

The # 4570
Gordon Lester Ford
Collection
Presented by his Sons
Worthington Chauncy Ford
and
Paul Leicester Ford
to the
New York Public Library.

Presented by
the Author to
Geo. Storms as
a token of regard
for the bold &
active part he has
taken in the
doctrine of eternal
life only by Christ
Jacob M. Blair

DEATH NOT LIFE:

OR

THE THEOLOGICAL HELL

AND

ENDLESS MISERY DISPROVED:

AND THE

DOCTRINE OF DESTRUCTION ESTABLISHED,

BY

A COLLECTION AND EXPLANATION OF ALL PAS-
SAGES ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

ALSO

METAPHYSICAL ARGUMENTS FOR THE IMMORTALITY OF
THE WICKED EXPLODED.

BY JACOB BLAIN,

BAPTIST MINISTER OF BUFFALO, N. Y.

~~~~~  
"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.  
~~~~~

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICE OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER,
No. 140 Fulton-street.

1853.

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 now often used to prevent research and reform on the reëxamination 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’s legal and necessary to teach immortality, and an endless hell. Prof. Finny 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 wo*, is casting gloom over the church of God. (2.) Driving our land into Universalism and infidelity. (3.) If it's 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. All well-balanced minds would see that the "Judge of all the earth" would be just in such a penalty for rebellion and impentence.

When I have finished an argument, and to my own mind exposed error, I have often been severe in reproof; but I have hoped the reader would feel like David—"Let the righteous smite me; it shall be a kindness: and let him reprove me; it shall be an excellent oil which shall not break my head." Ps. 141:5.

My reproofs are mostly designed for two classes—the learned in the original languages; and those who have had this subject brought to their minds and for *some cause* refuse to investigate, or only *partially* do so, and then denounce and ridicule it. The persecutors of Galileo refused to look through his telescope, lest they should be convinced his theory of astronomy was right, and per-adventure themselves would be persecuted. The reason I lay the blame on ministers is, they have ever been and still are the leading enemies to reform and persecutors of reformers—the laity must lead in reform in doctrines. They have also the most time to learn the truth in this matter, and as yet have generally neglected it and cried the loudest against it. The history of the church proves my charge, that ministers oppose reform. In the sequel I will show it.

Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones lest they provoke to a like practice. Dobney and others have written on this subject in a kind spirit, but have received little else but mis-sils of abuse. *Argument* has been thought too gentle a weapon to battle them with, or else they have had none to use, and still concluded they must fight in some way

"Take heed, lest you be found fighting against God."

INTRODUCTION.

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 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's 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.

INTRODUCTION.

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 ten years ago, Rev. Geo. 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 enquiry and convinced thousands of the truth of the doctrine. In 1846, Rev. H. H. Dobney, and Rev. Æ. 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.

From fifty to seventy-five 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 are so large, and so decided in spreading light, that all efforts

* 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.

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 wo 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, and temperance, &c., often asked the same question, and in the same spirit.

'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 wo 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 heavers" by it.

There is meaning and truth in the following seemingly harsh anecdote. At a public convention, Prof. Finny 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."

I affirm, with full confidence of being right, that a *denovo* examination 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*.

"Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? There is more hope of a fool than of him." "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."

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."

J. Lock, Esq., 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. Pa. 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; Jer. 21: 8; "I set before you the way of life, and the way of death." 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.

Math. 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 say could not be mistaken.

•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*."

Pa. 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*."

* 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.

Prov. 1: 32; 11: 3; 7: 16; 13: 13, 10; 29: 1; "He that being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be *destroyed*, and that *without remedy*." Matt. 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 exterminated*." 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."

2 Pet. 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 shouldest *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*." This time has not yet come, so it predicts the judgment. Matt. 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? 1 Tim. 6: 9; 2 Pet. 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. 87: 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 4,000 years did not know what future punishment would be.

Psa. 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 for ever, they will not be "as nothing," and they are *something* while on earth. Job 6 : 18, "They go to *nothing and perish*."

