

In thee and thy seed seed  
shall all the nations, etc. replied  
to by Bro. Moore, P. 91

Quotes from Hobbs & King  
debate P. 128, P. 197, in this book

Read

Dr. Macknight on Heb. 6:12  
concerning the firm. P. 210

Leaps  
moored argument on gehenna  
PP. 266-269 connect this with his  
reply to Bartolman PP. 288-290. Its good  
on "psyches"

Get moore's argument on the  
judgement PP. 293-296, 313  
Dr. George Campbell on hades. P. 308. Good  
Luke 16:19 - PP. 308-310

Admits salvation to be  
conditional PP. 43, 44

Bartolman teaches that  
an "endless hell" is  
taught in the O. Testament  
P. 40

Universalists say God  
is the author of sin. P. 71

Bartolman teaches that  
man is sinners more a C  
man. P. 83

Bartolman says baptism  
is immersion, etc. PP. 104, 105

Bartolman has held views  
40 debates P. 106

Bartolman admits that we  
behave the children of the  
devil by sinning, hence  
admits there is a devil  
P. 132. (Over)

P. W. SHICK,  
Mound Valley,  
Box 86. Kansas.

Presented to W. G. Roberts by  
T. J. Davis,  
Parsons, Kan  
April 12, 1906

W. G. Roberts,  
Ripley,  
Lawa

Kelasin - Pressing P. 292

Mans agency limited, so  
universalists teach P. 60

Carlton believes in a  
resurrection. (P. 139, 140.)  
John Hughes don't, hence  
a contradiction.

THE  
DESTINY OF MAN:

Carlton says the old  
teaches a resurrection P. 140  
A DISCUSSION,  
HELD AT UNION CITY, INDIANA,

ON TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY, AND FRIDAY,

APRIL 26, 27, 28, AND 29, 1870,

Universalists don't Read  
believe in a new world. P. 224  
BETWEEN  
REV. S. P. CARLTON,  
Read it Of the Universalist Church, Woodstock, O.,

AND

ELD. W. D. MOORE,

Of the Christian Church, Union City, Ind.

Universalists believe  
Angels will war

PHONOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED BY J. G. ADEL and J. V. LEE,  
Publishers of the Convention Reporter, Columbus, O.

heaven P. 244, Read it

Carlton's definition of  
soul body and spirit. P. 276  
CINCINNATI.

WILLIAMSON & CANTWELL, PUBLISHERS,

115 WEST FOURTH STREET,

1870.  
worms in germs, says  
Carlton. P. 280

Doctrine of endless punishment  
was in the world at the birth of  
Christ Carlton says. P. 299

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1870, by  
S. P. CARLTON AND W. D. MOORE,  
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, for the  
Southern District of Ohio.

---

STEREOTYPED AT THE  
FRANKLIN TYPE FOUNDRY,  
CINCINNATI.

## P R E F A C E .

---

IN presenting this humble offering to the reading public, we deem it necessary briefly to remark that, differing, as we do, in our honest convictions, on the teaching of the Holy Scriptures in regard to the final destiny of man, we were urged by our respective friends, some five years ago, to discuss in public those differences. We entered upon the work, and have discussed the same questions four different times, at as many different places. An arrangement was made for the publication of our third debate, which was held at Wilmington, Ohio, but the reporter utterly failed to furnish the manuscript. In answer to the solicitation of friends at Union City, Indiana, we again met and held another discussion, which was reported, and is presented in this volume, which, we trust, the attentive reader will find both interesting and instructive. And may the Divine Spirit direct this work to the glory of God and for the welfare and consolation of those who read it.

S. P. CARLTON,  
W. D. MOORE.

CINCINNATI, *June*, 1870.

FIRST PROPOSITION.

---

*Do the Holy Scriptures teach that those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ will be ultimately holy and happy?*

*P. 187 for 2nd Proposition*

REV. S. P. CARLTON AFFIRMS.

ELD. W. D. MOORE DENIES.

---

Tuesday, April 26th, 1870.

MODERATORS.

---

JAMES McFEELY, Esq.,  
Col. J. P. GRAY,  
H. H. YERGIN, M. D.

## DISCUSSION.

---

### FIRST DAY.

*Tuesday, April 26, 1870, 10 o'clock, A. M.*

At the time appointed for the discussion to commence, a large audience assembled in the Christian Church. Messrs. James McFeely, Esq., Col. J. P. Gray, and Dr. H. H. Yergin, were selected as moderators.

The exercises were opened with prayer by Rev. Mr. Drake, when it was announced that the discussion was to continue from 10 o'clock to 12 o'clock in the forenoon, and from 7 to 10 o'clock in the evening; and to extend through four days, the speakers to occupy a half hour alternately.

The first proposition was then read, as follows: "DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THOSE WHO DIE IN WILLFUL DISOBEDIENCE TO THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST, WILL BE ULTIMATELY HOLY AND HAPPY?"

Affirmative, Mr. Carlton; negative, Mr. Moore.

[OPENING SPEECH OF MR. CARLTON.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

We have convened this morning for the purpose of entering upon the discussion of the most important question that ever occupied the attention of mankind,

namely, the destiny of our race. And I only regret one thing on the present occasion, and that is, the feeble state of my health, which will perhaps render it impossible for me to do that justice to this great subject which it demands at my hands. But I hope and pray that it may continue to grow better, and that I may increase in strength. I have been so sick for several days past, that I almost gave up the idea of coming to the place, but I concluded to come, whether I should be able to prosecute the discussion or not.

A few remarks upon the subject of religious discussions: Agitation and free discussion have exerted a powerful influence in dispelling error and prejudice, and promoting truth and righteousness, for it can not be controverted that the great Teacher sent from God, who spake as never man spake, was the greatest agitator that ever lived in the world. He most fearlessly assailed religious error, and he most bravely unfolded the banner of eternal truth; and how glorious the blessings that have flowed to us and shall continue to descend to the emancipated millions of our race from that agitation! Then look at the holy apostles—as the Master disputed with doctors of the law in the temple, both hearing and asking them questions, and these discussions, refuting error, and defending truth, he called being “about his Father’s business;” so his own apostles reasoned with the people out of the Scriptures. Behold Paul assaulting the superstition and idolatry of the Athenians, and proclaiming the true God and the unsearchable riches of Christ. And we may also point with manly pride to the reformers, Wickliffe, Luther, Melancthon, Knox, and a multitude of others, who shine as stars of the first magnitude in the ecclesiastical heavens, and first roused the world from its sleep of ages by the stentorian voice of free discussion, which unshackled the human mind, and gave a new impetus to progress. I

feel that the occasion does not justify me in pursuing this thought further. Elder Moore and myself appreciate this, and meet to-day as Christian ministers, differing as brethren, to examine the Holy Scriptures in regard to what they teach on this very important and interesting subject. And I most devoutly pray that Almighty God will smile upon our efforts to elicit truth, and that the present investigation may redound to his glory and to the good of those who hear.

