A sufficient answer to this reiterated argument, as to my doctrine is this — *suppose* man has a separate part or soul, which is made of such other substance, cannot God disorganize, or destroy, or *annihilate*, if you please, *that created substance* as easily as he can matter? has he said he cannot, or will not do it? — *where?* He has said the "*soul shall die, perish*," &c. Let us hear more of Lock's reasoning:

“The idea of matter is an extended, solid substance: wherever there is such a substance, there is matter, and the essence of matter, whatever other qualities, not contained in that essence, it shall please God to superadd to it. For example, God creates an extended, solid substance, without the superadding any thing else to it, and so we may consider it at rest: to some parts of it he superadds motion, but it has still the essence of matter: other parts of it he frames into plants with all the excellence of vegetation, life and beauty, which is to be found in a rose, or a peach-tree, &c., above the essence of matter, in general, but it still is but matter: to other parts he adds sense and spontaneous motion, and those other properties that are to be found in an elephant. Hitherto it is not doubted, but the power of God may go, and that the properties of a rose, a peach, or an elephant, superadded to matter, change not the properties of matter; but matter is, in these things, matter still. But if one ventures to go one step further, and say, God may *give to matter, thought, reason, and volition*, as well as sense and spontaneous motion, there are men ready presently to *limit* the power of the Omnipotent Creator, and tell us ‘he cannot do it, because it destroys the essence, or changes the essential properties of matter.’ To make good which assertion, they have no more to say but that thought and reason are not included in the essence of matter. I grant it; but whatever excellency, not contained in its essence, be *superadded to matter*, it does not destroy the essence of matter, if it leaves it an extended, solid substance; wherever that is, there is the essence of matter; and if every thing of greater perfection, superadded to such a substance, destroys the essence of matter, what will become of the essence of matter in a plant or an animal, whose properties far exceed those of a mere extended, solid substance?

“But it is further urged, that we cannot conceive how matter can think. I grant it: but to argue from thence, that God, therefore, cannot give to matter a faculty of thinking, is to say God’s Omnipotency is limited to a narrow compass, because man’s understanding is so; and brings down God’s infinite power to the size of our capacities. * * * I cannot conceive how matter should think. What is the consequence? ergo, (therefore,) God cannot give it a power to think. Let this stand for a good reason, and then proceed with other cases by the same. You cannot conceive how matter can attract matter, at any distance, much less at the distance of 1,000,000 miles; ergo, God cannot give it such a power!” &c.—*Locke to the Bishop of Worcester; Works Fol. Ed. 1740, Vol. 1., pp. 588, 589, 590—592.*

When pressed with the argument, that *brutes* think, remember, feel, &c., and asked if they have souls made of this *other peculiar* substance? — some now say they have, and are immortal! Thus they have a new *assumption*, wedged under assumptions to hold up a system they see begins to totter.

It is a pity that all have not the humility and wisdom of Bishop Watson, who says, "I have read volumes on the nature of the soul, but I have no scruple in saying I know nothing about it. Hoping as I do for eternal life through Jesus Christ, I am not disturbed at my inability to clearly convince myself that the soul is, or is not, a substance distinct from the body."—*Memoirs I.*, p. 23.

Dr. McCulloh, of Baltimore, says, "There is no word in the Hebrew language that signifies either soul or spirit in the technical sense in which we use the terms as implying something distinct from the body." He adds, "A *soul* was first *inferred* from seeing that the body turned to dust, and not seeing how it could be raised, and its identity restored or continued, men concluded there must be a part of man that lived on."—V. 2, p. 466–8.

The mass of ministers are "*inferring*" and erring in the same way. I only need to remark, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the POWER of God." Math. 22: 29.

The Sadducees saw that their Scriptures said nothing of a *soul* which "lived on," and they had too much sense to *infer* a doctrine; but, like divines now, they vainly denied the "*power of God*" to restore a man when wholly turned to dust, and so unavoidably denied a resurrection. Their error, and that of modern semi-Sadducees, lies in denying God's *power*.

Let us illustrate and make this metaphysical argument be fully seen if possible. Suppose an astronomer says — there are men in the moon, and they are ten feet high, and made of electricity, *therefore* they will live forever. In such a case, we would ask for his telescope to prove men were there: next, we would ask how he proved by their *size* and *substance*, they would *live forever*? We would naturally inquire too, by what chemical process he ascertained what they were made of, seeing he had not come in contact with them? Surely we have not come in contact with the *substance* of a so-called *soul*, any more than with men in the moon. It seems to me that the *crucible* by which men try the quality or essence of the soul, must be something like what they say the soul itself is, *imma-*

terial — not tangible to the five senses, nor yet to our mental vision: I have never seen the *thing*. But perhaps my vision is obscure since I emerged from the cell of tradition.

Let any one read Dwight, Edwards, and other old writers on the immortality of man, and then notice the preaching and talk of the present day, and he will be reminded of these lines:

“The parrot prates, it knows not what,
For all it says it learned by rote.”

I will try and not be more light, when on a serious subject, than was Elijah when he said to the prophets of Baal, “Cry aloud, for he is God; peradventure he sleepeth.”

The *New York Recorder*, of May 11, 1853, which I have just seen, charges destructionists with being modern Sadducees. Among other absurd inferences, and false charges, (and they are all such,) I have only time to notice two. “If man has no immortal spirit of which the body is the dwelling-place, there can be no preservation of *personal identity* at the resurrection; and if God reanimates the dust, it will be completely a *new creation*.”

I take the liberty to affirm that it is rank Sadduceeism to assert that God cannot raise the dead — the whole man — from unconscious “dust,” to which he has “returned,” as God said he should, and continue his *identity*. It plainly contradicts the Bible to say, that such a resurrection would be a “*new creation*.” See this proved in 1 Cor. 15.

The chemist, in his *retort*, or *jar* of oxygen gas, burns iron wire to invisible gas, and then by acids brings that gas back to iron; and I ask if this is a new creation? This speck of earth is God Almighty’s *retort* or *jar*; and he can decompose any organized substance or thing he has made and placed in this jar, and then bring the same simple elements back to their former organized state; and do it with more ease than the chemist does his work.

And further.— to restore consciousness and continue identity in our reorganized systems, will be no more a miracle of power and wisdom, than it was to bestow them at first. How came our food to digest and change the simple elements of inert and unconscious matter into a conscious body or brain in brutes as well as men?

The common or general creed theory is, that some other substance, called the *soul*, is somehow infused into these particles

of matter and makes them conscious, or is itself the conscious thing. This brings up Dr. John Lock's question, viz., how came that other created substance called a soul, to possess consciousness and identity? The answer must unavoidably be, God's power and wisdom effected it; and this brings us back to the starting point, namely, that God's power has made our organized systems conscious beings in a way we cannot possibly comprehend.

"Aspiring to be Gods, if angels fell,
Aspiring to be angels, *men* rebel."

If we cannot conceive *how* we became conscious beings and possessed identity, nor *how* any other created substance possesses these qualities, neither can we conceive *how* we shall become beings with these qualities by a resurrection. But to deny God's *power* and *wisdom* to effect it, is just what the Sadducees denied as to a resurrection. Their denying that angels, or any other created spiritual beings existed, was *vainly inferred*; and was just such an inference as the *Recorder* has made; for he says, "that minds sufficiently intelligent to form a coherent system, see that this new Sadduceeism (destructionism,) is a denial of all spiritual existence whatever."

Paul in 1 Cor. 15: 44, says, "It is sown a *natural* body, it is raised a *spiritual* body." This we believe, and this is our hope, and how then does our theory deny spiritual existence?

Mark 12: 25, says, "When we rise" we are to be "as the angels." If our "spiritual body" is to be "*as the angels*," how do we deny *their* existence? The inference is an absurd one, and yet upon it the editor founds a column of dismal consequences and outrageous slander.

But to avoid being called Sadducees, the *Recorder & Co.*, have invented an "*eighth* wonder of the world," viz., that a *dead man* being *raised up* from the grave, means a *live man* coming *down* from heaven, or up from tartarus to be judged! This essentially denies a resurrection. It is not even intimated in the Bible.

Let me hint an illustration. Suppose God should reveal that he would give a resurrection to all *dead butterflies*; and a commentator should say this means that he will send all *live butterflies* back to their old caterpillar shells, and make those shells better than they were originally, or were before they turned to dust: should we not say with Paul, "*thou fool*," this

would not be a resurrection! — the primary meaning of a resurrection is “*to stand up again*,” but this would be having the butterfly “*stand down again*.”

But the Recorder and brotherhood say our doctrine leads to infidelity and atheism. I can only give a short answer to this charge.

We subscribe to God’s power to make any substance possess consciousness and identity — to suspend, and then restore these qualities in that substance; or, to decompose man’s organized body, and reorganize it with its former qualities — to end, forever, the life of a man as well as of an ox; in short, that “he can do all his will and pleasure.” The power and wisdom of God to do these things, these men deny.*

Again, Peter says, in Acts 2: 29, 34, “David is both dead and buried,” and “David is not ascended into the heavens.” These men say, “David is *not dead*, and *has* ascended into heaven.” And our editor says, “if God reanimates his dust, it will be completely a *new creation*;” so of course David is to have no resurrection! — and of course no other saints!

Once more: some heathen philosophers could not conceive *how* any substance came to exist, and think, and feel, &c., and this led some to deny their *own existence*, and others to say there was nothing but *thoughts* in existence. These men are on the same track, and where will they and, if they *think deeply* enough to pursue it?

Now I ask which of our systems of belief, looks the most like infidelity and atheism? and also which has the nearest brotherhood to Sadduceeism?

But I must hasten to a close of this chapter.

The plain common sense of all reasoning on this subject is this: it is a direct insult to the Almighty to say he has made any living being he cannot put an end to; no matter how many *parts* it possesses, nor of what substance it is made.

The Bible tells us plainly that men and beasts are made of the same material, “*dust*;” and that both have the “*same breath*,” that they “*both die alike*;” — but mark, a *resurrection* is not told for both. Ecc. 3: 18—21. See many other positive texts.

But as this point is not the object of this work, I leave it, hoping I have said enough to show the popular folly in reasoning

* I am aware that some begin to back out of this denial, but most yet continue it.

on immortality. All the Bible and metaphysical *objections* to the doctrine that dead men *are dead*, have been fully removed by Rev. P. Ham, Rev. Geo. Storrs, Rev. Thos. Reed, and others, and to their works I refer the reader.

I should not have said thus much on this heathen — this pitiable prop of immortality, had I not learned that it is *now* a great theme with ministers and dependent thinkers; and found they were seizing hold of it as if it was a mighty dagger with which to butcher *destructionists*. It is the only weapon of the *New York Recorder*. As yet it falls harmlessly at our feet; but it frightens many pupils, or dazzles their eyes by its glittering appearance.

I am aware that those who use these arguments appear to many sincere Christians like a peculiar character Milton tells of, "who could make the worse *appear* the better reason."

A certain D. D. in B——, lately found some of his flock inclined "to grow in knowledge," and he preached a sermon, by notice, to sustain immortality; and one of his most intelligent members told me he quoted but *one* text of Scripture. "Philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men," was his theme. Col. 2: 8, "Beware lest any man spoil you," &c.! Since "those who turn the world upside down" came to this B——, other ministers have taken a similar course.

Why this appeal to *reason*, if the Bible, as they say, is full of immortality? "Why prophesy false dreams, and cause the people to err? "what is the chaff to the wheat?"—Jer. 3: 28—32.

But I must notice a *new*, and the last refuge of our opponents; it is this: "The Bible *assumes* that man is immortal!" Three learned ministers, one an editor in New York, lately made this their main refuge in conversation with me. I was glad to find that destructionists had so far opened their eyes that they saw their old weapons were "broken reeds."

How does this look? A weighty doctrine proved by the *silence* of the Bible!! I would kindly say to such brethren, the time has come when many want, and all need, a "thus saith the Lord," for their belief; and many *will not*, and none should be satisfied with what he *saith not*.

I will just say a little on the reasoning to make this *assumption* appear plausible. First, they say, "Christ came to save us from endless misery." This is a new assumption, for the Bible nowhere says so: that says plainly he came to save from *sin* and *death*, and to give "eternal life."

Secondly, It is said, "Christ would not have suffered and died if the threatening 'thou shalt surely die,' meant no more than what it says." Or, in other words, "it was a little work for Christ to only save from blank oblivion." This is another and an insulting assumption. To bring up from the gloomy grave "an innumerable company," and give them *eternal life*, and crowns of glory; make them "kings and priests unto God:" this a *little work!* — a work not worthy of a life-loving Saviour!!

Read Eph. 2: 7, and 3: 10, and we see the "redeemed church" is "to make known the *riches* of God's *grace* and *wisdom*, to principalities and powers in heavenly places," — thus glorify God, and make happier the whole universe through eternity: and yet this is a little work for Christ to effect by suffering for a death-doomed race!! "Ye are a *chosen generation* * * * that ye should show forth the *praises* of him who hath called you out of *darkness*" — of death and sin, not out of a modern hell. Heb. 2: 9.

Further, this reasoning is an insult to the *feelings* of Christians, who are sustained in trials by the *hope* of eternal life and glory, and not by the thought of escaping woe, nor yet oblivion. But I cannot enlarge, and only add, away with such sophistry; blot it from the records of theology.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

I have now noticed the principal texts of Scripture except those claimed as proof of endless woe; and also the main reasons, relied on as proof, that all men were made, or are immortal, and as a consequence, have tested the authority, for changing from their literal sense, the 200 or 210 declarations for the proof of *destruction*. And I ask if the foundation for immortality, thus far examined, does not utterly fail? For myself I answer, it is built on assumptions, piled on baseless assumptions.

I am thankful that many begin to see and discard these assumptions. A writer in the *New York* (Baptist) *Recorder* of April 6, 1854, after showing the evasive course of critics on Dr. Beecher's "*Conflict of Ages*," concludes with these reflections: "How singularly sure all these critics are that God is all the while creating souls, thousands per minute, each soul for its body, somewhere between conception and birth. How did they find it out? who told them (in the Bible) that the Almighty

was thus critically and professionally occupied? Or how did they find out, (as numbers seem to be just finding out) that the immaterial principle is *not* created directly, but *propagated* by ordinary generation? Clamorous against preexistence as *not* proved, where is their *proof* of this on which they stand to be clamorous?"

Here we have the important question suggested: where in God's word do we read of concreation—a body and a *spirit*, or soul, created at the same time, or in union? We do, often, read of *traduction*; "Adam begat a son in his own likeness" &c.,—Gen. 5: 3. God commanded Adam to "multiply and replenish the earth." How could he obey if God himself must create the souls? Surely, multiplying souls was the greater work, if our creeds are correct. Further; if creeds be true, God must now be creating some 60,000 *polluted* souls daily, and putting them into new bodies!! Man has a mind, or *spirit*, but is it an *entity*, which lives when "man's *thoughts perish*?" Ps. 146:—4; or is it only the "spirit of love, of anger" &c., the *affect*, or an *attribute* of our physical organism?

Will we have two *entities*, or a spirit within us, when "raised a *spiritual body*?" Cor. 15: 44. In sermons we hear much of soul and body uniting in the resurrection, but the Bible never intimates it, nor tells the state of disembodied spirits; strange silence!! Have angels two parts, a body and a spirit? Thus I might multiply difficulties in the common theory. The fact is, the existence of a spirit or soul as an entity within us, is only *inferred* from a few uncertain texts, which can be explained another way; while numerous plain texts, and the sense of the Bible, are against it.

Where does the book of *nature*, or the book of *God* tell what *soul*, or *MAN*, is made of, except in the earth-wide and heaven-broad declaration, "DUST THOU ART?"* Echo answers, WHERE!!

Where in these two books do we learn by *plain* testimony, that *any* man has, or ever will have, immortality, *only* as we learn it from the positive, and *soul cheering* promises — "I give unto them [*believers*] eternal life," "and I will raise them up at the last day;" "this *mortal* must put on *immortality*;" "neither can they die any more?" Again echo answers, WHERE!

* Of course the generic term *dust*, includes all the substances of our globe, as air, water, electricity, earth, &c.

CHAPTER III.

OPPOSING TEXTS, OR TEXTS FOR ENDLESS WOE EXAMINED — HELL NOT A LOCAL PLACE TO CONTINUE ETERNALLY.

As the word *hell*, fifty-four times found in our English Bible, is prominently used as either direct or inferential proof of the immortality and endless misery of the wicked, I will endeavor to remove this proof, by devoting a short chapter to the meaning of the word. It will also aid much in removing the proof claimed to be found in other texts.

The following remarks on the term *hell* I published a few months since in a religious paper, and give them here nearly as they appeared then, with some additions.

The brief explanations will be made up in the following chapters.

The English word *hell*, as now generally understood, is a hindrance to those who are examining the doctrine of *destruction*; but if rightly understood, it would greatly aid in proving the doctrine. It now denotes a *place*, (no one dares say where,) as a prison for the eternal misery of men and devils. I deny this meaning, and say, that none of the four original words translated *hell* ever have this meaning, as used in the Bible. I will endeavor to prove this assertion, both from the Bible and the confessions of our best critics who hold to endless misery.

In the first place, let us hear what Dr. George Campbell, a Presbyterian commentator of Scotland, says on two words translated *hell*. "In my judgment," he says, "*hades* ought never in Scripture, to be rendered *hell*; at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by Christians. In the O. T., the corresponding word is *sheol*, which signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness or

badness of persons, their happiness or misery. *Hades* signifies obscure, hidden, invisible." See Diss., vol. 1, pp. 180-181. He elsewhere says, "The Saxon word *hell* originally means only a pit, or covered place."

1. SHEOL.—I will next quote from Exegetical Essays, on several words relating to future punishment, by Moses Stuart, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Andover. On page 99 he says, "*Sheol* is used sixty-three times in the O. T., and translated *hell* thirty-one times, *grave* thirty, and *pit* three. It is pit in Num. 16: 30—33; Job 17: 16."

On page 112 he says, "The meaning of *sheol* which lies upon the face of the sacred record (if I may thus speak,) is indeed that of *grave, sepulchre, under world, or state of the dead*, as I have given in the recension of the passages."

On pages 116-119, in giving a statement of what the Bible says of *sheol*, he says:

1. "Sheol is a place from which none ever return, e. g., Job 7: 9; 2 Sam. 12: 23.

2. "It consumes or devours the bodies laid in it. Job 24: 19; Ps. 49: 14.

3. "Sheol is a place of inaction and silence, e. g., Ps. 6: 5; 31: 17; 1 Sam. 2: 9; Isa. 38: 18; Ecc. 9: 10.

4. "Sheol extends deep into the recesses of the earth; yea, as deep as the heavens are high above it. Job 11: 8; Jonah 2: 1; Amos 9: 2; Deut. 32: 22.

5. "Sheol is a place of utter and perpetual darkness and gloom. Job 10: 21, 22.

6. "Here dwelt the *ghosts* or *manes* of deceased men." [This statement he gets from heathenism, as the texts he quotes do not sustain it; and besides he says, on page 121, "A deep region beneath, peopled with ghosts, is what we do not believe in." His texts are, Ps. 88: 10; Prov. 2: 18; 9: 18; Isa. 14: 9; 26: 14. None prove his views.]

7. "Sheol is sometimes personified, and represented as an insatiable monster, always devouring without remorse or distinction, e. g., Isa. 5: 14; Prov. 27: 20; 1: 12.

8. "Sheol, in common and popular language is the world or region to which both the righteous and the wicked go after death, e. g., Gen. 25: 8; Num. 20: 26; Deut. 32: 50."

On page 122 he says, "Where is the *specific* difference between the future state of the righteous and wicked, *fully* set forth in the Hebrew Scriptures? Where are the separate

abodes in *sheol* for each, particularly described? I know not nor do I believe any one can inform me."

Page 113 he says, "On the whole, it is to be regretted that our English translation has given occasion to the remarks, that those who made it, have intended to impose on their readers in any case, a sense different from that of the original Hebrew. * * * I am inclined to believe, that in their day, the word *hell* had not acquired, so exclusively as at present, the meaning of a *world of future misery.*"

Page 114, he adds, "It is *probable* that the Hebrews did sometimes so understand *sheol*," and he quotes five texts to make out this "*probability*," viz.: Job 21: 13; Ps. 9: 17; Prov. 9: 18; 23: 14. I ask the reader to look at these texts, and he will see no proof in them that *sheol* refers to a "world of misery." Ps. 9: 17, "the wicked shall be turned into *sheol* (hell) with all the nations that forget God," likely tells the final doom of the sinner, and if so, it is *death*; and the dead cannot occupy a world of woe. Ps. 37: 10, tells that "his place shall not be."

II. HADES.—The Greek word *hades* is translated *hell* ten times in the N. T., and once *grave*. It occurs Matth. 11: 23; 16: 18; Luke 10: 15; 16: 23; 1 Cor. 15: 55; Acts 2: 27—31; Rev. 1: 18; 6: 8; 20: 13—14.

Mr Stuart says:

1. "Hades designates the *under world*, subterranean *regions* simply, in opposition to the region above the earth," e. g., Matth. 11: 23; Luke 10: 15. "Thou Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, i. e., very highly (alluding probably to its site on a hill) shalt be brought down to the *under world*, i. e., very low." "This is the natural and primary explanation of the word *hades* here."

2. "Hades signifies the region of the *dead*, the domains of death, e. g., Matth. 16: 18; Rev. 1: 18; 6: 8; 20: 13—14.

3. "Hades means grave, sepulchre, depository of the dead, e. g., 1 Cor. 15: 55; Acts 2: 27—31.

4. "Hades has the sense of *Tartarus* in one passage, viz., the region of woe or punishment. Luke 16: 23, "In *hades* he lifted up his eyes being in torments,"

Hades and *sheol* are used seventy-five times, and all are given up by Stuart and others, as meaning a world of woe, except *one*, and that is an intricate parable. All good critics have admitted, and common sense teaches, that parables can

settle no doctrine. This parable has no reference to a literal death or grave, as has often been admitted by critics who hold to endless misery. It is similar to the parable of the prodigal son, with additional circumstances, so I leave it as no proof that *hades* ever means a *place* of torment. If it could be shown that this parable proved a place of woe in *hades*, it would be no proof of a place for *endless* woe, as Rev. 20: 13, 14, tells us *hades* is to give up the dead, and be destroyed. See this text explained on pp. —.

III. TARTARUS.—The Greek word *Tartarus*, used but once, and translated hell in 2 Peter 2: 4, is relied on to prove there is a world of misery. Here we need no authority, for the Bible forbids this idea. "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to *Tartarus*, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." An imprisonment for a limited time is here spoken of, while no place is named, as *Tartarus* here can only convey the idea of a *prison*, in the sense of John 3: 36, "He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him:" and in v. 18, "He that believeth not is condemned already;" and in 2 Peter 2: 9, "The Lord knoweth how to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." This sense is seen in the parallel text in Jude 6, "He hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day."

If devils are confined to a local place, it is on earth. See Job 1: 7; 1 Peter v. 8; 2 Cor. 4: 4; Eph. 2: 2: "He goeth to and fro," "is god of this world," "rules in the children of disobedience;" so we are all in the same *hell* the devil is. Heb. 2: 14, tells us he is to be "destroyed," and so his prison will end at the judgment. But further, devils are not punished yet, as they have not been judged, and are as criminals apprehended and waiting for judgment and punishment. They said to Christ, "Hast thou come to torment us before the time?" and again, "Hast thou come to destroy us?"

IV. GEHENNA.—But the Greek word *Gehenna*, twelve times translated "hell" in the N. T., is the main term used to prove a world of torment in a future state. It occurs in Matth. 5: 22, 29, 30; 10: 28; 18: 9; 23: 15, 33; Mark 9: 43, 45, 47; Luke 12: 5; James 3: 6.

Stuart says, "The word *Gehenna* is derived from the words *Gi Hinnom*, the valley of Hinnom." He adds, "It was a word used by the ancient Hebrews, and they are the only competent

witnesses of its meaning." The O. T., then, must be examined for this; for Dr. George Campbell says, "Our Lord, we find from the evangelists, spoke to his countrymen in the dialect of their own Scriptures, and used those names to which the reading of the law and the prophets had familiarized them." Not observing this fact, has been one great cause of the woeful mistake about future punishment. I affirm, then, that *Hinnom* (*Gehenna*) is never used in the O. T., to mean a place of infernal punishment or world of woe. It is used, first, as the name of a literal place; and second, as a symbol of destruction, slaughter, death. So the Savior used it. As this is among the most important points in examining the doctrine of future punishment, it demands full investigation, and I will therefore refer to all the places where *Hinnom* and *Tophet* (meaning the same as *Gehenna*) are used in the Old Testament.

See Joshua, 15: 8; 18: 16; 2 Kings, 23: 10; Neh. 11: 30; 2 Chron. 28: 3; 33: 6; Jer. 7: 31, 32; 19: 2—6, 11—14; 32: 35; Isa. 30: 33.

In these texts we find *Gehenna* used to symbolize slaughter and death, in Jer. 7: 32; 19: 6—11; Isa. 30: 33; also, to denote utter destruction, in Jer. 19: 11, 12; Isa. 30: 33. In Jer. 19: 13, it symbolizes a polluted *place*.

Jer. 7: 32 reads, "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;" see the same in chap. 19: 6. Jer. 19: 11—12, "I will break this people, and this city (*Jerusalem*), as one breaketh a potter's vessel, that cannot be made whole again, and they shall bury them in *Tophet* till there shall be no place else to bury, * * * * and even make this city as *Tophet*." Here, as in every place in the O. T., where it is used figuratively, it symbolizes *death* and *utter destruction*. Scott's Commentary says, "It became a place of execution of criminals for the Jews." The fact is plain that "God has *surnamed* the place, *the valley of slaughter*, and to affirm that the wicked are to be kept alive there forever, is to charge him with naming it inappropriately."—Bible vs. Tradition, pp. 219.

Christ evidently used *Gehenna* figuratively, in the same sense the prophets did: there is no proof to contradict this, but much to sustain it. Stuart, Barnes, and others, go to the heatfien and to the superstitious Rabbinnical writers, and not to the Bible, to prove he meant a world of misery by *Gehenna* and *Hades*; and

they do the same as to sheol. Out of much and full proof of this, I will quote a little from Stuart's work, named above.

Page 146: "That the word Gehenna was *common* among the Jews, is evident from its frequency in the oldest Rabbinical writings. It was employed by them, as all confess, in order to designate *hell, the infernal region, the world of woe.* * * * Indeed, it seems quite probable, as Gesenius suggests, that Gehenna came to be used as a designation of the infernal regions, because the Hebrews *supposed that demons dwelt in this valley.*" Mark, it was the *Rabbinical writers*, he says, who used it in this sense, not the Bible.

I admit that Christ used Gehenna to symbolize *punishment* at the judgment; but he used it as the prophets did, with the double meaning of punishment and the *kind* of punishment, namely, *death*. When he said to the Jews, "How can ye escape the condemnation (punishment) of Gehenna" (*hell*)? he meant the same as if he had said, "How can ye escape the *cross*?" that is, a disgraceful and miserable *death*; or the same as if we should say, "How can that murderer escape the punishment of the gallows or the stake?" Gehenna was a polluted *place*, as we see by 2 Kings, 23: 10, and so was the cross; "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree;" and it is just as absurd to say Christ meant the sinner would go to a world of woe and *live forever* there, by saying he would "be cast into Gehenna," as it would be for us to say, the murderer will *live forever* in misery, because he is going to the gallows or the stake.

On examining all the texts in the Old and New Testaments, I am compelled to fully believe that Gehenna ought never to be translated, any more than Babylon, Sodom, Egypt and Jerusalem. They are all names of literal *places*, and all used figuratively in both Testaments. No one is misled by these other names not being translated, neither would they be by this being untranslated. The Seventy did not translate it from the Hebrew to the Greek.

I cannot think of any other *literal place* thus translated in the Bible. The precious book is darkened and corrupted by its translation. I am credibly informed that in versions in other languages it is seldom translated.

Surely, the word *hell* is a wrong word to translate it into. Dr. Geo. Campbell says, "At first, *hell* denoted only what was *secret or concealed.*" Parkhurst says, "Our English, or rather *Saxon*, word *hell*, in its original signification, exactly answers to

the Greek word *hades*, and denotes a *concealed* or *unseen place*; and this sense of the word is still retained in the eastern, and especially in the western counties of England; to *hete* over a thing is to cover it." Mr. Sabine says, "It appears to me that in the time of this translation, hell, pit, and grave, were synonymous."

Certainly this is not the sense of *Gehenna* in a single place in the Bible; though it answers to the sense of *sheol* and *hades*. The present conventional and perverted meaning of the word *hell*, is about as far from the sense of *Gehenna*, as was its original meaning. I know it will be said, *Gehenna* symbolizes a place of punishment, where there will be "weeping and wailing;" yes, and so do the cross and the stake cause weeping.

All I have said of *Gehenna*, is confirmed by the concessions of Rev. A. Barnes, in his notes on Matth. 5: 22, where it first occurs as used by Christ—" '*Hell-fire*;' the original of this is the '*Gehenna of fire*.' It was made the place where to throw all the dead carcasses and filth of the city, and was not unfrequently the place of *executions*. It became, therefore, extremely offensive, and to preserve the pestilential air in any manner pure, it was necessary to keep fires continually burning there. It was the image which our Saviour so often employed to denote the future punishment of the wicked. * * * But he who shall load his brother with odious appellations and abusive language, shall incur the severest degree of punishment, represented by being *burnt alive* in the horrid and awful *valley of Hinnom*. Among the Jews there were three degrees of condemnation: that by the judgment, the council, and the *fire of Hinnom*."

From this description, *Gehenna* could symbolize nothing but a miserable and disgraceful loss of life. A Jew could understand Christ in no other sense, as they knew he understood the prophets, and was constantly calling their attention to them. It is unjustifiable to say Christ used *Gehenna* in a different sense from what the prophets did, without a good warrant for doing so.

Paul preached thirty years, and wrote fourteen epistles, and is it not passing strange that he never intimated a hell, if he knew there was one? He was explaining what Christ meant by being "cast into the *Gehenna of fire*" in Heb. 10: 26, 27. "If we sin wilfully * * * there remaineth! no more sacrifice for sins, but "a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall *devour* the adversaries." And Heb. 6: 8, "But that which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is

nigh unto cursing: whose end is to be *burned*." And in Rom. 9: 22, where he says the wicked are "vessels of wrath, fitted to *destruction*," not to an endless hell, as we now hear in every sermon.

If the common theory of a local hell be correct, there must be three distinct *hells* taught in the Bible; two now in existence, and one to be built in future. (1.) *Hades*, for souls between death and the judgment. (2.) *Tartarus*, (the atmosphere,) for the present home of devils. And (3) *Gehenna*, to be provided somewhere, at the judgment.

But we learn from God's word, that *hades*, the first hell, is to be destroyed. Rev. 20: 14. The devil's *hell* must be ended when he is destroyed; or, when "the new heavens and new earth are made," the "air" will be so purified, that he will no longer be "*prince* of it."

And as to *Gehenna*, hell, it only symbolizes the *punishment* to be inflicted at the judgment, which is death; but if we call it a *local place*, it is to be a slaughter-yard, "*the valley of slaughter* shall it be called," Jer. 7: 32; 19: 6; and when Christ says, "bring hither mine enemies, and *slay them* before me;" and "the last enemy is *destroyed*;" who can divine what will become of this third and last hell? or what need there will be of its existence?

The common-sense answer to such a question, in worldly matters, would be — when there is no more stock to butcher *slaughter-houses* will be discontinued.

I have quoted but a small part of the authority I have collected, both from the Bible and writers, to prove my assertion, *No Eternal Hell*. This is not saying there will be no future punishment. No; the sinner will see at the judgment, if not before, that to be "burned up with unquenchable fire" in *Gehenna*, to go to *Sheol*, "the place of the dead" forever, is a sad punishment, and one that will cause "weeping and gnashing of teeth," till the "blackness of darkness" forever ends his being and his woe.

When I had pored over seventy-seven pages of Stuart, in which he labors to make these four terms mean what *hell* now means; and witnessed his reliance on heathen and Rabbinic writers, his *probabilities* and *contradictions*, I unavoidably thought of the old proverb, "a mountain travailed and brought forth a mouse." But he had *immortal* and polluted souls on hand, and he *must* find a place for them somewhere. This *assumed* doctrine of immortality for the wicked, has produced

sophistry enough to make any one ashamed of poor, erring human nature, and do what it has done — fill Christendom with skeptics, and the world with gloom. With *hell*, and *hell-fire*, thus wrongfully put in fifty-three texts, or these texts wrongly translated and explained, no wonder the common people think the Bible is full of endless misery.

The whole learned Christian ministry have sinned in permitting and aiding in the change of the English word *hell* from its original meaning; and they “handle the word of God deceitfully” when they use it in its present perverted sense. Let them not censure me for “rebuking sharply;” for the remembrance that I have been kept in darkness and gloom for forty years; and the sad fact that millions of God’s dear people, whom I love and wish to comfort, are still kept in the same darkness and gloom, by their covering up the truth in this matter, arouses the deep emotions of my soul, and I cannot believe I sin by giving them vent.