Matt. 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 Pet. 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 : 23, "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 Pet. 3 : 7, says, "The present world is reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and *perdition* of godly 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.

Psa. 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* some where 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." Matt. 10 : 28, and Luke 12 : 4, tells us it is to be done in *Gehenna*, 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 impious 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 for ever 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.

Matt. 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.

Matt. 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 Matt. 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.—(*Eight texts.*)

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*." Neh. 1 : 9.

If men 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 : 16, "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; Obed. 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* for ever; 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."—(*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.

Matt. 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.

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*."—(*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 : 2, "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? Matt. 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 in fire to be preserved! So say our creeds. Mat. 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

* The American Tract Society published a tract, No. 277, by James Sau-

of enemies; see Sam. 3: 34; Mal. 4: 3; Rom. 16: 20, and when men say it means only 'shut them up,' they add to God's word.

Heb. 2: 8; 1: 13, are similar. Eph. 1: 10, "That in the fulness of times he might gather together in one *all things* in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him."

Phil. 2: 10, 11, "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, 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, 24, "For it pleased the Father, that in him should all fullness (power) dwell; and by him to *reconcile all things* unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be *things* in *earth*, or *things* in *heaven*; and you that were sometime alienated and enemies....yet now hath he *reconciled.*" The last clause tells what "reconcile" means.

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 for ever 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 key-stone 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,

rin, 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 "curses" to keep him humble? He adds—"This threatening is a mortal poison, diffusing itself into every period of my life, and making life itself a bitter."

would fully confirm their doctrine, were they not *overwhelmed* by the previous 200 for destruction. The fact is, and Restorationists 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, "Bowing 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 its 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.

INFERENTIAL TEXTS.

Another class of texts which indirectly but strongly prove destruction, are those which 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 Matt. 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 figurative-

ly, 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 reviv'd 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 a *sinner*; 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—that 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 114 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? 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 for ever* 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 *consummate 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 for 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 "*Keys* 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 *nondescript 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 thus 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 for ever*, 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 his 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 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 he *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 (*nepesh chayiah*) a living soul." Gen. 1: 24 reads, "Let the earth bring forth the (*nepesh 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 (*nepesh chayiak*) living creature, that was the name thereof." Gen. 6: 19, "And of every (*nepesh chayiak*) 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 creature* 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 deceitful translators, and the learned expounders keep up the deception, 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.

Corruption has been practiced 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)* 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, 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 down-

ward 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 downwards."

(4.) The Greek word *psuche* has the same meaning as *nephesh* 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.

The deception in translating it *soul* instead of *life* is seen plainly in Mat. 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 them 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 *ruath*: 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.

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."

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 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. Geo. 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 any thing 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. 82-3.

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."—Vcl. 1, p. 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.

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.' Matt. 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 for ever. 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 enquire 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, *immaterial*—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, that 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?

The common or general creed theory is, that some other substance, called the *soul*, is some how 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 us 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, for ever, 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*

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

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 come 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 land, 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 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 a 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 prophecy false dreams, and cause the people to err?" "what is the chaff to the wheat?" Jer. 23: 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 *saieth* the Lord," for their belief; and many *will not*, and none should be satisfied with what he *saieth 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 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.

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!*

A NEW WORK.

[The *nature* of man, the *state* of the dead, the *errors* of our translators, and the *penalty* of God's law as being literal *death*, are made perfectly plain, in a new work just published in New York, by Geo. Storrs, entitled "BIBLE vs. TRADITION," by Aaron Ellis, revised and much enlarged by Thomas Read. It shows the meaning of the Hebrew and Greek words in relation to these subjects. It must become a standard work, and all who love the truth should possess it. Three years were spent in compiling it. Price 75 cents. It contains 312 pages, 12 mo.

In this work has appeared a *David* to "slay Goliath." The "sling-stone" "is mighty to pull down strong holds" —to slay the *Goliath systems of divinity*, so far as the penalty of God's law is concerned.]

CHAPTER II.

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,

The brief explanations will be made up in the next chapter.

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 meant only a pit, or covered place.'