The proposition now before you has been read by the moderators:—“DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THOSE WHO DIE IN WILLFUL DISOBEDIENCE TO THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST, WILL BE ULTIMATELY HOLY AND HAPPY?”

I freely, and willingly, and joyfully, take the affirmative of this proposition, and believe it with all my heart; and the first argument that I shall make in support of this affirmation, I base upon the perfections of the living God—the attributes of Jehovah. These we find revealed in the Scriptures to be eleven in number.

First, his eternity: that God himself is a self-existent being, without beginning and without end.

Secondly, that he is an omnipresent being; that he is every-where and in every place. We can not go where God is not. That every portion of the illimitable universe is imminent with the divine presence.

That God is an omniscient being. That his all-seeing eye beholds all things.

That he is an omnipotent being; that he reigns the Lord God Almighty.

That in addition to these perfections, which are usually denominated by theologians the essential attributes of God, the Scriptures reveal seven moral perfections. These are, first, WISDOM. The first passage of Scripture I will quote in support of this position you will find in Psalm cxlvii, 5: “His understanding

is infinite." Isaiah xl, 28: "Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of his understanding."

Secondly, GOODNESS. Exodus xxxiv, 6, 7: "And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation." Luke xviii, 19: "And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, that is, God." In which Jesus teaches clearly that notwithstanding he was good, notwithstanding there were multitudes in every age that were good, yet there was but one who possessed perfect, underived, and immortal goodness, and that is, God. Psalms lii, 1: "Why boasteth thou thyself in mischief, O mighty man? The goodness of God endureth continually."

JUSTICE. Deuteronomy xxxii, 4: "He is the Rock, his work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he." Psalms lxxxix, 14: "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne: mercy and truth shall go before thy face." Isaiah xlv, 21: "Tell ye, and bring them near; yea, let them take counsel together: who hath declared this from ancient time? who hath told it from that time? have not I the Lord? and there is no God else beside me; a just God and a Savior; there is none beside me." Psalms lxii, 12: "Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy: for thou renderest to every man according to his work." 1 Peter i, 3, 4, 5. "Blessed be the God and Father

of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." Psalm cxlv, 9: "The Lord is good to all: and his tender mercies are over all his works."

TRUTH. Psalm xxxi, 5: "Into thine hand I commit my spirit: thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth." Hebrews vi, 18: "That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us."

HOLINESS. Psalms lx, 6: "God has spoken his holiness; I will rejoice, I will divide Shechem, and mete out the valley of Succoth." Revelations iv, 8: "And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within: and they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come."

IMMUTABILITY. Malachi iii, 6: "For I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." James i, 16, 17: "Do not err, my beloved brethren, every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

We perceive, then, that God possesses every attribute that is essential to the composition of an infinitely perfect moral character. He is perfect in wisdom, goodness, justice, mercy, truth, holiness, and immutability. We freely, then, indorse the great truth uttered by the Sent of God, who declared to the children of men: Your Father which is in heaven is perfect. We plant ourselves just here,

then: that as God has revealed himself as possessing a perfect character, we may understand, and learn, and reason in regard to the issues of his work, the accomplishment of his will. He has brought us all into being. That there is such a God as the Holy Scriptures reveal, my brother and I agree and believe, and that he is our Creator we agree; but in regard to our destiny we differ. I believe that the destiny, the final destiny of the world, will be in harmony with the perfections of the Creator, the Author of our existence.

My brother begs leave to differ, and here you will note the difference between us throughout this discussion. In the views I entertain and shall advocate, there is no room, there is no space, there is no possibility of any failure nor disappointment upon the part of God. He will tell you of the conditions, of what the Bible says about faith; of what it says about obedience; of what it says about the Christian life and Christian duties: and of all these things we find no fault. We shall, perhaps, say little, if any thing, only to concede all the benefits and blessings that the Scriptures promise and offer to the children of men as the consequences and rewards of repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. But here will be a difference again between us. While he will contend that these things present contingencies, on which are suspended, as upon a brittle thread, the immortal weal of God's own offspring, I frankly, and candidly, and fearlessly take the position that the great Creator of all beings and of all worlds has never suspended the immortal welfare of the children of men upon any contingencies whatever. That no contingencies of nationality, of place, of birth, of education, of faith that man may receive and cherish in this world, nor of aught that he shall do, can immortalize him or decide his im-

mortal interests or immortal destiny. Could I believe that God had placed us in existence here, and then suspended the most important of all things connected with man's existence, man's happiness, upon contingencies, it seems to me it would be very easy and natural for me to adopt the idea of contingencies upon every thing else, and believe that there was nothing certain, nothing settled; no ruler, no purpose, no design, no God, but that all things were under the dominion and control alone of chance. I say, I think it would be easy and natural for me thus to conclude.

Well, then, God having brought us into being has brought us into being with a design. Being infinite in wisdom, he has devised a plan, a plan that is commensurate to the end proposed. Being infinite in goodness, the end proposed is perfect good. Being almighty in power, he will successfully accomplish the end proposed in man's creation and in man's existence by his infinite wisdom, prompted by un-failing goodness; and hence the issue, the ultimate condition of our race can not, in harmony with the perfect character of God, be any other than that of one of universal holiness and happiness. For my life I am utterly unable to see how any other result is even supposable.