And besides, the time has come for the 200 or more ministers, in the United States, who have been hurled from the churches, and branded with *heresy*, for preaching the *Bible* instead of the *creeds*, to *speak out* with boldness, and carry back the ponderous load of *heresy* to the doors where it belongs. War has been declared against us, and I am not content with *defensive* warfare, but judge it best to drive the battle into the enemies’ camp, knowing they cannot defend it, as they have not “the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God;” that mighty weapon is in *our* camp, and we should use it, and let our deceived foes feel its *power*, to “pull down strong-holds, and cast down imaginations.”— 2 Cor. 10: 4.

I wish to act in the same spirit of love and boldness that Paul did, when he “withstood Peter to his face, and said he was to be *blamed* for dissembling.”—Gal. 2: 11—13.

True, I have sinned myself; for the English student of the Bible, by a long research, can find it teaches *no endless hell*, but simply a *second death* for the poor sinner. Thanks be to God, that thousands are thus learning at the present time. But the joy of this fact is chilled by hearing from the learned ministry the cry, “*pernicious doctrine*,” “*infidelity*,” “*illiterate souls*,” “cast them out of the synagogue!!” Surely, mountain piles of “hay, wood, stubble,” will have to be “burned up” at the judgment, or many, whom we hope will have “eternal life,” will be cast into Gehenna.

The Lord in mercy save the church from a far worse than papal-purgatory delusion.

Buffalo, N. Y., Nov. 9, 1852.

THE CATHOLICS MORE HONEST IN THEIR TRANSLATION THAN THE
PROTESTANTS.

I here throw in an interesting fact from the Catholic Bible in relation to the word *hell*, which I have just discovered. As far as I have examined, they translate *sheol* and *hades* honestly, in giving to the English word *hell* its original and proper meaning, viz., *secret, covered, &c.*, or, *the state of the dead*, without making any distinction between the saint and the sinner. Their notes, of course, are useless, and I only add them as a curiosity.

The *Douay* Bible, which takes its name from its being first published at *Douay* in 1609, and which is the present Bible of the English Catholics, has the following translation and short comments:

Gen. 37: 35, "I (Jacob) will go down to my son into *hell* (*sheol*) mourning." Comment—"Into *hell*, that is, into *limbo*, the place where the souls of the just were received before the death of our Redeemer. For allowing that the word *hell* sometimes is taken for the *grave*, it cannot be so taken in this place; since Jacob did not believe his son to be in the *grave*, (whom he supposed to be devoured by a wild beast) and, therefore, could not mean to go down to him thither; but certainly meant the place of rest, where he believed his soul to be." So *hell* means heaven! Gen. 42: 38, "You will bring down my (Jacob's) gray hairs with sorrow to *hell*," (*sheol*.) Note—"To *hell*, that is, to that place where the souls then remained, as above, chap. 37: 35."

1 Sam. 2: 6, "The Lord bringeth down to *hell* (*sheol*) and bringeth back again." Job. 14: 13, "That thou mayest protect me in *hell* (*sheol*) and hide me till thy wrath pass." Note—"Protect me in *hell*, that is, in the state of the dead; and in the place where the souls are kept waiting for their Redeemer.

17: 13, "If I wait, *hell* (*sheol*) is my house, and I have made my bed in darkness."

Ecc. 9: 10, "For neither work, nor reason, nor wisdom, nor knowledge, shall be in *hell* (*sheol*) whither thou art hastening." Though this text tells that the dead are unconscious, and thus cuts off their belief, yet they honestly translate *sheol* by *hell* to

be uniform. See Job 21: 13; Ps. 5: 6; Prov. 1: 12; Songa 8: 6; Isa. 38: 10, 18, where the term hell is put instead of grave as in our Bible. Hos. 13: 14, they translate curiously. "O, death, I will be thy death, O, *hell*, I will be thy *bite*." But "bite" is an old Saxon expression for destruction. This text as quoted in 1 Cor. 15: 55, they translate, "O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?"

Acts 2: 24, "Having loosed the sorrows of *hell*" (*hades*) instead of *death*, as in our Bibles.

Thus I find that where *sheol* meant the state of death, they have been uniform and put it *hell*; and where it meant grave, as *kever*, they put it grave and sepulchre, whereas our translators change to suit their doctrine of a local *hell*.

Here we have full proof that the Saxon word *hell* has been changed from its original meaning; and my charge of "corruption in changing it, and that the learned sin in using it in its present perverted sense," is justifiable. I defy them to evade the proof and argument, or to justify their practice.

Thus, as I have said, the unlearned in Greek and Hebrew may, by research, learn that the Bible teaches no local eternal hell.

MORE ERRORS IN OUR TRANSLATION

I will add here, that the Bible is perverted by the learned in applying the term "bottomless pit" to a local place of woe. They know "the Greek word *abussus*, translated 'bottomless pit,' is only used metaphorically in Rev., and only means immense, profound, a wilderness, &c. It is used in Rom. 10: 7, 'Who shall descend into the deep, *abussus*? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.) Here it evidently means the grave; for who believes Christ was in a place of woe?" See "Bible vs. Tradition." Rev. 9: 1—5, shows its meaning; as all agree the Mohammedan delusion is meant.

I have just further discovered that the Douay Bible is honest and exposes the corruption of our translation in the term "give up the ghost." It is thus: Gen. 25: 8, "And *decaying* he died;" 49: 33, "and *died*." Job 10: 18, "And that I had been *consumed*." "Giving up the *ghost*," in the sense now attached to it, is very different from "*decaying*, and being *consumed*, and *dying*;" and yet the learned know that the latter is the sense of the Hebrew and Greek as used in the Bible; and to get the former sense they go to the heathen and ignorant

Jewish writers, who even held to the pre-existence and transmigration of souls.

“The word *ghost* is a Saxon word, derived from *gust* of wind, and originally meant merely giving up the wind, or “breath of lives.”—Bible vs. Tradition.

So we see our teachers have changed the meaning of this word, just as they have of *hell*. Will the laity patiently continue to be thus deceived, or awake and demand of instructors the whole truth? They must do so, or “follow the multitude to do evil;” for as I have said, *learned* ministers seem bent on having no reform, or on not giving any new light to the people on this great subject. They seem to think that an eternal hell and endless torment must be preached, or religion will go to wreck. Preach the *truth*, and Christ will take care of his own cause.

When I say the translators designedly covered up the truth, I do not mean that they did so in relation to all doctrines and duties, but only where they wished to sustain a favorite doctrine, and a faithful and uniform translation of the original would seem to destroy it. They had retained the pagan and papal doctrines of immortality, that the dead are alive, and that there is a hell, or local place of torment; and on these points it can be demonstrated that they use equivocation, and the learned now refuse to expose it.

See a proof: *Hades* occurs eleven times in the N. T., and they render it *hell* ten times, but when they come to 1 Cor. 15: 55, lest their idea of hell should appear false, they translate it *grave*. “O, grave, where is thy victory?” They evidently start back! “If we are uniform, and translate this *hell*, the unlearned will see that our place for torment is to have ‘no victory,’ no inhabitants or deathless spirits after the *judgment!*—so we must put it *grave* here!”

Acts 2: 27, “Thou wilt not leave my *soul* in *hell*,” (*hades*) if rendered *grave*, the people would see his *soul* did not go off to paradise with the thief, and so their doctrine of going to heaven when we die, would be disturbed; hence they put it *hell*, concluding the people (as proves to be the fact) would wonder and wonder over it, as a mystery, and leave it there!

Rev. 20: 13, “*Death* and *hell* (*hades*) delivered up the dead which were in them.” Here a good purpose could be answered by putting it *hell* instead of *grave*, as the people would think (as is the fact) that the wicked came from a world of torment to be judged.

Look at the thirty-one texts, where *sheol* is translated *hell*, and it is plain they rendered it *hell* wherever the sense did not compel them to put it *grave* or *pit*.

We hear much about the *sainted* king James, who ordered our translation; but do divines tell that his reign was a corrupt one; that he restrained the translators as to certain words, &c., and that he died a Catholic? Yet history tells these startling facts.

We should be traitors to the cause of religion, if we did **not** condemn what is wrong in our translation, and seek to have it corrected; and the outcry that we are destroying confidence in the Bible, is fallacious. The course the mass of ministers are now taking in opposing a new translation, is a direct way to do it.

The ostrich, when pursued, hides its *head* in the sand or a bush, to avoid being discovered. Opposers to a correction of king James' translation, exhibit a similar folly. Learned Unitarians, Universalists and Deists, are exposing these errors, and by proving that the orthodox use evasion, much injury is done. The learned ministry are now, in a *special* manner, practicing evasion to oppose those who teach the destruction of the wicked.

Give us the *mind of the spirit*, if it tears into atoms every human creed in Christendom, should be our motto.

PRESIDENT EDWARDS ON HELL AND HEAVEN.

In vol. 4, pp. 287 and on, he says, "The woes of sinners in hell will not be a cause of grief to saints in heaven, but of rejoicing. This rejoicing will be the fruit of an *amiable disposition*, and a perfect holiness and conformity to Christ. At the judgment you may be ready to fly to some godly friend, but you will see them, unconcerned for you, with joy ascending to meet their Lord; and not the less joyful for the horror in which they see you. When they hear you groan and gnash your teeth, these things will not move them at all to pity you. After your godly parents shall have seen you lie in hell millions of ages, in torment day and night, they will not begin to pity you then; they will *praise God* that his justice appears in the eternity of your misery."

Page 260-1, "But to help your conception, imagine yourselves to be cast into a fiery oven, all of a glowing heat, or into

the midst of a glowing brick-kiln, or of a great furnace; imagine, also, that your body were to be there for a quarter of an hour, full of fire, as full within and without as a bright coal of fire, all the while full of quick sense; how long would that quarter of an hour seem to you? - If it were to be measured by a glass, how long would the glass seem to be running? But what would be the effect on your soul, if you knew you must endure the torment twenty-four hours? How much greater, if for a year! for a thousand years! O! then, how would your heart sink if you knew you must endure it forever and ever! that after millions of millions of ages your torment would be no nearer an end than when it began! But your torments in hell will be immensely greater than this illustration represents!!”

This is a specimen of five sermons on this subject; and, with such teaching, no wonder Universalism has spread in the eastern states. Professor Finny slanders God far worse, by saying that “the torment will *eternally increase.*” Verily, God is “forbearing and forgiving,” or he would (not eternally torture, but) annihilate, for such blasphemy. Where is the Bible for such stuff?

Compare such statements with Bible language, “Our God is full of compassion — of pity — will not hold his anger forever — his mercy endureth forever,” &c. All texts, as we shall prove, which tell of “vengeance, and woe,” show them to be temporary; so, “our God will not hold his anger forever.”

AMEN.

CHAPTER IV.

A FURTHER EXAMINATION OF PASSAGES SUPPOSED TO TEACH THE DOCTRINE OF ENDLESS MISERY.

II. CLASSES OF PASSAGES EXAMINED.

In attempting the proof of endless woe, the following classes of texts must be left out, when this doctrine is contrasted with the doctrine of *destruction*.

1. In controversies with Universalists, by *assuming*, instead of *proving* the wicked immortal, about all the 200 texts previously named for destruction, have been dragged in to prove endless woe.

2. Let it be well observed, too, that besides these 200 texts, many others, which only tell of punishment and woe at the judgment, or coming of Christ, without defining any *time of continuance or end*, are also quoted by the orthodox as good proof of their theory. Note — It is one thing to prove future punishment or woe, and another and very different thing to prove it is to be *endless*. The following are a specimen of such texts. “Be cast into outer darkness, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.” “Be more tolerable for Sodom in the *day* of judgment.” “Shall receive the greater condemnation.” “He that believeth not shall be condemned,” (as all agree, *damnet* should be rendered) “not be forgiven in this world nor that to come.” If a murderer be not forgiven he dies. “Have judgment without mercy.” “Good if he had not been born,” “be ill with the wicked,” “indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish,” &c. When Dr. Webster was condemned to die, the *wrath* of the State was manifested, and “*tribulation and anguish*” was experienced; but it was not endless, so not one of these texts indicate *endless* woe. They have only been used on the supposition that the wicked are immortal.

Some thirty such passages exist, a part of which, but not all, refer to the final doom of the sinner, and which, if it be consistent to quote against Universalists, who hold the immortality of all men, cannot be brought against us, who hold there must be more or less misery in the second death; and even enough to "render to all as their works may be," if that be the import of such texts.

Lest any should think I judge wrong on these neuter texts, I will refer to all I can find in the N. T., where our main light is found: Matth. 3: 7; 8: 11, 12; 12: 32; 13: 47—50; 22: 12, 13; 24: 51; 23: 14; 25: 30; Mark 6: 11; 12: 40; ("severer punishment,"—George Campbell,) 16: 16; Luke 10: 12—14; 12: 46, 47; 13: 9; 25: 28; * * John 5: 29; 8: 21; Rom. 2: 9; 2 Thess. 2: 12; 2 Peter 2: 1; Rom. 3: 8; 13: 2; 1 Tim. 5: 12; Rev. 22: 11, "Let him be filthy still." Peter says, they "shall utterly perish in their own corruption." Truly the Bible expounds itself.

Prov. 14: 32, "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death." James 2: 13, "He shall have judgment without mercy," &c. The murderer is driven away, and has "judgment without mercy." Isa. 50: 11, "Ye shall lay down in sorrow." Jerusalem, when doomed to destruction, and Webster, the murderer, "layed not down in peace, but in sorrow." Thus all this class of texts can be shown to be consistent with destruction.

3. All the thirty one texts with *sheol* (hell) in them must be left out. We have seen by the concessions of Stuart, Barnes, and others, that if any of these texts tell the final doom of sinners, they prove destruction; as *sheol* means the grave, or *state of death*, "the dead know not any thing," and so cannot suffer.

4. The ten passages with *hades* (hell) in, must be silent as witnesses, or testify for destruction. Six of them, all agree, mean only the grave, viz., Acts 2: 27, 31; Rev. 1: 18; 6: 8; 20: 13, 14. One other, Matth. 16: 18, evidently means the grave, "The gates of hades (the grave, and not hell,) shall not prevail against the church," as the resurrecter will deliver the saints from it. Two others, "thou Capernaum * * * shalt be brought down to *hades*." (hell.) Matth. 11: 23, and Luke 10: 15, Stuart says, do not refer to a future state; and Barnes, in his notes, says, "This does not mean that all the people should go to hell, but that the city, which had flourished, should lose its prosperity. The word *heil* is used here, not to denote a place of punishment

in the future world, but a state of desolation and *destruction* as a city." As ministers yet quote these texts, to support their theory, they betray a lack of criticism or of sincerity.

But as *hades* (hell) is once figuratively used in the parable of the rich man, as being a place of woe, divines will have it, that this must change its meaning and make it contradict the plain import of the other seventy-four times where it, and its equivalent, *sheol*, occur. *Hades* is also found sixty times in the Septuagint, and never there indicates a place of misery.

I am happy to learn, however, that they begin to own, as I have said, that *hades* in this text is no proof of woe beyond the judgment. As this is the great point I am at, and not the intermediate state, I will only give briefly its meaning as given by the best expounders.

The "rich man" denoted the Jewish nation, or the priesthood, or both combined; the priests, by the law, having to be clothed "in purple and fine linen:" Ex. 33: 1, 2. His "death" symbolized the death (destruction) of their *political* and ecclesiastical state; "torment in the flames," (the flames meaning God's judgments) denoted or predicted the misery they would endure, as a nation. It is a fact that they have been in "torment" by persecutions ever since they *died* as a nation. Their looking to Abraham for relief, may denote their relying on the *law* instead of Christ, or grace through him. They have been "buried" as to nationality, and a priesthood.

The "poor man," as the prodigal son, symbolized the Gentiles and publicans, who were looked on as "dogs" by the Jews, and lay, or could only come to the "gate" of the temple, for "crumbs" of light. "Abraham's bosom" meant the *gospel church*, and when the Gentiles "died," or changed their former sickly state, they were not "buried" as were the Jews, but "carried by angels" (messengers) into the gospel church. Peter and Paul were special "angels" to thus transport them. "Publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you,"—Matth. 21: 31. The "branches being broken off," &c. Rom. 11: 17—21, conveys the same ideas as this parable; and I apprehend Christ meant the same in Matth. 8: 11, 12, "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," denoting the "election," Rom. 11: 7, with whom the Gentiles were to "sit down" in gospel privileges.

Matth. 22: 1—13, the parable of the "marriage feast," doubtless meant the same; the one "without a wedding gar-

ment" denoting a false Gentile church, or the papacy, which we learn from Rev., is yet to "weep and wail" under the "seven viols of wrath," but it is to be *on the earth*. Compare Matth. 21: 33—44, with Matth. 22: 1—13, and we see they mean what I have said the parable of Dives means.

The casting away of the Jews, and the woes coming on them, with the call of the Gentiles, had been often foretold by prophets, and was very prominent in Christ's figurative teaching; but we have so long applied this teaching to a future state, in fighting Universalists, and to drive men to Christ and heaven by *terror*, that it is hard seeing our mistakes, or rather the orthodox will not search to discover them, while the Universalists have, and are shocked at their ignorance.

Another part of the parable is to illustrate the unbelief of the Jews. Dry bones, and calling out of graves, Ezk. 37: 1—13, are similar figures. Christ inspired Ezekiel, and had a right to use the same symbolic teaching himself.

By the principle adopted to explain this parable of the rich man, we might prove that trees choose a king, and eagles plant cedar trees. See Judges 9: 7—15; Ezk. 17: 2—10. No one had taken a lamb but David, and he not a lamb, but a woman. 2 Sam. 12: 3.

A. Barnes admits parables are not histories of facts, and then treats this one as being such. McKnight and Whitby say this parable was in the Calde, or Babylonian Targums: yet some divines now betray their weakness or dissembling, by saying it is not a parable. Trench, on the parables, says, "They may not be made the first sources of doctrine. When a doctrine is settled by plain texts, they may illustrate it. But controversialists, to sustain some weak position, often forget this rule; and looking round for arguments to sustain their weak position, invent for themselves supports in these." This is just what most are now doing. Not a text in the Bible says the wicked dead are in misery in hades, or anywhere else, nor that they are conscious till the resurrection, unless this parable tells it.

Jude 7, (also figurative) is often perverted and forced in to prove it. I defy the world to give a reason why so awful a doctrine, if true, has been thus obscurely revealed by the Spirit. No plain text, intimating the misery of the wicked till the wailing of the "second death," is the reason why ministers are now making a *perfect hobby* of this parable. But see the sophistry used: in one breath, they say it is a literal history of facts, and

in the next, say, literal "*flames*" are not meant, but a *gnawing conscience!* Who authorized them to turn Bible facts (if this is one) into *fiction?* Again, they say the lost are like devils, full of hate and revenge; but *Dives* they make a praying and benevolent soul, wishing his five brethren to be saved.

Who could wish for such a heaven as they say Lazarus and Abraham have: hearing useless prayers, and seeing friends in flames eternally? No wonder but few are aroused to seek such a heaven; and but few reverence and love a judge, who himself *made* and then doomed his helpless creatures to such a fate as divines say *Dives* is now sharing! The remark is often made, and is true, that parables must not be made to go on *all-fours*, but the very same men forget this rule when they come to this one; and ask who the five brethren were, &c., &c. The reason is obvious: they have a *theory*, or creed, to prop up, and not a single *plain* text with which to support it.

With the explanation I have suggested, how natural are these similitudes! the Jews "in their life-time," (dispensation,) had their "good things"—the means of salvation; now, as Christ told them, "the things that belong to their peace, are hid from their eyes." They are "tormented," spiritually and temporally; "wrath has come on them to the uttermost;" God is "rendering his anger with fury, and his rebukes with *flames of fire.*"—Isa. 66: 15. "The *flaming flame* is not quenched."—Ezk. 20: 47. On the other hand, the Gentiles "had evil things:" gloomy paganism, till the Jews were "rejected," but now are "comforted" with the gospel; "the solitary places are made glad." The 11th of Romans tells plainly what the "impassable *gulf*" symbolized. "Blindness is on them till the fullness of the Gentiles be come in." We cannot reach them with *light* to "cool their tongues," for "their eyes are closed." Nor have the nations "passed the gulf," for they have persecuted and scattered them, as God had said. The "*gulf*" is only said to be "fixed" *eternally* by erring men, and not by the Bible; and we hope the time is near, "when the veil will be taken away," "the fullness of the Gentiles come," and the "*flames*" of God's wrath will cease to burn against his anciently beloved people, and all his creatures. One thing is certain, "*hades*" must, ere long, with "the last enemy, be *destroyed*," and where will be this frightful "*gulf*" then? Ecc. 9: 5—10, tells us the literally *dead* "know not any thing," and "there is no knowledge in the grave," (*sheol*,) and so no praying to Abraham, and no suffering there.

In Rom. 7: 9, Paul says, "Sin revived and I *died*;" that is, he died to all hope or dependence on the *law* for justification. So, in this parable, the Gentiles *died* to all hope or dependence on idolatrous worship—"ye turned to God from idols." *Die* and *dead* are sometimes thus used figuratively where the sense shows that *literal death* is not meant; and to say "*died*" in this parable must be literal, is absurd, as the whole tenor of the Bible forbids it.

It should be noticed that this parable immediately follows that of the prodigal son, Luke 15; and all commentators agree that referred to the Jews and Gentiles on earth. In that the fate of the elder son is not told, and the main design of this seems to be to tell that fate.

Turn to Rev. 11: 7—12, and we see that to be "killed, lie dead, to arise and ascend to heaven," is a similar symbolic representation. But Bible expounders act as if their eyes were "closed," as predicted of unbelieving Israel, or as the horse, seeing a hole in the bridge, he can see nothing else, and so runs into the ditch.

Thus we see that not one of the ten texts with *hades* (hell) in them, can be admitted as sane witnesses in our issue.

5. Again, the number of texts used to sustain the common theory must be reduced by the twelve in which *Gehenna* (hell) is found. I have quoted them above, and will add but little except refer to some more texts and authorities. There could be no proof that the wicked will live and suffer forever in *Gehenna*, figuratively used by Christ to tell *punishment* (not a *place*) at the final judgment, were it not *inferred* from the fact, that to three of them (properly but one and repeated) is added the terms, "the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." But these terms, as I have shown, make it more certain that all cast into the "*fire of Gehenna*," will be *consumed*, unless Christ meant by them just the *reverse* of what the prophets did when they used them.

And who will dare to say he did? Pause, dear reader, and forbear to charge the friend of sinners with deception!

The term, "the worm dieth not," is used but once in the O. T., Isa. 66: 24, and denotes the utter consumption of the thing on which it preys." In Isa., and Mark 9, it is added to *fire* to increase the *certainty of destruction*; as carcasses cast in *Gehenna*, if not burned, would be eaten up of worms.

In Jer. 4: 4, God says, "Lest my fury come forth like *fire*,"

and burn that none can *quench* it." This, with many like texts, demonstrates the fact, that by *fire*, in Mark 9, is meant God's fury or vengeance, and if that is not *quenched*, the sinner must be consumed, "for our God is a *consuming* fire." But I shall more fully illustrate this thought in another place.

George Campbell translates Mark 9: 43—45, "Than having two hands to go into hell, into the unquenchable fire," instead of "into the fire that never shall be quenched," as it is in our Bibles. This makes these two expressions more plain, and makes them agree with Matth. 3: 12, where the same doom of the sinner is told; and here it is: "shall *burn up* the chaff with unquenchable fire."

Bishop Whately, on the expressions, "the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," says, "the expressions are taken from Isa. 66: 24, and evidently describe the kind of doom inflicted by eastern nations on the vilest offenders, who were not only slain, but their bodies deprived of the rights of burial, and either burned to ashes, (which among them was regarded as a great indignity,) or left to molder above ground, and be devoured by worms."

Dr. Alexander, of Princeton, N. J., agrees with Bishop Whately as to these expressions. A. Barnes, on these texts, says, "the *worm* feeding on the dead, shall not die, shall live long, as long as there are carcasses to be devoured; and the *fire*, used to burn the bodies of the dead, shall continue long to burn, and not be *quenched* till they are consumed. The figure, therefore, denotes great misery, and *certain* and *terrible destruction*." See his notes on Mark 9: 42—50.

If, then, the *figure* used in Mark 9, denotes utter *destruction*, I ask what right Alexander, Barnes, or any others, have to hold that Christ did not mean to teach *destruction by it*? Bishop Whately saw that he did, and teaches it as the doctrine of the Bible, in his works: and he is one of the most learned living writers, and the present Episcopal Bishop of Dublin.

The Jews could understand these terms in no other sense than denoting utter destruction: and it is bold work' to say Christ aimed to deceive them.

I will again call attention to the fact that no *continuance* of misery in *Gehenna* is taught in the twelve texts, except as it is *inferred* by wrongfully explaining the terms "fire not be quenched," found in three of them; and by *assuming* that the soul is *immortal*, and so cannot be destroyed in *Gehenna*.

That these terms are wrongfully explained, is not only proved from the Bible, but by the common use of language. If I say my house took fire last year, and it could not be put out, or was not *quenched*, would you say the *fire* is then burning yet? No, the *inference* is understood, even by a child: the *house* is burned up.

See Jer. 7: 20, "Mine anger and my fury shall be poured out upon this place, upon man, beast, trees, fruit of the ground: and it shall burn, and shall not be *quenched*." Jer. 17: 27, "But if ye will not hearken, &c., then will I kindle a *fire* in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be *quenched*." Ezk. 20: 47, "I will kindle a *fire* in thee, and it shall devour every green tree in thee, and every dry tree: the flaming flame shall not be *quenched*." See also Isa. 34: 10; Jer. 4: 4, "lest my fury come forth like *fire*, and burn that none can *quench* it."

McCulloh, M. D., of Baltimore, in a learned work just published, entitled *Analytical Investigations* concerning the Credibility of the Scriptures, and of the religious system inculcated in them — in which he advocates briefly the views I hold — says, v. 2, pp. 487, "That this phrase *unquenchable fire* was understood only in the sense of an intense fire that *totally consumed* whatever was subjected to it, is evident from the use made of this very expression by the primitive Christians (A. D., 267) in describing the martyrdom of certain of their brethren. Thus Usebius, (Eccles. His., lib. 6, chap. 41,) in two places, uses the very words of Matth. 3: 12, (unquenchable fire,) which has been translated by Cruse, 'an *immense or intense fire*,' in which certain Christians were burnt in Alexander by their heathen persecutors."

The Bible vs. Tradition, pp. 223, quotes the same. "Eunus and Julian were finally consumed in an *immense fire* (*puri asbesto*.) With such facts before them, I ask, why do we hear the learned often quibbling about the Greek phrase *puri asbesto*, as meaning that it will never *consume*, or bring to an *end*?"

From this brief examination, I *must* believe that these twelve texts, instead of supporting endless woe, should be added to the long catalogue for *destruction*.

6. *Tartarus*, (hell,) as we have seen, is no proof for either side, as it tells not the doom of devils at the judgment, nor of any *place* of punishment except the *air* or earth where they and ourselves now are. Quoting this text to prove a *hell* or torment, endlessly continued beyond the judgment, is a striking proof of the blindness of orthodoxy on this subject.

A BRIEF REVIEW.

Here let us review :

(1.) We have found 200 texts and words, the primary sense of which evidently shows the final *destruction* of the wicked, and of course disprove their immortality.

(2.) Ten passages, plainly telling that the universe is to be cleansed from all enemies to God, and consequently, so far as relates to the orthodox, proving *destruction*.

(3.) Thirty texts I have called and showed to be *neuter*.

(4.) I have showed that the fifty-four texts with *hell* in them, are either neuter, or testify for *destruction*.

Making a total of 294 texts.

Leaving out the ten for restitution, all the rest have been claimed and used as proof of endless woe. We have, then, 284 witnesses removed from the stand of our opponents. Quite a reduction, one would think!

With such a host of texts perverted from their Bible and common-sense meaning, the unlearned and honestly credulous, may well think they have a "thus saith the Lord" for this doctrine, and feel established.

I am often told, that if but one text plainly tells endless woe, that settles the point. This rule would be of force, if there were no opposing texts, and we could agree what is a plain text. But on this rule, I might say, I have quoted 210 texts for *destruction*, a large share of which are as plain as the English language can make them, *therefore*, the doctrine of *destruction* is established. As about all doctrines, however, have more or less *apparent* contradictory texts, they should be carefully canvassed to see which class of texts preponderates. Why the Spirit thus inspired the language of the Bible, is not for us to say. Not observing this rule, and taking time to balance evidence, are the great causes of error. Texts for the two doctrines I am examining, have never been fully thus balanced, and those who assert that they have been for ages past, betray great ignorance of Bible language and of theological works. If investigation had been made, it would have been written. Edwards, Dwight, Fuller, and others, just say enough to show they had not investigated the subject, or else they kept their researches to themselves. The "Conflict of Ages," and its numerous reviewers, leave it untouched.

CHAPTER V.

III. AN EXPLANATION OF PARTICULAR TEXTS SUPPOSED TO TEACH ENDLESS WOЕ.

Leaving out the *classes* of texts spoken of in the last chapter amounting to 284, let us see what remains to sustain the popular doctrine. Prof. Stuart claims but *fifteen*, and we shall see he has far too many. Andrew Fuller claims but *twelve*, as indicating *time* of woe, except the three I have examined, with the terms "the fire shall not be quenched," in them. So he claims but fifteen. I affirm there is not *one plain text in the Bible for the doctrine*; and will endeavor to sustain my position by explaining all the fifteen texts thus claimed, asking the reader to withhold anathemas till he has "heard me patiently."

I will first refer to them all, to make some general remarks on them, and then explain them separately.

1. Isa. 33: 14, "Who shall dwell with *everlasting burnings*?"
2. Isa. 66: 24, "And the *fire* is not quenched."
3. Dan. 12: 2, "To shame and *everlasting contempt*."
4. Matth. 5: 26, "Not come out till the utmost farthing be paid."
5. Matth. 18: 34, "Delivered to tormentors, till all is paid."
6. Matth. 25: 41, "Depart into *everlasting fire*."
7. Matth. 25: 46, "Go to everlasting punishment."
8. Mark 3: 29, "In danger of *eternal damnation*," (condemnation.)
9. John 3: 36, "Wrath abideth on him."
10. 2 Thess. 1: 9, "Punished with *everlasting destruction*."
11. 2 Peter 2: 17, "Mist of darkness is reserved *forever*."
12. Jude: 13, "Is reserved the blackness of darkness *forever*."
13. Jude 7: 7, "Vengeance of *eternal fire*."
14. Rev. 14: 10, 11, "*Smoke* of their torment ascendeth

forever and ever:" 19: 3, "Her smoke rose up *forever and ever.*" Note.—These two refer to one event.

15. Rev. 20: 10, "Devil—tormented day and night *forever and ever.*"

These are all I can find which are quoted to prove *protracted woe*, except the three, (properly but one,) in Mark 9, which I have shown are positive proof of *destruction*.

On these passages I remark:

First, They are *few* when compared with the 210 opposing texts I have referred to. They are *few*, too, when we consider the awfulness of the doctrine to be proved by them.

Second, All but four are in the parables and figures used by Christ; or in the extreme (as is admitted) figurative and symbolic language of Isa., Dan., and Rev. Of these four, one (2 Thess. 1: 9,) is decided for *destruction*, and I have only quoted it to answer an objection; the other three are figurative, and proved so by the terms "mist of darkness" and "fire."

Our best critics say, and say rightly, that no doctrine can be originated and settled by parables and symbolic language. A doctrine must first be expressed in plain terms, and then figures may illustrate it. I ask where in the book of God it is said, in plain terms, that the wicked shall suffer *endless misery or torment* after the final judgment? Echo answers, *where?* By the above rule, advocated by the orthodox themselves, these fifteen texts do not lay the first stone in the foundation of their towering fabric; and my assertion is proved, that not a plain text for endless woe can be found. But Christians generally seem to think that Christ taught in a plain style. It appears strange to me now, that when investigating this doctrine, so little notice has been taken of Christ's words in John 16: 25, "These things have I spoken unto you in *proverbs*, but the time cometh when I shall no more speak unto you in *proverbs*, but I shall show you plainly of the Father." Notice—This was said in his last discourse, and so, of course, referred to all he had taught; and the "time" of his "speaking plainly," is by inspiration through the apostles; who never tell of a *hell*, nor intimate *endless woe*. "Without a parable, spake he not unto them."—Matth. 13: 34; and in Mark 4: 34, it is said, "And when they were alone, he expounded all things to his disciples." But notice, only a small part of this "expounding" is written.

All the great doctrines of the gospel are taught by many, and the most important, by scores of *plain texts*; and then some-

times illustrated by similitudes. I ask if a more important doctrine exists than the one we are considering — not the momentary but the *eternal consequences of sin!*

Third, In seven of these texts, the word *fire* is used, and in Bible judgments, *fire* is about universally a symbol of utter *destruction*. These seven are also further proved to be symbolic by this term. Where on God's footstool do we hear of *fire* being a *preservative*, except in man-made systems of divinity? The common people are wont to call *salt* a preserver, and *fire* a destroyer.