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 93 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 : 6; 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, 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.'

HADES.—The Greek word *hades* is translated *hell* ten times in the N. T., and once *grave*. It occurs Matt. 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. Matt. 11 : 23 ; Luke 10 : 15. 'Thou Capernium, 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. Matt. 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 in 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.

TARTARUS.—The Greek word *Tartarus*, used but once, and translated hell in 2 Pet. 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 Pet. 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.

If devils are confined to a local place, it is on earth.—See Job 1 : 7; 1 Pet. 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?'

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, or endless hell in a future state. It occurs in Matt. 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 the great cause of the woful 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 secondly, as a symbol of destruction, slaughter, death. So the Saviour 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; 38 : 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 ch. 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 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, p. 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, Burnes, and others, go to the heathen and to the superstitious Rabbinical 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*.' He elsewhere shows that the Jews got their ideas from the heathen, and not from their Scriptures.

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 for ever* there, by saying he would 'be cast into Gehenna,' as it would be for us to say, the murderer will *live for ever* 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 *hele* 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 Matt. v. 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 measure pure, it was necessary to keep fires continually burning there. It was the image which our Saviour 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 Hin-nom*. 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 willfully...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 briers 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 rather, 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’ for ever, is a sad punishment, and one that will cause ‘weeping and gnashing of teeth,’ till the ‘blackness of darkness for ever 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 sceptics, and the world with gloom. With *hell*, and *hell-fire*, thus wrongfully put in fifty-three texts, 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 fifty 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 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." 1 Kings 11 : 6-9, "Bring down Joab with blood to *hell*,"—so of Shemei, 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; Songs 8 : 6; Isa. 38 : 10, 18, where the term *hell* is put instead of *grave* as in our Bibles.—Hose. 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 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 the local *hell*.

ERRORS IN TRANSLATION.

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.

I will add here, that the Bible is perverted by the learned in applying the term "bottomless pit" to a 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 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 Mahomadan delusion is meant.

I have just further discovered that the Dauay 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* minis-

ters 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 used 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 *sanctified* 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.

CHAPTER IV.

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

I. 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, *damned* 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 were 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.

Let any should think I judge wrong as to these neuter texts, I will refer to all I can find in the N. T., where our main light is found. Matt. 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,"—Geo. Campbell,) 16 : 16 ; Luke 10 : 12-14 ; 12 : 46, 47 ; 13 : 9 ; 25 : 28 ; 23 : 47 ; John 5 : 29 ; 8 : 21 ; Rom. 2 : 9 ; 2 Thess. 2 : 12 ; 2 Pet. 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, "laid 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 fully prove destruction; as *sheol* means the grave, or *state of death*—"the dead know not anything," 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, Matt. 16 : 18, evidently means the grave, "The gates of *hades* (the grave, and not hell,) shall not prevail against the church," as the resurrection will deliver the saints from it. Two others, "thou Capernium... shalt be brought down to *hades* (hell)." Matt. 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 *hell* 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," Matt. 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 Matt. 8 : 11, 12, "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," denoting the "election," Rom. 11 : 7, with whom the Gentiles were to "sit down" in gospel privileges.

Matt. 22 : 1-13, the parable of the "marriage-feast," doubtless meant the same; the one "without a wedding garment" 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 Matt. 21 : 33-44, with Matt. 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 despise 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 dis-

semblings, 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* to prop up, and not a single *plain* text with which to support it.

With the explanation I have suggested, how natural is this similitude—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 tongue," 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 anything," 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 for ever 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 figuratively.

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.

Geo. 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 Matt. 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 moulder 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 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 Isa. 1: 31; 34: 10; Jer. 4: 4; 7: 20; 17: 27; Ez. 20: 47,—these texts settle it, that "unquenchable fire" denotes destruction. 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*.

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, p. 487, "That this phrase *unquenchable fire* was understood only in the sense of an intense fire that *totally consumed* what ever 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 Eusebius (Eccles. His. lib. 6, chap. 41.) in two places uses the very words of Matt. 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, p. 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* ?

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! 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.