Now, dear friends, the fact that various theories have existed among men, that different doctrines have been agitated in different ages of the world, that mankind may generally believe differently from what your speaker believes, has no influence at all upon truth, and no power to change my settled convictions in regard to this result. The majority of mankind in every age has been in error, and we propose to decide nothing in this contest by the vote of majorities. The inquiry with us all should be, What is truth? Not what this church, or that church, or



the evangelical churches believe, or what popular sentiment is, but what has God Almighty revealed? What do the Holy Scriptures teach? And I rejoice that we stand together here this morning, and have agreed that during this discussion the Holy Scriptures shall be the umpire; that to them we shall appeal in all matters of controversy, and that their decision shall be final. What, then, do the Scriptures teach in regard to the final destiny of our race? Is it one that shall harmonize with the perfections of God? Is it one which will issue in the final accomplishment of the Savior's mission? Is it one which shall gratify the desires of the angels of God in heaven—that desire to look into the work of human redemption? Is it that which alone can gratify the longing desires and answer the ardent prayers of every Christian spirit, or is it one which shall present for our contemplation endless discord, endless antagonism in the universe of God, endless opposition to God and to his government, an issue which can not harmonize with his infinite wisdom, and goodness, and power? Is it one that shall issue in the failure of God's plans? in the failure of the accomplishment of Christ's mission? in the endless separation and endless mourning of the children of men? Shall heaven, then, in our anticipations in the future, be viewed as the home of the ransomed race, where God Almighty shall gather all his family to himself, where all hearts shall be united in love to God, and to one another? or shall we be left to contemplate heaven itself as consisting in the remnants of broken families, where some of each family and kindred of earth shall have been cast off to wail in hopeless and endless perdition? These are the questions which rise in our minds, and will not down. To the consideration and examination of these inter-

esting and important questions your careful attention is candidly invited for the coming four days. We do not ask you, in coming up to this discussion, to lay aside all prejudice and preconceived opinion. We do not expect that, and we know you will not do it. But we ask you, as far as possible, notwithstanding your prejudice and preconceived opinions, to examine carefully and diligently after truth. We hope there are no persons who have come here with cotton wool in their ears, and that there will be none here, as I have seen in some discussions, that will sit patiently in the house while the opposite sentiment is being discussed, and then go out and remain until I get through, and then go away and report what a successful discussion they have had. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. MOORE'S FIRST SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

It is not without a sense of the responsibility resting upon me that I arise now to enter on my part of the discussion already opened. I heartily sympathize with the sentiment of Bro. Carlton expressing the exceeding, and—to use a stronger word—infinite importance attaching itself, possibly, to the effects of the labors of the speakers during the four days' anticipated discussion. And with a heart, I think, always interested in the welfare of mankind, also desiring their elevation, their purity, their highest good, both in this world and in the next, with equal conscientiousness and honesty which my brother has claimed, and I award, I would beg to be heard in the defense, and the affirmative that shall be considered hereafter. With Bro. Carlton, I can say that I do not expect you to throw aside all your prejudices—

possibly you would not be able to accomplish this work all at once. But I would most earnestly entreat you, as you are able, to prevent your prejudices affecting your judgments. Let your inquiry not be, "What is my opinion, my desire?" but What is the truth? for truth, and truth only, can make the man properly free. I sympathize most heartily with another sentiment that I desire to call attention to—it is, that our appeal is to the Bible. It is not to human sympathy, or human prejudice, to any book of human origin, but to the Bible, the book conceded by my brother and myself both, to be the book of God. Hence, I would say that any appeal to the passions or sympathies can by no possibility affect the issue, or change facts or truths. Were I to grant all the horribleness which my brother has depicted and will develop in the future of our discussion more fully, when I shall stand before you after awhile to affirm; were this to be presented with all its possible vividness, and in a form so repugnant to your feelings as to make you frown upon it, your feelings do not settle the question. Men's feelings are not a criterion of truth, for they are often absurd and contrary to truth, as the experience and observation of every intelligent mind will most certainly attest. I am glad, then, that we have what we together concede to be a book of final appeal; that is, what does the Bible say upon this question? And I recur to the question again: "Do the Holy Scriptures teach that those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ will be ultimately holy and happy?"

The first thing necessary in the discussion of the proposition, is the definition of the terms of which that proposition is composed. First, let it be noted that we agree to make the Holy Scriptures, as already said, the high court of appeals. We can not appeal to any thing else as testimony except as merely circum-

stantial or corroborative. Secondly: The persons about whom Bro. Carlton affirms and I deny should be freely and clearly defined; brought out so that we will understand exactly what is the point at issue. We are not now talking about the whole human race. Nor are we counting up the numbers, and attempting to swell the millions on this side or that. It is a simple question of the ultimate condition of a certain class whose peculiar characteristics are presented in this phrase of the proposition: "Those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ." If I thought it were necessary to enter into details in further definition of this clause, I would do so; but I trust that it is sufficiently simple, sufficiently plain, sufficiently pointed for every person to understand it. We are not differing about what will become of the Christian; we are not differing about the infant; we are not talking about this class or that class outside of the class included by the phraseology just now read—"those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ." You will observe that this word "willful" imports that there are those who know what the Gospel of Jesus Christ is, with every possible opportunity to do what it requires, and yet, notwithstanding this, continue persistently to reject the overtures that it makes, and fail to submit to its requirements; and continue so to act during the whole period of their lives, and then die in this condition. This is the man about whom we are talking, and reference to any other man is surely out of the question. When we have concluded this we have a few other subjects. My brother has told you that this class of persons is to be holy and happy in the future state; and I believe I would be willing, for the sake of the argument, to concede this much—not that it is true, not that it can be established—but for the sake of bringing out

the point that they, after death, will be holy and happy. You will observe that he affirms that this is "ultimate." What does that mean? It means the last state, the final condition, or the endless condition, of that class of persons. Suppose that he succeeds in showing that they will be in happiness; the next thing to be done is to show that they will remain and abide there, and continue to be holy and happy without end. There are two things to be done, consequently, and I hope my auditory will forget neither the one nor the other.

I would submit the rule of evidence in this discussion, and I would read in this way :

First. Each passage of the Scriptures should be made to harmonize with its context and that of the other parts of Scripture. Scripture can not be used by an affirmant or negative consistently, so as to affect the Scriptures themselves. Both the parties conceding that they are of divine origin, both alike conceding that they harmonize, and the mere raising of a difficulty is not sufficient to establish a proposition, provided, even, that difficulty involve an absurdity or an apparent conflict between difficult passages of Scripture. And it is especially the work of an affirmative to show that his Scriptures not only harmonize with the proposition itself, but with the general teaching of the Scriptures.

Second. The teaching of the plain and unfigurative or literal Scriptures must not be set aside, or ignored, or changed, so as to correspond with the teaching of figurative Scriptures; but, on the contrary, the figurative must always be made to harmonize with the clear, plain, and literal.