Fourth, Twelve of these texts derive all their force or proof of this terrific doctrine from the uncertain terms *aion*, (forever,) and its adjective *aionios*, (everlasting.)

To show briefly their uncertain meaning in the Bible, I remark that any one, by Cruden's large Concordance, can find, in a few hours, over 200 texts, besides the few for future punishment, in which these words are used to express limited time. Pres. Edwards says, "These terms occur 104 times in the N. T.; and thirty-two of these mean temporary duration, and in seven of them the meaning may be doubtful," making most one-half. Says a learned writer, "These terms are translated in the Bible, twenty-five times *old* and *of old*, six times *ancient*, four times *long*, five times *age* and *ages*, and in the N. T., thirty times *world*." See a sample: "The sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven in this *world*, (*aion, forever*,) nor in the *world*, (*aion, forever*,) to come." Here, as in most or all of the places where it is translated *world*, we see that *age* is meant. To argue, as divines do, that these words are applied to the existence of God, and the state of the saints, and therefore they *must* mean endless time in all texts, is just as absurd as to say *wisdom* and *power* are applied to God and men, and as God is *infinite* in wisdom and power, *therefore* men must be.

This is but an item of the evidence that these terms are variable and uncertain in their meaning, and that the context must settle their import as being endless or not.

Destructionists, however, only need to limit these terms in Isa. 53: 14; Rev. 14: 11; 19: 3; and 20: 10, and these texts I shall prove mean only earthly judgments. Universalists need to limit them in others.

Prof. Stuart, on these terms, as used in the N. T., says, "On this inquiry, of course, depends, substantially, the issue of the question before us;" referring to *endless misery*. So it comes

cut that the mighty fabric of *immortality* and *endless torment*, is founded "substantially" on these two terms, thus uncertain in their use in the Bible; and, so far as Destructionists are concerned, on their use in four extremely symbolic texts: and these four texts, if proved to refer to earthly judgments, as I have said, the whole foundation will be swept away, according to Stuart's confession. Any one can see, too, that Stuart is correct; for no other terms help sustain the doctrine except as the one, "the fire shall not be quenched," has been wrested from its Bible meaning to aid in the case. This is the reason so much has been said to prove these terms always mean unlimited time, notwithstanding over 200 texts positively forbid it.

Look over the 210 texts for destruction, and it is plain that we need not depend at all on these variable terms to prove the wicked will eternally cease to be. "They shall *be no more*," "destroyed without *remedy*," "utterly perish, and perish as the *beasts*," "not be written with the *living*," "not see *life*," and other terms, show this. I ask the attention of Universalists to this fact, while I admit they are right in holding *aion*, &c., do not prove the doctrine of endless woe, and that it is not found in the Bible. Another *solemn penalty* is found there, for *mortal man*, which is strictly and literally *endless* in its consequences. O! come to Christ that you may avoid it! "*live and not die*."—John 6: 48—50.

Fifth, I remark, that such are the figures, and such the imagery, (so uncertain to us, but not so much so to a Jew,) that all the fifteen texts claimed by Stuart as proof of endless misery, have been given up as proof, by different critical writers who hold the doctrine. Not all by any one, of course, but some by one, and some by others. This assertion I shall notice as I examine the texts. They have, in reality, all been relinquished, by the correct rule of critics, viz., poetic, symbolic, and figurative books and texts can prove no doctrine.

Again, I assert that nine of these fifteen texts refer only to earthly judgments, as I shall prove by the analogy of Bible language, and the confessions of our best orthodox writers.

These six remarks, if well considered, certainly show that *positive* proof for the popular doctrine, is not found in the Bible; and show, with what I have before said, that *inferential* proof is weak in the lowest degree, even were there no opposing texts. But I remark,

Lastly, One consideration alone annihilates the whole of them.

viz., the overwhelming number of *opposing texts*. Not only their *number*, but their *plainness* does it. A large share of them, say at least 100, are in plain language and didactic teaching.

But popular opinion "will catch at, and can swim on a straw:" or, like "the chameleon, live on air;" so I proceed to test the weight of these fifteen texts separately.

FIFTEEN MAIN TEXTS EXPLAINED.

1. Isa. 33: 14, "Who among us shall dwell with *devouring* fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?"

The great Andrew Fuller, in his letters to a Universalist, gives this text up, as not referring to future punishment. And well he may, for, (1.,) by reading from v. 7, we see only an earthly judgment is spoken of. The enemies of hypocritical Israel were to be a "devouring fire," and they were either killed or carried away captive to Babylon. Or, if the heathen nations were meant, they were to be "devoured," and "as thorns be burned in the fire."

(2.) The text is a question, implying that none could "dwell in *devouring* fire." Just as Paul asks, "How can we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" "Everlasting" is used here in its intensive sense, as in the text "everlasting hills." Traditionists can see the words "*dwell*, and *everlasting*," in this text, but not "*devour*," nor the interrogation point. A few following verses are promises to the righteous; but the terms, "bread shall be given and water be sure, and meditate-terror," &c., show that both the threatening and the promises are earthly.

I will here make what may seem a harsh charge, but will prove it correct before I finish these texts, viz., that orthodox churches, on this subject, are equal to the Catholics, and much worse than Universalists, in quoting a few isolated texts, and neglecting to examine their connections.

All orthodox sects holding the doctrine of endless woe, popular opinion has led ministers and people to treat with scorn all opposers, and only quote a few texts without criticism, while many of them have no relation to the subject. The excuse that "our fathers have examined them, and all real Christians believe the doctrine," have produced idleness and partial knowledge.

2. Isa. 66: 24, "And they shall go forth, and look upon the *carcasses* of the men that have transgressed against me: for

their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh."

I have showed that President Alexander, Albert Barnes, Scott, Lowth, and Bishop Whately, say this text only tells an earthly scene. It would sound odd, indeed, to hear of immortal "worms" and "carcasses" in the fire of Gehenna! The terms, "*all flesh*, coming to worship, and abhorring," &c., in this and verse 23, fully prove it is on earth; as "*flesh* and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." The text seems to refer to the slaughter of Gog and Magog, or the battle of Armageddon, where "birds eat flesh," &c., told of in Rev. 16 and 19. When, O when will Christians cease to pervert the precious Bible, by applying such texts to future punishment? Since literal *worms* and *fire* have been given up, as too absurd, a "*gnawing conscience*" has been invented, with less authority than Catholics have for a purgatory.

3. Dan 12: 2, "Many awake * * * some to shame and everlasting contempt."

(1.) If the "awaking" here foretold could be proved a literal resurrection, let it be noticed that "*everlasting*" is only applied to "*contempt*." Arnold, the traitor, who awoke to a sense of shame is dead, but held in everlasting "*contempt*;" so will the wicked be, if they die as criminals at the judgment.

But, (2,) this chapter and the previous one is a vision, and extremely symbolic; so no literal resurrection is meant as the context shows. The term "*manu*" shows it is partial. When Christ arose, none "came out of their graves but saints," so it cannot refer to that resurrection: Matth. 27: 52, 53. The events of this verse, are at the time named in the close of chap. 11., and that is before the final resurrection or end of the world.

(3.) The first three verses of chap. 12, may be thus briefly explained: the "time of trouble," v. 1, refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. See Matth. 24: 15—21. "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel, (Dan. 9: 27; 11: 31,) then shall be great tribulation." V. 1 proves the time to be the destruction of Jerusalem, as such trouble was never to be again. When Christ came, "Michael stands up,"—all "written in the books,"—"the election," (Rom. 11: 7,) "awake from the dust," * not literal graves—the darkness of the old dispensation, and Christ "gave unto them (the election) everlasting

* Dr. George Campbell says, "The primitive meaning of resurrection is, being raised from inactivity to action, and from obscurity to eminence."—Note on Matth.

life," and they "shined as the firmament"—"as lights in the midst of a crooked generation;"—Phil 2: 15—and "turned many to righteousness." While most of the Jews "awaked" to hear the gospel, but rejecting it, when the "time of trouble" came—Jerusalem was destroyed—they "awaked to shame," and are yet held in "everlasting contempt." In Jer. 23: 39, 40, we read a like threatening, and probably tells the same event. "I will forsake you, and the city that I gave you, and cast you out of my presence; I will bring an *everlasting reproach* upon you, and a perpetual *shame*." Who quotes Ezk. 37: 1—13, to prove a resurrection? Yet there it is said "I will open your *graves*—cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel." Isa. 52: 2, "Shake thyself from the *dust*; *arise*, and sit down, O Jerusalem." The prophets abound in such similitudes.

Christ said, "This is my *flesh* and my *blood*," and when the Catholics wish to establish a particular dogma, they say, "*this must be literal*"—the Protestants have been their apt scholars, in learning about a hell from symbolic language. This symbolic text then, can be no *positive* proof on this subject, and a full criticism would show that it has nothing to do with it. As the murderers of Christ said, "His blood be on us and our children," they will be held in "*everlasting contempt*," whether living, or "burned up, root and branch." Calvary will never be forgotten.

These are all the texts I know of in the O. T., where it is pretended by any that protracted or endless woe is intimated. And as these fail, we must say, with Stuart, it is *not* there.

That a God of pity and justice should leave the world 4000 years without an intimation of such a doom, if true, and in the same time fill more than 100 pages, and make more than 3000 threatenings of earthly and momentary sufferings for sin, is a matter of astonishment, which should strike dumb its advocates, and lead them to re-examine their parabolic proof from the N. T.; instead of charging *infidelity* on those who find, in that same O. T., ninety-seven threatenings of death, destruction, &c., as can be seen in the above catalogue of texts. And we should think, too, that this silence, and the awfulness of the subject would arouse them to examine the ninety-three texts to the same point, in the N. T., found side by side with the dozen presumptive ones,

22: 23. Thus in Rev. 11: 7—12, the "witnesses" are said to "lay dead, to arise and to ascend up to heaven," where all agree literal death and resurrection are not meant. Men often tell of comparing Bible with Bible, but they "say and do not."

claimed to sustain their theory. I am aware that some, if not all of the ministers, are proclaiming that we take all, or about all our texts for destruction, and the state of the dead, from the O. T. Whether this is done ignorantly, or to deceive, I leave the Judge of all hearts to decide.

We come now to the New Testament:

4.—5. The first two are alike: viz., Matth. 5: 26, "Thou be cast into prison * * * not come out till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing;" and 18: 34, "And his Lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him."

These two texts, A. Barnes gives up as referring to punishment in the world to come. He says on Matth. 5: 25, 26, "This is still a further illustration of the sixth commandment. * * * The phrase, "Thou shalt not come out," &c., does not refer to the *eternity* of future punishment—that will be eternal, but this passage does not prove it.—*Notes on the Gospel*. The parable in 18: 23—35, he also applies to God's dealings with his church on earth. Dr. Clarke, on these texts, says, "No metaphor ever proves a doctrine."

But if these texts do refer to future punishment, *death* will "pay the uttermost farthing," as that is the "wages (pay) of sin." If endless suffering be the penalty, it will be *paying*, but never paid—justice can never be satisfied. The sinner "*owes*" love and obedience to God: will suffering, and cursing, and hating, pay the debt? The "furnace for the tares" will be a "tormentor," and none will "come out" of "the second death."

I ask if good sense will say these texts prove what they are often quoted for—eternal woe? Christ, we find, used parables to illustrate earthly duties and penalties, as well as future scenes. These make up five texts, so far, telling only earthly woes.

6. Matth. 25: 41, "Then shall he say also unto those on his left hand, depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: for I was a hungered," &c.

Here the scenes of the judgment are represented by proceedings in an earthly court, and similitudes and figures are used, as in the parable of the ten virgins and talents in the same discourse. I remark—

(1.) In Matth. 18: 8, 9, "To be cast into *everlasting fire*," and into "*Gehenna of fire*," we see means the same thing; and as these two expressions refer to the same event as this one, the doom must be the same. We have seen that the "*fire* of

Gehenna," is a symbol of destruction, so the same must be meant in this text.

Historians of the French Revolution, in telling the final fate of Louis XVI., do not mean to make out that his doom was various — that of the rack or the Bastile, or the block, but simply one — he was beheaded. So Christ, in the various representations he makes of the final doom of the sinner, must mean but one; and the expressions, "cast into everlasting fire" — "into the fire of *Gehenna*" — "go to everlasting punishment" — "*burn up as chaff*" — "loose life," &c, must be made to agree in one fate. Torment believers explain the Bible, as if they had never got this idea into their minds, and could see only one text at a time.

Again, the apostles were authorized expounders of Christ's teaching, and they, in thirty-one plain texts, say the final doom of the sinner is to be *death*, to *perish*, to be *destroyed*, *devoured*, &c.; and these six symbolic texts by Christ, must harmonize with those of the apostles. This remark alone compels us to explain the symbols of Christ, on this subject, to mean destruction.

But let us see if this text cannot be harmonized with my views, without this general argument.

(2.) The term *fire* is always symbolic when literal fire is not meant; and as it is not claimed to be literal here, of what is it a symbol or sign? I ask special attention to this question, as it affects other texts with the term *fire* in them.

NOTE.—It is the FIRE, and not the SINNER, nor his WOE, that is said to be "*everlasting*:" and *fire*, when used figuratively, often represents an *attribute* of God, or his *nature* and *dispositions*. This is plain from Deut. 4: 24, "For the Lord our God is a *consuming fire*. Heb. 12: 29, "Our God is a *consuming fire*." President Edwards says, "Hatred to sin, is as essential to the Deity as the love of holiness, as necessary to the general good, that he express the former as the latter." Butterworth and Cruden say, in their concordances, "*fire* is a *symbol* of God's holiness, *justice*, and *displeasure* with sinners."

A. Barnes, in his note on Matth. 3: 11, ("Baptize with the Holy Ghost, and with *fire*,") says, "*fire* is a symbol of *vengeance*."

Further, God's *anger*, *fury*, *wrath*, and *indignation*, are often called *fire*, or compared to it. It is used figuratively much oftener than any other term in the Bible. I will give a few examples: Jer. 21: 12, "Lest my *fury* go out like *fire*, and *burn* that none can *quench* it, because of the evil of your doings:" 4: 4, is the same.

Lam. 2: 3, "And he burned against Jacob like a flaming *fire*; which *devoureth* round about." Ezk. 21: 31, "I will blow against thee (the Ammonites) in the *fire* of my *wrath*." Amos 5: 6, "Seek the Lord, and ye shall live; lest he break out like *fire* in the house of Joseph, and *devour* it, and there be none to *quench* it." Nah. 1: 6, "Who can stand before his indignation? and who can abide in the fierceness of his anger? his *fury* is poured out like *fire*." Mal. 3: 2, "He is like a refiner's *fire*." Matth. 3: 10, "Every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down, and cast into the *fire*," (God's *wrath*:) 7: 19: Luke 3: 9.

But Heb. 10: 26, 27, decides this point, and the meaning of the text before us: yes, and all other texts with the term *fire* in them, which relate to the final doom of the impenitent. "If we sin willfully * * * there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of *judgment* and **FIERY INDIGNATION**, which shall **DEVOUR the adversaries:**" v. 31, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

Now call to mind the fact that "God and his attributes *change* not," and we see, plainly, an "*everlasting fire*" in *God himself*; see it as we see "*everlasting love and mercy*" there. To be plain, God's *justice*, *wrath*, and *hatred* to sinners and sin, ever was, and ever will be the same; and as these qualities or dispositions are called *fire*, the finally "*accursed*" who "depart," that is fall under Christ's *justice*, *displeasure*, and *wrath*, or *indignation*, fall into "*everlasting fire*;" and so must be *consumed*, as "our God is a *consuming fire*."

This Bible view of the term "*fire*, and everlasting fire," applies equally to the term "*unquenchable fire*," and the "*fire* of Gehenna," (hell,) and to most, if not all the texts, where the final doom of the impenitent is told, and *fire* is used. God is an "unquenchable," as well as a "devouring fire;" and the fire of Gehenna may only mean God's wrath, "indignation," &c. But it requires a trip-hammer to beat this idea into the brains of some men, they have become so stereotyped by traditional explanations of these texts. But few see the blinding power of old views and explanations. It is the curse of the Catholic and the Jew; and is just as much so of Protestants, as to this doctrine. ("Let the righteous smite me," &c.)

It is yet a matter of doubt with me, whether *literal fire* is ever intended as the *instrument* to destroy the wicked; but it may be. And it is comparatively but of little importance for us

to know, while it is fully revealed that God will, by some means, put an utter end to them.

Whoever will examine carefully will find reason to doubt, as I do. In telling of judgments on the "beast and false prophet" alone, *fire* and *burn*, are used eight times where literal fire is not meant; and in over 100 texts they are thus used.

This accounts for the frequency of the terms in Christ's teaching, as he inspired the prophets, and spoke in their style.

In Rev. 19: 20, the beast and false prophet (false systems) are "cast into a lake of *fire*." Rev. 20: 14, "*Death* and the *grave* are cast into a lake of *fire*." Now notice — a *nonentity* cannot be cast into a *literal fire*. The idea is plainly this: God is displeased with false systems of religion, and with *death*, and the *grave*, — they are personified and fall under his displeasure, here called a "lake of fire," and are put an end to. "The last enemy, *death*, shall be destroyed."—1 Cor. 15: 26. Notice again, in the next v., Rev. 20: 15, (and 21: 8,) the wicked are cast into "*the lake of fire*,"—the same *fire* as in v. 14, is evidently meant; and if so, *literal fire* is not meant in these texts, but "*fiery indignation*," as in Heb. 10: 27, where the same scene is spoken of.

These texts demonstrate destruction. Woe preachers admit that *four* things, *beast*, *false prophet*, *death*, and the *grave*, are *ended* by this "lake of fire." Why say the *fifth*, the sinner, is *preserved*?

A. Barnes says, "there is no distinct affirmation respecting the *mode* of future punishment. Note Matth. 25: 41. As symbolic descriptions of judgments on the *living wicked*, when Christ comes, are intermixed with their final doom, *literal fire* may be used in the first and not in the last.

(3.) I remark, further, on our text: "departing into the *fire* prepared for the devil and his angels," can only mean — sharing the same fate, which had been decreed, ("prepared") for devils, who had sinned first. Heb. 2: 14, says, the devil is to be "destroyed," and 1 John 3: 8, says, Christ is to "destroy his works," the wicked, and, of course, they are cast into the same "*fire*," or one doom is decreed for both. *Amen*—"Let the wickedness of ALL the wicked come to an END," and also the wicked *themselves*, if it be in the all-wise plan of our Maker.

(4.) Compare this text with Matth. 21: 44, where *Christ himself* is the "stone," (the same as *fire* in our text,) which "*falls*

on," (the same as being "cast into,") the sinner, and grinds him to powder:" powder meaning *dust*,—"dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," poor sinner, if not in Christ. Christ will verily be an "everlasting" "stone," "fire," and "fall on" "the last enemy."

Thus we see that it is the *instrument* of punishment, God's wrath and vengeance, which is "everlasting," and not the sinner and misery. See another text to illustrate: Jer. 17: 4, "Ye have kindled a *fire* in mine *anger* which shall *burn forever*." The context shows that Judah was slain or cast out of the land, but restored; so God's wrath did not "*burn*" without end, and "forever" must be limited here, as the *fire* as well as the *effects* ceased. Note.—No "Scriptures" were written but the O. T., when Christ commanded to "*search them*."

With this brief explanation, dare any say "everlasting" *torment* is intended in this text? If Christ meant it, why did he not say so, instead of using the word *fire*, which he knew all the prophets, by his own inspiration, had used to denote utter destruction? Why does he *never* say there will be "everlasting" *torment* or *misery*, if he meant to teach it? Remember, the word "*punishment*" in v. 46, is not synonymous with *torment*, and blind must the learned be who do not see it. Let us examine it.

7. Matth. 25: 46, "And these shall go to everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." (George Campbell's translation.) Go *away into*, adds darkness to the text.

When a murderer is going to the gallows, it is proper to say, he is "going to punishment," but not so to say, he is going *into* punishment.

(1.) This text is in the same *figurative* discourse as the one in v. 41, and so cannot be positive proof of a doctrine.

(2.) It must mean the same as the 41st v., which we have seen proves destruction. Christ did not tell two contradictory dooms in the same parable or symbolic account of the judgment.

(3.) Paul was an authorized expounder of Christ's figurative teaching, and his plain language settles the meaning of this text to be *destruction*, as seen in 2 Thess. 1: 7—9. (1.) *Christ* says, v. 31, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit," &c. (2.) *Paul* says, "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance. * * * Who shall be punished with everlasting *destruction* from the

presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Acts 3: 19, tells the meaning of—"from the presence of the Lord:" "When the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." Thus we see the event and time are the same. Paul's words here, just agreeing with twenty-two other positive assertions made by him for utter extinction, must decide what Christ meant, or their testimony is contradictory.*

(4.) The Greek word translated punishment here, is *kolasin*, and is a noun from the verb *kalaso*; the radical meaning of which is, to *cut off*. Donegan's Greek Dictionary says, "*kalaso* means, (1) properly, to *cut off*, or take from; to curtail, clip, &c." Liddel and Scott have "*kolasis* (1) a pruning, (cutting off,) (2) hence a checking, punishing, &c." Thus *punishment* is seen to be only an inferential or secondary meaning. Christ never uses this word only in this text.

The words punishment, torment, sorrow, and misery, in their variations are used seventy times in our English N. T., and this original word is found in only four of them: viz., Matth. 25: 46, and 1 John 4: 18, as nouns; and Acts 4: 21; 2 Peter 2: 9, as verbs. In the three last they admit, and seem to demand the sense of *cut off*. We have seen by the translation of *sheol*, *hades*, *ghost*, &c., that no confidence can be put in the translators when they come to words relating to this subject. Such has been the corruption, that the Germans and Hollanders translate *kolasin* by a word that means *pain*.

The word implies punishment, but like the word *hanging*, it also implies the *kind* of punishment: viz., loss of *life*, as "*cut off*" means this.

A. Barnes says: "It means being *cut off* from *hope* and *happiness*." This is blank assumption, and destroys the contrast—*death* is the opposite to *life*. Ps. 37: 9, 22, 28, 38, and 34: 16, tells us the wicked "shall be *cut off* forever," and Christ does not mean to contradict David.

Ellis and Read, in Bible vs. Tradition, translate it thus: "And these *apeleusontai* will go *eis kolasin aionion* to the cutting off [that takes place] at the age."

* Boneraaft, the learned Unitarian, who held to destruction, says: We read of "eternal redemption," Heb. 9: 12; not that God will be forever redeeming men; but the blessed *effects* of redemption will be eternal. In the same sense we may understand the punishment of eternal fire, of eternal destruction, &c.; not that the act of destroying, or the fire of consumption will be perpetual and eternal, but the effects will be. A destruction which will never be reversed, nor with strict propriety, be called an everlasting punishment." See his sermons. "The same remarks apply to "eternal judgment." Heb. 6: 2.

(5.) The English word *punishment*, means not the same as torment. Death is the highest punishment; but not the greatest *pain* that could be inflicted on the criminal.

If God should put to death for one year, prosperous, happy man, it would be a year's punishment; if for 1000 years, and then bring to life, it would be 1000 years' punishment; and so, if he never raised him to life, it would be an "*everlasting punishment*," but not *everlasting torment*. Was *loss* a punishment to Moses when deprived of entering Canaan?

Confusion, and the sad effects of old and wrong explanations are seen in the statement, that the wicked must *live* and be *conscious*, or else their punishment cannot be said to be *everlasting*.

The *New York Recorder*, of May 11, 1853, in an article to which I have referred, says, "The idea of punishment involves *life*, and is impossible without it." Profound instruction this! Who holds that a *stone* can be *punished* with *death*? But he adds, "To use the term in connection with a being which has ceased to exist is simply nonsense." This is a specimen of the sophistry now used by divines. Did Christ, or do we say, the wicked will be punished (that is, tormented) *after* they are "*cut off*?" or does Paul say, they will be punished (tormented) *after* they are "*destroyed*?" Where does the Bible say they will be tormented after they are "*burned up as chaff and tares*?"

"Weigh these remarks well, and we see the 'simple nonsense' belongs to the muddy brain from whence these vain statements came." Query:—Is such a brain a proper one to instruct the rising ministry?

If God should say to Gabriel, "In one year I will, for disobedience, blot you out of existence forever," I think Gabriel would feel and say, "It is a great, and *everlasting* punishment." O! tell me not I must rot eternally in yonder gloomy grave, even if there is to be no "*second death*!"

(6.) The learned editor, Mr. Lord, of New York, in opposing H. H. Dobney, on *destruction*, says, "This text only tells the destruction (cutting off) of the living wicked who are on the earth when Christ comes a second time; and they are not to be raised and judged till after the thousand years." Here is another sample of the strongest texts being given up, as I have said, owing to their uncertain meaning. See his *Review*, for 1850, pp. 411.

This is one witness turning traitor to his party. But let us hear a better one.

(7.) Pres. Edwards, (the younger,) in his Review of Chauncey, the Unitarian Restorationist, v. 1, pp. 80, when proving sin to be an infinite evil, which Chauncey had denied, charges Chauncey with admitting it, by admitting that *annihilation* would be just in God. In remarking on Chauncey's admission, he says, "Endless *annihilation* is an *endless* or an *infinite* punishment. It is an endless loss of, not only all the good a man at present enjoys, but of all that good which he would have enjoyed throughout eternity, in the state of bliss to which he would have been admitted, if he had never sinned. This in an endless duration, would amount to an infinite quantity of good. Annihilation, therefore, is an infinite punishment, both as it is *endless*, and as the quantity of good lost is infinite.* * * That annihilation is an evil, no man will deny, who allows that existence and happiness are good * * * final annihilation then is an infinite evil, as it is inflicted in disapprobation of sin."

He says much more to illustrate and prove this point. And here is good sense, and conclusive proof that our text, though it bears against Universalism, bears not against *destruction*, but favors it.

We see Destructionists need not limit the sense of *everlasting* in this text, and all the cry about it is vain. The "cutting off," or "destruction," will be endless.

We are told by most ministers now, (J. G. Stearns among them,) that annihilation, loss of *life* and *glory*, would be no punishment to the sinner — no terror in the prospect — no motive to induce to seek for *life* and *heaven*!

Thus "the witnesses agree not among themselves;" and we ask who manifests the most wisdom, Edwards, or those who, against the light now being spread, still struggle to prop up their falling doctrine, by such Babel-like language — *death*, no *punishment*! O! "tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the enemies of God's church triumph" over the weakness and confusion of the standard-bearers!

This is altogether the strongest text in the Bible, from which to infer endless woe, and properly the *only* one. I ask if it looks strong enough to vanish the 210 opposing texts? No, it is a silent witness even if there were none to oppose it. It cannot make out even a *prima facie* case; and yet it is quoted as if it was a full refutation of destruction; and quoted with the same air of triumph and scorn that Luther beheld in his popular opposers.

8. Mark 3: 29, "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of *eternal damnation*."

Darkness has been thrown over the Bible by the learned, corruptly explaining "damn, and damnation" to mean eternal torment. Thus, even Webster's dictionary, gives this popular notion, as one of its meanings, and so deceives the unlearned. He took it from popular use and not the Bible. The light of the present day begins to drive ministers to own it only means *condemnation*. Christ says, "Some will come forth to the resurrection of condemnation." But what are they "condemned" to? or what is the punishment of the condemned? The Bible says it is "everlasting destruction," and "the second death," and as there is to be no recovery from this death, it is proper to say it is an "eternal condemnation." This word only shows it is *final*, just as "the *eternal* judgment," Heb. 6: 2, denotes a *final* decision, and not that the judgment would last forever. The Syriac version has it, "but is obnoxious to eternal judgment:" and this makes it agree with Heb. 6: 2. This text is no witness.

9. John 3: 36, would explain itself, had not *traditionary* explanations blinded the Christian world on this subject. "He that believeth not the Son, shall not *see life*; but the wrath of God abideth on him." "Not see *life*," not be *alive*, and yet be in torment!!

The wrath of a government abides on the murderer, and if not forgiven, he must die; and if it does not raise him from the dead, it *abides* on him: thus God's wrath will *abide* eternally on the destroyed sinner.

Geo. Campbell renders it, "The vengeance of God awaiteth him." The Bible is perverted when this text is used to prove endless woe, as it is direct proof of destruction. It is strong proof against restoration.

10. 2 Thess. 1: 7—9, "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance * * * who shall be punished with everlasting *destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power."

There is no avoiding full proof of my views here, only by *adding* "*favorable*" presence, as deluded men are doing. In Lev. 10: 2; 9: 23—4; and Num. 16: 19, 35, we learn what is meant here: "And fire went out from the Lord and devoured them, and they *died* before the Lord." See also Acts 3: 19, "When the times of refreshing shall come *from* the *presence* of

the Lord." If Christ "devours" the wicked in any way, they will be "from his presence," but not so if they are alive *anywhere*. Again, if the "fire in which he is revealed" destroys them, the fire comes "from his presence." Here are two of the most natural ways to explain, "*from the presence of the Lord,*" without adding to God's book.

Note.—(1.) If there is to be no recovery, it is proper to say "*everlasting destruction.*" (2.) Why did Paul not say "*everlasting*" torment or misery if he believed it, and not attempt to deceive by the word "destruction?" (3.) This text, as it tells the same event, must mean the same as Heb. 10: 26, where "*fiery indignation devours the adversaries.*"

"Woe unto them that put darkness for light, and light for darkness."—Isa. 5: 20.

11 — 12. 2 Peter 2: 17, and Jude 13, are one in meaning. "These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest, to whom the mist of darkness is reserved forever." Jude has it, "raging waves * * * wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." Here we have full evidence that the language is figurative, as the apostles sometimes used figures, and none so much so as Peter and Jude.

The figures here favor *destruction* much more than life in woe, as the analogy of Bible language shows. 1 Sam. 2: 9, "The wicked shall be *silent in darkness.*" Job 17: 13, "If I wait, the grave is my house: I have made my bed in *darkness.*" 10: 21, 22, "I go even to the land of *darkness*, and the shadow of death; a land of *darkness* as *darkness* itself." Ps. 9: 17, "The wicked shall be turned into sheol," the state of the dead. These texts, we see, must mean the same as Ps. 92: 7, "When the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be *destroyed forever.*" Desperate must be the case, and confused the mind which relies on these texts for proof of endless woe.

The three parables of Christ in which "outer darkness and wailing" are told, will be seen to refer only to God's dealings with Jews, Gentiles, and his church on earth. They are in Matth. 8: 12; 22: 13; 25: 30, and are more easily proved earthly events than Matth. 5: 26; 18: 34, which Barnes admits to be so. No *time* is told for the wailing, and it is only *inferred* to be endless by divines. The second death will produce wailing, if they refer to that. In these two texts, the word

“forever” is added to show the doom is *final*, just as in Ps. 92 : 7, “*destroyed forever.*” These texts have not even a shadow of evidence in them against destruction; but they have against restoration.

13. Jude 7, “Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.”

I remark, (1.,) the people have been kept in the dark by being taught that “*eternal*” means unending, though “*everlasting*” does not; while the learned know they are from the same original word, *aiônios*. (2.) The Syriac N. T. has it — “are placed beneath everlasting fire, being doomed to judgment.”

The “eternal fire” is now admitted not to be literal fire, and so only is a symbol of God’s justice, displeasure, &c., which are eternal in their nature, as I have before explained.

(3.) What is meant, is plain from 2 Peter 2 : 6, where the same thing is told in *plain* language, which Jude tells in figurative: “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.” Here we see it is only the “overthrow” of these cities which is the “ensample,” and not their suffering in another state.

(4.) If suffering in another world was to be “an example,” why did God not tell of it till 2000 years afterward, and then only in very figurative language, and also have Peter and Jude make contradictory statements about it?

(5.) Luke 17 : 29, 30, says, “But the day Lot left Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all: even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed.” Where will this “eternal fire and suffering” be when all the wicked are “destroyed” at Christ’s coming?

Lastly, if it could possibly be inferred from this text, and the rich man, (and they are the only ones in the Bible from which to infer,) that the wicked are now suffering somewhere, it would not be a particle of proof that they will suffer after the “wailings” of the “second death.” It is when that comes that Christ is to “*destroy the last enemy,*” and “*the works of the devil.*”

We have now examined all the texts in the epistles except Revelation; and find only three figurative texts from which to infer endless woe; and one other (2 Thess. 1 : 9,) used for the

purposes by adding to the Bible. By turning to my list, thirty-seven plain texts are found in these epistles for destruction. Who are *fanatics* and jump into conclusions without "searching the Scriptures?" "He who sitteth upon the throne" will, ere long, decide this question.