CHAPTER V.

II. AN EXPLANATION OF PARTICULAR TEXTS SUPPOSED TO TEACH ENDLESS WOES.

Leaving out the classes of texts spoken of in the last chapter, 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. Matt. 5 : 26, "Not come out till the utmost farthing be paid."
5. Matt. 18 : 34, "Delivered to tormentors, till all is paid."
6. Matt. 25 : 41, "Depart into *everlasting fire*."
7. Matt. 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 Pet. 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 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 showed 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.

Secondly, 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." Matt. 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 sometimes 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*!!

Thirdly, 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.

Fourthly, Twelve of these texts derive all their force or proof of this terrific doctrine from the uncertain terms *aion* (for ever), 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*, for ever,) nor in the *world*, (*aion*, for ever,) 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. 13 : 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 enquiry, of course depends, substantially, the issue of the question before us;" referring to *endless misery*. So it comes out 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 that *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.

Fifthly, 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 dif-

ferent 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.

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 contented ignorance.

(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 adhorring," &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 made 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 "*many*" shows it is partial. When Christ arose none "came out of their graves but saints," so it cannot refer to that resurrection; Matt. 27: 52, 53. The events of this verse, are at the time named in the close of chap. ii., and that is before the final resurrection or end of the world.

(3.) The three first verses of chap. 12, may be thus briefly explained,—The "time of trouble," v. 1, refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. See Matt. 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." 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 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* but sit down,

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

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 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 4,000 years without an intimation of such a doom, if true, and in the same time fill more than 100 pages, and make more than 3,000 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, 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. and 5.) The first two are alike, viz., Matt. 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 Matt. 5: 25-6, "This is still a farther 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. Matt. 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 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 Matt. 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 the 14th, do not mean to make out that his doom was various—that of the wreck or the Bastille, 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 expression,— "cast into everlasting fire"—"into the fire of Gehenna,"—"go to everlasting punishment"—"*burn up as chaff*"—

"lose life," &c., must be made to agree in one fate. Torment believers talk as if they had never got this idea into their heads.

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 expresses 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 Matt. 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 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." Neh. 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*." Matt. 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 : 26-7, 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 wilfully...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,"—to "depart" as "cursed," into, or under God's *wrath*, for they must fall be "*devoured*,"—not kept alive and tormented!!

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 traditionary 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 of but little im-

portance 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 Matt. 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 alwise plan of our Maker.

4. Compare this text with Matt. 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 for ever*." 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 "for ever" 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? 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. Matt. 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 figura-

tive teaching, and his plain language settles the meaning of this text to be *destruction*, as seen in 2 Thees. 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."* 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 *kolaso*; 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.—ⁿ Thus *punishment* is seen to be only an inferential or secondary meaning. Christ never uses this word only in the ^{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., Matt. 25 : 46, and 1 John 4 : 18, as nouns; and Act. 4 : 21; 2 Pet. 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 *hang-*

* Boncroft, the learned Unitarian, who held to destruction, says, "We read of 'eternal redemption,' Heb. 9 : 12; not that God will be for ever 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, may with strict propriety, be called an everlasting punishment." See his sermons.—The same remarks apply to "eternal judgment." Heb. 6 : 2.

ing, 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, tell 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."

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, a prosperous, happy man, it would be a year's punishment ; if for a 1,000 years, and then bring to life, it would be a 1,000 year's 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 for ever,' 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 the 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, p. 411.

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

7. Pres. Edwards, in his *Review of Chauncey*, the Unitarian Restorationist, v. 1, p. 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 Bable-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” (damnation). 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 for ever. 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." If Christ "devours" the wicked in any way, they will be "from his presence," but not so if they are alive *any* where. 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. and 12. 2 Pet. 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 for ever." Jude has it, "raging waves...wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever." Here we have full evidence that the language is figurative as the apostles sometimes used figures, and none as 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 : 3, "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 Matt. 8 : 12 ; 22 : 13 ; 25 : 30, and are more easily proved earthly events than Matt. 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 "for ever" 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 *aionios*. (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 Pet. 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 example 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 2,000 years afterwards, and then only in this 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 purpose, 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 at conclusions, without "searching the Scriptures"? "He who sitteth upon the throne," will ere long decide this question.