Third. Each word, whether either human or divine, must be interpreted literally unless, First. The associated words shall suggest a different meaning and show what that meaning is, or, Second. Unless the

author gives the meaning that he attaches to the word in the particular place in which it is used. Then if the proposition that my brother has affirmed be true, that "those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ will be ultimately holy and happy," it ought to be stated in clear, plain, explicit language; for it is a matter of too much importance to be passed over carelessly by the sacred writers. There is too much in it to leave it so that it might be questioned.

Fourth. It must be found that all figurative Scriptures harmonize with the view assumed by the literal. I would make a remark now in regard to the object of the discussion. It is not to prove a theory, I trust. I am sure it is not my own object, and it is not my brother's object. After having been with him in discussion twelve days, after a considerable acquaintance with him, I heartily concede to him all the honesty I would claim for myself or concede to any man. I conclude, then, it is not the object of either of us to establish a preconceived theory, however dear that theory may be to us, but that it is to establish the truth, or rather to find out the truth, for the truth has already been established. The manner of discussion should certainly be manly, dignified, and sober, always comporting with the character of the subject under consideration. If either of us, therefore, were to make an appeal to your passions, and excite levity and produce indifference to questions involving your destiny, it would surely be treating you disrespectfully, as well as the subject, and show that we had not ourselves properly comprehended the position that we sustain to you and to the world around us.

I proceed now immediately to the argument based, as it is assumed, upon the character of God, as a sufficient guarantee for the salvation of those who

die in willful disobedience to Him. I would say that I might concede every thing that has been said, so far as I am able to perceive its bearing on the proposition, and yet I would lose nothing. That God is eternal is true; and I hope you will not forget my brother's explanation of the meaning of that word eternity—one of the essential attributes of Deity—for I shall have use for it before the discussion closes. That he is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent, I have no doubt; or that he is wise, good, just, merciful, truthful, holy, immutable, that these are essential immortal principles of the Divine Being, as far as I can know any thing of him, I would not dare to call in question. I scarcely know whether I shall proceed to the examination of the Scriptures because I simply admit the truth of these Scriptures. They contain nothing else except that God changes not, that he is wise, good, just, immutable. I admit all of it. But after this is established, how to draw the conclusion, that "those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ will be ultimately holy and happy," I am as yet unable to perceive, and, to save time, for the present at least, I do not propose to examine these Scriptures, though I might do it with the context, and even gain an advantage by so doing. I would prefer, however, to proceed differently, and get at the gist of the matter. "What has God revealed?" is the question of my brother; "What do the Scriptures teach? will it issue in the fulfillment of the Savior's mission, or will there exist an eternal antagonism? Shall heaven consist of broken families?" These and the like of these were the questions he presented. What did he mean by asking these questions? Did he mean to prove that "those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ will be ultimately holy and happy?" Strange way to prove an affirmative proposition!

Strange way, I repeat, to attempt to establish a proposition of this kind! He says, Let reason rule. Reason has an important use in subserving every investigation where it can sit as a judge and decide whether the language is adequate or not. It can examine the notes, but can not furnish them. This is conceded in the preceding. Hence, reason is not to tell whether heaven is to be made up of "broken families;" whether the issue of the mission of Jesus Christ is to be a perfection, by which my brother means the bringing ineffable glory and endless blessing to all our race. It is the simple question of the Bible, What does the Bible say? This is simply our question. I may say that he bases the matter on three facts, if I gathered them correctly, that God's infinite goodness would prompt, his infinite wisdom would plan, and his infinite power consequently would execute. Being infinitely good, desiring the good of all, he would be disposed to make a plan if he could; and being infinitely wise, his wisdom comprehending the end from the beginning, he would be able to devise a plan, and his power would enable him to execute it.

Let me build up another argument in this way: God's infinite goodness would desire every creature's happiness *just now*. It is not sufficient that an infinite Creator would desire their happiness just now, and not in the long hereafter. We are sure of just now. And if we can be happy just now, and all the time just now, we have secured the end. But the infinite goodness of God would require him to secure the happiness of the greatest number just now. His wisdom, being infinite, would enable him to plan what his goodness would prompt, and his power enable him to execute what his wisdom would plan, and therefore we ought to have the complete and perfect happiness of each of God's creatures on earth just now. What are

the facts? Just now there is a great deal of sin. Just now there is a vast deal of misery. Just now there is a great deal of wrong-doing, and this has continued for a period of six thousand years. And if an infinitely good Being, with all the desires of an infinitely good Being, can allow misery to continue to exist during a period of six thousand years, and his wisdom does not prevent it, nor his power, either, I would ask where reason would tell you that these combined attributes would accomplish any thing more than has been done in the history of the six thousand years which are past.

I expected, indeed, that he would call your attention to the fact that the good Parent would bring no children into existence unless he intended good for them; and that God saw all the sins of his creatures and their consequences before he called them into existence. He has said this substantially. And this being true, these things exist under the reign of an infinitely good, wise, holy, and just being. They exist, my brother, notwithstanding all the infinite attributes of God. I mean to say that sin exists, misery exists, now. They either exist in harmony with those attributes, or in antagonism to these attributes. There is no other way that I can see. If they exist now, and have existed for six thousand years, in harmony with his attributes, unless God changes, they may exist endlessly in harmony with his attributes. Secondly: If they are in antagonism to his attributes, they are so, either because he would not prevent, or because he could not prevent them. If he would not prevent this antagonism to his attributes, when will he? If he will, why will he? If that will change, has not God himself changed essentially? If it is because he could not, since he is infinite in power now, and infinite power can not be increased, then when will he be able? Don't forget

that these do exist, they have existed for six thousand years.