Mark 9: 43, 44, explained. It is better for thee to enter into *life* maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." This is one of the strongest passages in the Bible to prove *destruction*; and why then is it constantly quoted to prove endless torment? I answer,—those who thus use it will not, or do not examine the Bible, to learn the meaning of the symbolic terms here used. All admit that "worms" and "fire" are not literal. These two assertions I will prove: (1.) by asking the reader to turn back to page 70, where I explain Isa. 66: 24, from which Christ takes these expressions. I there show they mean utter destruction. See "fire," explained on pages 74, 75. (2.) I prove the term, "fire shall not be quenched," tells destruction, by the following texts. Jer. 17: 27, "I will kindle a *fire* in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and *it shall not be quenched.*" Will Jerusalem burn for ever? Jer. 7: 20; 4: 4; 21: 12. Ezek. 20: 47, 48; Isa. 1: 31; 34: 10; 66: 24. Amos, 5: 6. 2 Kings, 22: 17; 2 Chron. 34: 25. Here are twelve texts in which "the *fire shall not be quenched,*" and "*unquenchable fire,*" (meaning the same) prove utter *destruction*, as their contexts plainly show. All critics agree that Christ used the figures and symbols of the prophets. Now read this text, and Matt. 3: 12, with Luke, 3: 17, all telling one and the same punishment, and we see perfect proof that Christ taught *destruction* by these figurative terms, just as the twelve above-named texts teach it. Their contexts do not forbid, but favor the same meaning. "To go into *Gehenna,*" (here put *hell*) adds to the proof, as that denoted a place of *death*, or *slaughter*, as plainly as "gallows" does to us. *Gehenna* is the Greek word for "Valley of Hinnon," and to see its meaning, read Jer. 7: 32; 19: 6, 11, 12. In *Gehenna*, (falsely translated "hell," twelve times) carcasses, if not burned, were eaten up by worms. (See this explained in Chap. III.) A. Barns, in his notes on this text, and Isa. 66: 24, says: "The figures denote great misery, and *certain*, and *terrible destruction.*" Geo. Campbell, Dr. Alexander, and Bish. Whately say the same. We use the term "unquenchable fire" in the same way that Christ and the prophets did:—if a house is on fire, and it is not *quenched*—put out, the house is, of course, *destroyed*. As man is *mortal*, he can also be "burned up."

I ask, now, if I have not shown, (1.) that this text proves *destruction*, and (2.) that endless misery teachers do not study the Bible so as to understand its meaning. The parable of the rich man and Lazarus is murdered by the same means. See it explained in Chap. IV, p. 59, 61 of my whole work.

Such neglect to compare Bible figures and symbols is the cause of error as to future punishment, and a reproach to the ministry. *Traditional* explanations of such texts blind Protestants, just as they do Catholics as to a purgatory.

CHAPTER VI.

EXPLANATION OF TEXTS CONTINUED.

THE SMOKE OF TORMENT.

13—14. Although it is agreed that the book of Rev. can settle no doctrine, yet "the smoke of their torment," (Rev. 14: 9—11,) is constantly quoted as conclusive proof of endless woe.

To understand the expressions here, and in chap. 19: 3, both referring to the same events, we must read from this verse to the end of chap. 19, and mark well the connection.

A. Barnes, in his Notes on Rev., just published, rightly connects the events of these five chapters. In his Analysis of them he says, chap. 14: 9—12, "Tells the final overthrow of all the *upholders* of that anti-christian power, (papacy.) Chap. 15, the seven plagues are to fill up or complete the wrath of God on this persecuting power; and chap. 16 tells the execution of the purpose, by the pouring out of the seven vials on this beast.

"The seventh vial, vs. 17—21, tells the complete and final overthrow of the papal power, (the beast and false prophet:) chap. 19, is a further representation of the fall of powers opposed to the Son of God, and the introduction of the millennium. Vs. 19—21, the *beast*, &c., the last enemy of the *church on earth*, is *destroyed*, and the way is prepared for its universal triumph." Mark well this confession.

This is a brief and faithful synopsis of these chapters; and we might ask if the "beast and false prophet" and their "upholders" are destroyed "*on the earth*," *previous* to the millennium, and of course previous to the *judgment*, how Mr. Barnes or any one, can transport "the smoke of torment" to a future world, and have it unending? When the "beast," &c., are spoken

of, not an intimation is found in these five chapters of their doom at the judgment, or in eternity — only earthly judgments are described, and they are ended before Christ comes to judge and raise the dead. To further assist the reader in learning what is meant by the “smoke ascending forever,” if he wishes to see for himself, and not be led, Catholic-like, I will refer him to a few texts which fully show a limited earthly scene is intended.

The figure, or comparison and language, is evidently taken from Isa. 34: 9, 10, where it is said of Idumea, “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*.” But persons do “pass through it” *now*: so that “forever and ever” has passed away.

Modern travelers tell us this land is blown over with sand, and no one dwells there; but we know they will when it is included in the “new heaven and new earth.” — 2 Peter 3: 13. Here we see “*forever* and *ever*” must be limited; and the “smoke going up *forever*” is only for *ages* — is on earth, and not unending. If teachers studied the Bible, and would show the people the similarity of these two judgments on wicked powers on earth, they would not “err concerning the faith.” — 1 Tim. 6: 21.

The beast and false prophet are identified, and only their earthly destruction is told of through these five chapters. In 16: 10, one vial is on “the *seat* of the *beast*,” (Rome.) In 18: 9, “The kings of the earth see the *smoke* of her *burning*. Do kings on earth see burning in *hell*? V. 15, merchants weep, and “stand afar off for fear of her *torment*.” In v. 18, “sailors cast dust upon their heads, and cry, when they see the *smoke* of her burning.”

Chapter 19 is another description of the final end of the “beast and false prophet.” See v. 20. On v. 21, Barnes says: “The remnant were slain with the sword — cut down with the sword; not rescued for protracted torment.” In v. 18, 21, we see “birds eat the flesh of kings, horses, &c. This tells the final end of the “beast and false prophet,” and of the “smoke of their torment,” on earth; but not a word is said of their doom at the judgment, or beyond this state.

Before referring this text (14: 11) to a future world, why do not men, or ministers who have time, read on to the end of these symbolized judgments, and then inquire, “Will there be *flesh* of kings and *horses*” in *hell*? and “*birds*” there to “eat” it?

Let us not blame Universalists any more for quoting isolated texts, nor yet charge Catholics with ignorance of the Bible.

When Destructionists are charged with forsaking or murdering the Bible, have they not good reason to retort, "first pull the beam out of thine own eye,"—"physician heal thyself?"

It could be proved, if we had space, that this "smoke of torment" is now "ascending," and has been for two "*forevers*" (ages.) Since the French Revolution in 1779, the "vials of God's wrath," have, in a special manner, been pouring upon every Catholic country on earth. "The seat of the beast is full of darkness." Italy, the garden of the world, is the most wretched land in Christendom. France, Poland and Italy have had "blood to drink."

Why has Kossuth moved the United States by depicting the horrors of despotism on the continent of Europe? Why are Protestant Holland, Denmark and Sweden, comparatively calm, amidst the commotions which rend the dominions of the "beast?" How plainly do the "vials" extend to Ireland, and the republics of Mexico and South America! "Kings lament for the smoke of her burning," and "merchants stand *afar* off for fear." The sixth vial is pouring on the "river Euphrates." Turkey is "drying up."—Rev. 16: 12.

The "seventh vial" is not yet poured out. When it is, "Babylon, (*the beast, &c.*,) will "sink as a mill-stone and be found no more."—Rev. 18: 21. When "*no more*," where will be "*the smoke of her torment?*" It is *presumption* in erring men to carry it over the mountain heights of the judgment! beyond which "there shall be no more death, neither *sorrow, crying, nor pain;*" for "he who sitteth on the throne makes *all things new.*"—Rev. 21: 4, 5.

Albert Barnes admits, and it is plain, that the scenes of these five chapters end before the millennium and the final judgment; and what *reason* do Barnes and others assign for applying this "smoke of torment" to a future world? I answer, they assign no reason *only* that the words "*forever* and *ever*" are twice added to the terms. Let us hear Barnes' words as to the *reason*: "They (the beast worshippers) were tormented while the smoke ascended, and as this is declared to be '*forever and ever*' it implies (notice the assumption) that the suffering of the wicked will be eternal; and this is such language as *would not* and *could not* have been used in a revelation from God, unless the punishment of the wicked is eternal." See his Notes. The

use of the word *aion*, forever, in the N. T., fully proves this statement to be entirely incorrect, and a gross abuse of Bible language.

I will add a little to what I have said above, to show it is so. (See pp. 67, 68.) (1.) We read of the *end of aion, forever*. Matth. 13: 39, 40, reads, "so will it be in the end of this *forever*, (*aionos*;) the harvest is the *end of this forever*, (*aionos*.) Here the translators have used evasion to cover up the meaning of the word, by rendering it "*world*," instead of *age*

Matth. 24: 3, and 28: 20, the truth is hid in the same way. See also Heb. 1: 1, and 1 Cor. 10: 11, where *forever* is rendered *world* and *worlds*. In Heb. 9: 26, *kosmos*, the proper word for *world* is used, and also *aion*, (*forever*,) and both are rendered *world*. How does it sound to tell of the *end of eternity*?

(2.) The Bible tells of a number of eternities, if *forever* has this meaning. Eph. 2: 7, "That in the *ages to come*," &c. Col. 1: 26, "The mystery which hath been hid from *ages and generations*." In these texts the word is *aionon*, the plural of *aion, forever*, and here it is translated *ages*, as it ought to be. But are there many eternities?

(3.) In 2 Tim. 1: 9; Titus 1: 2, and other texts, we read of a time before eternity began, if *forever* means eternity. Thus, in thirty texts, *aion, forever*, is translated *world* and *worlds*, and only in two, *ages*; and does this not look like a design to cover up its meaning?

When the material world is meant, *kosmos* is used, and it is put world 188 times in the N. T. Stuart says, (pp. 69,) "*Forever and ever* is a mere intensive form of expression, and so means no longer time than *forever*." I will quote more from his work named above. On pp. 15, he says, "The classical sense of *aion*, (*forever*,) is, (1,) *length or space of time*; and so, *time of life, age of man, age* considered as a space of time. (2.) *Long time, eternity, long, indefinite space of time*. These are the usual significations given by lexicographers."

With this statement before us, what can we make of learned ministers who are now telling us that the only *classic* meaning of *aion* is, *always being*? I have often been thus imposed upon by them. Another quibble is used, by saying *aion* and *aionios* means *endless*, when applied to things of a future world. Suppose this to be true, I defy them to show a single text where they are applied to torment, misery, or wailing, in a future state.

Surely the "worshippers of the beast," (Rev. 14: 11, and 19: 3,) are on *earth*, and are tormented and destroyed there before a future world begins.

They only add another quibble, when they say *punishment* and *torment* are synonymous, and refer to Matth. 25: 46, which I have explained on pp. 77.

Stuart takes up nine pages to prove these words, when applied to God, his attributes, and the state of the saints mean *endless*. What folly! who ever disputed it? These, like other words, are used in different senses, and the text and context must show their import.

On pp. 24, 25, 37, he says, "the Bible meaning of *aion* in many texts, is, (1.,) an indefinite or long period in time past. (2.) *Age*, in the sense of dispensation, as Jewish and Christian age. (3.) It has the meaning of *world*, as the present and future world.

I will refer to the texts he quotes to show these meanings, that the reader may fully understand the evasion practiced by the translators and learned expounders; and, especially, by A. Barnes, in the assertion I have called "a gross abuse of language." Look at it again, and then at the following texts.

Matth. 12: 32; 13: 22, 40, and 49; 24: 3; 28: 20; Mark 10: 30; 4: 19; Luke 16: 8; 18: 30; 20: 34, 35; Rom. 12: 2; 1 Cor. 1: 20; 2: 6, 8; 3: 18; 2 Cor. 4: 4; Gal. 1: 4; 2 Tim. 4: 10; 1 Tim. 1: 17; 6: 17; Titus 2: 12; Eph. 1: 21; 2: 2; Heb. 1: 2; 11: 3.

Here are twenty-seven texts where *aion*, (*forever*,) is translated *world* and *worlds*, and twice *ages*: viz., Eph. 2: 7; Col. 1: 26; and Stuart admits they might or should be translated *age* and *ages*, as they have this sense.

He adds, pp. 33, 34, "All the texts where *aion* refers to future punishment, (as being endless,) are 2 Peter 2: 17; Jude 13 Rev. 14: 11; 19: 3; 20: 10." We who hold to destruction, need to limit its meaning only in the last three; and I have proved two of these, Rev. 14: 11, and 19: 3, to mean only punishments in *this world*, both by the Bible and the confession of A. Barnes. As I have said, Barnes tries to carry the torment of the beast-worshippers into a future state, by incorrectly or absurdly stating that *forever and ever*, ages of ages, must here mean endless time. He knew these terms are applied scores of times to earthly woes, and were taken from Isa. 34: 9, 10, where they are certainly limited.

As hundreds of learned ministers are still absurdly using this text to prove endless woe, my severe charge is demanded, and is justifiable.

On pp. 67, Stuart says, "It is plain that the Scriptures have not asserted the endless happiness of the righteous, if *forever*, &c., means not endless." This is a common remark by teachers now. Here we have another evidence that our teachers are either ignorant of the Bible, or aim to mislead in *this* matter; while I know they do not in others. Let us notice a few out of many expressions which prove the eternity of saints and their happiness, without these words.

Luke 20: 36, "Neither can they *die any more*." 1 Cor. 15; 42, "It is raised in *incorruption*." V. 52, "The dead shall be raised *incorruptible*,"—"this mortal must put on *immortality*,"—"death is swallowed up in *victory*." 1 Peter 1: 4, "To an inheritance *incorruptible*—that *fadeth not away*, reserved in heaven for you." 1 Peter 5: 4, "Ye shall receive a crown of glory that *fadeth not away*." "Heirs and *joint-heirs with Christ*."—Rom. 8: 17.

With such facts before us, is it not time to search the Bible for ourselves, and not heed these teachers when they cry against going after *new things*, and being *changeable*, &c. This they are now doing to stop the investigation of the subject I am treating of.

The adjective *aionios* can mean no more than the noun *aion*, from which it is derived; so everlasting and eternal mean no more, or are as uncertain as *forever*, though not limited as often. Stuart, on pp. 44, quotes three texts to show this: Rom. 16: 25, he renders, "the revelation of the mystery which was kept in silence *in ancient ages*: i. e., during all preceding *ages*." Our version is, "kept secret since the *world began*." 1 Tim. 1; 6, Stuart, "Grace given us through Jesus Christ *before the ancient ages*." Titus 1: 2, he has the same. Here it seems *everlasting*, from *aionois*, is put *world* by our translators, when it should be *ages*, in the plural; and is further proof that *eternity* had a beginning, if our leaders are right in their construction of the term. Peter "dissembled" in one matter, and so do our "*great and good*" men in the one before us.

But as I use severe reproof, perhaps I ought to notice an excuse for these good men, for I esteem them as good, but not perfect, and highly prize and commend most of their writings, preaching, &c. This is the excuse: they were contending with

Universalists, and in reality had no other weapons to use but these terms, (Stuart owns this,) as both held to the immortality of the wicked. They could not consistently use the 200 texts Destructionists can to disprove restoration.

It is both amusing and painful to read debates by these parties: such as Ely and Thomas, of Philadelphia; Rice and Pengree, of Cincinnati; Stuart and Balfour, of Massachusetts,—to see how like “the priest and Levite,” both parties “pass by” these 200 texts. They give *some* of them a passing notice, but dare not criticise the whole, or any of them; for if they had, both parties would have ended even worse than the two fabled *Kilkenny cats*, in their battle—had *nothing* left. True, they would not have been *annihilated*; but transmigration would have occurred; and they would have found themselves *Destructionists*—quite a new state!

O! what sad effects were produced in the “garden,” and is still produced, by the devil’s falsehood, “THOU SHALT NOT SURELY DIE!!”

I will just ask, if more good would not have been done to Universalist friends, by owning the truth as to these terms, and depending more on other parts of the Bible, than has been by the evasive and contradictory course which has been pursued? They have plainly seen the sophistry, and it has strengthened them in their belief, and helped them advance it, by showing that the orthodox used deception in one point at least. A similar wrong, with like results, has been done by wresting language to make out a local, eternal *hell*.

But I add a few more remarks on our text, Rev. 14: 10, and leave it: (1.) Notice, the threatening and torment told here, is *only* to the worshippers of the beast; no other sinners are included;—the “seven vials” which cause the “smoke of torment” are poured on them only—except one on Euphrates. So then, Protestant sinners are not to be tormented forever and ever. (2.) These vials are poured out “upon the *earth*,” not in hell.—Chap. 16: 1. (3.) *Forever and ever* should be translated *age of age*, or *ages of ages*, and then all dispute would be ended. The whole five chapters compel them to mean a limited time, to be ended before the final judgment.

We might as well quote the texts which tell the destruction of Idumea, Jerusalem, and Babylon, to prove endless woe, as to quote Rev. 14: 11; 19: 3, and 20: 10. No future punishment is told of in this book till we come to chap. 20: 11, and then

no intimation of protracted torment is made to the end of the book.

I will add a page on these texts, from *Bible vs. Tradition*, both to commend the work, and further to illustrate my views. Page 276, 277.

“Rev. 19: 2, ‘True and *righteous* are the judgments of God; for he hath judged the great harlot, who corrupted the *earth* with her fornication * * * and her smoke ascendeth, *eis tous aionas ton aionon, until the ages of ages.*’ 20: 9, ‘And they * * * encircled the camp of the saints, and the beloved city; and fire came down out of heaven from God, and ate them up. And the devil that deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and sulphur, where both the beast of prey and the false prophet are; and they will be tormented day and night, *eis tous aionas ton aionon, until the ages of the ages.*’ Rev. 14: 9, ‘A third angel followed them, saying, * * * If any man *worship* the beast of prey and his image, and receive a mark on his forehead or on his hand, he also shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out undiluted into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and sulphur, before the holy angels and before the throne, and the smoke of their torment ascendeth, *eis aionas aionon, until the ages of ages;* and there is no rest, by day or by night, to those that worship the beast of prey, and its image.’ These are all clear examples of the limited meaning of ‘*aion.*’

“The preposition *eis*, which we have translated *until*, in these passages, because the context requires it, and, because in this connection it is in accordance with the strictest rules of grammar, can never bear the meaning of ‘*for.*’ *Eis* properly signifies *at*; but this, its *radical* meaning, is differently modified. It sometimes means *being at*, either as *close beside*, or actually *within*. ‘He actually stood (*eis*) *at* the door.’ ‘To enter (*eis*) *into* the temple.’ ‘They shall be fulfilled (*eis*) *at* their season.’ But it likewise denotes *motion* or *tendency toward* an object, so as to arrive *at* it; and then may be rendered *to* or *into*, when applied to *place*, and *until*, when applied to *time*, or referring to *place*. ‘They came (*eis*) *to*, or *into*, the land of Israel.’ But, as referring to time, ‘They feast (*eis*) *until* sunset.’ ‘He that endureth (*eis*) *until* the end shall be saved.’ ‘And put them in hold (*eis*) *until* the next day.’ It likewise signifies *directed at*, or *aim at*, and then may be translated *toward*, *in respect to*, *respecting*, &c. As all the three texts

quote I refer to time, we translate *eis, until*, as the grammar and context absolutely require. But how can these texts teach 'eternal torments,' when they so evidently refer to judgments to take place on the earth, and to be inflicted on symbolical personages, or systems, which 'shall be utterly burned with fire,' 18: 8; or upon a succession of a class of persons, while they *continue to worship* the beast of prey. This is evident from the expressions, 'Go your ways and pour out the seven vials of God's wrath upon the earth,' during which a space was given unto them to repent, 'and they repented not.'"

From this brief review, have we not reason to ask, "Do the priest's lips keep knowledge" in the 19th century? Mal. 2: 7. I doubt if a greater perversion of the Bible can be found in the Catholic world, than is made in using these texts to prove endless woe. The Lord forgive those who do it,—yea and myself, too, for I have done the same, without the research the doctrine demands of every Christian.

THE DEVIL TORMENTED.

15. Rev. 20: 10. This ends our inventory. Here the devil is said to "be tormented day and night, forever and ever;" and on it I remark:

(1.) The events here told are symbolic, and such prophetic language is hard to be understood, and is no proof of a doctrine when unsupported by other Scripture.

(2.) Only earthly events are told in this chapter till we come to the 11th v. "Day and night" are in this "*forever*," (*age*;) and they are not to be in the future world, "for there shall be no night there."—Rev. 21: 25; 22: 5. President Edwards, the younger, v. 1, pp. 97, on this text, says, "The scene of which this text is a part, is manifestly an exhibition of what is to take place before the general judgment. This is evident from the context." So this text is given up, &c. A. Barnes says, "there may be a long period between the events stated in vs. 9 and 10, and those of 11 and 15,"—or the judgment; if so, these "*ages of ages*" may run out in this period.

(3.) These thoughts alone neutralize this text, as "*forever*" is no proof of *endless* time, unless the connection, or the nature of the thing shows it to be so. There is nothing in the nature of *devils*, men, nor torment, compelling their endless existence; for God, if he will, can end them at any time.

(4.) The events and result of all the judgments told from Rev. 14: 8, to 20: 11, are comprehensively stated in chap. 11: 15—18. There, under the seventh trumpet, “the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of Christ,” and before that is established, “the time comes to *destroy* them that *destroy* the earth.” Of course the devil is included — when *destroyed*, the “*torment of ages*” must end. This trumpet includes the seven vials, and briefly tells the judgment, which is renewed, and enlarged upon, in chap. 20: 11, and on to the end of the book.

(5.) The *literal* devil is not here meant. So says Lightfoot, Brightman, and Usher, eminent authors of England and others. Lightfoot's Works, vol. 6, pp. 255.

But Rev. 12: 9, compared with 20: 2, settles it. In 12: 9, *dragon, serpent, devil, satan*, occur; and here all expounders agree that the literal devil is not meant, but *paganism*, which was cast out of the Roman world after Constantine's day, and is symbolized by being “cast out of heaven.” This is doubtless correct, and when we find the same four terms “*dragon*,” &c., in the same order in chap. 20: 2, analogy compels us to believe that some other corrupt system, or false religion, resembling paganism, is also meant by *dragon, devil, &c.*

In chap. 13; 4, 11, the papacy becoming a corrupt, persecuting power, is also called a “*dragon*;” but in 16: 13, the frogs coming out of the mouth of the dragon, beast, and false prophet, shows that some *other* persecuting power besides the papacy, is called a *dragon*.

This Magog army, and false and persecuting system, symbolized by this *devil-dragon*, are but briefly noticed by John, for the plain reason that Ezk. 38 and 39 had described them largely. We have seen that the *beast* and his worshippers were tormented for *ages* before being finally put an end to, (chap. 19, 20,) and so we see the “fire from heaven devours this Magog army,” but it is to be tormented for *ages of ages* by this “*fire*,”—God's wrath and judgments — before finally “devoured.” This is symbolized by the “*devil*,” the deceiver, (in the sense the “*beast and false prophet*” were deceivers,) being “tormented for ages of ages.” The “*devouring*” in v. 9, is not said, and need not be understood to be sudden; and so it tells the same *time* as v. 10, when the *devil-dragon*, (a false system,) is “tormented.” The “*beast and prophet*” and their “*worshippers*” were tormented together for ages, and then destroyed together; so it is to be with this Magog power, and the *dragon-devil* deceiver. But I have not

time to go into all the proof of this assertion, nor is it needed for my object.

The Bible fully reveals a literal devil, but his name is only used figuratively in Rev. 12 and 20.

Expounders err greatly by making these "lakes of fire" for the beast and dragon-devil, told of *before* the judgment, the same as the "*second death*" lake, told of in vs. 14, 15, *after* the judgment. The first plainly tells judgments on earth, to last for *ages*; the latter, judgments after the general resurrection. Not a word is said of the *dead* being raised or punished till we pass v. 11.

I have not room, nor is it necessary to my purpose, to show what corrupt system or power is meant by this dragon-devil and Magog army. Keith, in his *Signs of the Times*, after writing several hundred pages, was compelled to say, the Turkish power is meant, and that the "fire from heaven" is now devouring them — that this fire is the same as the "sixth vial poured upon the river Euphrates." — Rev. 16: 12. Prof. Bush agrees with him in his work on the *Millennium*, written in 1832, before he became deluded by mesmerism. He gives the best exposition of Rev. 20: 1—10, I have ever seen, and I must believe that a few years will show him and Keith correct. Bush makes plain or removes all objections to his views, found in these ten verses. It is now settled by the best late critics, that v. 5 is an interpolation, except the clause, "this is the first resurrection."

I cannot see that his plan interferes but little with what is called "*the age to come*," as that, if correct, (which I have not had time to read and decide about,) is mostly founded on other parts of the Bible.

History settles one fact, viz., the pagan Turkish power, since 1821, (Keith's time,) has been in the same lake, (God's judgments,) "where the *beast* (papacy) *is*," and has been "*tormented day and night*," for more than one "*age*." When the "*seventh vial*" comes, and the "*battle of Armageddon*," (Rev. 16: 16,) the "*smoke of torment*," and the "*dragon-devil's torment*" must end, for the last enemy will be *destroyed*; and the "*kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of Christ*."

Note.—"The *last* seven plagues" are finished before these uncertain thousand years begin, and why should we say there will be an *eighth* plague after they are finished?

I have showed the folly of making the term *forever and ever*, carry these torments into a future state, while every thing else in

Rev. up to 20: 11, forbid it; and from this verse on, no protracted woe is told, but the reverse.

Hardly any two writers ever agree about Rev. 20: 1—10, and this shows the extreme folly of depending on them to prove endless misery.

The error of inferring endless woe from Rev., is owing to the fact that but few take the necessary time to study the book, and compare its symbols among themselves, and with those of the O. T., from which most of them are taken. Barnes and others do not pretend that the judgments and torments apply to another state, only as they *force* them there against their natural import, by falsely concluding the term *forever and ever* mean endless time.*

On Isa. 34: 9, 10, "The smoke thereof shall go up forever," &c., Barnes says: "The idea here is, that there would be permanent and utter destruction. The image is evidently taken from the destruction of Sodom." Is it not unaccountably strange that, when he came to Rev., he could see no "image," only an imaginary heathen *hell*, where smoke would ascend *forever!!* Why could he not see Jer. 23: 40; 17: 27; 4: 4; 7: 20; 21: 12; Ez. 2: 45, and scores of other texts from which the imagery of the N. T. is taken?

As to the term "lake of fire," it occurs five times, and only in Rev.; but the idea it conveys is often found in other symbolic terms in the O. T. See Rev. 19: 20; 20: 10. In these, it evidently denotes heavy earthly, protracted judgments of some kind, which are to result in ending the "beast, false prophet, the dragon-devil," and their worshippers.

In chap. 20: 14, 15; 21: 8, we are told plainly that it causes the extinction of *death* and the *grave*, (*hades*;) and, of course, of all who are "not found written in the *book of life*," as they are cast into it. It is called, and so means the same here as "second death." This term settles its meaning to be a cause of the extinction of life. If it means a *hell*, as divines say, then *hell* is cast into *hell*. Rev. 20: 14; "death and *hell* were cast into the *lake of fire*." I know a papal deluded church, (as to

* I ask the attention of the learned to the statement of Bible vs. Tradition, on pp. 92. Is there not corruption in translating the Greek preposition (*eis*) by *for*, in these texts? It appears to me so. Certainly, it would be absurd to say, "he that endureth (*eis*) *for* the end shall be saved," and yet, in Rev. 11: 10, and 20: 10, *time* is intended just as much as in this text. It is certain that these texts mean ages, &c., and it is certain the learned are yet deceiving as to the translation of *hell*, *ghost*, &c., and are they not doing the same by putting *eis*, *for*, instead of *until*? If the sense is *to*, or *until*, then the translation of *aion* must be *ages* in these texts.

this matter,) are telling of a "*death that never dies!*"—just as much common sense in it as to tell of a *life that never lives!*

I own that "wisdom shall die with" doctors who use such language, (Job. 12; 2,) but thanks be to God *all* wisdom will not die with them. Like Job's friends, they have one dark, confused department in their heads; even confused enough to "speak wickedly and deceitfully for God," as Job's friends did,—Job. 13: 7.

As I have said, it is just as absurd to quote these texts in Revelation, to prove endless misery, as it would be to quote those which tell the destruction of Sodom, Idumea, Jerusalem and Babylon.

The design and grand result of the symbolized judgments, told of in Rev., after chap. 14: 8, may be thus briefly summed up: God, for great and wise ends, having permitted sin and misery to exist for a "moment," (Paul's time,) here manifests his purpose to end them. Christ, "who must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet,"—1 Cor. 15: 25, (a Hebrew phrase for utter destruction,) "takes to himself his great power,"—Rev. 11: 17; "a fire is kindled in his anger,"—Deut. 32: 22; corrupt dynasties and their worshippers fall under his displeasure, and after being tormented for ages, on earth, are finally ended—"as a mill-stone, sink, and are found no more."—Rev. 18: 21—24. Either at the time of this final destruction, or subsequently, (the time is not made plain, but *sure*,) the general resurrection and judgment comes.—Rev. 20: 11—15.

Here nothing is said of "beasts, and dragon-devils, and their worshippers," as they have all gone to "*hades*," the grave, or state of death; and now come up with the *whole* human family, without the distinction which had been noticed before v. 11, to be judged and receive a final doom. Only two classes are here named: those whose names are "in the book of *life*," and those whose names "are not found there."

From v. 11 to the end of the book, the final ending of sin and woe, in the universe, and the blessed state of the righteous are predicted. When all evil and evil beings are finally ended, and "Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father,"—then Pollok, changing the word "*damned*," will have occasion to sing, and with far greater joy of soul, than when he sang his God-dishonoring picture of *hell*—

"Time past,
The righteous saved, the wicked DEAD,
And God's eternal government approved."

CHAPTER VII

A BRIEF REVIEW AND RESULTS.

WE have now examined and referred to the texts relied on to prove immortality and endless woe, and let us see the result.

1. We have showed that thirty or more texts relied on, are entirely silent as to *endless woe*, and I have called them neuter.

2. That fifty-four texts with the word *hell* in them, so far as any of them relate to future punishment, prove the *destruction* of the wicked. These two classes, with the 200 texts for destruction, making 284, have been stolen to prove endless misery, and must be given up, as Destructionists have a *legal* demand on them.

3. Of the fifteen remaining texts relied on, I have proved that eight of them tell only earthly judgments, both by comparing them with other texts, and their being given up by Fuller, Edwards, Barnes, Lord, and others.

4. That twelve have no proof of *endless woe* in them, only what is derived from the variable words, *forever and everlasting*, and that, in reality, the whole proof rests on them.

5. That seven of them have the word *fire* in them, which, in every case is figurative, and, in Bible judgments, is a universal symbol of *destruction* of men and things.

6. That some, as John 3: 36, and 2 Thess. 1: 9, are positive proof of *destruction*, unless we add to the Bible to make them otherwise; while others, which relate to a doom in the future world, as "the *mists of darkness*," &c., favor extinction more than preservation in woe.

7 That not one is a *plain positive witness* for endless misery, and the strongest are given up by the best writers. If any speak in its favor, their testimony is extremely doubtful or inferential, so as not to make out even a *prima facie* case.

8. What confirms the last remark is, I have proved *all* the texts to be in *figurative language*, such as the best Bible critics say can establish no doctrine, even if there be no opposing texts—especially must they fail, if there be *any plain* opposing texts. I just ask here, if we have not *plain* texts for destruction?

Well does a learned writer remark—"a doctrine or sentiment so infinitely opposed to reason and conscience, so awfully revolting, and utterly incredible as that of *eternal suffering*, ought *certainly* not to be founded on, or inferred from a few *parabolic, mystic, poetic, idiomatic, proverbial, localic,* and *symbolic* sentences." But, strange to tell, every text or sentence relied on to prove this terrific doctrine, belongs to one of these classes.

There has been a great outcry against Wm. Miller for being positive about the prophesies, seeing they are so symbolic; but those who are positive that they find eternal torment in a future world, in the above-named figurative texts, betray a hundred fold more folly than Miller did, as the consequences of error on this point, are immensely greater. God is dishonored, and christendom filled with infidels by it.

In courts of law these three rules are observed: first, the *character* of the witnesses; second, the *plainness* and *positiveness* of their testimony; third, where they are *positive* on both sides, and no blot is on their character, the *number* on either side determines the case. Now apply these just rules to the issue before us. Of course no blot on the *character* of the witnesses (texts) can be admitted, and so their *plainness* and their *number* must decide the case. Of their *plainness*, good sense must decide. Divide 210 by 15, and the result is 14 to 1 on the side of *destruction*. Deduct the eight which I have proved to refer only to earthly judgments, and the result is 30 to 1. On such testimony in a suit, would not the opposing lawyer be told that his case was a desperate and hopeless one?

The fact is, if men reasoned on a worldly subject as they

do on this, it would be thought worthy of nothing better than *ridicule*, unless it was as *popular* as theologians have made *immortality* and an *eternal hell*.