CHAPTER VI.

EXPLANATION OF TEXTS CONTINUED.

THE SMOKE OF TORMENT.

13. and 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 ch. 19: 3, both referring to the same events, we must read from this verse to the end of ch. 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, ch. 14: 9-12, "Tells the final overthrow of all the *upholders* of that anti-christian power (papacy). Ch. 15—the seven plagues are 'to fill up or complete the wrath of God on this persecuting power; and ch. 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,) ch. 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 for ever," 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 *for ever* : 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 "for ever 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 Pet. 3 : 13. Here we see "*for ever* and *ever*" must be limited; and the "smoke going up *for ever*" 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 have less sin to answer for.

But instead of doing this, too many, as to this subject, study "vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called, and so err concerning the faith." 1 Tim. 20 : 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 vs. 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 enquire—“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 thy self”?

It could be proved, if we had space, that this “smoke of torment” is now “ascending,” and has been for two “*for evers*” (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 "*for ever 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 '*for ever and ever*,' it *implies* (notice the assumption) that the suffering of the wicked *would* be eternal; and this is such language as *would* not *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*, for ever, in the N. T., full proves this statement to be entirely incorrect, and a gross absurdity.

I will add a little to what I have said above to show it is so. (See p. 71-2.) (1.) We read of the *end* of *aion*, *for ever*. Matt. 13: 39, 40, reads, "so will it be in the *end* of this *for ever*, (*aionos*.)—the harvest is the *end* of this *forever*, (*aionos*). Here the translators have used deception to cover up the meaning of the word, by rendering it "*world*," instead of *age*.

Matt. 24: 3, and 28: 20, the truth is hid in the same way. See also Heb. 1: 1, and 1 Cor. 10: 11, where *for ever* is rendered *world* and *worlds*. In Heb. 9: 26, *kosmos*, the proper word for *world* is used, and also *aion* (*for ever*), 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 *for ever* 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*, *for ever*, and here it is translated *ages*, as it ought to be. But are there many eternities?

(3.) In 2 Tim. 1: 9; Tit. 1: 2, and other texts, we read of a time before eternity began, if *for ever* means eternity. Thus in thirty texts, *aion*, *for ever*, 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, (p. 69,) "*For ever and ever* is a mere intensive form of expression, and so means no longer time than *for ever*." I will quote more from his work named above. On p. 15, he says, "The classical sense of *aion*, (for ever,) 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 *aiwnos* mean *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 Matt. 25 : 46, which I have explained on p. 81.

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 p. 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 deception practiced by the translators and learned expounders; and especially by A. Barnes, in the assertion I have called 'a gross absurdity.' Look at it again, and then at the following texts.

Matt. 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; Tit. 2: 12; Eph. 1: 21; 2: 2; Heb. 1: 2; 11: 3.

Here are twenty-seven texts where *aion*, (*for ever*), 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, p. 33-34, "All the texts where *aion* refers to future punishment, (as being endless,) are 2 Pet. 2: 17; Jude 13; Rev. 14: 11; 19: 3: 20: 10." We who hold to destruction, need to limit its meaning only in the three last; 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 *for ever 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 p. 67, Stuart says, "It is plain that the Scriptures have not asserted the endless happiness of the righteous, if *for ever*, &c., mean 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 Pet. 1: 4, "To an inheritance *incorruptible*—that *fadeth not away*, reserved in heaven for you." 1 Pet. 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 *aiônios* can mean no more than the noun *aiôn*, from which it is derived, so everlasting and eternal mean no more, or are as uncertain as *for ever*, though not limited as often. Stuart, on p. 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*.”—Tit. 1 : 2, he has the same. Here it seems *everlasting*, from *aiônios*, 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 then terms, (Stuart owns this,) as both held to immortality. 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. (2.) These vials are poured out "upon the earth," not in *hell*. Ch. 16:1. (3.) *For ever and ever* should be translated *age of age*, or *ages of ages*, and then all dispute would be ended. The whole five chapters compels 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 in this book till we come to ch. 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.