Now I have presented to you the parallel of his argument. I will, however, change it in this wise: The holiness and justice of God demands the condemnation of all who sin, because his holiness can not look on sin with any allowance. Secondly: The wisdom of God is sufficient to make a plan to punish it. Thirdly: His power is sufficient to carry out a plan that his holiness prompts and his wisdom arranged. Fourth: All have sinned and come short of the glory of God, and therefore all have been opposed to the holiness and wisdom of God, and are included in the general condemnation demanded by these attributes; and since the holiness and justice demanded the execution, and the wisdom was able to arrange the plan, and the power able to execute, the universal damnation of the sons of men follows incontrovertibly, since all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. I place this simply as a parallel argument. Let him dispose of it, and if any man can dispose of it, Bro. Carlton can; but I am perfectly satisfied no man can, in consistency with his position; or, to make this a little shorter, God's holiness requires the ultimate holiness and happiness of the race; his wisdom devises the means, his power executes the plan, and, therefore, all will be ultimately holy and happy. Or, the parallel: God's holiness and justice require the damnation of all that are disobedient, and the race was disobedient. His wisdom is able to furnish a plan in harmony with his holiness and justice. His power is able to execute the plan, and, therefore, the race will be ultimately condemned. [*Time expired.*]

## [MR. CARLTON'S SECOND SPEECH.]

*Brother Moderators, and Respected Auditors :*

Before proceeding directly with the affirmative arguments, I propose to notice the reply of Bro. Moore. The first thing I will notice, or that seems to claim notice, is, he says that any appeal to the sympathies of man will decide nothing in this controversy, and hence is very absurd, that is, it amounts to nothing, he says, only correlatively, that is, as it may be shown to harmonize with evidence. This is just what I used it for, and shall use it for again and again. The next thing, he says, in entering upon the discussion, the first matter to be considered is the definition of the terms involved in the proposition. I answer, that in engaging in a controversy, it is necessary that the terms of the proposition should be defined, if they are not plain and easily understood. Can any of you perceive any term in this proposition that is not understood by the school children that may attend the discussion? There is nothing in this proposition that I think needs any definition, or calls us to go to the dictionary. Hence we do not stop to define the terms about which there is no controversy, and will be none in the discussion. But he says that the proposition is clear, and so it is; that it is plain—so it is; and, he asks, Will those who die in willful disobedience be ultimately holy and happy? Hence, he says, that talk about the destiny of the human race, of all mankind, has nothing to do with the question. Well, I presume we would get along very well if he could establish that in your minds or mine; but you all understand, and so does my brother, that the whole includes all its parts; and he clearly gives you to understand, before he gets through with his discourse, that he would rather labor to prevent me from proving the

salvation of all men, than attempt to make you believe that I have nothing to do but with the salvation of only a class. If I prove that all mankind will be ultimately holy and happy, which I intend to do, and which, by the grace of God, I shall do, he may look after any of these classes that he pleases, and as long as he has a mind to. He says there is no controversy between us in regard to what will become of the Christian, or what will become of the infant. No; and there is really no controversy between us what will become of any class; but the question of questions, the conflict of the ages, is, What shall become of the race last of all? what shall be the ultimate condition of the human race? It does not rest upon what shall be the destiny of any particular part, but of all; and if he proves that any part will not be ultimately holy and happy, he shall have successfully labored against the affirmative of this question.

There is one thing, however, that might surprise all of us a little, and I presume it did. It looks a little like theories that used to be popular about war up there, and about the angels in heaven being driven out; and, as though the brother was apprehensive if he got to heaven there was no certainty of his staying there; and he calls me to prove that he will stay. He says if he will admit that they will all get there, then my argument is not done, and I have to prove they will stay there. I don't admit that any body was ever routed from there that got there, nor that they ever will be. I believe that when we get to heaven it is a sure thing. If you believe that any of the happy spirits up there were ever banished from that happy world, I don't wonder that you are anxious to learn some ground of security, that you may have some hope that you will remain there, or any body else will after he gets there. "Let Bro. Carlton show that they will all get there, he must then show that

they will stay there." Does the brother claim that the inhabitants of heaven are not secure, and that those who will be ultimately holy and happy will be in any danger of losing their place after they get there? We hope to have a further revelation upon that subject after this. Then, we desire to know what the Bible teaches about their losing their places after they get there.

But then, he says, to establish the doctrine from the Scriptures, it ought to be stated in the Scriptures in such clear, and unmistakable, and unambiguous language as not to be questioned. I will ask him, then, what he will prove from the Bible? Can you name any thing that any body ever tried to prove from the Bible that has not been questioned by somebody else? If you can, please to name it and tell what it is.

Then he approaches the position laid down by me—that God Almighty possesses eleven attributes or perfections of character and nature, four natural or essential attributes, the strict eternity or self-existence of his being; and then he thinks he has got a favorite morsel, for he realizes that he is going to need some help after awhile, and he wants to accumulate and prepare for it, and he wants to show the use I made of eternal. I did not use the word "eternal;" I spoke of the strict eternity of Jehovah; so he may take all the advantage he can get out of that.

After having presented the Scripture testimony on the subject of the perfection, he says he would not dare to question the fact that Almighty God possesses all these attributes. I thank him for that. It is one of the most important things to clearness and progress in the controversy that each disputant understands the position and admission of each speaker, the position of his opponent, and what he admits. He admits frankly and freely that God Almighty possesses these perfections. I want you to remember that, for we will have use for it.

Then, he says, he rejoices that we agree that the Bible shall be the court of appeal; that we shall come to the Bible for final decision; and he says the question is not what reason or human sympathy teaches in regard to heaven's being composed of broken families, but what does the Bible teach in regard to the destiny of mankind. I thank him for that; that is the issue.

Now, let us examine his attempt to invalidate the argument based upon these perfections of moral character. He feels the force of the argument that God's infinite goodness would prompt him to devise a plan that would issue in final good; that his infinite wisdom would be sufficient to form a plan commensurate to the end; and that his almighty power would be able to control all agencies for the successful accomplishment of that end. Well, now, how will he work against that result? Well, God is infinitely good now, and sin and misery exist now, and why may that not always be the case? But, my friends, there is a very great difference between temporal, limited evil, and endless evil. All can perceive that. I said, that here I was willing to admit and insist upon all that the Scriptures teach in regard to the benefits and blessings of faith, obedience, and Christian life. I deny that God Almighty has suspended the immortal destiny of the human race upon any contingency whatever. An earthly parent may place some responsibility upon his child, but there must be a limit to that responsibility. Suppose, for instance, that we illustrate this by an incident. It is said, that once, in the western country—and this was all west awhile ago—there was a family that lived in a house without a floor, save the earth; and in the great cabin that they had built up, they had their well in one corner of the room. It had remained uncovered, and the little children were playing around.