It is unaccountably strange too that the *number* of texts should be so small, both when we consider the awfulness of the doctrine, and the number of texts telling the *final* reward of the righteous, and other cardinal doctrines.— They are *few* too, when, as I have said, we find more than 3,000 warnings, threatenings, and denunciations made, in relation to the *temporary* consequences of sin. If the common theory be true, who can tell why our merciful Father should feel so *deeply* for the welfare of his creatures in this short life, and feel and say so little about their woes that were to be unending? Yes, and for 4,000 years say *nothing* about those woes, nor warn to escape them!!

The profound mind of John Foster said, "May we not think that, if *so transcendently dreadful a doctrine had been meant to be taught*, there would have been such forms of proposition, of circumlocution, if necessary, as would have rendered all doubt or question a mere palpable absurdity." See his noted 'letter to a young minister,' who, by the by, proves to be Edward White, a Congregational minister, now of London, who has written an able work to prove the doctrine I hold. Its title is, "Life only in Christ."— If Foster had criticised the *Bible* as his pupil has, he would not have given the preference to restorationism. He names the two doctrines and says, "One of them must be the truth, but acknowledges he had not directed much thought to *annihilation*."

I know the word *hell* will be clung to as proof of a *world* to be inhabited by wretched beings. An old proverb says, 'a man may tell a falsehood so often as to finally believe it a truth'; and in like manner the word *hell*, has been reiterated, till Christians think it is outrageous sacrilege to disturb it. Like purgatory to the Catholics, it has become a *darling word* and conclusive proof of orthodoxy.

I have proved that Christ only meant to tell a disgraceful death by being "cast into Gehenna," and not that there would be such a *place* eternally.

If men, who think clearly on other subjects, could get this idea into their snarled-up and conceited minds, we

should hear no more of a "dismal world, deep in the *imaginary* regions of despair; where God-almighty ('who is *love*' *itself*) has stored up some *unknown* materials of *vengeance*, sufficient to last through eternity"—(blasphemous language!!)

I will justify the remark that our ministry are too *conceited* and dogmatical, by a sentence of the great and Godly Dr. Vinet. He says, "Even now, after eighteen centuries of christianity, we are *very probably involved in some enormous error*, of which christianity will at some future time make us ashamed." The doctrine of an eternal hell for endless woe, is such an "*enormous error*," and the church will yet be *ashamed* of it. Yet most are as *positive* there is such a place as if they had seen it with their own eyes. "Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight." Isa. 5 : 21.

We have now before us the foundation of the mighty fabric—*immortality* and consequent *eternal torment*, for a greater share of our race—we see its length, and breadth, and *solidity*. On this foundation our opponents *profess* to feel as secure as soldiers in Gibraltar. I ask which looks most like a Gibraltar, these 15 texts, or the 210 quoted for *destruction*!

On such testimony, not only the doctrine of endless woe is founded, but also the following consequential doctrines, or items of belief.

1. That it is consistent with the *justice* of God, to *create* innumerable beings whom he knew or foresaw would be endlessly miserable, and curse him for their creation. [He is now causing to come into being about 60,000 daily. If half are lost, he is daily creating 30,000 for endless woe. May not our sense of *justice* ask how long he will continue this work!!

2. That it is in accordance with his *love, goodness, pity* and *mercy*, to *create*, and then afflict thus.

3. That it will be consistent with his *wisdom*, and *power*, to continue, *endlessly*, that "abominable thing he hates"—*sin*—also, thus to continue *misery*, in which "he delighteth not" and over which "he grieves." [Would it be *wise* in a king to permit rebellion, and consequent misery to continue for ever if he had *power* to end them?

4. That saints, and all holy beings in the universe, will be

for ever the happier for this *continuance* of misery and sin; and hatred to themselves, their God and Redeemer. Mark—"all things work for good to all who love God"*

5. That saints, when made perfect in heaven, will be destitute of, or deprived of *qualities* which God commands them to possess in their present state—such as *pity, sympathy, sorrow* for others woes, "*good will to all,*" &c.

Do not flinch, brethren—these items of belief are the unavoidable fruit of your system—the legitimate children of hell-torment teachers, and they must own them, and cherish them, though *forbidding in their appearance*.

Prof. Stuart, (see *Biblical Repository*, July, 1840,) was so troubled with two of these items of faith, that he made this astounding remark—"Perhaps God may in *mercy extinguish our social susceptibilities in heaven*"!!—Make us *hermits*, so that we can hear the groans of the damned, and stoic-like, be unmoved by their hopeless wail!!

Surely the foundation for such a faith should have a pyramid-base—be supported by scores of plain texts, and no opposing ones—be made far more plain than the promise of *life* to the righteous; for if they should perish as the beasts, seeing they have sinned, God's *character* would remain untarnished in the view of his other creatures; and these creatures rejoice for ever that rebellion and woe had ceased to exist.

But I ask if the texts I have reviewed afford such a broad foundation? I ask with mingled feelings of joy and sorrow—joy, that God's word *does not* teach such a soul-chilling and God-dishonoring doctrine—with sorrow for the sad fact that most of "the excellent ones of the earth" are teaching it, and burdened by it—with sorrow, too, that the "blind are led by the blind, and both are fallen into the ditch" of error—a gloomy ditch, where wheat indeed grows, but is much "choaked" by "wood, hay and stubble," so that it cannot "bear sixty and a hundred fold."

* In Mount Auburn, (Boston,) I saw a lovely marble monument of a dear dead child, which the parents had obtained to keep in their house, but had to remove it, as they could not endure the sight; yet the marble child suffered not. Pres. Edwards and other great divines, who formed our systems of divinity, and whom the present clergy seem to think are infallible guides, say that the saints will see their friends writhe for ever in *literal fire*.

After four years' examination, I am compelled to dissent from the view of some great and good men who have rejected endless woe. H. C. Dwight, A. M., and Professor Sears say, "That Dr. Tholuck, and other eminent and pious divines of Germany, who hold to restoration, acknowledge that the N. T. *seems* to inculcate the doctrine of eternal punishment, (meaning misery by the term punishment,) while others contend that it is not *apparently* announced there." The *latter* is my belief. I own everlasting punishment not only *seems*, but is *plainly* taught, in the sense Pres. Edwards gives it, viz., "that *annihilation* is everlasting punishment;" but neither the N. nor the O. T. *seem* to teach everlasting torment. Take the 15 texts I have examined, and add to them the 12 with Gehenna in them, (those with sheol and hades, [hell], in, can be no witnesses,) and weigh well the relative force of evidence among themselves, or give them a full criticism, and I fear not to affirm that they afford strong proof of utter destruction, without going to the 200 texts I have quoted; *unless* it be first proved from some other source, that the wicked are immortal—this we have seen cannot be done—the texts to prove they are to suffer for ever, are the only ones to prove they are immortal.

Strange as it may at first appear to my readers, yet it can be shown that we have, in reality, no need to fetch our 210 swords into the battle-field, for like David, we can cut off Goliath's head with his *own sword*. I will show how this can be done by a little repetition. Of the fifteen texts I have proved that eight tell only earthly woes—two *plainly* prove destruction—add to these two the eleven with Gehenna in, (in James it is no proof,) and as Gehenna is a perfect symbol of destruction, we have thirteen to overbalance the five remaining ones of the fifteen. And these five are merely inferential. One of them, Matt. 25 : 41, "Depart into everlasting fire," we have seen denotes destruction. This is telling briefly how Goliath's head can be cut off with his own sword.

Let any one fully examine the O. T., and understand its symbols, figures, and poetic style, and then read the N. T. with special reference to this subject, and he will agree with me; *unless* some selfish interest warps his judgment, or his judgment itself is too weak to grasp an argument.

The neglect to take time (and it requires much time) for this examination, on the plan I have briefly adopted above, is one great reason why those great men erred.

But they with Bishop Newton, and the eminent John Foster, who erred in the same manner, took for *granted* that the wicked were *immortal*, and this was another grand cause of their error. They saw the N. T. *seemed* to intimate no *recovery* after the sentence at the final judgment; and this caused the confusion. The Bible *must seem* to contradict itself wofully while the immortality of the wicked is believed.

But a day-star of hope has arisen—the scales have fallen from many eyes, and I must believe that our God designs to give his people more enlarged views of his word and government.

The nineteenth century has regulated brains so as to use steam and lightning, and it will yet regulate them so as to use the figurative language of the Bible aright. A hint will be taken from the example of the “noble Bereans,” and “Apollas,” and to use a comparison, a telegraph line will be established between the O. and the N. T. Newly constructed telescopes too, have enabled us to see far into the regions of *space*, and we believe the vision, the *power* of *thought*, will be magnified, so as to see far enough into *eternity* to discover that a *glorious eternal life* affords a sufficient *motive* to action while on earth; and that its *loss* at the judgment would be a punishment—yea an *everlasting punishment*—seen to be so by all the living, eternally.

The living perceiving the *loss* sustained by the dead, will constitute an eternal monument to exhibit the evil of sin, and God’s displeasure against it, without having a State Prison, a Bastile, or an abominable Inquisition-dungeon left to pollute the fair universe.

In a sad delusion must the mind be, which conceives that God’s allwise government will require such an exhibition for ever.

UNIVERSALISM AND ORTHODOXY CONTRASTED.

In examining the Bible on the consequences of sin, as to our future final destiny, the class of texts relied on by Universalists and Restorationists, demands a more serious

attention than Christians generally believe ; but I have only room to notice them briefly. I will use the terms Universalism and restoration as synonymous, for when we duly weigh the import of ETERNITY, we see the difference is comparatively small.

One object of this brief notice is, to make torment teachers ashamed (if possible) of their infallibility, and violent warfare against Destructionists. When the Bible is rightly canvassed, the only legitimate dispute is between Destructionists and Restorationists, while endless misery should be treated something as we treat Mormonism. Traditionists may call this remark outrageous folly if they please—I owe and own allegiance to none but my God, and my grey hairs admonish me to *fear* none but Him.

A Universalist tract is in circulation containing 100 texts for *their* views. I have examined them, and find some fifty, which, when combined, afford much stronger proof for the restoration of all men, than do the texts for *endless* woe, when combined in a like manner. A work called *The Reason of our Hope*, claims 1,000* passages as directly, or by implication, sustaining *restoration* ; and though it perverts the sense in many texts, it perverts it in none more *grossly* than have the orthodox in many which I have referred to, and explained. Verily, it can do no worse than completely *reverse* the sense ; and this the orthodox do in scores of texts. See “ *Burn Up, Devour,*” §c. §c.

I will quote a few texts for restoration. 1 John 4 : 14, “ And we have seen and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the *world*.” 2 : 2, “ He (Christ) is the propitiation for our sins : and not for ours only, but also for the *sins of the whole world*.” Rom. 11 : 32, “ For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have *mercy upon all*.” Rom. 5 : 18, 19, “ Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon *all men unto justification of life*.— For as by one man’s disobedience *many* were made sin

* This vast number need not astonish us so much when we learn that they claim all texts which tell God’s natural and moral attributes as favoring their views. They say, and say justly, that all of them seem to be disparaged if endless woe be true.

ners, so by the obedience of one shall *many be made righteous.*"

This chapter alone is more conclusive proof for restoration, than all the combined texts are for *endless* woe, leaving out the 284 which I have called stolen ones.

1 Tim. 2: 4, "Who will have *all men* to be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth." Compare with Isa. 56: 10. Isa. 45: 25, "In the Lord shall *all the seed* of Israel be justified, and shall glory." 53: 6, "All we like sheep have gone astray...the Lord hath laid on him (Christ) the *iniquity of us all.*" John 12: 32, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will *draw all men unto me.*" 2 Cor. 5: 14, 18, "We thus judge, that if one *died for all*, then were all dead." "To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the *world* unto himself, *not imputing* their *trespasses* unto them." Ps. 86: 9, "*All nations* whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name." Dan. 9: 24, Christ is "to finish the transgression, and to make an *end of sins*, and to make reconciliation for iniquity." John 1: 29, "Behold the Lamb of God, which *taketh away the sin of the world.*"

Here are fifteen texts which prove my assertion, as they are not as figurative, and are vastly more decisive for final restoration, than are the fifteen claimed to prove endless woe.

But we are told that the contexts and opposing passages do away their proof. Very well—but this rule is not a one-sided thing, and Universalists can apply it to measure the orthodox texts. I have applied this rule to all the texts for endless woe, and find the *contexts* silence their testimony; and the *opposing* texts for *destruction* swallow them up, or leave them "twice dead, plucked up by the roots."

Universalist books abound, in which they apply this rule, as I have done, and the people seeing the proof for endless woe fails; and being taught both by the orthodox and Universalists, that all men are *immortal*; and hearing nothing of the doctrine of *destruction*, they unavoidably say '*all will be saved.*'

Add to these fifteen texts some twenty of a similar nature, and then add the ten I have quoted for the cleansing of the universe from woe and sin, and we see why Re-

storians are so positive, and their doctrines spread in our thinking and reading age. Multitudes of thoughtful, unconverted men and women think on this subject, and think more correctly than most professors, for the obvious reason that they are not hooped up to think in a *circle*, by "iron-bedstead" creeds and traditional fetters; nor yet overawed by fear of being cast out of churches.

One thing should be noticed in these texts, viz., they cannot be made to cut their own throats, so to speak, as can the fifteen texts claimed to prove endless woe. Nothing can do away their proof but the opposing texts for destruction.

The orthodox have taught the people to mystify the plainest part of the Bible, (which I rely on,) and restorationism has been the legitimate result. Make *death, life, destruction, (of the man,) perish, burn up, &c., figurative*, and Universalists have about as good ground for saying, (as they do say,) that they only mean the ending of *sin and evil*, or violent death and judgments on earth, as their opponents have for saying, (as they do,) that they only mean the ending of *happiness*, or to make *miserable*.

The fact is plain to all who investigate, as the greatness of the subject demands, that if all men are immortal, and these terms are figurative, Restorationists have the *truth*; for the texts for *endless* suffering weigh but little when put in the scales to balance the texts, and the arguments from the attributes of God, for restoration. I am well aware that this will astonish many, for but few in our day have investigated this as they have other doctrines. They have been content to float with popular opinion.

The vicarious sufferings of Christ, or his dying for our sins, (not strictly as for debt, but for crime,) is the only foundation of our hope of "eternal life;" and one of the *great* errors of Universalists is in rejecting, as they generally do in this country this doctrine; and not in believing that the universe will be cleansed from evil.*

* I aim not to misrepresent the views of any sect; and I understand the views of Universalists to be, that Christ died, properly, as a martyr only, to confirm "the glad tidings," that God's purpose was to save all our race. In England, I learn from one of their periodicals, they hold the atonement as the orthodox do, and only differ from them in saying it will be applied to all, whether faith and repentance be exercised or not. If all receive full punishment for sin, as they hold, then, of course, there was no need of "Christ dying for our sins." They are logically driven into this error.

They think, many of them, much on *this* subject, if they do not on other points of doctrine; and they see clearly, with Bishop Newton, the noted writer on the prophecies, who says, "Nothing can be more contrary to the divine nature and attributes, than for a God all-wise, all-powerful, all-good, all-perfect, to bestow existence on any beings whose destiny he foresees and foreknows, must terminate in wretchedness and misery, without recovery or remedy, *without respite or end*. God is love, and he would rather have not given life, than render that life a torment and curse to all eternity. *Imagine* such a state of misery you may, but you can never *seriously believe it, nor reconcile it to God and goodness*."—Newton's Works, v. 6, London edition, 1787.

By *assuming*, like others, immortality, Newton was driven to restoration; where all Protestant christendom will soon be, if the delusion of immortal-soulism continues to be taught as heretofore. Catholics may keep ignorant enough to still believe in *their purgatory*. But a great reason of their continued belief is, that their hell is almost infinitely better than the Protestant hell: as their popes and priests can pray all out of it; while from the Protestant hell, divines say, the Almighty himself can deliver *none*.

We need not wonder that thoughtful Protestant Germany, as is now admitted,* have all gone over to restoration: and that go-ahead England and America are just upon their heels. As to the unconverted, we are now side by side. Our clergy and the church are not aware of the state of things in our land. *Secret Universalism* and

* Prof. Stuart, in the *Biblical Repository*, July, 1840, says, "A belief in the *future* repentance and recovery of sinners, has become widespread in Germany, pervading even the ranks of those who are regarded as serious and evangelical in respect to most or all of what is called orthodox doctrine, saving this point." He adds, "Not a few persons in our community (U. S.) *secretly* are Restorationists; and *among them* are not a few of the *professed preachers of the gospel*." H. E. Dwight, A. M., (son of Pres. Dwight,) who traveled in Germany, says, "I have seen but one person who believed in the eternity of future punishment in Germany." The latter writings of Prof. Stuart I think show that himself was a *secret* Restorationist.

It is now ascertained that the great Christian philosopher and writer, Dr. Thomas Dick, fully believes in restoration.

skepticism are many fold greater than they will believe them to be. In five years' special enquiry, I have found but one unconverted man who would own to me, (knowing my views) that he believed in endless misery; and he would not have done so, had he not been in company where it was *popular* to profess such a belief.

The Church of God, while aiming to do good and save men, by erring, has *wronged* the Universalist—has made them such—has persecuted them for errors into which she had driven them. As is common to erring man, one extreme drives to another. Our *absurd* penalty has driven millions to the opposite extreme of total restoration; to sustain which, and harmonize it with the *Bible*, other errors had to be adopted. It is slander to charge them, as many do, with throwing away the Bible (some are led to it,) as an ultimate guide—they generally reverence it as the *grand charter* of their hopes for a future world—in this we agree. We owe them a vast debt, and should make sacrifices to pay it—we whose eyes God in mercy has opened, to see the delusion of all christendom on this subject, should confess our former errors to them, and if possible, convince them that the Bible means literally what it says—“*The wages of sin is DEATH.*”

When they and the orthodox cease from the sad error of mystifying the plain language of the book of God, and let it *speak out its common-sense meaning*, both parties will find no pigmy work, but *more* than a *Herculean* task to demolish the 200 *adamant pillars* on which *destruction* is founded.

“Be not deceived, for God is not mocked,”—“if ye live after the flesh, ye shall DIE”—not *live* in a *theological hell*, nor yet be *chastised*, and then *live* and reign with Christ, in the “new heavens and a new earth.” Gal. 6: 7; Rom. 8. 13; 2 Pet. 3: 13.

One outcry against Destructionists now is, that they are on the road to Universalism. This is just such logic as the *New York Recorder* used, viz., If God has given to the brain the power, quality, or attribute, of thinking, reasoning, &c., then no angels exist, or God has not created any spiritual beings whatever; and further that we cannot be “raised a spiritual body,” as 1 Cor. 15: 44, predicts.—(See the *Recorder* of May 11, 1853). It is such an ab-

dity too, as is manifested in saying—‘ If we have a spirit or soul that leaves the body when we die, and lives till the judgment, then that soul is *immortal*, and God cannot destroy it at the judgment. That believing God will “burn up the wicked, root and branch,” as he has said, should lead to Universalism and infidelity, is strange logic to me, however it may appear to college-learned divines who use it.

These are specimens of all the arguments I have been able to find against our views.

It may be said that I ought not to collect and quote these Universalist passages—I answer first, the Spirit has written them; and secondly, that my opponents are deceived if they think the masses do not know they are in the Bible.

With this summary view of the texts used by Restorationists, as opposing the weak and uncertain texts for endless misery; and also of the texts opposing them, by teaching destruction—what shall we say—what think, of the dogmatical spirit and language of the church—of its boasted knowledge of the Bible—its opposition to further investigation—its persecution of those who *will* investigate and proclaim what they learn!!—Especially what can we think of those who are learned in the original languages!—of the responsibility resting on them in this matter. For some cause, (God knows best,) they evidently “shun to declare all the council of God,” and “make the vision plain.” Acts 20. 27; Hab. 2: 2.

I have already given my reasons for being severe in my charges. If I have erred, or those who love our God and oppose me err, there is a *consoling truth*—“with the Lord there is *forgiveness*.”

Brethren in Christ, you must either yield to the doctrine of *destruction*, or with Germany, yield to *restorationism*—investigation *will* go on, and *annihilate* your yet too popular, but fast-waning theory of eternal torments! Which horn of the dilemma will you choose? rather which does the *great umpire*, the precious *Bible*, direct you to embrace?

Of one thing be *assured*, as Cowper justly and *sweetly* sang—

"The groans of nature in this nether world,
Which heaven has heard for ages, have an END.

. . . . For all things were once
Perfect, and all must be at length *restor'd*.
So God has purpos'd; who would else
In his *dishonor'd* works, *himself endure*
Dishonor, and be WRONGED WITHOUT REDRESS."
Amen and AMEN. *The Task, book 6th.*

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

Having a little space in the 120 pages assigned to this work, I add—

1. I have said the ministers (and deacons by their side) oppose *reform in doctrines*, (not in practice). We need not go to papal history to prove this. The Protestant clergy drove the Puritan fathers from England. See how they now persecute the missionaries in Armenia, Greece, and Germany—imprisoning the Baptists, &c. Who drove Roger Williams among the savages, and hung the Quakers? I answer, ministers stimulated the people, and thus accused them to the civil authorities, just as papal priests have ever done. Even Calvin was a leader in having Servetus put to death. The Baptist and Methodist know the bitter opposition of the clergy in the Eastern States, in former years, and yet themselves are now in the same warfare against the advocates of *life through Christ alone*.

Ministers nobly oppose *error*, but they fight all *truth* which does not happen to be in their creeds with the same zeal.

They also contend for most of the blessed truths of the gospel, but they war for popish *errors* retained in their creeds with equal warmth. If all the fallen angels, and all the tyrants, infidels, and atheists of earth, were to hold a convention to invent the *greatest slander* against the Almighty, (excepting the one against the Holy Ghost) they would have no new work to perplex them—they would only have to look over the creeds, and finding the doctrine of *eternal torments* there; and learning that the ministry illustrated it by "*Dives in flames*," they would *resolve*—'No need of further deliberations,' and adjourn *sine die*. ("I am not mad, most noble" D.D.) *They* would see, (if idle, superficial, or interested thinkers, as to this subject, do not)

that the doctrine, rooted up, polluted, reversed or darkened *every* revealed attribute of our Maker.

Yet this doctrine, without a single plain text to support it, is now contended for with equal, or greater zeal than are the atonement, salvation by faith, &c. The slander of the *New York Recorder*, and other periodicals—the pulpit—the *cold shoulder*, &c., &c., prove this to be true.—Of course there are exceptions to this general charge. Some will impartially investigate a new doctrine and confront popular views, at any sacrifice; and they with the people effect reforms. But where did a *popular* minister ever commence a reform? Where?

2. My space requires me to be thus brief. If Providence permits, and the sale of this cursory work warrants another edition, I will add a chapter or two on the objections to our doctrine, the reasoning to sustain endless woe, and other matter which I could not consistently introduce in a consecutive argument (as I have endeavored to give) drawn from the Scriptures. The texts I have referred to also may be further illustrated by analogy of Bible language.

If, however, the Bible teaches destruction, as I have proved it does, all objections against it, and all reasoning for endless woe, are "*vain babblings*"; but as these are now the main weapons of ministers and people, they need warding off, and we are prepared to do it.

3. Luther's courage is only needed to tear endless woe from all creeds, in a few years. Brethren, you who believe in the destruction of the wicked and hold your peace; ask yourselves what Luther's *great* reward will be eternally? Read Matt. 5: 11, 12, "Blessed are ye when men shall say *all manner* of evil against you falsely," &c. Do you not wish for the "*great reward* in heaven?" Why bridle your tongues and close your purses, when your own "*heavenly riches*," and the HONOR of our GOD and REDEEMER are at stake?

Read with care Ps. 69: 9, "The *zeal* of thy house hath eaten me up; and the *reproaches* of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me," said He who *suffered* and *died* to "give you and me ETERNAL LIFE.

ENGLAND ON THE VERGE OF UNIVERSALISM.

From the New York Evangelist of December 17, 1846.

"The recent Convention in London, for the formation of the Evangelical Alliance, has unveiled the fact, that the so called Evangelical religion of England, and of Europe, is infected, to an alarming extent, with a tendency to *Universalism*. The doctrinal basis, as drawn by those who managed it from the outset, contained no assertion of everlasting punishment, nor of the soul's immortality.

On this side of the Atlantic, many at first regarded it as an omission, a mere oversight. Others who had visited England, as Drs. Cox and Patton, knew and said the omission was intentional, and they meant to include those who disbelieved in future punishment. This apprehension was found correct, when the convention assembled. More will yet be known, but enough is already known to make it highly probable that the original basis would have remained, had not the American brethren, with much effort, changed the course of the Convention."

England has enjoyed profounder schools, and thought longer, and of course ought to think more deeply than our new country; but our current of thought is rapid, if not deep, and a little more correct perceptions of God's attributes, must explode endless woe, both here and in England, as it has already in Germany. Where shall we land?

WRITERS AND EMINENT MEN WHO REJECT ENDLESS MISERY

John Lock, Esq., John Foster, Henry Melville, B. D., Hon. James Stephen, K. C. B., Alfred Addis, B. A., Bishop T. Newton, Bishop Whately, Sir Isaac Newton, Thomas Dick, Author of the "Christian Philosopher," &c., Dr. Henry More, Dr. T. Burnet, Bishop Tillitson, Wm. Whiston, Dr. Samuel Clark, Dr. Wm. Paley, Bishop Warburton, Bishop Hurd, Rev. — Broughton, James Brown, D. D., Rev. F. Leicester, Rev. R. Clark, Rev. J. Tyler, of Conn., Bishop Law, author of the "Serious Call." Dr. I. Watts.

Watts *seems* to teach it, but his works show that he used *forever* and *everlasting* in a limited sense, and in this way he concealed his real belief.

These all remained or remain in their churches, and never openly professed Universalism. Some adopt destruction; so it is not true that all the good and learned have believed in endless misery, as is often affirmed, and which, if true, would be no proof of the doctrine, as "to err is human."

DR. I. WATTS BELIEVED NOT IN ENDLESS MISERY.

In his work on the world to come, p. 162, he says, "Nor do I think we ought usually, when we speak concerning creatures, to affirm positively, that their existence shall be equal to that of the blessed God, *especially* with regard to the *duration* of their punishment. . . . These *aions* or ages must enter far into the eternity of God's existence yet to come. . . . If the blessed God should at any time, in consistence with his perfections, release those wretched creatures from their acute pains in hell, either with a design of the utter destruction of their being by annihilation, or to put them into some world upon a new foot of trial, I think I ought joyfully to accept this appointment of God, and add my joys and praises to all the songs of the heavenly world, in the day of such a glorious release of these prisoners."

On p. 191, he says, "Dr. Thomas Burnet published a treatise in Latin, against the eternity of punishment; and he, (Burnet,) in his work, in giving advice to ministers, says, 'Whatsoever you determine within yourself concerning those punishments, whether they are eternal or no, you ought to use the common doctrine and common language when you preach or speak to the people, especially those of the lower rank, lest they run headlong into vice, for they can be restrained only by fear of punishment. If any should translate these sentiments (in his Latin work) into English, I shall think he does it with an evil design, and to a bad purpose.'"

Here Burnet betrays the secret and absurd principle on which thousands are yet acting. An old Baptist minister lately told me it would be *impossible* to convert sinners by preaching *destruction*. This is saying, we must preach a lie, for fear God will not, or cannot bless the truth.

"Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge,"—the Bible—"made it void by your traditions."

"He who through vast immensity can pierce,
See worlds on worlds compose one universe;
Observe, how system into system runs,
What other planets circle other suns,
What varied beings people every star,
Can tell *why* Heaven has made us as we are."—POPE.

BRIEF ANSWERS TO REASONS TO JUSTIFY ENDLESS WOE.

1. Edwards says, "It will vindicate God's injured majesty, and glorify his justice."

Capital punishment of *death*—"everlasting destruction," will answer these ends; but endless woe would ruin *justice*, or else *reason* must be abandoned as any guide.

2. "It will be just, as sin will continue in hell." This denies the Bible, which says, punishment will be "for deeds on earth," not for those in hell. Besides, it betrays a want of common sense to say men should be punished for sin when doomed, as all say, to a state of sin, and denied recovery by repentance and reform.

3. "Sin is an infinite evil, and so merits infinite woe." God alone can do an infinite evil, as he only can put an end to all good. Man is finite, and neither reason nor the Bible say he can, or has done an infinite evil; so the argument is perfect sophistry.

4. "It will be just, as salvation is offered to all." This denies a *fact*, and betrays consummate ignorance. Three-fourths of men have never heard the gospel; and "how then shall they call on, and believe in him of whom they have not heard?" Rom. 10: 14. And further: half the churches are Calvinists, and say the lost were decreed to be left; so how could salvation be offered to them?—This argument is "speaking wickedly for God." Job 13: 7; yet most Christians are now guilty of it.

5. "It will be just, as we admit, *temporary* woe is just." On this principle, if it is just to put the murderer in agony by hanging him, it would be just to keep him hanging forever, or as long as we could keep him alive. Would that be just and good in God which we detest in men? The intellect is to be pitied, if not despised, which cannot discern the difference, in principle or justice, between *momentary* and *eternal* chastisement or woe. The first may or will result in the good of the universe; the latter is impossible, unless God and holy beings are so changed as to delight in misery.

6. Pres. Edwards says, "Saints may be happy in heaven, though they see sinners in hell, because we are happy here while many are in State Prisons." I ask if we would not be *happier* if all prisons on earth were empty? Will "all things work for good," &c., in heaven?—if so, prisoners and dungeons must not exist. But it is said, "we shall miss friends if they are *deceas'd*, and so heaven will not be perfect." The Bible more than intimates that relative, (not social) ties will cease "in the resurrection," ("they marry not," &c.) so we shall miss relatives no more than strangers. Christ's family will all be there.

7. It is said, "The terror of eternal woe is greater than that of destruction, and so more salutary." This would be true in part if men believed it; but in our day it effects sinners just as a child ten

years old is affected by the parent saying, 'Obey, or I will cut your head off.' It is the *certainty* and *justness* and not the *severity* of threatened punishment which is salutary. On this principle, destruction, as it is seen to be just, has more terror, and so is more salutary than endless torment.

8. The Baptist Register has said, "It would be forgotten, in eternity, that sin ever existed, if the wicked were all dead." It is an insult to say, God could not stamp the fact on the memory of all beings eternally: or, if he pleased, leave unconscious monuments, like Lot's wife.

9. Mr. Lord, of New York, in his Review of Dobney, says, "God *must* keep the wicked alive to show his *power* to restrain and govern them." I ask, if God's *power* will not be seen at the judgment, and forever, without such a horrid display of it? This idea represents God as acting infinitely worse, and more absurdly than a king would if he should shut up flies or mosquitoes, and some way torment them to show his mighty power. We are but "dust of the balance in God's sight," and insects are more than that to a king.

10. When all other reasons fail to make this doctrine look consistent, it is said, "We must *believe* what we cannot *comprehend*." This argument is consistent, where God's moral character is not involved; as in the belief of his omnipresence, creating power, &c.; but it is sin to believe a doctrine which impeaches his attributes. While some other revealed doctrines are *above* our reason, none contradict it, nor injure his moral character, but this. Christians seem to be ignorant of this distinction, when they use this argument, while those not fettered by tradition see it.

These are specimens of reasons to justify the doctrine of endless misery, and the main ones; and, as they all outrage reason and common sense, just as Catholic arguments do, their direct tendency is to make skeptics or Universalists, and not to save souls.

The heathen reason better. In Siam a priest came to our missionary, and asked "how long his God tormented bad men in a future state?" and when answered, "forever," he replied: "Our God torments the worst of men only one thousand years, so we will not have your American God in Siam!" The doctrine is a barrier to the gospel, both to the heathen and us.

As to reasoning on the justice of destruction, the strongest objection which can be preferred against it, is the one often

made by Universalists, viz.; "It is too severe—God will not destroy any of his children." Locke wisely says, "The wicked had no right to demand their existence, and so no right to demand its continuance."

Reason teaches that there is much more mystery in God's ordering that noble animals should suffer and cease to be, than man should, seeing they have not sinned as man has. Verily, "his ways are in the mighty deep,"—but "the Judge of all the earth will do right."

NOTICES OF THE PRESS.

From Rev. W. G. MONCRIEFF, Editor of "The Expositor of Life and Immortality," Edinburg, Scotland.

"DEATH NOT LIFE," BY REV. J. BLAIN.

We could not, perhaps, better characterize this work than by saying that it is, in the fullest sense of the expression, all that its title professes it to be. Every passage of Scriptures bearing on the momentous doctrine of future punishment is brought forth and examined; and their invariable testimony is shown to be, that the final doom of the lost is an utter and everlasting destruction. Every objection is manfully met, and successfully overthrown,—every strong hold of the heathenish dogma of immortal-soulism falls, broken to pieces beneath the ponderous sledge hammer of the author's reasoning. To every diligent Bible-student we cordially recommend this able little treatise. Across the wide ocean we bid its author God-speed. We feel assured that in the wide continent of America, a rich harvest waits on his earnest and pious labors."