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 towards* 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 *towards*, *in respect to*, *respecting*, &c. As all the three texts quoted 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, for ever 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 "for ever," (*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, p. 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 "for ever," 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 ch. 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* the earth"—of course the devil is included when *destroyed* the "*torment of ages*" must end. The trumpet includes the seven vials and briefly tells the judgment, which is renewed and enlarged upon in ch. 20: 1, 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, p. 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 ch. 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 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, (ch. 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*" 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 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 10 vs. 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 seven *last* 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 *for ever and ever*, carry these torments into a future state, while everything else in Rev. up to 20: 11, forbid it; and from this v. on, no protracted woe is told, but the reverse.

Hardly any two writers ever agree about Rev. 20: 1-10,

a
of
the
bea-
-
*I:
hadit
propo-
:ronl
:over
:uch a
nd it is
glor
nd of
the mea

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 t~~or~~ments apply to another state, only as they *force* them there against their natural import, by falsely concluding the term *for ever and ever* must mean endless time.*

On Isa. 34 : 9-10, "The smoke thereof shall go up for ever," &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 *for ever*!!". 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 ch. 20 : 14, 15 ; 21 : 8, we are told plainly that it denotes 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 extinction of life. I know a papal deluded

* I ask the attention of the learned to the statement of Bible vs. Tradition on p. 97. 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. 14 : 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 *eternum* must be *ages* in these texts.

church, (as to 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 Revelations 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 ch. 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," (a Hebrew phrase for utter destruction) 1 Cor. 15 : 25, "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, and 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, chang-

ing 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.”

“ 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.

CHAPTER VII.

A BRIEF REVIEW AND RESULTS.

We have now examined and referred to all 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 210 texts for destruction, making 294, 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 the 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, *for ever and ever*, 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-

Restorationists 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 traditionary fetters; nor yet over-awed 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 simply 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.

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 plainly 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 two 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.

I N D E X.

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, 11. ‘Their Bible meaning,’ 21. Ten texts for restoration, as proving destruction, 22. *Life and death* not figurative, 26. What was lost by the fall, 26. Prof. Stuart reviewed, 28. Wholesale perversion, 29. All the Bible proof of immortality, 30. A non-descript dictionary, 30. Error in our translation, 32. Meaning of soul and spirit, 32.

CHAP. II.—Metaphysical proof of immortality exploded, 35. New York Recorder reviewed, 38. Immortality *assumed*, 42.

CHAP. III.—HELL NOT A LOCAL PLACE TO CONTINUE ETERNALLY, 45. Meaning of the English word *hell*, 45. Prof. Stuart on the four terms, *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Gehenna*, *Tartarus*, translated *Hell*, 46. *Gehenna* (*hell*) explained, 48. Corruption in translating *Gehenna* by *hell*, 50. Paul told of no *hell*, 52. *Hell* is to be ended, 52. Meaning of the English word *hell* has been corruptly changed, 53. Catholics the most honest in translating *hell*, 54. Errors in translation, 56.

CHAP. IV.—Texts supposed to teach endless woe explained, 59. Six classes of texts amounting to 284 to be left out, 59. The rich man in *hell* explained, 61. Unquenchable fire no proof of endless woe but of destruction, 65. A review, 67.

CHAP. V.—P. 69. All the remaining texts, being 15 explained—but 15 claimed by Prof. Stuart. All of them quoted, 69. General remarks on them, 70. All figurative, 70. *Aion*, (for ever,) explained, 71. All given up by different divines, 72. No endless woe told in the O. T., 73. Dan 12: 2, “everlasting contempt” explained, 74.—“Everlasting fire,” 77. “Everlasting punishment,” 81. The Recorder, 83. Pres. Edward’s views 84.

CHAP. VI.—Smoke of torment, 89. For ever and ever explained, 92. Bible vs. Tradition, 96. The devil tormented, 98. Literal devil not meant, 99. Lake of fire, 101.