A neighbor went in, and said to the mother, "I should be afraid to have the children running around; they might fall in, and get drowned." "Law me," she replied; "we have a dozen children; we have lived here so many years, and there have never been but two drowned yet." [Laughter.] Now, had the parents the right to expose their children to such a danger? You answer, no. They might have placed certain responsibilities before the child; but as good parents they could not have placed so great a responsibility and risk; and the civil law of our land will hold these parents responsible for the death of those children; and you know it. The mother might say: If you do thus and so, while I am absent, I will deny you such and such things, and I will inflict such and such punishments upon you. It would not be right for the mother to take some pills of arsenic, roll them with sugar-coating, and lay them on the table, and say to the children: "Do n't touch those pills while I am gone; if you do, you will suffer for it." She goes to the neighbors, and when she returns she finds them all dead. The law says that mother has murdered her children. She has exposed them to a great danger. She has placed a needless responsibility on them. While she has a perfect right to train them with reasonable exposures and dangers, she has no right to offer these unreasonable dangers. The parent may be perfectly good, and place reasonable and limited responsibility upon the child; but in placing this great danger before it, or destroying its life by the pills of arsenic, she is fiendish, she is cruel, she is devilish; and the law decides that no such mother is fit to have the care of children, and will do one of two things, either incarcerate her in the penitentiary, or give her a home in the lunatic asylum. Where will you put your God? According to my brother's theology, God has acted in a worse

manner than this mother; for he has exposed them to an infinite danger, and to inextricable evil, one from which the omnipotent God himself can not extricate them. I do n't believe any such thing as that. I do n't pretend to. Well, then, the limited evil, the limited disobedience and chastisements and punishments exist in the family government; they do in the divine government. God is good in the administration of such a government of his own, because the evil which is then possible for them to involve themselves in is not an inextricable evil, is not final; it is temporary and limited; and the whole thing in itself is susceptible of being controlled for final good in harmony with that character; and as it is in harmony with that character, the permission of the temporary evil was not incompatible with that goodness which results in the final good of all concerned. That is what I mean. I know the argument of limited evil and limited suffering is brought up against the benevolence of God and the divine goodness; but when we understand this thing, the apparent inconsistency vanishes. Here, for instance, is a man that goes into a room. He beholds a man bound down on a table. Men are there amputating a limb, sawing the bone, cutting the flesh, and tying up the arteries. The man tries to seize something to kill those monsters of cruelty. The surgeon says: "Hold on a moment! This man has a terrible cancer on his limb. The only way to save his life is to amputate it." These cruel monsters become angels of mercy, and he is ready to furnish any assistance to them. We can see how these can be made to harmonize with goodness. And if temporal evil can be made to harmonize, why not endless evil? If it can be shown that it would be just as good and just as consistent with the goodness of the surgeon to be cutting away at the man's limb as long as he lived,



then there would be no difference. But that would be different, because in the one case they have a good object, and in the other they can not have a good object. That is the difference. In temporal suffering and pain, there may be a good object; in endless misery there can be no good, because there is no afterwards to it. That is the point! God's holiness and happiness demand the final holiness and happiness of all mankind. To balance that, he has taken a position that we want to examine: that is, that God's holiness and justice demand that the wicked shall be punished. Is that the highest demand of holiness?—the primary, the great demand of justice? No! Will the holiness and justice of God be satisfied with the suffering of the wicked? Let him take that ground, if he dare! What is the primary demand of God's holiness and justice? Why, the ultimate purity and obedience of all the governed. Yes! Well, when will the demands of goodness be satisfied? When they become good. Why does justice require punishment? It can not, only as looking to the bringing of all to obedience, goodness, and happiness.

So much for the argument, which you can all perceive is no argument at all. The justice of God requires that the wicked should be damned. All have sinned, and all will be damned. That is so. Nothing is more clearly taught in the Bible. The Bible does teach the universal damnation of sinners. There can be no controversy on that. The question then is: Does it teach the holiness and happiness ultimate beyond that damnation?

My second argument upon the affirmative of this proposition is: God has revealed his purpose to bring all mankind to holiness and happiness. Genesis i, 27: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female

created he them." Isaiah xlv, 22-25: "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear. Surely shall one say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength. Even to him shall men come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory." Hebrews ii, 6, 7: "But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels: thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands."

A little lower than the angels, *brutus*, a little while lower than the angels. The apostle says God made man a little while lower than the angels; what did he make him for the rest of the time? Ephesians i, 8, 9, 10: "Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself: That in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him." Romans viii, 20, 21: "For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

How clear and plain! You can all perceive this fact in the revelation of God's possibility concerning man. He made man for a little time lower than the

angels. He tells for what destiny he designed him beyond that little time, "the creature also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption—from this condition in which they are placed, a little lower than the angels of God—into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Is that "glorious liberty" a happy destiny? Are not those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, persons that are just as much made in subjection to vanity as the good and virtuous? Are we not all in subjection in the same state of "vanity," and in the same "bondage of corruption?" What does the testimony say? The same beings and the same number of beings, there is no exception, all that were made subject to vanity, shall be delivered from that state into the glorious liberty of the children of God. Ephesians i, 11-14 inclusive: "In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will; that we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ. In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory."

I want you to notice particularly the language employed here, that the Christian here enjoys "the earnest of the inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." Now, what is "the purchased possession?" Hebrews ii, 8, 9: "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him: but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering

of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man."

How many did he give himself a ransom for? "Ye are not your own," said the apostle, "ye are purchased with a price." Who constitute the purchased possession? He gave himself a ransom for all men, says the Apostle Paul, in 1 Timothy ii, 6. Then all mankind constitute the purchased possession, and the Christian here enjoys the earnest of the inheritance previous to entering upon that inheritance into which the purchased possession is to be brought. [Time expired.]

[MR. MOORE'S SECOND SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

I hope that every person will feel sufficient interest in the subject, and the importance of the exercise of justice to hear both sides of the question fully.

Bro. Carlton was mistaken about my saying that an appeal to sympathy was corroborative evidence. I said that nothing but the testimony of the Bible could be relied upon, except as it might be corroborative. My mind had not before it, at the time, the sympathy of which he speaks. If he can show that the Bible teaches that human sympathy is corroborative evidence, I shall have no objection to receiving it. We want first what the Bible says, and then, if there be any corroborative witnesses, let them be placed on the stand afterwards. This seems to be logical. Much of what has been said I need not farther call attention to.