The Rev. J. Blain of this city, has just published a volume entitled "Death not Life"—a work which he has been carefully preparing for some two years. We are scarcely theologian enough to discuss its merits, and can only remark that it betrays great research, a thorough familiarity with the Scriptures, and a good degree of learning.—*Buffalo Morning Express*.

THE CONFLICT OF AGES! BY DR. EDWARD BEECHER.

The problem proposed for discussion is the most difficult and momentous that can engage the human mind. * * * He considers, in detail, all the moral and theological solutions that have been attempted in all ages, by the ancients and by the moderns, * * * and rejects the whole without hesitation or remorse.—*Baptist Christian Review, Hartford*.

Similar testimonials could be multiplied indefinitely. Indeed the amount of matter already printed, in the form of reviews, criticisms, replies, &c., would form several volumes of the size of the book itself. Its publications must constitute an era in the world's thought.—*National Era*.

A REVIEW,

GIVING THE MAIN IDEAS IN DR. EDWARD BEECHER'S

CONFLICT OF AGES:

AND A REPLY TO THEM, AND ALSO TO THE
VIEWS OF HIS REVIEWERS.

BY REV. JACOB BLAIN.

FOR ages no work has appeared, as well calculated as this, to call the attention of all, especially of ministers, to the subject of *future punishment*, and lead to a re-examination of this doctrine. The reasons are, 1. The reputation and standing of the writer, he being one of the noted Beecher family, a son of Dr. Lyman Beecher, and brother of Henry Ward Beecher, and of the writer of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. 2. He holds on to the main orthodox doctrines, and remains in their fellowship. 3. He shows, better perhaps than any one ever has, that the common theory is erroneous, in holding that the wicked are to suffer in endless misery, on the short, poor probation they have on earth. He holds the doctrine, and attempts to justify it, by our existing and falling in a pre-existent state. As all think he must fail in this object, many conclude his book is useless; but *mark*—though he fails in this object, he succeeds in proving conclusively, that the doctrine of eternal woe, as now held, cannot be vindicated on the principles of justice, and greatly dishonors God. To show that he succeeds in this, is my object in this notice of his work; and not to say much on his new theory, except to state his plan, and show that it fails to justify the endless suffering of the wicked, as he thinks. I rejoice that his book has appeared; for, to use a comparison, the Doctor has, with a giant hand, torn down the old house, and as his new one affords no shelter, many, seeing they are houseless, will, by re-examining the Bible, set about erecting a new and better one, and cease to patch up the old deformed fabric.

The *National Era*, the Anti-Slavery paper at Washington, has the following notice of the work:—

“THE CONFLICT OF AGES!—An impression has already been produced by this masterly treatise, the most profound, wide reaching, and permanent.

“It is perfectly manifest to all competent observers, that we are upon the eve of a theological discussion, the most comprehensive, radical, and portentous, the world has ever seen. To this discussion this book leads the way, with a momentum irresistible. There is not a question in Theology which is not destined to come up for a new and thorough settlement in the light of this final development.

“All those who have Theological doubts and difficulties should examine the solution this work affords.

“Those who have no doubts, but who wish to study the history of opinions in the past, and to keep pace with the developments of opinion in the future, will grievously err if they neglect to make themselves familiar with this book. It contains the seeds of the thinkings and debatings of the next hundred years. The work has caused a great commotion among the D. D.'s in our land. It merits their attention. It has reached its *fifth* edition in the brief space of *three months!* A success unprecedented in Theological Publications!”

The Doctor begins by showing that the common theory works badly in promoting Christianity, even “as a steamboat with wheels revolving in opposite directions.” This is caused by the doctrine of depravity and of eternal misery, as held by the churches, conflicting with our intuitive sense of justice and goodness in God, or, as he says, “with the principles of *honor and right*, in God.” Good and bad thinking men see injustice in the plan, and a sad conflict is the result. His object is to remove this conflict, and thus to comfort saints and save sinners. He agrees with destructionists, as to this apparent reproach of God's justice and mercy, and aims at the same great objects they do, but takes a widely different course to effect them.

To prove the common theory needs a “re-adjustment,” and that it dishonors God, he first establishes some great principle of equity and benevolence, by which he holds God is governed in his dealings with his creatures, the same as good and wise men are, or should be, in dealings with their fellow-men. These principles are—

“1. God has made us intuitively to perceive and feel, and,

therefore, he also perceives and feels, that increase of powers to any degree of magnitude produces, not a decrease, but an increase, of obligation to feel and act benevolently towards inferiors, —that is, with an honorable regard to their true and highest good.

“Does any one alledge his right, as creator, to do as he will with his creatures? Within certain limits, he has this right. But creation gives no right to the creator to disregard or to undervalue the well-being of creatures. It is not enough for them to say, that, as he would treat them if he had not made them, so ought he now to treat them. On the other hand, the fact that he created them makes the most touching of all appeals to every principle of honor and right in the Almighty Creator to be their defender, protector, and friend. God cannot promote either his own happiness or glory, except by the observance of the principles of honor and right of which we are now speaking.

“2. No man, unless compelled by some supposed necessity, would ever think of denying that the principles of honor and right call upon God not to hold his creatures responsible or punishable for anything in them of which they are not the authors, but of which he is, either directly or indirectly, the creator, and which exists in them anterior to and independent of any knowledge, desire, choice or action of their own. Whatever thus exists is a part of the original constitution conferred by the Creator on his creatures; and for this he is obviously responsible, and not they.

“3. The principles of honor and right require of God that he should not deal with the righteous as with the wicked.

“4. The principles of honor and right demand of God not so to charge the wrong conduct of one being to others as to punish one person for the conduct of another, to which he did not consent, and in which he had no part. No decision of the human mind concerning honor and right can be clearer than this, and it is distinctly recognized by God as true. (See Ezekiel xviii. 33.

“5. Since the creatures of God do not exist by their own will, and since they exist for eternity, and since nothing more vitally affects their prospects for eternity than the constitutional powers and propensities with which they begin their existence, the dictates of honor and right demand that God shall confer on them such original constitutions as shall, in their natural and proper tendencies, favorably affect their prospects for eternity, and place

a reasonable power of right conduct and of securing eternal life in the possession of all.

"6. Not only do the demands of honor and right forbid the Creator thus to injure his creature in his original constitution, but they equally forbid him to place him in circumstances needlessly unfavorable to right conduct, and a proper development of his powers.

"What benevolent being, dealing with new-created minds committed to his care, would not feel bound to place them under a system of influences most favorably arranged for their highest good, and where all needless trials and temptations to sin and ruin would be avoided?"

"These principles are so simple and obvious, that no one accustomed to regard benevolence, honor and right, would ever have thought of calling any of them in question, had not certain supposed facts seemed, at times, to make it necessary. Are not these views in accordance with the revealed character of God? Does not the Bible ascribe to him all those traits from which all the principles that have been stated may be inferred? By his own testimony, he is love."

Dr. B. tells another first principle on pp. 16, 17, in telling what the two great *powers* of Christianity are. He says they are these:

"1. A true and thorough statement of what is involved in the fallen and ruined condition of man as a sinner;" [that is, their depravity must be fully shown.]

"2. A full development of the honor, justice, and benevolence of God, in all his dealings with man, so made, as, in the first place, to free him from the charge of dishonorably ruining them, [in their creation,] and then to exhibit him as earnestly and benevolently engaged in efforts for their *salvation*, through Christ, after they have been ruined by their own *fault*."

[He admits "the ruined state of man," or depravity as it is generally held, and only differs as to its origin, which he says was in a previous state.]

These seven principles he holds, are the same as a revelation to us, and the sense of the Bible makes them so. We are there often called on to reason and judge that "God's ways are equal." The motto of his book is, "Why judge ye not, even of yourselves, what is right." Luke 12: 57. He argues thus: "Such principles cannot be exterminated. Our intellectual and moral nature, will protest against the violence. The mind still yearns

after them, and cannot rest and be satisfied till they are assumed as true. If any alledged actions of God come into collision with these intuitive principles, there is better reason to call in question the alledged facts, than to suppose those principles to be false which God has made the human mind intuitively to recognize as true."

He next shows from the common theory, what the alledged acts of God are, which come "into collision with these principles. Acts," he says, "have been by some ascribed to God, which, to say the least, are at war with our common ideas of equity and honor in Him."

The first act he inquires into, arises out of his main intuitive principle, namely, that "God should confer on new created beings, such constitutions, powers and propensities," as would render it as likely, or more likely, that they would stand than fall; in other words, that every man for himself, should have a fair trial, when created and put on probation, *especially*, if the penalty be endless misery, as our creeds hold. This is the great point in his book.

In view of this principle, he dwells long on the great fact, that whatever fair trial Adam had, none of his children have had such a fair trial. He agrees with the universal belief, that all our race are born either with corrupt natures, or else with propensities, appetites, or a disposition, as of anger, lust, selfishness, &c., which render it as certain that they will sin, as that they will breathe. Besides, all come into being surrounded by temptations, of God's ordaining, or permitting, so that they are sure to fall. And further, he permits devils to tempt, not only to run into sin as soon as they act, but to continue sinning; so it is true of *necessity*, "that no man liveth and sinneth not."

Dr. B. shows clearly, that in *reality*, there is no difference between Calvinistic and Arminian views on this point, as both agree that all are thus sure to sin, and God foreknew it. Adam was "made upright," but his offspring "go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies." Ps. 58: 3. "I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Ps. 51: 5. "Man is born as a wild ass's colt." Job 11: 12. The pinch is, how came he to be born so? None beget themselves, nor request God to create them thus! None choose what propensities, &c., they shall possess.

Here then, is one great alledged act of God, which comes in collision with Dr. B.'s "principles of honor and right;" and

well may it produce a *conflict*, as divinity is now adjusted, holding that men are to be doomed to endless torment for sinning when created with such propensities, and placed in such circumstances.

The next alledged act of God, which he notices, opposes this principle; "it is not in accordance with our sense of justice, to punish one being for the sin of another." The Doctor inquires thus: "How can the guilt and forfeiture of Adam's sin be transported across the chasm of hundreds or thousands of years of absolute non-existence, and be honestly ascribed to beings just beginning an immortal career, and be made the ground of punishing them with a depraved nature, and inability to do good?" also to surround them with temptations, and let loose legions of devils to "rule in their hearts, and lead captive at their will?" He quotes Ez. 18: 20; "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father." He shows that, logically and strictly, according to creeds, it is for the sin of Adam that men are to suffer eternal misery. (I will make this plainer hereafter.) He proves this to be the doctrine of his own, and of most churches. This "alledged act of God," opposes his principles of "honor and right," and makes a part of the "conflict."

A third "act ascribed to God," by creeds, which conflicts with the Doctor's principles of equity, is, "that He does *not* use all the means in his power to *restore when ruined*," at least not to restore all.

This principle is properly the most important one the Doctor gives. It is seen to be so by the fact, that Adam's seed do not become "ruined by their *own fault*." This he proves, if man begins his existence on earth.

On pp. 179, 180, Dr. B. says: "It is said that our natural appetites and propensities, and our outward circumstances do not lead us into sin by any absolute or physical necessity; but what difference does it make, either as to God's character or the result of his proceedings, whether he constitutes us sinners at first, or knowingly places us in such circumstances that we shall certainly *become* sinners, and that very soon?" The facts being such, then the principle is correct, that the justice and goodness of God, bind him to "use all efforts to restore when *ruined*." Yet the Doctor says but little on this principle, for the obvious reason that it would not as directly aid in proving pre-existence, as the two other ones I have named.

He says nothing about God's "using efforts to restore" in his supposed previous state; and as to efforts on earth, he holds, with the churches, that God does not use all the means in his power, to restore the fallen, at least to restore all of them. He is a Calvinist, but shows that Arminian views logically result in the same doctrine. All must admit that God could have converted Mahomed as easily as Paul, and thus saved 100,000-000 from that delusion. He could have sent the gospel to the heathen as easily as to us: "He turneth the heart whithersoever he will," Prov. 21: 1. Why not turn all to holiness? The great question, then, must be left where Christ leaves it: "Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight," Matt. 11: 25-6. Free-agency does not remove the difficulty; for God is able to present *motives* (as to Saul, &c.) to turn to him the worst man on earth, though possessed of a free will, or be a free-agent. But facts, and the Bible show He does not present such motives to all. Why not? To say, as some do, He employs all the means or power His wisdom dictates, is only changing the difficulty from His *power* to His *wisdom*, and then that is impeached, and the trouble remains — why does God not exert *all* His attributes to restore *all*, seeing He created all, except Adam and Eve, in such circumstances, that they were sure to fall and be ruined? This is a third act of God, or admitted doctrine, which comes in collision with the Doctor's principles of equity and goodness, and vastly augments the "conflict."

These three "acts of God," or admitted doctrines, which plainly oppose the principles of justice and benevolence, can be resolved into one, thus — God, with a foreknowledge of the result, voluntarily brings beings into existence, with such propensities, and in such circumstances, that they are as sure to sin as to breathe — refuses, or arbitrarily omits to restore a part of them, and dooms those left to endless torments for sinning.

Here then is a real conflict. It is between what the creeds call undeniable facts or doctrines, and what common sense calls undeniable principles of justice and goodness. Dr. B., in speaking of the common theory of the fall and punishment, says, "It involves God, and his whole administration, and his eternal kingdom, in the deepest dishonor that the mind of man or angel can conceive." "The human mind cannot be held back from abhorring such theories, except by the most unnatural

violence to its divinely inspired convictions of honor and right," pp. 225 and 306.

He shows the practice of the church in leaving these doctrines as a *mystery*, cannot satisfy thinking minds, and the effect on Christians is deep trouble, and on the unconverted, skepticism and aversion to Christianity — just what I have said in the past work. Dr. B.'s orthodox reviewers dare not say these doctrines can be made to harmonize with our views of equity and mercy, and all hide under "*mystery and faith*;" though some old divines were foolish enough to say they were reasonable. These reviewers, either for evasion, or by blindness, omit to notice the *infinite* difference between a mystery which involves God's moral character, as this does, and those which are only incomprehensible, and affect not his justice and mercy. Such mysteries exist, as, creating out of nothing, the incarnation of Christ, omnipresence, &c. As to faith, it is vain to ask wise men to believe God will do what sound reason sees to be unjust and cruel. As Dr. B. wisely says, "we had better *re-examine* a theory which requires such a belief."

A PRE-EXISTENT STATE.

We will next glance at Dr. B.'s plan to harmonize, and end this war between these principles of equity, and these supposed acts of God, and thus end the "conflict of ages."

He says, "there must be a re-adjustment," of our system of divinity, and to effect it, has recourse to a *pre-existent state and fall* — that is that our souls (taking for granted that we have souls which can exist separate from our bodies) were created and existed somewhere, and in some period in eternity past — were put on probation, and each soul, for itself, had a *fair trial*, and fell, each soul for itself — that the *penalty* for failure in that probation, was endless life in misery.

God, then, in his sovereignty, devised the present material system, and making our material bodies, brings these fallen and polluted souls into them, at some time between conception and birth; entirely forgetting they ever existed before. In this way he accounts for the universal depravity of our race — this is the cause of "going astray as soon as born." Properly, we are old offenders, or old devils, when born.

The *design* of this system, and new probation, is to redeem a church out of the race, for his glory, and the good of the

universe. All not redeemed, are to be doomed to eternal woe, as the reward of their fall and sins, in that former state. On p. 368, he says, "Christ came to redeem a church, to destroy the kingdom and works of Satan, and to reorganize the universe of God. All of our race not included in this redemption, are to perish forever." (This, one would think, is annihilation.)

The aggravating nature of the fall in this pre-existent state, he thinks, clears God from blame in bringing us into this world, with dispositions, and in circumstances so that we are sure to sin here. We only continue our old course. This world he calls "a moral *hospital* of the universe — in it are collected, for various great and public ends, the diseased of past ages, the fallen of all preceding generations of creatures."

But we will just ask the Doctor here in passing, if this hospital for a cure, does not look too much like a Botany Bay, where transported criminals tempt each other to be *worse*, instead of *better*? and besides, why admit numerous devils as physicians? As he holds this trial is to be a *final* one, why has not God made it so favorable as to be a full and final cure of all moral disease, and so of all misery? What the present hospital, or trial, for Adam's children, is professed to be, may be seen by the Presbyterian Catechism and confession of faith. I give the main statements of the creed.

"The sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consisteth in the guilt of Adam's first sin — the want of that righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually." — *Assembly's Larger Catechism*, question. xxv.

"Others, not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved; much less can men not professing the Christian religion, be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, and to that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may, is very pernicious, and to be detested." — *Ibid.*, chap. x.

"These men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and the number is so certain

and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished." — *Confession of Faith*, chap. iii.

The Methodist quarterly review for April, 1854, in reviewing Dr. B., after crying down Calvinism, says: "It is manifest that the heart is deeply and essentially depraved, and the gift of salvation is seen to be eminently, and *absolutely* of grace — the heir of salvation confesses: 'By the grace of God I am what I am.'" So he adopts Calvinism in full; for "grace" means a free gift, without merit: "Who maketh them to differ — why dost thou glory, &c.," 1 Cor 4: 7. Thus it is seen, as the Doctor has said, that all endless misery churches make this "moral hospital" the same thing. Surely the Doctor is right in saying, "acts are ascribed to God, which outrage our sense of justice and goodness." There must be a sad "conflict," unless a "readjustment" be made.

THE PROOF OF PRE-EXISTENCE.

The Doctor admits that the Bible does not teach it in direct terms; and he labors hard and ingeniously to show that it does not *oppose* it. But he leaves out many texts which seem to forbid it; such as being "judged for deeds done in the body." &c., and not for those done in a spirit-world.

The *sum* and *substance* of his proof, is the *necessity* of the theory. This necessity springs from the principles and doctrines above stated, which he says show God to be a malevolent, cruel Being, if he sends to eternal woe for such a probation as we have on earth.

This proof would have some weight, (though his opposers ridicule it) if, as he thinks, no other way could be found to remove this apparent *injustice* in our Maker. This is his grand object. As it is plain that God must appear unjust, if men have no probation only on earth, and the penalty for failure here, be endless suffering, then if it could be proved they had a fair one in a previous state, it would lessen the dishonor in a small degree. That the degree would be *small*, I will show in future remarks.

FURTHER EXTRACTS FROM DR. BEECHER AND HIS REVIEWERS.

Wishing to give the Doctor's views as clearly as possible in this brief outline, I will quote some more from him, and his

reviewers. I will first give a page from Rev. T. S. King, his universalist review, p. 38.

"A most singular spectacle it would be, should Dr. Beecher be summoned before a council and probed with questions to settle the charge of heresy. How savory would his answers seem, as returned in detail! 'Do you believe the Trinity?' 'Yes.' 'Do you hold to universal sinfulness?' 'Yes.' 'Do you accept the doctrine of total depravity?' 'Yes; I hold to complete corruption of nature antecedent to all volition.' 'Do you believe in eternal punishment?' 'Yes.' 'Do you acknowledge this world as a final state of probation?' 'Yes.' 'Do you hold strictly to the atoning mission and death of Christ?' 'Yes.' 'Do you believe that faith in the atonement, and a consequent regeneration of the Holy Spirit, open the only avenue of salvation?' 'Yes.' 'Do you believe that Dr. Bushnell is a heretic?' 'Yes.' Surely the accused must be acquitted by acclamation. But let us imagine one question more. 'You hold then, firmly to the Orthodox system of theology as organized in the prominent Confessions?' 'No; I believe that every one of its theories of forfeiture involves God, and his whole administration, and his eternal kingdom, in the deepest dishonor that the mind of man or angel can conceive, by the violation of the highest and most sacred principles of honor and right, and that on the scale of infinity and eternity. . . . The human mind cannot be held back from abhorring such theories, except by the most unnatural violence to its divinely inspired convictions of honor and right.' (pp. 225 and 306.) We will not try to imagine the perturbation of the council, nor their expressions, when told by the defendant, that the idea of pre-existence is the only key-stone that will bind the tumbling arch of their theory into symmetry and strength.

"Dr. Beecher's brethren, as a general thing, will, no doubt, smile at his theory of pre-existence. But when they turn it off, what is to be done with the arguments that have led him to it? *They* are called upon to answer them. They are solemnly bound to show that his impeachment of their system, in the name of benevolence and equity, is invalid." "If they turn it off with a sneer, they trifle with the deep experience of a man as sincere, learned, and pious, as any opponent can claim to be."

The answers to these questions give his doctrines as I understand them from his book. He lays open his own feelings (and

those of thousands) in view of the common theory of depravity and punishment, thus: "Who can describe the gloom of him who looks on such a prospect? How dark to him appears the history of man? He looks with pity on the children that pass him in the street. The more violent manifestations of their depravity seem to be the unfoldings of a corrupt nature, given to them by God, before any knowledge, choice, or consent of their own. Mercy now seems to be no mercy, and he who once delighted to speak of the love of Christ, is obliged to close his lips in silence, for the original wrong of giving man such a nature, seems so great that no subsequent acts can atone for the deed.* In this state of mind, he who once delighted to pray, kneels and rises again, because he cannot sincerely worship the only God whom he sees. His distress is not on his own account. He feels that God has redeemed, and regenerated him.; but this gives him no relief. He feels as if he could not be bribed by the offer of all the honors of the universe, to pretend to worship or praise a God whose character he cannot defend. . . . Never before has he so deeply felt a longing after a God of spotless character. Never has he so deeply felt that the whole light and joy of the universe are in him, and that when his character is darkened, all worlds are filled with gloom. . . . In contrast with this, it would be appropriate to place the experience of one who retains all the radical facts as to human depravity, and the system that grows out of it, but passes from the deep gloom of the last experience, into the sunshine of divine glory, by discovering a mode in which these facts can be so adjusted, as to harmonize with the principles of honor and right in God." pp. 190 and 191.

The relief Dr. B. finds in pre-existence, myself, and thousands have found in *destruction*. Multitudes have found it in universalism: which is the most rational, and Scriptural, the reader must decide for himself.

I am happy to see the Doctor rejects the absurd common view, that the *death* threatened to Adam, was a "compound one." On pp. 413-14, he says, "We ought to interpret 'death' in Rom. 5: 12-19, by the sentence in Genesis; and this says nothing of spiritual and eternal death. It refers to temporal

* Dr. B. errs in saying, "no subsequent acts can atone for the deed." God can atone for it, either in this life or the next. If the wicked be destroyed, still their life, on the whole, is a blessing, as there is more happiness than trouble in this world

death, and to that only. The words are 'Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.'" If the Doctor should ever logically carry out this view, he must unavoidably become a *destructionist*. How are we to escape the "death and dust" threatened, if we come not to Christ the "tree of life?"

In accordance with the above view of the threatening to Adam, he says on pp. 442-3, "If a penalty is enormously disproportioned to an offense, it loses all its power as a penalty, and produces reaction and disgust, if not indignation. If a king, because of some sin of a viceroy, of which his subjects were entirely ignorant, should send out his armies, and exterminate, with extreme torments, every man, woman and child, in the province of that viceroy, and then should proclaim that he did it to show his indignation against sin, in view of its enormous evils, and his fixed purpose to punish it, what rational human being could be found upon whom such a proceeding would not react, and rather create abhorrence of the king's injustice, than of the viceroy's sin. And yet there would not be, in such a transaction, one millionth part of the horror and injustice that is involved in the idea of an utter forfeiture, by all the millions of the human race, of the favor of God, and their exposure to his frown, and to all the miseries of endless damnation, by a solitary act of Adam, of which they had no knowledge, and over which they had no control,—and which forfeiture actually results in the endless ruin of the great majority of them. It is not in the power of human language to express, nor of the human mind to conceive, the horror and injustice of such a proceeding. How must it confuse our ideas of justice and honor!"

On his "great principles," he remarks, "The supposed acts of God are assumed as a standard, and all principles are rejected, that disagree with them; or, at least, it is said that, though true with respect to man, they are not with respect to God, and he is not bound by them, though man is." "Should he not follow his own convictions of honor and of right, he could not retain his own self-respect, but would experience infinite condemnation and remorse; he would be the most miserable being in the universe. It is, therefore, an infinite necessity in God's own nature, that he should obey the laws of honor and right; and beyond all doubt, he ever has, and ever will."

"He who holds, that God, in the manner already set forth, gives existence to men with natures radically corrupt and

depraved, anterior to any knowledge, desire or choice, of their own, with full power to do evil, and none to do good, and then places them under the all pervading influence of corrupt and corrupting social systems — and, in addition to all this, subjects them to the tremendous and delusive power of malignant spirits, fearfully skilled in the work of developing, maturing, and confirming the original depravity — cannot, at least with any apparent consistency, say that the Creator has fulfilled toward them the demands of honor and right, as they have been exhibited.” “When we make the record of God’s word contradict God’s own revealed nature, we may be sure we have misinterpreted the record.”

“That the human mind has strong intuitive convictions in this case, Dr. Woods concedes. The acts ascribed to God, according to our necessary convictions, appear dishonorable and unjust. But, to concede that, in this case, these moral intuitions are of divine origin, would be to abandon the argument. Nothing, therefore, remains, but in some way to destroy their power, by giving them an evil name. This is commonly done by calling them ‘human reason,’ or ‘unsanctified philosophy,’ or ‘natural reason,’ or ‘carnal reason,’ and then warning all who revere God and love the truth not to be carried away with the subtlety of human reason, or by philosophical or metaphysical sagacity and adroitness.” pp. 103-4.

I join with Rev. S. Cobb, in his remark on the above sentiment. “We thank Dr. Beecher for this timely and efficient aid which he lends us in tearing off this mask of unintelligible faith and mystery, under which a portion of his brethren have so adroitly sought to shield themselves from the forces of honor and right.”

FURTHER REMARKS ON DR. BEECHER’S VIEWS, AND THOSE OF HIS REVIEWERS, AND ALSO ON THE DOCTRINE OF DESTRUCTION.

I have made brief remarks while giving a sketch of the Doctor’s views, but they need to be enlarged, and others added, in order to exhibit and reply to his ideas clearly.

I. DR. BEECHER’S FAILURE.

Dr. B. would utterly fail to remove the conflict of ages,

even were his theory believed. The unanswerable reason is, — he retains the doctrine of endless misery for the finally lost. This failure, he would have foreseen, had he thought a little more, and taken more enlarged views of “great moral principles.” Had he done so, he would have been compelled to add the following intuitive principle to the seven I have quoted above.

God, in creating beings, and putting them on probation, would not, and could not, consistently with *justice, infinite wisdom, and goodness, annex the penalty of eternal misery and sin*, as a consequence of failure, though the trial were the fairest he could devise.

Truths taught in the Bible, as well as reason, show this to be a correct principle. 1. It teaches that God hates sin and woe. 2. That he is grieved by evil. 3. He “will not hold his anger forever.” 4. He has *power* to put an end to whatever displeases him; to “destroy the last enemy,” and “reconcile all things unto himself:” *therefore*, he could not annex such a penalty; for 2 Tim. 2: 13, tells us, “He abideth faithful: he *cannot deny* himself;” but he must do so by such a penalty; as it would bind him to “hold his anger forever;” to forfeit his word, which says, “His mercy endureth forever;” and to keep in existence forever, that with which he, and all holy beings are displeased! Of course, if he foresaw there would be no danger of falling, then *no* penalty would be needed.

Another reason why he could not justly make such a penalty, is, that all new created beings, must, as the Doctor owns, be more or less imperfect in wisdom, &c.; and Prof. Stuart says, “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;” therefore, infinite suffering as a punishment, God would see could not be just, and so could not make the penalty. No one dare say it would be unjust for him to annex a less severe penalty — that of “death.”

The Doctor himself gives a good reason on this point, by saying, “If a penalty is enormously disproportioned to an offense, it loses all its power as a penalty, and produces reaction and disgust, if not indignation.” p. 442.

He should also have remembered his just principle on p. 347: “It is not enough to resort to the idea of divine *sovereignty*. God as a sovereign, has no authority to disregard the original

rights of his creatures." If the penalty was made in a previous world, we were then "new created beings," had forfeited no rights, (a penalty is made before offense) and so justice in God forbade him to make an "enormously disproportioned" penalty, seeing we were weak, and comparatively ignorant. When myself taught ceaseless agony, by tradition, and "pinning my faith on other men's sleeves," my ignorant argument was, that God, to prevent sin, must annex the *worst possible* penalty; being blind to the sad fact, that by so doing I was slandering my Father in heaven!

It is this supposed *infinite suffering*, for a finite offense, by an imperfect creature, which throws a dark and dismal cloud over God's character, and our system of divinity. Strange that Dr. B. did not see *this* to be the "*misadjustment*" in the system. None who contend for eternal woe, seem to have weighed the import of *eternity*, as did John Foster.

As I have said, then, Dr. B.'s theory, if proved true, would lessen the "conflict" but a mere speck. He, and all others who try to justify endless wailing, fully illustrate the verse of Dr. Watts, —

" As when a raging fever burns,
We toss from side to side by turns,
'T is but a poor relief we gain,
To *change* the *place*, but keep the pain."

The doctrine has been a raging fever to millions, and they have shifted and philosophized, but all in vain. It must ever remain, while held, a fever, for which neither reason, nor God's word, affords an antidote!!

II. THE GREAT MYSTERY.

Dr. B. and his orthodox reviewers, in four quarterly reviews, place the *great mystery*, in this matter, in the *entrance* of sin and woe into the universe. I confidently deny this to be correct. The *great mystery* which overwhelms us, is the assumption that the Bible teaches their *eternal continuance* there. God's wisdom and power can make *temporary* evil add to his glory, and the greater happiness of the universe, through the endless future which follows its existence; but good and wise men can never see how *eternal evil* can do so; nor how God can be just and good in ordering, or permitting it. Here

properly, arises the "conflict of ages," and not in the *time* nor *manner* of sin's existence, nor yet in the fact that it *exists*.

I own I can see no great mystery in the existence of evil, since I saw it was to come to an eternal end. A thinking man can see that much good can result from it, if it is only temporary. None trouble themselves about God's character, because he has made beasts with vicious natures, and to suffer: why not? — their existence is momentary, is the answer. When we consider, fully, the state of three-fourths of our race, the heathen, we might nearly as well say, it would be just for God to torment the vicious brute, eternally, as them.

To constitute *free agency*, (a great object,) there must be *temptation*. God could, on "principles of honor and right," place temptations before new created beings, as before Adam and Eve, if he foresaw or purposed the final ending of the sin and misery of a fall; also saw that eternal good to his universe would be the effects of such a trial and fall.

For an illustration, look at the history of Joseph, Pharaoh, &c. God caused Joseph to dream, (not the devil nor chance.) He foresaw the sin and woe that would follow for about two hundred years, or till Pharaoh was drowned. Temptations, which overcame, were placed before Joseph's brethren, Potiphar's wife, and Pharaoh — woe came upon righteous Jacob and Moses, as well as upon those who sinned. We do not charge God with injustice, and want of goodness, in this piece of history; and why not? simply because the sins and woes were *temporary*, and great good resulted from them — honor to God, and good to man.

But now, suppose it was revealed, that God sent Joseph's brethren, and others who sinned in this affair, to endless torture for yielding to the temptations of his own ordering, then our sense of "honor and right" in him, would not only be shocked, but overwhelmed! Instead of this supposition, not a word is said in the Bible about the *eternal* effects of their sins. It is more than intimated that the twelve patriarchs will shine in glory, though some of them were murderers in heart. In this transaction, many sinned grievously, and were punished severely. But learned ministers, to oppose destruction, tell me: "if it be just for God to afflict for sin one hour, or year, as facts show he does on earth, then it will be just to afflict eternally — the *principle* is just the same!" This is one of Satan's latest devices to deceive.

It may be said God had a special end in causing Joseph's dream. Admitted; but then I ask if he had not a *special end* in having a temptation in Eden, (or first in some other part of his universe,) when he knew sin and woe would be the result? I ask too, if he is not able to end them, and bring good out of them, just as easily as he ended the *bad* effects of Joseph's dream, and brought good out of that? We see mystery in this transaction, but not one that dishonors God.

To attempt the murder of a brother through jealousy, and then to sell him into slavery, was a great sin; yet hear what Joseph says in Gen. 45: 8, and 50: 20; "So now it was not you that sent me hither, but God. But as for you, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass, as at this day, to save much people alive." Pharaoh's sin was great, yet hear Paul in Rom. 9: 17; "Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up,"—hear the object, "that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth." Now carry out this thought, that throughout the *universe*, and through *eternity*, God's "name," &c., is to "be declared" by the existence of evil; and can we not obtain light and relief? *May* it not be said of every transaction on earth, that God "raised up" the actors as he did Pharaoh and Joseph's brethren, and that "he meant them unto good!" If so, will he torture eternally the actors? I know here is "strong meat;" but I see in brethren an inclination to set up a rival God; the *God chance*; and with my brother Beecher, and Elijah, I feel zealous for the honor of "the only true God, of whom, and through whom, and to whom are all things; to whom be glory forever. Amen." Rom. 11: 36.