CHAP. VII.—*Review and Results*, texts perverted, 104. Thirty texts to one for destruction, 105. Absurdities, 107. The Bible does not seem to teach endless woe, as the texts relied on prove destruction, 109. Universalism and orthodoxy contrasted, 110. They have the most texts, 112. Been abused, 115. Are more numerous than is known, 114.

Concluding remarks, 117. Endless woe, slanders all God’s attributes, 118. Ministers oppose reform, 117.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, TRACTS, &C.
FOR SALE AT BIBLE EXAMINER OFFICE
140 FULTON STREET, NEW-YORK.

Postage can be pre-paid, or paid on *delivery*, as the purchaser may choose. Works not weighing over 8 oz. can be sent to any part of the United States for one cent, if pre-paid, or two cents if paid on delivery. Books bound, or unbound. one cent per oz. under 3000 miles: one-half cent to be added if not pre-paid. Tracts half cent per oz. if sent in packages of not less than *eight ounces*, otherwise subject to same postage as three oz. pamphlets, each.

1. **SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT**, by H. H. Dobney," Baptist minister; an argument in *two parts*. This is a work of great power, showing the *Righteous only will live Forever*, 286 pages. Price 60 cts. bound. Weight 13 oz. In paper covers 37 1-2 cts: wgt. 9 oz.

2. "DOBNEY ABRIDGED."—Or, the *Second Part* of the Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment, in an edition by itself. It contains all that is really essential in the controversy, to enable the reader to decide whether *endless torture*, or *destruction of being*, is the true teaching of Scripture. We put it at the extremely low price of 25 cents, in paper covers. Weight 6 oz.

3. "THE UNITY OF MAN, OR LIFE AND DEATH REALITIES.—A Reply to Rev. Luther Lee, by Anthropolos." This is a thorough refutation of Mr. Lee's position of the natural immortality of man. Price 15 cents. Weight 3 oz.

4. "SIX SERMONS, by Geo. Storrs. An inquiry, *Are the Wicked Immortal?*" To which is added a dissertation on the "State of the Dead;" and prefaced Archbishop Whately's remarks on the "The Second Death." Price 15 cents. Weight 3 oz.

5. "STORRS' MISCELLANY"—It contains the foregoing Nos. 4 and 5, with a variety of other matter, bound. Price 50 cents. Wgt. 9 oz.

6. "THE GENERATIONS GATHERED AND GATHERING; OR, *The Scripture Doctrine of Man in Death*." By J. Pantan Ham," Congregational minister, England. Price 10 cents. Weight 2 oz.

7. "LIFE AND DEATH; OR, *The Theology of the Bible in Relation to Human Immortality*." Three Lectures, by J. Pantan Ham." A most interesting work in connection with his other, above named. Price and weight same as the other.

8. "BIBLE VS TRADITION."—Price 75 cts. Weight about 16 oz.

On the foregoing works one-third discount will be made, for cash, to wholesale purchasers.

9. "THE BIBLE EXAMINER," super royal octavo, sixteen pages, is published *monthly*, at *one dollar* for twelve numbers. *Payment always in advance*. Its object is an examination of the Scriptures—in their prophetic revelations, doctrinal instructions, and practical use, but especially to illustrate and defend the great gospel truth—"No Immortality, nor Endless Life, except through Jesus Christ alone."

10. BIBLE EXAMINER for '50 and '51, bound in one vol. Price \$1.50. Also in *sheets* for '49, '50, and '51. Price 50 cents for each year: and for '52, price 75 cents.

11. "BIBLE EXAMINER, EXTRA."—New Edition. It contains Bishop Whately's remarks on "Second Death"—"Endless Misery," by Bishop Newton—Our "Six Sermons," &c., 16 pages, quarto, and sold at the extreme low price of \$2.50 per 100, or 5 cts. single copy. Wgt. 2 oz.

A variety of Tracts also can be had of us on the foregoing topics—**All orders and communications must be addressed,**

GEO. STORRS, New-York.