I ask you immediately away to the assumption that the ultimate destiny of mankind depends on no contingency. This is really the "tug of war." This is precisely the point of issue. If my brother shall show

that it is true, I yield the whole question. And that Bro. Carlton is not alone upon this subject among his brethren, I shall read a few passages from some Universalist works. "Pro and Con," by George Rogers, pages 63, 64: "There are in the Scriptures, unquestionably, some conditional promises; these all, however, respect our situation in time, and in no case extend their reference to eternity. Salvation, through faith, takes place during the present existence of the believer, and damnation through unbelief takes place during the present existence of the unbeliever. The promises which respect man's condition beyond death are absolute. As already said, they rest on no contingent." I read from I. D. Williamson's "Exposition of Universalism," pages 160, 161: "There has been a great question in the world whether gospel salvation is conditional or unconditional, limited or universal, and it will appear, in the course of this discussion, that all this controversy originates in a want of attention to the meaning of this word, and that in a sense both parties have been right and both wrong. There are two kinds of salvation mentioned in the text, and it will appear, on examination, that one is limited and conditional, and the other universal and unconditional; so that what may be affirmed of the one can not be affirmed of the other. To illustrate these two kinds of salvation is the work now before us. I notice, first: The special salvation of the believer. God is the Savior of all men, especially of those that believe. 1. The believer is saved from sin, 'the direst foe of man.' This salvation is wrought on the believer by faith." I will stop to make inquiry of Bro. Carlton, since he has assumed, substantially, the same thing that I am reading: If that salvation is wrought on the believer by faith, whether the individual that never has faith enjoys this salvation, and whether this salvation is of any consequence?

"2. The believer is saved from ignorance of God and his character. 3. The believer is saved from the bondage of the fear of death. I come to speak of that salvation which is for all men. This salvation is unconditional, and is uniformly so represented in the Scriptures. Human agency can not affect it, nor does it, nor can it depend upon any thing that man can do or believe, or upon the strength of man in any sense of the word."

Again, Mr. Carlton, in the debate that he and I held in Pricetown, Ohio, made this statement: "Did God ever teach you to be anxious about your future destiny? All anxiety about our future destiny is folly."

It should be remembered here that we are to take nothing for granted, especially where there is a difference, and that there is a difference between us no one can doubt. The major proposition demands proof, according to the law of syllogism, which says: "No conclusion can be legitimately drawn in any argument except from two propositions: either admitted by the opponent or proved by the affirmant."

I will read a few passages of the sacred Scriptures upon this question of unconditional happiness.

Bro. Carlton should show us a few of those passages establishing unconditionality, which he has assumed and roundly asserted, and I doubt not, thinks he has proved; but assertion is not proof, and an intelligent audience asks for the Scripture. I ask his attention to a portion of the Bible teaching on this question of conditional happiness. John iii, 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." John iii, 14-17: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only

thereby in the day that he turneth from his wickedness; neither shall the righteous be able to live for his righteousness in the day that he sinneth. When I shall say to the righteous, that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it. Again, when I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right; if the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he had robbed, walk in the statutes of life, without committing iniquity; he shall surely live, he shall not die. None of his sins that he hath committed shall be mentioned unto him; he hath done that which is lawful and right; he shall surely live." This expresses clearly and palpably the divine arrangement, and settles beyond question the manner of God's dealings with the good man and the bad man. He means if the bad man continues bad his curses will rest upon him, and if he ceases to be bad, his curses shall be removed, and *vice versa*, with the good man. I read further: "When I shall say to the righteous that he shall surely live,"—not merely "shall live," which is the abstract expression of unconditionality,—but to make it stronger, if possible, we have the word "surely" thrown in; "When I shall say to the righteous thou shalt surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it. Again, when I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die," etc. What is the import of it? Simply that when God utters a statement, though there is no expressed condition, there is an implied one; and when he says to that good man, "You shall live," he means that that good man shall understand him to say: "If you continue to be what you are, you shall be blest."

On the contrary, let us see what the next verses say: "When I say unto the wicked thou shalt surely die," etc.

After using this strongest language that can be summoned, "*He shall surely die*," he says: "If he shall turn from his sin he shall surely live, he shall not die." This shows, most conclusively, what the Lord means when he makes a promise, or expresses a threat, without naming the conditions of such promise or threat. He tells us, if he does say to the righteous that he shall surely live, or to the wicked that he shall surely die, he means that these things shall be so, conditionally. If the righteous continue to be righteous, he shall live; if the wicked continue to be wicked, he shall surely die. Here a rule is given; it is plain and may be expressed thus: If no condition be expressed, one or more must be implied.

I now ask your attention in connection with these same passages, very clearly settling this question, as it seems to me, from another view. I shall not take up your time in presenting all I might, but only a portion, and just as they occur to my mind. 2 Peter i, 10, 11: "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." "These things" of the 10th verse you will gather by the context, meaning the seven qualities of character necessary to qualify the man for the associations of a better life. Now, says he, "if ye do these"—hypothetically—whom does he address? Not a sinner, but a member of the kingdom, a person who, he says, "had obtained like precious faith with us," enjoying the present salvation. To these men it is now said, "If ye do these things you

shall never fall;" that is to say, you shall not fall, conditionally. Beside this, that is, in this way, or after this manner, in the use of these instruments or agencies, or upon these conditions, you shall have an abundant entrance into—not a kingdom that they were now in, but the everlasting kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. I hope he will give attention to this, and show us that it does not relate to the ultimate state.

I have shown you that the conditions are undoubted. I read from 1 Peter i, 3: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." I hope you will remark now that they are begotten again to a lively hope—to an inheritance. Where is it? What is its character? It is "incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." An inheritance possessing these qualities must, from the necessity of the case, be somewhere else than in this earth. It must be beyond the contaminating influences of this world. It is the inheritance, from the necessity of the case, ultimate, endless, that shall never fade away. Now, who are kept to the inheritance, undefiled and that fadeth not away, "reserved in heaven?" Answer, verse 4, "Ye who are kept by the power of God." How? unconditionally? No; "*through faith* unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." There is no avoiding this. They "are kept by the power of God." But how? By faith. In the absence, therefore, of the faith of the individual, they are not kept by the power of God to the salvation, and hence, are not begotten again to a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ to this inheritance that I have spoken of.