Many other facts in Bible history illustrate my point; but I need only refer to that of Job. God knew that by his permission to Satan, the Sabeans would become robbers and murderers, and Job's friends, (good men,) would sin; and all this be done to afflict a saint. Will he doom those Sabeans to endless woe for being left in Satan's power for a season? Was there a violation of "honor and right," in the permission of sin and woe, here? We say no, because all was temporary, and the end good and durable. Here again is *mystery*, but it does not tarnish God's attributes, but in both these cases they shine the brighter.

Wherever sin originated, God in wisdom and justice, ordered temptation to exist. A holy being, and we must believe all were

created such, could not sin, unless a temptation existed. This is a self-evident truth. But *notice*: this does not exclude the idea that there was no *guilt* in yielding to the temptation. The promise is, and ever was, "to him who overcometh," and the woe to him that does not. Yet from this view, who, on due reflection, considering well the weakness of the new created being, and the power of the temptation, can believe that a God of pity, as well as of justice, threatened eternal torture, for a failure to overcome? Reason can see that a *less* penalty would be just, benevolent, and wise.

God's works are all great. He is doing on a grand scale in our earth, what we see dimly in miniature in such historic facts as I have noticed. We know the earth is but a speck in the vast universe, yet he is making an exhibition here, which will affect all worlds and the eternal future. His only Son "took on him our nature," and "by the church, manifold wisdom" and "the exceeding riches of grace; are to be made known to principalities and powers in heavenly places." Eph. 2: 7; 3: 10. So we see that among his unnumbered mighty works in the universe, the most sublime one *seems* to be doing on our little planet; and being done by or through the introduction of evil. With this view of the glory to God, effected by the existence of sin, *can* we believe that a God of love and mercy will view it in such a light as to doom to ceaseless agony any in whom it existed "but for a moment?" especially a large share of the very race through which such glory is to redound to his name forever!

I have said all God's works are great. He is making a great exhibition of the evil and abomination of sin on the earth. Far be it from me to make less of sin than the Bible does. If the guilt, horror, and groans of six thousand years are not a *great* and sufficient manifestation of its evil, my sensibilities must be very weak. Add to the groans of earth the wailings of "the second death," (if destruction be true,) and who dare say there will be needed a greater display to be worthy of our God! To say God cannot punish enough, nor show the evils of sin, and his hatred to it, unless they are continued eternally, to me is the climax of folly, D. D.'s to the contrary notwithstanding.

If these brief remarks and illustrations accord with truth and common sense, then the Doctor, his reviewers, and thousands, have labored at the *wrong end* of this great problem, as I have

said. As sin and woe *exist*, they must be, somehow, consistent with the holiness of God, and with all his attributes. Our business is, to learn his *end* in their existence, and if it will not honor him, as did Joseph's dream. The misjudged, horrible *results* of sin, have terrified good men, and driven them back to grope and languish in the darkness of its *origin*; and their toils there have only changed twilight into midnight. Dr. B. has only gone a good long step beyond others in this business. The conflict of ages, on the question whether God was or was not the *author* of sin, originated from the same misjudged, horrible consequences of it. It can be ended. When they have struggled with traditionary opinions and feelings as I have for years, and searched to learn from the Bible God's purposes as to the existence of evil, they will cease to be thus horrified at its results, and perplexed about its origin. The "conflict" will be ended. Bible saints looked at "the times of *restitution* of all things,"—the "crowns of glory on their own heads and on that of Christ; and so were not in gloomy darkness, nor distressed by an unresolvable *mystery*."

III. REASONS FOR ENDLESS MISERY.

Dr. Beecher offers but one argument to justify God in this infliction. From page 156 to 159, he says, in substance, thus: "All sin grows out of selfishness, and selfishness is essentially cruel. No holy instincts are shocked when cruel purposes are disappointed and thwarted. Now the root of future misery will be the just defeat, and exposure of the spirit of cruelty, by infinite love, armed with infinite power. So that God will be glorified, and pure minds can rejoice in the future and unending suffering of the wicked."

This may seem plausible reasoning to those deceived by a false traditionary exposition of the Bible on future punishment. It is the best he could use, and the best I can find in Edwards or any writer. Yet three thoughts will show its fallacy.

First. When a murderer is put on the gallows to be hung, "selfish cruelty is defeated and exposed;" but should an absolute king order him to be kept dying fifty years, (not to say eternally,) all good men, instead of "rejoicing in the act," (as the Doctor says, &c.,) would say the king was more cruel than the murderer had been. Why will God keep the sinner alive thus to suffer? (I will answer this in another remark.)

Secondly. How came the wicked by this "cruel selfishness?" Let us go to the bottom of this matter, as nothing but *creeds* forbid us. How came the Doctor to forget his just "principle," that "we are not responsible for a disposition, or what is in us, before will, choice, and action?" Our creeds say this disposition is either in us when born, or sure to exist in all by temptations of God's ordering. On the Doctor's plan, we ask, when God set temptations before us in a previous state, knowing we would fall, and we did, why did he *curse* us with a "selfish, cruel nature," which he knew we could not get rid of, neither in that state nor this, without his aid, which aid he withholds from some or most? David, Moses and Peter sinned against light, yet God did not curse them (nor other saints) with "cruel selfishness," and impenitence forever. Do the "principles of honor and right" justify such a *curse*, on "new created beings?"

If Dr. B. says, "we might have got rid of this selfishness in this previous state," I answer, first, this is guess-work; and next, that it would not remove the difficulty, if true; for why did God make us so weak and ignorant, that we refused help if offered? This question may be asked as to our present state. Why are most, to whom light or help is offered, so impotent as to refuse it? Was it not *possible* for God to give more wisdom and strength to overcome the temptations with which he has surrounded them?

It is plain, then, that the *injustice* of endless misery must follow the Doctor into his bygone world, and haunt him still, if he ever thinks as deeply on this point, as on others in his work.

Thirdly. The Doctor says, "all sin is selfishness, and selfishness is *cruel*." Why is it cruel? The Doctor answers, "Because it regards not the feelings and welfare of others." He says, "to remove this *selfishness*, is the object of regeneration." All right; so when really converted, men lose selfishness; let me then ask the Doctor, (and others who say the same,) how "holy minds can rejoice in the future sufferings of the wicked?" how lose all "*regard for the feelings and welfare of others?*" If they do, of course they must again become selfish, and so sinful. God is not selfish, and how then can he "disregard the feelings and welfare of others," and "rejoice in their eternal wailing?"—the Father, Christ, saints and angels lose all sympathy and regard for the well-being of others eternally! The argument that "we rejoice when wickedness is defeated," I have answered in

the comparison of hanging to defeat selfishness. To punish and stop sin is one thing, and to lose all feelings for the good or woes of others, is quite another.

Is it not strange, that when the Doctor was examining the attributes of God, and the just principles by which he is governed, that he should overlook, and finally reject, as do others, those which are the most plainly revealed in the Bible? namely, mercy, compassion, love to enemies, forgiveness, long-suffering, pity. These parts of his character could not have been known, had not sin existed; but as it does, and we see them fully manifested in his dealings with his enemies, saving some; the mystery of mysteries is, that common sense, and the Bible, should ever be so perverted, by good men, especially by Dr. B., as to make them teach that these parts of his character will forever cease, at "the restoration of all things."

The grossest error that ever disgraced the Protestant church, is this of changing a God of love and mercy, and all holy beings, into DEVILS, the very moment the judgment comes! Yes, it goes farther, and represents our Maker as *worse* than Satan; for though he delights in woe, he does not torment the helpless creatures of his *own* creation and preserving.*

Satan's plans are deep laid and far-reaching; so he saw this doctrine, if got into creeds, would create a distinctive "conflict," when knowledge increased, and men thought for themselves. This "conflict" must yet be continued, in spite of the Doctor's work; for the just "principles" which he has set forth, to make our God and Father appear just and good, become useless by his retaining *one* "fact" too much — eternal suffering. He "began to build well, but not sitting down and counting the cost," has failed to finish that *peaceful* edifice his generous and God-honoring soul longed to see. Who will *finish* the house? Will not the Doctor try again?

But I must do the Doctor justice. He would not have been thus bewildered, and used such contradictory arguments to make the doctrine appear just, had he not *first* been bewildered by the common error, that the Bible plainly teaches it. He quotes John Foster, as owning that "the language of the Scriptures is formidably strong in its favor." But let me call attention to

* My brother Beecher, I believe will pardon me for censuring thus severely, as he *knows well* what it is to feel deeply for the honor of our God. I feel that he needs no pardon for censuring the common theory full as strongly, though most of his other reviewers feel otherwise.

the fact, that Foster, in his noted letter, also owns — “I have perhaps been too content to let an opinion, (or impression,) admitted in early life, dispense with protracted inquiry and various reading on this subject.” In speaking of annihilation, he adds, “I have not directed much thought to this point.”* He owns he rejected endless woe, “on the *moral argument* founded on the *stupendous idea of eternity*.” Five years’ ardent and special research compels me to firmly believe, that should the Doctor, and all others, especially those versed in the original languages, *really* re-examine this doctrine, they will be compelled to make the confession Foster does, — “a culpable neglect of the *Bible*.”

The heathen-invented and church-assumed dogma of *immortality*, has about totally disqualified wise men for understanding the Bible on *this* subject. They reason in a circle, thus: “All are immortal, and cannot ‘die,’ so the Bible *must* teach endless woe; for as it tells no recovery after the judgment, ‘second death’ must mean *life* in misery;” and when asked for *Bible* proof of immortality, the reply is, “It teaches that the wicked must die, perish, be destroyed, &c., and therefore they must be immortal.” Properly, this immortality delusion is the basis of this doctrine of “abominations.”

Could I utter but one more exhortation and warning to my brethren before my tongue was silent in death, it would be — *Re-examine the Bible* on this momentous subject! — you are in darkness. Tradition, and a sinful neglect have deceived you, as they did me for forty years — “redeem the time, for now it is high time to awake!” To “provoke,” as Paul says, to this re-examination, is my main object in this review; and not to condemn brethren as heretics, as they do me for teaching that “the wages of sin is DEATH.”

Let me again call to notice the Doctor’s valuable rule: “When we make the record of God’s word contradict God’s own revealed nature, we may be sure we have misinterpreted the record.”

* Notice; J. Foster does not decide whether annihilation, or restoration be the Bible doctrine. He only says, “annihilation would be a prodigious relief, . . . yet one would wish to indulge the hope that all will be restored.” If he had “directed much thought to this point,” he would have decided as did the Rev. E. White, to whom the letter was written, and who is now preaching *destruction* in London.

IV. THE WOES OF SOME, TO MAKE OTHERS HAPPY.

The common sentiment, that God could not make holy beings happy, or, as happy as he wished, without eternal suffering and sin, is a manifest slander of his wisdom and power; yet Dr. B., with his commendable zeal for his honor, holds this sentiment. "If this was not so," he says, "then the suffering of the lost are so much needless, and worse than needless misery." pp. 485-6. He quotes and approves Dr. Woods, who says, "the eternal suffering of the lost, will give the intelligent creation as a whole, a higher knowledge and enjoyment of God." pp. 485. Their reasons to make this sentiment appear plausible, are absurdities, into which their assumed doctrine drove them.

The existence of *temporary* suffering and sin, will be for the greater happiness of the holy throughout the universe, or of course God's wisdom and power would not have permitted them. This sentiment is plainly taught in the Bible, in such texts as tell that the "momentary afflictions," of saints, "work out for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." 2 Cor. 4: 17. To have persecutions, which Christ said "*must* come," there must be temporary *sin*, as well as woe; yet Christ told the disciples to rejoice in them, for "great would be their reward in heaven." The case of Joseph, to which I have referred, will illustrate this sentiment, so I need not enlarge.

I have said the Dr. has not advanced enough "intuitive principles." He says, "it is unjust to punish one, or make one *miserable* for the sin of another." Right; but I ask if it is not *equally* unjust, to keep one alive, and torment him eternally for the *happiness* of another? Is not this also an "intuitive principle?" Horrible! Deliver me from a happiness, purchased by the eternal wailings of my brethren, created as good and wise as myself; and if I differ from them, *grace alone* is the cause!!

When we reason with divines, and tell them that saints will be confirmed, and so no need of woe to keep them, and no need that one of the lost should suffer for the rest, as creeds say there is no help for them, their inventive faculties tell us, that this woe may keep *other* worlds, and new made orders from falling. As it seems vain to reason with some men on this subject, let me suppose one to reason with the Lord, as did Abraham, in Gen. 18. Would he not reason thus? "My Lord, wilt thou keep hosts of my weak, sinful race in woe, to prevent worlds from falling which thou mayest create millions of ages hence? Canst

thou not keep them from falling, by keeping Satan or a forbidden tree out of their garden? Or, if trial be needed, canst thou not give strength to overcome, without their hearing groans from a burning lake, forever? 'Let me speak once more to my Lord.' Will it not be just for thee, to *end* the sufferings of my kinsmen, and if other worlds fall, let *them* suffer for their own sins, as may seem good in thy sight? I feel more deeply for the *everlasting* welfare of millions, than thy servant Abraham did for the *temporal* death of Lot and the Sodomites, therefore I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord. Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?"

Rev. S. Cobb, an able universalist reviewer of Dr. B. makes a wise and cutting proposition on this misjudged sentiment. He says: "Let us see what arrangement can be made. Now be it known that I, Sylvanus Cobb, will consent and even petition, to be permitted to forego that extra share of happiness which was to be added to me by the infinite suffering of my brothers and sisters, and to put up with that moderate degree of happiness which I may enjoy in the divine love and grace in common with all, for the sake of having them, too, reformed and blessed. And who else, of the righteous, will join in this consent and petition? Will not you, Dr. Beecher? Yes, on reflection you will; and so will all holy beings in the universe. We have a unanimous petition from the righteous, to be disencumbered of that enormous surfeit of enjoyment which should be derived from the endless miseries of others. Now, respected Doctor, what apology will you henceforth have for your God, if he persists in his unmerciful treatment of *the rest of mankind*. You have acknowledged that if it were not that it should add pleasure to the righteous, there would be no defense of the work of ceaseless torment; and now you see that the righteous all refuse that pleasure."

The *superlative* mystery, or absurdity in the universe, is the one, "that God can be just, good, wise, and merciful, in tormenting forever the helpless, ignorant creatures of his own creation;" and the next, but very little lower in *degree* is this, "that endless torture is to increase the happiness of our God, and all holy beings!!" These two slanders, exterminate the God of the Bible; so that the intelligent, benevolent, sympathetic Christian, must say with Laban, (if he believe the dogmas,) "Ye have stolen away my God, and filled my heaven with

gloom, and what have I more!!" But what is far worse, thoughtful, unconverted men must say, "Your God is not worthy to be loved, nor your heaven to be sought; your *Bible* is a fable — we will trust the God of nature."

The Presbyterian Quarterly Review of March, 1854, on the Dr.'s work, says: "Whatever contradicts the plain dictates of reason and conscience, can have no claim to a divine origin." p. 566. The Princeton Quarterly for Jan., 1854, p. 120, says: "To say that any revelation of God can contradict these intuitive principles, is to say that God can contradict himself." Very good; then endless woe is not "revealed" in the Bible — why not own the truth at once, that it is of *Pagan origin*, and erase the foul blot from Christian creeds?

V. DESTRUCTION, THE ONLY READJUSTMENT.

The conflict of ages, Dr. B. says, can only be removed by believing in a pre-existent fall. I must believe it can only be removed by the doctrine of *destruction*. Universal restoration, of course would do it, if the *fact* that the Bible does not warrant it, was not in the way. This I have endeavored to make plain in the past work, DEATH NOT LIFE.

The Dr.'s great object is to exhibit God as just and good in the penalty of his law: and as to the *justice* of destruction, but little has yet been said. Rev. T. S. King, a universalist reviewer of Dr. B., admits its justice. He says, pp. 17, 18: "Certainly the destruction of sinners is not an impossible process, nor offensive to our ideas of equity. Is it not infinitely preferable, if we decide by our *moral instincts*, that the wicked should expire all their miserable breath into the night of death, when the sunset of hope arrives, than that they should be kept in bitter and everlasting malignity? . . . what motive can God have to keep them in existence forever, after the possibility of renewal has passed, simply to darken the universe with their depravity and woe?"

Milton, in imagining Adam's feeling, reasons on destruction thus:

O fleeting joys
Of Paradise, dear bought with lasting woes!
Did I request thee, Maker, from my clay
To mould me man? did I solicit thee
From darkness to promote me, or here place
In this delicious garden? *As my will*

*Concurred not to my being, it were but right
And equal to reduce me to my dust ;
Desirous to resign and render back
All I received ; unable to perform
Thy terms too hard, by which I was to hold
The good I sought not. **

These lines convey a very different idea from the following, penned on the supposition of endless woe:

“ Father of mercies ! why from silent earth
Didst thou awake, and *curse* me into birth ?
Tear me from quiet, ravish me from night,
And make a thankless present of thy light ?
Push into being a reverse of thee,
And animate a clod with misery ? ”

Here is a problem that heaven nor earth, time nor eternity, can ever solve, if the common theory or the Doctor's be true!

The strongest objection that can be brought against destruction, as to moral justice, is that God would not force into existence any creature, whose existence, on the whole, would not be a blessing. But how know we that any will be destroyed, who will not have seen more joy than woe on earth? The expression about Judas, “better not been born,” is said to be a Jewish proverbial one, to express the greatness of a particular calamity. The Bible, as the 73d Ps. says, “The wicked are not troubled as the righteous, but prosper.” If any have ever so happy a life, and be blotted out of being at the judgment, it may properly be said, “it shall be ill with him,” for it will be so at that time. It was ill with Judas and Joab for a short space, though they may have seen many happy years. Most of the wicked live as stupidly as to the future as beasts—they seek their all here, and as Christ says, “they have their reward” here; and why not as justly perish as the beasts? Even the most able universalists, as T. S. Smith, on the *divine government*, and Moses Ballou, contend that “there is more joy than woe, more virtue than vice, on the earth.” The *degree* of happiness may *justly* vary. The ox enjoys less than a prosperous bad man, if both die alike. God “does good unto all,” and “his tender mercies are over all his works;” Ps. 145: 9; but this does not imply that all must *live* forever, else brutes must. But such parts of the Bible cannot be true if creeds are correct. The perfections of God as

* Paradise Lost, Book x.

revealed, seem to compel the belief to right reason, that he will not force existence on any as a curse, on the whole; and this one consideration, should drive to a re-examination of the common horrible doctrine.

A learned divine said to me: "If the trial man has on earth, and his sins here, will not justify endless woe, as Dr. B. says, neither will they justify annihilation." This is false reasoning: for all governments vary punishments to crimes. It would be just to put an officer out of office for idleness, but not to hang him in gibbets. Common sense can see an *infinite* difference in the two punishments I am speaking of.

Another learned minister, (a relative,) writes me, and raises this objection: "If sinners are annihilated, there must be a great difference in the amount of suffering between the first one who died, and the one who dies just before the judgment." I was pained to learn from this remark, that he was too slothful, or "vainly puffed up" by supposed knowledge to read my work, *Death not Life*, sent him six months before; for if he had done so, he would have learned that I believe the Bible (instead of creeds,) which says, "the dead know not any thing; their thoughts perish," &c. Even "David is *dead*, and is *not* ascended into the heavens." Acts 2: 29—34. That the *dead* are *alive*, is another heathen invention, adopted by the church by disregarding scores of plain texts, and wrongly interpreting a few, which at first sight, by a wrong translation &c., favor it. As this error has been fully exposed by a number of our writers, I omit to dwell on it.

This friend also says in his letter, "if your doctrine should be published among the damned, it would give joy in hell!!—certainly it is comforting to one dying in his sins, to know that his sufferings will have an end!!" What is painful in these remarks, is to see still lurking in a truly converted man, the very spirit which built the inquisition—a delight in torment, for all but the favored few! For observe: he is an old school Calvinist, who hold that a definite class were decreed to be shut out of heaven; and as they *know* the Scriptures say much on destruction, why be so terrified by it, when it proposes to release them from their tortures, if they love not torment, or revenge? I know the excuse is, that the worst punishment must be preached to save the elect; (even Watts says this;) but why fear God's decrees will be frustrated by preaching a *less* penalty? Paul saw it to be "terror" enough to teach "everlasting destruction,"

and so never named a "theological hell." But further; do they wish, or hope, to overturn God's ordination, and save the non-elect, by tormenting them about an "eternal hell," — even "when *dying* in their sins?" If I cannot say with propriety, that these men love torment and revenge, I can certainly say, that pitiable *stoics* have been manufactured out of feeling Christians, by a false faith, and the chilling, blinding power of an erroneous education!

This brother, after saying he "believes me a Christian, and he will meet me in heaven," adds, "I consider you under an hallucination, which nothing but the light of eternity is likely to remove." I am compelled, with grief, to say this of him, and with a hundred fold more consistency than he can say it of me, for the reason Sir Isaac Newton gave to Hally, the infidel, — "You have only tried *one* side, and I have *both*."

Proper investigation, I must believe, will show God to be just in *destruction*, for sins of earth, though committed under pressing temptations of his ordering, or permitting. But as I am not directly reasoning with universalists, who object to destruction, on the ground of *justice*, I will be brief in remarks on the point.

Leave out, then, what the Dr. wrongly admits as *one* "fact" — endless woe, and other facts or doctrines, he discusses, can be made to harmonize with his "principles of honor and right." Had he used his discriminating mind to discover which the Bible teaches, endless woe, or destruction, he would have found the latter to be the fact; and then, with a tenth part of his reasoning for pre-existence, he could have effected a "readjustment," and ended the "conflict." I can but hope he will employ his logical powers in this way ere long. Let me, again, remind him of his valuable rule — "when alledged facts (doctrines) contradict intuitive principles, it is better to *re-examine* the facts, than to set aside the principles." Dear Doctor, has a God of love, with foreknowledge, deliberately forced on numerous legions an *infinite curse*, in creating them *any where*? Harmonize this "alledged fact," with your "just principles," if you can!! — Do it, whoever can!!

VI. THE CONFLICT IS PRACTICAL.

The Christian Review, (Baptist) for January 1854, owns that "theoretically, the conflict cannot be settled, the mystery must

remain," but adds, "it is not *real*, it cannot be real, it is only apparent." I ask then, why good men are so deeply distressed by it, and why it is filling the land with skepticism, atheism, &c.? Was it not practical on Rev. A. Barnes? Hear him reply, — he says "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 willing 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, in a word, 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 dead and dying; 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, a thought to suggest, which would be of relief to you. I trust others, 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 upon a world of woe, filled with hosts to suffer forever — when I look upon friends, and 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." — *Practical Sermons*, pp. 123-125.

See a specimen of its practical effects on children and the unconverted. A pious minister lately told me this fact in his experience: "The first I ever heard of a God, was by my mother telling me, when two years old, that there was a God, and if I was bad he would burn me forever in such a fire as I

saw on the hearth. My reply was, 'If God does so He is a *bad man*.' I grew up an infidel, and remained so till converted under those who preached destruction."

The sad fact is, that under the common teaching, we grow up with a horror of our Maker, and think as little of him and the future as possible. The statement of this writer, in saying "the conflict is not real or practical," shows gross ignorance or a wicked design to deceive the unreflecting. Well does Prof. Stuart say, "it agitates our breasts as *storms* do the mighty ocean; and if any are strangers to such difficulties, they are to be pitied for ignorance, or a want of a sympathy which seems to be among the first elements of our social nature." It also led him to make the soul-chilling remark, "perhaps God may, *in mercy, extinguish* our social susceptibilities in heaven!!" It cannot be denied that this conflict causes many suicides, and fills our insane hospitals. I am aware of the sad fact, that a false system, and cringing to a popular theory, are freezing up the sensibilities of many, as I have said. But still the doctrine of eternal suffering and despair is producing such a *groan* as Pollock describes—"long, loud, deep, dolorous and immense!!"

VII. ARE WE PUNISHED FOR ADAM'S SIN?

The Bible shows plainly that we are doomed to natural death in consequence of Adam's sin; and also that God "visits the iniquities of the father upon the children to the third and fourth generation"; but it is a query if this suffering should be called a *punishment* or only a consequence, ordered by God, which is to work for good in the final end. Facts daily show that children suffer in consequence of parents' sin, as in the case of the drunkard; but we do not call it punishment to the child, though his woe reacts as a punishment to the parent.

Dr. B. does not make a distinction here as plainly as he should, and some of his reviewers quibble and make a great outcry about it, charging him with contradicting the Bible and daily facts. His book, however, shows that his magnanimous and far-reaching mind led him to overlook, as it were, these momentary earthly sufferings or punishments for Adam's or parents' sins, and he only had his eye on *eternal* suffering for such sins. But the contracted or deceptive minds of these reviewers confound them together, or only tell of earthly sufferings, and then charge the Doctor with blindness.

To make this distinction plain, look at the case of Dathan and Abiram, Num. 16: 27—33, where it is said “their sons and little children were swallowed up in the earth in consequence of the sin of the parents; but who believes these little children will be sent to endless woe for this sin? So of the infants in the Flood, Sodom, &c. Isa. 57: 1, says “the righteous is taken away from the evil to come”; so with these children, and they will be saved. The woes of children of drunkards may lead to Christ, and so be a blessing. Dr. B. was reasoning with Calvinists, who hold “that all become sinners by Adam’s sin, that we are helpless, and as God does not help the lost out of their fallen state, therefore they strictly go to hell for Adam’s sin.” The *injustice* of such an act in God, forms the basis of Dr. B.’s argument for a pre-existent fall, in which he guesses each one fell for himself.

To prove and justify the imputation of Adam’s sin, it is said “our sins were imputed to Christ, and he suffered for us, therefore imputation of sin is just.” But I ask if it would have been just for the Father to have doomed his son to *eternal* torture for our sins? Here again we see the folly of confounding *temporary* with *eternal* suffering or punishment, as all the ministry are doing.

These reviewers say “the Bible is full of imputation—Christ’s righteousness is imputed to us;” &c. Very well; but it is one thing to impute this righteousness, and so God exhibit himself as *merciful*, as the Bible says he is; and quite another thing to impute sin, and thus show a God of *cruelty*, which the Bible forbids.

I hope these brief remarks will show the Doctor’s principle correct—God will not so impute Adam’s sin as to doom any of his children to endless woe for that,—nor yet for their own sins.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

1. To prove the enormity of sin, and thus justify endless woe, Dr. B. refers to the *feelings* of Edwards, Payson, and all who are truly enlightened by the Spirit. He and others are right in saying these feelings are deep; for it is the work of “the Comforter to convince of sin,” so it *must* be deeply felt. My own experience confirms this fact. But men err in calling this a proof that the penalty is eternal suffering, or that our sins

deserve it. For as a sample,—Webster, the murderer, felt deeply his guilt, though being a Unitarian, I conclude he believed not this doctrine. Cannot a child feel deep guilt, who has knowingly burnt his father's house, unless he believes the law demands endless torture for the act? Sin must be enormous to merit a “*death*” from which there is no recovery!

2. Dr. Beecher has given us one noble example, now greatly needed — he has boldly condemned a popular theory, and advanced a new and unpopular one, not fearing *consequences*. Should all in the churches who secretly disbelieve in endless woe; and all who believe in *destruction*, be equally bold, and follow this boldness with liberality, in spreading light, the “*conflict of ages*” would soon cease, by the church being driven to try their old creeds by the *Bible*, instead of popular opinion, and perverted views and feelings.

3. Doctor Beecher owns he has been eighteen years digesting his subject, and as he fails to justify ceaseless woe, no vindication of it can be made. Prop it up by popular opinion, or disguise and conceal it as we may, it must ever appear, to all rational creatures, the very essence of folly, injustice and cruelty! It shows a cruelty as much greater than man can manifest as God is greater than man, and eternity longer than time! *Can* we believe such a doctrine is taught in the “*Precious Bible*, book Divine!!”

And is it so? *must* our reason, and sense of justice and goodness in Him in whose hands we are, float on a tempestuous and shoreless ocean forever? No; the effort to lock up reason and common sense, much longer, in the narrow, dark cell of *mystery*, will be vain. Just, impulsive feelings, both of saints and thoughtful sinners, must burst the bolts, and emerge into light and relief.

It is matter of joy, that many begin to see that the *mystery* involved in ceaseless suffering, is as different from all other mysteries in the Bible, and in the universe, as Satan is from God — as hell is from heaven — the one is of Satan, the others, of a wonder-working God, “*Who hideth himself for a little season, till his wrath be past,*” but has *assured* us that he will make “*darkness light,*” by “*destroying* the last enemy” and “*reconciling* all things unto himself, by Jesus Christ.” *Amen.*

4. The Princeton reviewer of Dr. Beecher tries to evade the Doctor's principles of equity by saying, "God, as a sovereign, does what it would be unjust for man to do—as burning Sodom, destroying the first born of Egypt for the sin of the king; also the infants and beasts of Canaan—leaving most of the world in heathenism, when he has power to prevent it," &c. He refers to these facts to prove we are not fit judges of God's acts, and that we must believe mysteries. True, such acts would be unjust in man, but why? The answer is, simply because man has not the power to bring final good out of such acts; God has, and has promised to do so. He has given us an example in Joseph's dream, as I have noticed. There is, then, no unanswerable mystery here, as in eternal suffering. They are only mysteries which do not violate the principles of equity and goodness. Will such arguments convince the thoughtful inquirer, or sceptic? No, they will say the reviewer was ignorant or equivocal.

5. This reviewer also, to prop up the *mystery system*, compares us to a little child who would say to a monarch, "Father, I cannot see the justice and goodness of jails and gibbets in your government;" and the father replies, "You poor little sceptic, faith and not sight is the proper element of your being; you are no child of mine unless you believe, though you see not." I ask if such a father could not satisfy a confiding child by telling him he would put an end to gibbets and criminals in a little while, and work all for good? But how could he pacify the child by telling him he had *power* to end criminals and jails, but he would not, and they must last forever in his government?

He also says, "he who has looked upon the agonies of a dying infant, has stood in the presence of as awful a mystery as the universe contains." As he knew God had power to work such agonies for the eternal good of the infant, how can we believe him honest in comparing such a mystery with that of *endless* agony?

6. I am glad Dr. B. sees that it is the unreasonableness of our system which leads to scepticism and restorationism, and not alone the corruption of the heart. This plea, which is now common, contradicts facts; for the worst of men will own that the laws to love God, our neighbor, be thankful, &c., are *reasonable*, although he does not love to obey them. It is his *judgment* that revolts at the cruel penalty as held.

7. The Doctor says, page 150. "Future suffering will consist in malignant passions." Who told him so? But he approves the late sentiment, to palliate the theory, viz: "That God will not directly afflict the wicked, but their continued sins will torment them, and so they will be their own tormentors." Is there not folly in this palliation? First, who made the sinner and placed temptations before him, knowing he would be overcome, as I have said? Secondly, who will doom him to a *state of sin*, and forbid reform? Thirdly, who will keep him alive, so that he must sin and torment himself?

8. Dr. B. in his second principle, says: "God cannot justly hold his creatures responsible or punishable for any thing in them of which they are not the authors, and which exists in them anterior to and independent of any knowledge, desire, choice, or action of their own."

His Princeton reviewer says, "this is nearer intuitively false than intuitively true." His argument is, that "moral character is *not* the result of personal conduct. It matters not how a man becomes a sinner, whether he inherits a sinful nature and appetite, or renders himself corrupt, he is sinful; and an unholy being is and ought to be an object of dislike and disapprobation. Moral principles derive their character from their nature, and not from their origin,—infants, though not in the exercise of reason, or conscious of guilt, are "children of wrath."

According to this reviewer, an infant is just as much to be hated and punished by God, as if it had created itself, and with full knowledge, chose a sinful disposition. This absurd reasoning led some old divines to teach infant damnation. Mark the sentiment—"moral character is *not* the result of *personal* conduct—it matters not *how* man becomes a sinner!"

Is it not time, in the nineteenth century, to cease "thinking in a circle," or parrot-like, and inquire *how* man became so sadly depraved, as Dr. Beecher has done, and also President Edwards in his work on the will? When this is done, (as it now is by the unfettered,) all will see, with Dr. B., the slander cast upon the Almighty by the doctrine of endless misery, for such a trial as man has on earth.

When divines talk of total depravity, or of man being "dead in trespasses and sins," and tell the awful result, they seem entirely to forget that man did not *create* his own disposition, or propensities, nor cause all the temptations which surround him—they see not, or tell not the *mystery* of man's being

“dead in sin,” and only try to justify their sad penalty. The trouble is, (and the thinking world see it) that when any especially Calvinists, look to the bottom of this “death in sin,” they see that if the wicked suffer eternally, God made them expressly for this doom; and this is a *mystery* they know not how to justify, nor reconcile with His attributes; nor will the people bear it.

9. I will give one more specimen of absurd reasoning, and leave the painful subject. Ministers, and missionary agents, proclaim, “that a whole generation of heathen will go down to hell, if we give not to send them the gospel.” The thoughtful inquire thus:—does the Bible teach such astonishing contingencies in God’s government? has He suspended the eternal weal or woe of countless millions on the liberality of a few Christians, on the opposite side of the globe, and at the same time left these Christians in such weakness that the love of the world is constantly tightening their purse strings!!” With the common penalty in view, well might Dr. Hodge, a leading Presbyterian, say, (as quoted by Dr. B.,) “the dealings of God with our race, *cannot* be explained on *common-sense principles* of moral government.” And is it so? Has our Father, knowing the weakness of our faith in unseen things, not even given us a common-sense religion, or revelation?

The Bible was given us to make light God’s dark providence over the present world, (in the existence of evil,) by connecting it with a future world, and revealing the heart-cheering truth that *evil* is not to be *eternal*—but if, as creeds say, it reveals the sad fact that evil is to be eternal, then indeed it is not a common-sense revelation, as it *must* make God’s providence over the future world look infinitely darker than it is over the present—for evil on the earth is temporary with all, as death soon closes the scene:

But “bless the Lord, O my soul,” that no such dark providence is revealed—**EVIL IS NOT ETERNAL**—the time must come when our God *will* fulfill his promise in Rev. 21: 4.—“and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.”

UNIVERSALISM AGAINST ITSELF.

Wishing to commend this work, by A. Hall, of Ohio, because it opposes Universalism by the doctrine of *destruction*, (a "new thing under the sun") I quote a few pages to show its merits, and also to express my own views. On pp. 418-19 he says—

Again: It might be argued, and Universalists, according to their own doctrine, can be compelled to admit the same, that the wicked will be raised from the dead, and utterly destroyed or annihilated! Paul says concerning them: "Whose *end* is destruction."—Ph. 3: 19. It might be asked: How can their *end* be destruction, unless they come to an *end*? And how can they come to an *end*, unless they are annihilated; or unless they "*utterly perish*," as says the apostle Peter; or how can they *live*, after they die "*the second death*."—Rev. 21: 8. How, it might be asked, can the punishment of the wicked be compared to the burning up of "*chaff*,"—"tares,"—"dry branches,"—"hay, wood, stubble,"—"thorns and briers,"—and they be always burning, and never burn up?—Math. 3: 12; 13: 40. John 15: 6. 1 Cor. 3: 15. Heb. 6: 8. Would there be any similarity between endless misery, and the burning up of *chaff*? The whole fraternity of Universalists contend, that the destruction of *death*, and the *devil*, signifies their utter annihilation!—that *death*, and the *devil*, will no longer *exist*, after Christ destroys them! Now as the same *being* is to destroy the wicked, who is to destroy death and the devil, and as they are to be destroyed at the same time, and in the same place,—"*the lake of fire and brimstone*,"—Rev. 20, will it not be the same destruction; and, according to Universalism, will not wicked men, as well as *death* and the *devil* be *annihilated*? They certainly will, which disproves universal salvation, and is not "*ceaseless torment*" either! But Universalists will tell us, that the destruction of the wicked, is simply their destruction as such, that is, the destruction of their sins! But stop: whatever is *destroyed* is *punished*. "*Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction*."—Thes. 1: 9. Is it the *man* who is punished, or his *sins*? The *man* certainly; and hence my opponent is compelled, according to his own theory, to admit that it is the man who is to be annihilated! Thus he is completely driven, by his own arguments, out of Universalism, and if he can't go the horrifying theory of "*endless torment*," he can just step over into "*destruction*—

ism," and have a much more consistent theory to contend for, than the one he is now advocating.

On pp. 252-7, in proving the personality of the devil, he reasons as follows:—

Universalists deny, in toto, that there is now, or ever was such a spiritual being as the *devil*, either real or personal; and contend, that all the idea designed to be conveyed by that word, is a personification of the principle of *evil*, in its various forms. It is applied in a metaphorical sense, they tell us, to various objects, such as *human nature*,—the *Roman government*,—*wicked men*, such as *Judas*,—*the lusts of the flesh*, &c., &c., but in every case it is to be understood as a figure of speech and nothing more.

This *figure* was known, in days of old, and designated by many titles, expressing his character, attributes, and offices. He was called "Abaddon," "Apolion," "Belial," "Accuser," "The Beast," "The Angel of the bottomless pit," "The great Dragon," "Beelzebub," "Deceiver," "The Evil One," "The God of this world," "A Murderer," "A Liar," "The Prince of this world," "The Prince of the power of the air," "The Old Serpent," "The Devil," "The Father of lies," "The Tempter," "Satan," and "The Prince of Devils!"

He must truly have been an extraordinary metaphor, possessing doubly as many names as the Almighty himself! And I will disprove the existence of God, as a real personal being, upon the same principle precisely that Universalists make out the devil nothing but a figure of speech,—a personification of a mere principle of evil!—If because Judas was called "*a devil*,"—John 9: 70, and Peter "*Satan*,"—Math. 16: 23, there is therefore no other devil, except Judas and Peter; then, according to the same logic, because Moses was called "*a god*,"—Ex. 7: 1, and Abraham "*lord*,"—Gen. 18; 12, there is therefore no other *Lord God* except Abraham and Moses! If, because God is said to perform many wonderful and mighty works, he is therefore a real being, and not a personification of a *good* principle; then, according to the same logic, the devil must be a real being, and not a mere personification of an evil principle, for many wonderful works, in the scriptures, are ascribed to him. He appeared in the presence of God, and they held a conversation together concerning Job. Mark the fact: they both conversed together; and if it be consistent to

say that one was a mere principle of evil, the other was nothing but a mere principle of good!

Again: He caused a wind to blow down the house on Job's children, and kill them:—brought the Sabians upon Job's oxen, who took them all away,—caused the fire of God to fall from heaven, and burn up all of Job's sheep: and finally, he smote Job with sore biles, from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet. If this was all done by a figure of speech, they must have had rather a savage sort of metaphors in Job's time! This same figure of speech conveyed the Saviour around from place to place,—conversed with him, quoted scripture,—fell from heaven like lightning,—broke chains and fetters,—had power to cast men into prison,—to walk about as a roaring lion,—to work miracles—to overcome seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew,—to bind a woman eighteen years,—to possess a herd of two thousand swine, and drive them down into the sea, and drown them,—is in possession of a kingdom,—is to be judged at the last day,—was conscious that there was a time coming, when he had to be punished,—confessed Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, is finally to be tormented in the lake of fire and brimstone, which is the second death: and strange to tell, all this is spoken of with reference to an eastern metaphor, a figure of speech; and not any real being, visible or invisible, neither in heaven above, earth beneath, or the waters under the earth!—Job 1st and 2d chap.

If the devil, possessing all the foregoing characteristics and performing all these wonderful exploits, be nothing but a metaphor, a mere principle of *evil*, then I defy a Universalist to prove, that God is any thing more than a mere principle of *good*, the opposite of evil; and that the bible is any thing more than a mere principle of humbuggery!

* * * * *

But let us try some of the *real* significations of the devil, according to Universalism, such as the wicked Jews,—the I . man government,—Judas,—Peter,—human nature,—the lusts of the flesh,—the carnal mind, &c.

The best plan of testing a doctrine, is to substitute the definition for the word itself, and see what kind of sense it makes. We shall thus give the Universalist theory of no-devil-logic a fair trial. "And his fame went throughout all Syria, and they brought unto him all sick people that were

taken with divers diseases and torments, and those that were possessed with *Roman governments*, and he healed them.”—Math. 4: 24.—“Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the *Roman government* and his angels.”—Math. 25: 41. “And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon: and after the sop, *Peter* entered into him.”—John 13: 26, 27. Or perhaps Judas entered into himself, since he was as much of a devil as Peter was! and of course before that he was out of himself! “Resist *Peter*, and he will flee from you.”—Jam. 4: 7. “Be sober, be vigilant, for your adversary, *Peter*, as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour.”—Pet. 5: 8. “And the Lord said: Simon, Simon, behold *Peter* hath desired to have you, that he might sift you as wheat.”—Luke 22: 31. “And the God of peace shall bruise *Judas* under your feet shortly.”—Rom. 16: 20. “There was given me a thorn in the flesh, the message of *Judas* to buffet me.”—2 Cor. 12: 7. “And he was casting out a *Judas*, and it was dumb: and it came to pass, when *Judas* was gone out, the dumb spake, and the people wondered. But some of them said: he casteth out *Judas* through *Peter*, the prince of *Judas*.”—Luke 11: 14, 15. “Ye are of your father *Peter*, and the lusts of *Peter* will ye do. He was a murderer from the beginning and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him.”—John 8: 44. “And he asked him, what is thy name? And the *human nature* answered, my name is legion, for we are many:—and all the *human natures* besought him saying, send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. And forthwith Jesus gave them leave, and the *human natures* went out, and entered into the swine, and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, and were choked.”—Mark 5: 9–13. As they went, behold they brought to him a dumb man possessed of a *human nature*: and when the *human nature* was cast out, the dumb spake, and the multitude marveled, saying, it was never so seen in Israel.”—Math. 9: 33. No wonder the people would marvel, that a man could speak, after his human nature was cast out of him! “Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven *human natures*.”—Mark. 16: 9. I wonder how many she had left? “And the Lord God said unto the *carnal mind*, because thou hast done this, thou art

cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field, upon thy *belly* shalt thou go, and *dust* shalt thou eat all the days of thy life."—Gen. 3: 14. The carnal mind must surely have a singular mode of traveling, and live upon extraordinary diet!! "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand; and he laid hold on the *lusts of the flesh*, that old *carnal mind*, which is *Judas* and *Peter*, and bound them a thousand years."—Rev. 20: 1 2. "Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the *lusts of the flesh*: and when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterwards an hungered: and when the *lusts of the flesh* came to him, they said unto him, if thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread. But he answered the lusts of the flesh, and said: it is written, man shall not live by bread alone; but by every word of God. Then the *lusts of the flesh* taketh him into the holy city, and placeth him on the pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him: if thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down, for it is written; He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. Jesus answered the *lusts of the flesh*: it is written, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. Again, the *lusts of the flesh* taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, and said unto him, all these things will I give unto thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then said Jesus: get behind me, thou *lusts of the flesh*, for it is written: thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. Then the *lusts of the flesh* leaveth him, and behold, angels came and ministered unto him."—Math. 4: 1–11. Had Christ no *lusts of the flesh*, before the devil came to him? And after the devil left him, had he no more lusts of the flesh? If his own lusts, or his own carnal mind, was the devil that tempted him, was he not sinful? He certainly was: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God."—Rom. 8: 7. His lusts were most unquestionably sinful, if they were the devil that tempted him; for that which is holy, will not try to tempt any one into wickedness!

I am sorry my limits will not allow fuller extracts on these points, as his arguments are conclusive.

MATERIALISM SCRIPTURAL.

DOCTRINE OF THE BIBLE.

1. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul."—Gen. 2: 7.

2. "For dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return."—Gen. 3: 19.

3. "For the wages of sin is death."—Rom. 6: 23.

4. "Sin when finished brings forth death."—James 1: 15.

5. "For in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."—Gen. 2: 17.

6. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die."—Ezek. 18: 4, 20.

7. "The dead praise not the Lord."—Psa. 215: 17.

8. "The dead know not anything."—Eccl. 9: 5.

9. "This is the second death."—Rev. 20: 14, 15.

10. "But he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."—Mat. 3: 12.

11. "But the wicked shall perish."—Psa. 37: 20.

12. "All the wicked will God destroy."—Psa. 145: 20.

13. "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and *all* that are in them, *heard I saying*, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever."—Rev. 5: 13.

DOCTRINE OF CHURCHES.

1. And the Lord God formed man of dust and spirit, and breathed into his nostrils an immortal soul, and man became a mortal-body-man, and an immortal-soul-man.

2. For dust and spirit thou art and unto dust and spirit shalt thou return.

3. The wages of sin is separating the soul-man from the body-man.

4. Sin, when finished, brings forth sin: (spiritual death, or dead in sin.)

5. For in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt not surely die, but sin (die spiritually.)

6. The soul that sinneth it shall live a sinner, (die spiritually.)

7. The dead praise the Lord but not as the living do.

8. The dead know more than all the living.

9. This is the second time dead in sin.)

10. But he will not burn the chaff up, but burn it forever.

11. But the wicked shall not perish, but live forever in misery.

12. None of the wicked will God destroy, but will burn them forever.

13. *I heard* by far the largest part of the human family, which are under the earth, in a place I call hell, *cursing* Him that sitteth upon the throne and the Lamb forever and ever.

Thus do men "make the word of God of none effect through their *traditions*," and "have caused many to *stumble at the law*." Mark 7: 13. Mal. 2: 8.

LETTER OF REV. JOHN FOSTER

ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

REV. J. FOSTER was a Baptist minister of England, who, for over forty years rejected the doctrine of endless misery, yet remained in good standing in that denomination, and died in 1843. He was universally admitted, and this letter shows him, to be a profound thinker and powerful reasoner. He was not decided whether the wicked will be annihilated, or finally restored.

Some few sentences, having no *particular* bearing upon the subject, have been omitted for want of room.

[This letter is thus published in a tract form, by J. BLAIN, Baptist minister, of Buffalo, N. Y., author of "DEATH NOT LIFE: or the DESTRUCTION of the Wicked (often called Annihilation) ESTABLISHED, and the Doctrine of *Endless Misery Disproved*.—To which is added a Review of Dr. E. Beecher's CONFLICT OF AGES." One hundred and sixty pages. Price twenty-five cents, at retail. Postage four cents. Several other valuable works on this doctrine may be had of him, at No. 19 North Division Street, Buffalo.

September 24th, 1841.

DEAR SIR:—If you could have been apprized how much less research I have made into what has been written on the subject of your letter than you appear to have done, you would have had little expectation of assistance in deciding your judgment. I have, perhaps, been too content to let an opinion (or impression) admitted in early life dispense with protracted inquiry and various reading. The general, not very far short of universal, judgment of divines, in affirmation of the doctrine of eternal punishment, must be acknowledged a weighty consideration. It is a very fair question, Is it likely that so many thousands of able, learned, benevolent, and pious men should all have been in error? 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.

Nevertheless, I acknowledge myself *not* convinced of the Orthodox doctrine. If asked *why* not, I should have little to say in the way of criticism, of implications found or sought in what may be called incidental expressions of Scripture, or of the passages dubiously cited in favor of final, universal restitution. It is the MORAL ARGUMENT, as it may be named, that *presses irresistibly on my mind*,—that which comes in the STUPENDOUS IDEA OF ETERNITY.

It appears to me that the teachers and believers of the Orthodox doctrine hardly ever make an earnest, strenuous effort to form a conception of eternity; or, rather, a conception somewhat of the

* This expression could not have been made by Foster, had he not taken for granted the immortality of the wicked. On this supposition he (with others) applied about two hundred texts for their *destruction*, as threatenings of endless life in misery,—a serious error.—J. BLAIN.

nature of a faint incipient approximation. Because it is confessedly beyond the compass of thought, it is suffered to go without an attempt at thinking of it. They utter the term in the easy currency of language, have a vague and transitory idea of something obscurely vast, and do not labor to place and detain the mind in intense protracted contemplation, seeking all expedients for expanding and aggravating the awful import of such a word. Though every mode of illustration is feeble and impotent, one would surely think there would be an insuppressible impulse to send forth the thoughts to the utmost possible reach into the immensity, when it is *an immensity into which our own most essential interests are infinitely extended*. Truly it is very strange, that even religious minds can keep so quietly aloof from the amazing, the overwhelming contemplation of what they have the destiny and the near prospect of entering upon.

Expedients of illustration of what eternity is *not*, supply the best attainable means of assisting remotely towards a glimmering apprehension of what it is. All that is within human capacity is to imagine the vastest measures of *time*, and to look to the termination of these as only touching the commencement of eternity.

For example: it has been suggested to imagine the number of particles, atoms, contained in this globe, and suppose them one by one annihilated, each in a thousand years, till all were gone; but just as well say, a million, or a million of millions, of years or ages,—it is all the same as against infinite duration.

Extend the thought of such a process to our whole mundane system, and finally to the whole material universe; it is still the same. Or, imagine a series of numerical figures, in close order, extending to a line of such a length that it would encircle the globe, like the equator,—or that would run along with the earth's orbit round the sun, or with the outermost planet, Uranus,—or that it would draw a circle of which the radius should be from the earth or sun to Sirius,—or that should encompass the entire material universe, which, as being material, can not be infinite. The most stupendous of these measures of *time* would have an end; and would, when completed, be still *nothing to eternity*.

Now think of an infliction of misery protracted through such a period, and at the end of it being only *commencing*,—not one smallest step nearer a conclusion,—the case just the same if that sum of figures were multiplied by itself. And then think of *man*,—his nature, his situation, the circumstances of his brief sojourn and trial on earth. Far be it from us to make light of the demerit of sin, and to remonstrate with the supreme Judge against a severe chastisement, of whatever moral nature we may regard the infliction to be. But still, what is man? He comes into the world with a nature fatally corrupt, and powerfully tending to actual evil. He comes among a crowd of temptations adapted to his innate evil propensities. He grows up (incomparably the greater portion of the race) in great ignorance, his judgment weak, and under numberless beguilements into error; while his passions and appetites are strong, his conscience unequally matched against their power,—in the majority of

men, but feebly and rudely constituted. The influence of whatever good instruction he may receive is counteracted by a combination of opposite influences almost constantly acting on him. He is essentially and inevitably unapt to be powerfully acted on by what is invisible and future. In addition to all which, there is the intervention and activity of the great tempter and destroyer. In short, his condition is such that there is no hope of him, but from a direct, special operation on him of what we denominate grace. *Is it not so? are we not convinced? is it not the plain doctrine of Scripture? is there not irresistible evidence, from a view of the actual condition of the human world, that no man can become good, in the Christian sense,—can become fit for a holy and happy place hereafter,—but by this operation ab extra?* But this is arbitrary and discriminative on the part of the sovereign Agent, and independent of the will of man. And how awfully evident is it, that this indispensable operation takes place only on a comparatively small proportion of the collective race!

Now, this creature, thus constituted and circumstanced, passes a few fleeting years on earth, a short, sinful course, in which he does often what, notwithstanding his ignorance and ill-disciplined judgment and conscience, he knows to be wrong, and neglects what he knows to be his duty; and, consequently, for a greater or less measure of guilt, widely different in different offenders, deserves punishment. But ENDLESS PUNISHMENT! HOPELESS MISERY, *through a duration to which the terms above imagined will be absolutely NOTHING!* I acknowledge my *inability* (I would say it reverently) *to admit this belief, together with a belief in the Divine goodness,—the belief that “God is love,”* that His tender mercies are over all His works. Goodness, benevolence, charity, as ascribed to Him, can not mean a quality foreign to all human conception of goodness; it must be something analogous in principle to what Himself has defined and required as goodness in His moral creatures, that, in adoring the Divine goodness, we may not be worshipping an “unknown God.” But, if so, how would all our ideas be confounded, while contemplating Him bringing, of His own sovereign will, a race of creatures into existence, in such a condition that they certainly will and must—*must* by their nature and circumstances—go wrong, and be miserable, unless prevented by especial grace, which is the privilege of only a small proportion of them, and at the same time affixing on their delinquency *a doom of which it is infinitely beyond the highest archangel’s faculty to apprehend a thousandth part of the horror!*

It must be in deep humility that we venture to apply to the measures of the Divine government the rules indispensable to the equity of human administration. Yet we may advert to the principle in human legislation, that the man tempted to crime should, as far as it is possible without actual experience, be apprized of the nature and measure of the penal consequence. It should be something, the main force of which can be placed in intelligible *opposition*, so to speak, to the temptation. If it be something totally out of his faculties to apprehend, to realize to his mind, that *threatened something* **is unknown**, has not its appropriate fitness to deter him. There is, or

may be, in it what would be of mighty force to deter him, *if he could have a competent notion of it*; but his necessary ignorance precludes from him that salutary force. Is he not thus taken at a fearful disadvantage? As a motive to deter him, the threatened penalty can only be in the proportion to his (in the present case) narrow faculty of apprehending it; but, as an evil to be suffered, it surpasses, in magnitude, every intellect but the Omniscent. Might we not imagine the reflection of one of the condemned delinquents, suffering on, and still interminably on, through a thousand or a million of ages, to be expressed in some such manner as this?—"O, if it had been possible for me to conceive but the most diminutive part of the weight and horror of this doom, every temptation to sin would have been enough to strike me dead with terror; I should have shrunk from it with the most violent recoil."

A common argument has been that sin is an *infinite evil*, that is, of infinite demerit, as an offence against an infinite Being; and that, since a finite creature can not suffer infinitely *in measure*, he must *in duration*. But surely, in all reason, the limited, and in the present instance *diminutive, nature of the criminal* must be an essential part of the case for judgment. Every act must, for one of its proportions, be measured by the nature of the agent. And it would seem that one principle in that rule of proportion should be, that the offending agent should be capable of being aware of the magnitude (the *amount*, if we might use such a word,) of the offence he commits, by being capable of something like an adequate conception of the Being against whom it is committed. A perverse child, committing an offence against a great monarch, of whose dignity it *had some*, but a vastly inadequate, apprehension, would not be punished in the same manner as an offender of high endowments and responsibility, and fully aware of the dignity of the personage offended. The one would justly be chastised; the other might as justly be condemned to death. In the present case, the offender does or may know that the Being offended against is of awful majesty, and, therefore, the offence is one of great aggravation, and he will justly be punished with great severity; but, by his extremely contracted and feeble faculties, as the lowest in the scale of strictly rational and accountable creatures in the whole creation, he is *infinitely incapable* of any adequate conception of the greatness of the Being offended against. He is, then, according to the argument, obnoxious to a punishment not in any proportion to his own nature, but alone to that infinity of the supreme nature, which is to him infinitely inconceivable and unknown.

If an evil act of a human being may be of infinite demerit, why may not a good one be of infinite excellence or merit, as having also a reference to the infinite Being? Is it not plain, that every act of a finite nature must have, in all senses, the *finite quality of that nature*, and can not, therefore, be of infinite demerit?

Can we,—I would say with reverence,—can we realize it as possible that a lost soul, after countless millions of ages, and in prospect of an interminable successions of such enormous periods, can be made to have the conviction, absolute and perfect, that *all this is a*

just, an equitable infliction, and from a Power as good as He is just, for a few short, sinful years on earth?

Yes, those twenty, forty, seventy years, growing up to infinity of horror in the review, in proportion to the distance which the condemned spirit recedes from them—all eternity not sufficing to reveal fully what those years contained!—MILLIONS OF AGES for each single *evil thought or word!*

But it is usually alleged, that there will be an endless continuance of sinning, with probably an endless aggravation, and, therefore, the punishment must be endless. Is not this like an admission of disproportion between the punishment and the *original cause* of its infliction? But, suppose the case to be so,—that is to say, that the punishment is not a retribution *simply* for the guilt of the momentary existence on earth, but a continued punishment of the continued, ever aggravated guilt in the eternal state; the allegation is of no avail in vindication of the doctrine, because the first consignment to the dreadful state *necessitates a continuance of the criminality*; the doctrine teaching that it is of the essence, and is an awful aggravation, of the original consignment,—that it dooms the condemned to maintain the criminal spirit, unchanged, for ever. The doom to *sin* as well as to suffer, and, according to the argument, to sin in order to suffer, is inflicted as the punishment of the sin committed in the mortal state. Virtually, therefore, the eternal punishment is the punishment of the sins of time.

Under the light (or the *darkness*) of this doctrine, *how inconceivably mysterious and awful is the aspect of the whole economy of this human world!* The immensely greater number of the race hitherto, through all ages and regions, passing a short life under no illuminating, transforming influence of their Creator; ninety-nine in a hundred of them, perhaps, having never received any authenticated message from heaven; passing off the world in a state unfit for a spiritual, heavenly and happy kingdom elsewhere; and all destined to everlasting misery! The thoughtful spirit has a question silently suggested to it, of far more emphatic import than that of him who exclaimed, “Hast Thou made all men *in vain?*”

Even in the dispensation of redemption by the Mediator, the only light that shines through this dark economy, how profoundly mysterious is its slow progress, as yet, in its uncorrupted purity and saving efficacy! What proportion of the earth’s inhabitants are, at this hour, the subjects of its vital agency? It was not the Divine volition that the success should be greater,—that a greater number should be saved by it,—or, most certainly, most necessarily, its efficacy *would* have been greater. But in thus withholding from so large a proportion of mankind even the knowledge, and from so vast a majority in the nominally Christian nations the Divine application, indispensable to the efficacy of the Christian dispensation, *could it be that the Divine purpose was to consign so many of His creatures, existing under such fearful circumstances, to the doom of eternal misery?* Does the belief consist, with any conception we can form, of infinite goodness combined with infinite power?

But after all this, we have to meet the grave question, *What say the*

Scriptures? There is a force in their expressions at which we well may tremble. On *no* allowable interpretation do they signify less than a very protracted duration and formidable severity. But I hope it is not presumptuous to take advantage of the fact, that the terms *everlasting, eternal, forever*, original or translated, are often employed in the Bible, as well as other writings, under great and various limitations of import, and are thus withdrawn from the predicament of *necessarily and absolutely* meaning a strictly endless duration. The limitation is often, indeed, plainly marked by the nature of the subject. In other instances the words are used with a figurative indefiniteness, which leaves the limitation to be made by some general rule of reason and proportion. They are designed to magnify, to aggravate, rather than to define. My resource in the present case, then, is simply this: that since the terms do not necessarily and absolutely signify an interminable duration, and since there is in the present instance to be pleaded, for admitting a limited interpretation, *a reason in the moral estimate of things, of STUPENDOUS, of INFINITE urgency, involving our conceptions of the Divine goodness and equity, and leaving those conceptions overwhelmed in darkness and horror if it be rejected*, I therefore conclude that a limited interpretation is authorized.

If it be asked, *How could* the doctrine have been more plainly and positively asserted than it is in the Scripture language? In answer, I ask, How do *we* construct our words and sentences to express it in an absolute manner, so as to leave no *possibility* of understanding the language in a different, equivocal, or questionable sense? And may we not think, that if *so transcendently dreadful a doctrine had been meant to be stamped as in burning characters on our faith*, there would have been such forms of proposition, of circumlocution, if necessary, as would have rendered all doubt or question a mere palpable absurdity?

Some intelligent and devout inquirers, unable to admit the terrific doctrine, and pressed by the strength of the Scripture *language*, have had recourse to a *literal* interpretation of the threatened destruction, the eternal death, as signifying *annihilation of existence*, after a more or less protracted penal infliction. Even this would be a prodigious relief; but it is an admission that the terms in question *do* mean something final, in an absolute sense. I have not directed much thought to this point;* the grand object of interest being a negation of the *perpetuity* of misery. I have not been anxious for any satisfaction beyond *that*; though certainly one would wish to indulge the hope, founded on the Divine attribute of infinite benevolence, that there will be a period somewhere in the endless futurity, when all God's sinning creatures will be restored by him to rectitude and happiness.

It often surprises me that the fearful doctrine sits, if I may so express it, so *easy* on the minds of the religious and benevolent believers of it. Surrounded immediately by the multitudes of

*Here Foster erred; for he should have "given much thought to the point of *annihilation*," and then he would not have given the preference to restoration. Rev. E. White, to whom this letter was written, gave much thought to this point, and decided in favor of annihilation.—J. BLAIN.

fellow mortals. and looking abroad on the present, and back on the past, state of the race, and regarding them, as to the immense majority, as subjects of so direful destination, how *can* they have any calm enjoyment of life? how can they be cordially cheerful? how can they escape the incessant haunting of dismal ideas, darkening the economy in which their lot is cast? I remember suggesting to one of them such an image as this:—Suppose the case that so many of the great surrounding population as he could not, even in a judgment of charity, believe to be Christians, that is, to be in a safe state hereafter,—suppose the case that he knew so many were all doomed to suffer, by penal infliction, a death by torture, in the most protracted agony, with what feelings would he look on the populous city, the swarming country, or even a crowded, mixed congregation? *But what an infinitesimal trifle that would be in comparison with what he does believe in looking on these multitudes.* How, then, can they bear the sight of the living world around them?

As to religious teachers, if the tremendous doctrine be true, surely it ought to be almost continually proclaimed as with the blast of a trumpet, inculcated and reiterated, with ardent passion, in every possible form of terrible illustration; no remission of the alarm to thoughtless spirits. What! believe them in such inconceivably dreadful peril, and not multiply and aggravate the terrors to frighten them out of their stupor; deploring still, that all the horrifying representations in the power of thought and language to make are immeasurably below the real urgency of the subject; and almost wishing that some appalling phenomenon of sight or sound might break in to make the impression that no words can make! If we saw a fellow mortal stepping heedlessly or daringly on the utmost verge of some dreadful precipice or gulf, a humane spectator would raise and *continue* a shout, a scream to prevent him. How, then, can it comport with the duty of preachers to satisfy themselves with brief, occasional references to this awful topic, when the most prolonged, thundering alarm is but as the note of an infant, a bird, or an insect, in proportion to the horrible urgency of the case?

A number (not large, but of *great piety and intelligence*,) of ministers within my acquaintance, several now dead, have been disbelievers of the doctrine in question; but at the same time not feeling themselves called upon to make a public disavowal; content themselves with employing in their ministrations strong general terms in denouncing the doom of impenitent sinners. For one thing, a consideration of the unreasonable imputations and unmeasured suspicions apt to be cast on any publicly declared partial defection from rigid Orthodoxy, has made them think they should better consult their usefulness by not giving a prominence to this dissentient point; while yet they make no concealment of it in private communications, and in answer to serious inquiries. When, besides, they could not be unaware of the grievous truth of what is so strongly insisted on as an argument by the defenders of the tenet,*—that thoughtless and wicked men would

*This sentiment is seen, by experience, to be true, where restoration is preached, but not so where literal *destruction* is proclaimed and proved—as it can be. This has *terror*, and the cause is, the impenitent see much more *reason* and *Bible* for it than for either eternal woe, or universal salvation.

be sure to seize on the mitigated doctrine to encourage themselves in their impenitence. But this is only the same perverse and fatal use that they make of the doctrine of grace and mercy through Jesus Christ. If they *will* so abuse the truth, we can not help it. But methinks even this fact tells against the doctrine in question. If the very nature of man, as created, every individual, by the sovereign Power, be in such desperate disorder, that there is no possibility of conversion and salvation, except in the instances where the Power interposes with a special and redeeming efficacy, how can we conceive that the main proportion of the race thus morally impotent (that is, really and absolutely impotent,) will be eternally punished for the inevitable result of this moral impotence? But this I have said before.


NOTE.—The 200 texts for *destruction*, referred to in note on page first, are such as the following: *Die and death*, 50 texts; see as a sample, Ez. 18: 20; Rom. 6: 23; *Be destroyed*, 40 texts, Ps. 92: 7; 2 Pet. 2: 12; *Perish*, 30 texts, 2 Pet. 2: 12; *Perdition*, 8 texts, 2 Pet. 3: 7; *Be consumed*, 6 texts, Ps. 37: 20; *Be devoured*, 2 texts, Heb. 10: 27; *Be slain*, 8 texts, Luke 19: 27; *Be blotted out*, 4 texts, Ps. 69: 28; Rev. 3: 5; *Be hewn down*, twice, Matt. 3: 10; *Lose life*, 8 texts, John 12: 25; 3: 36; *Come to an end*, 5 texts, Heb. 6: 8; *Not be*, 5 texts, Ps. 37: 10; Oba. 16; *Be cut off*, 5 texts, Ps. 37: 9; *Ground to powder*, 2 texts, Luke 20: 18; *Be torn in pieces*, Ps. 50: 22; *Be as nothing*, 3 texts, Isa. 41: 11, 12; *Burned, and burned up*, 9 texts, Mal. 4: 1; Matt. 3: 12. But it is a sad fact that our divines make *death* mean *life* in misery; *life* to mean happiness; *to lose life* is to have existence in woe; *to burn up* means to make a living salamander; *to destroy* is to preserve whole; *to devour, perish, consume, &c.*, means to make *indestructable, and immortal*—*not to be, to be without end!*

All the two hundred texts are quoted in my work, *DEATH NOT LIFE*; also, all for endless woe, which are all proved to be figurative, symbolic, or in parables; so no plain text for the doctrine exists. It came from the heathen, and is now making infidels and atheists, as well as universalists, and is a horrible slander of our God.

The wicked are never said to be *immortal* in the Bible, but just the reverse. See Job 4: 17; Rom. 2: 7; 1 Tim. 6: 16. The texts for *destruction* overwhelm both those for misery and for restoration. There is no immortality out of Christ. He is now the only "Tree of Life." The creeds, as to punishment, teach Satan's doctrine—"Thou shalt not surely die." Divines in the nineteenth century do not know the meaning of *death*; a false education has thrown a "vail" over their minds.

The doctrine of destruction has only been examined partially, except by a few in past ages, who found it true, and about two hundred ministers, and some thousands of members, who have of late adopted it in the United States and England. It must yet become the doctrine of the churches, or they go into universalism, which the greater mass of the impenitent now believe, while multitudes are skeptical or infidel—eternal torment has driven them there, and they can only be reclaimed by teaching them a more reasonable, and yet a Bible penalty.—J. BLAIN.

TUFTS UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 9090 001 279 864