Hoping that I have now submitted enough to call

out my brother a little further in this direction, I return to consider his argument, based upon the decree or purpose of God. In Genesis i, 27, he has read: "So God created man in his own image," etc. I shall just consider these passages now in the light of the proposition he is to prove, that those who die in willful disobedience shall be holy and happy. Here we are told that God created man in his own image. That is conceded. But, after the concession, what bearing this passage has on the ultimate destiny is left yet to be developed by my brother. I think I could tell you what use he could make of it, but I shall not do so now. There is not a single word of his proposition in it, or squinting in the direction of it. Simply the statement of what God did when he created man. Only that and nothing more. Isaiah xlv, 23: "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." I have already read you the rule when this "shall" has no express condition; there is always an implied one, as in the case referred to in Ezekiel, where, when it was stated the righteous shall not surely die, the meaning was, if they should continue righteous. So it will always be with the spiritual or literal Israel. Again, in regard to the verse just read, "Every knee shall bow, every tongue confess," I ask your attention to Paul's use of that quotation, Romans xiv, 9: "For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." He refers, doubtlessly, to the literal death, for he is speaking of himself. But why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. For it is written, "As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God." So, then,

may be nurtured, and the education he may receive, and the apostle speaks particularly of such a salvation as this in the tenth verse of the fourth chapter of first Timothy: "For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of those that believe." He is the special Savior of those that believe, and at the same time he is just as certainly the Savior of all men. And it is certainly true that God Almighty is not, and can not, be the Savior of any more than he saves.

Bro. Moore also expresses some surprise at a remark which he says I made in the Pricetown discussion in regard to man's future welfare, meaning his immortal destiny. To me this is not surprising at all. I take much pains and care in searching the word of God, in reading the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and what may appear surprising to many of this congregation, is that I find nothing in either the Old or New Testament intimating that any person feared that when he should die he should fail of a happy immortality. That no one expressed any anxiety, when any friend departed, that he had failed of reaching heaven, or would fail of going there. That there is no instance recorded in the Bible that any person ever prayed that himself or any body else might ever be saved from endless suffering in the world to come, and go to a place of endless happiness. If such dread and anxiety preyed on the minds of the ancient servants of God that have preyed on the minds of many Christians, for the last eighteen hundred years, we shall, before the close of this discussion, I trust, perceive the reason why these things are so.

Then a position is assumed, and it is all assumption, that the eternal life, taught by Jesus Christ, which was within the reach of man to be received and enjoyed by him in consequence of faith and obe-

dience, was the endless felicity of heaven. That is all assumption, and having assumed that, then my brother presented an array of passages in which the phrase eternal life or everlasting life occurs, and undertakes to show that that conflicts with the position I have taken. Let him prove what he assumes. He assumes the very point that he must sustain, or gain nothing at all by his position. "He that believes on the Son hath everlasting life." When does he have it? When he believes. Is that the endless happiness of heaven? Will the brother say yea or nay? If he says yea, to-morrow the individual makes shipwreck of faith and conscience, and loses his endless life. "He that believeth not the Son hath not life." And then he assumes that the individual who, within a certain time does not believe on the Son, shall not at any future time enter into that life. That is a mere assumption without a particle of evidence to sustain it. Let us look at this idea for a moment. He asks, What does the phrase eternal life or everlasting mean, if it does not mean endless felicity in heaven? I think we can easily understand what it means by looking at the connection in which it is employed. Jesus says, in John v, 24: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." From what death has he passed? Why, he was dead in trespasses and sins, and through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ he was raised up out of it, and came into spiritual life and peace by faith in the Son of God? Yes. That is the spiritual life which a believer enjoys when he believes? Yes. What does that prove in regard to the endless felicity of heaven? I leave this congregation to judge.

Again, to show that this phrase simply signifies spiritual life, I present another quotation. The apostle

lose sight of the idea that God punishes man as soon as he becomes guilty. Then he begins to suffer; and if, after he sins, he turns, before the future judgment, he shall not receive any punishment. That is a confession of the point. This passage of Ezekiel, instead of referring to the immortal death of mankind, speaks of his sins with reference to the temporal death, as the penalty for those transgressions. You will find this pointed out with regard to the case of the watchman who failed to give the alarm at the approach of danger. Also Ezekiel xviii, 26: "When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die." He dieth only for the iniquity that he has done. Here the doctrine is taught that was taught in the Garden of Eden: "On the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The individual who commits iniquity dies when he commits it. The death of the body, or infliction of the special judgment by which the individual was to suffer, or destruction of his literal life, is the punishment. There the brother will find the figurative death and the literal death treated in the same verse, one of which he will suffer certain, the other of which may be avoided by timely reformation.

Next, our attention is called to 2 Peter i, 10, 11: "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."

He infers, again, that the phrase everlasting kingdom denotes heaven, which I by no means grant. Well, what is the proof he furnishes that it does mean heaven? He says these persons had already entered the Christian Church and were disciples of

Jesus. If he goes back to the eighteenth chapter of Matthew, he will find the Savior addresses persons who were in the church. He said: "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall in no case enter the kingdom of heaven." And when he addressed Peter, who was one of the most ardent and devoted followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, he said, Luke xxii, 31, 32: "Satan has desired that he may have you; that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." He told him he was not converted. A great many persons in the church are not converted yet. The apostle was exhorting them to Christian perseverance, and he said, "If ye add these graces to your profession, ye shall never fall, and so an entrance shall be administered unto you in the everlasting kingdom." You are in the visible church, and you shall be admitted into the spiritual reign of our Lord Jesus Christ, and enjoy these rich spiritual blessings which the Apostle Paul anticipated when he said he was laboring if by any means he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead, not as though he had already attained, or was already perfect. What has that to do with the immortal destiny of mankind?

Well, then, he quotes 1 Peter i, 3: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." He says he begot them unto a lively hope—they were begotten unto the hope of an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away. He does not say that by faith they were entitled to that inheritance. "Unto you who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." Were they now by their faith begotten into that end.

less salvation? That is just the point that remains to be proved. Through their faith or through the fidelity of God? It was through the faithfulness of God that they were reserved unto that salvation. But, my friends, there are several things to be looked at in the construction of these points: whether this depends on accidental circumstances, or whether God is working it out according to the power of his own will.

Next, Genesis i, 27. What has this to do with it? Isaiah xlv, 22, 23: "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear." What does the brother do with this? I was surprised, after he had gone over this with me so many times, to hear him emphasize this little word *one*, surely shall *one* say: that God has said the salvation of *one*, at least, is certain! I would ask the brother whether that does not depend on contingency? The brother knows that word *one* is a supplied word. It is not in the original; there is an ellipsis in the sentence, and it requires that we fill it and gather from its sense what would fill it. I have sworn, etc., that unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear, surely shall say. How many shall say? Why, you understand, *every one* shall say, should supply the ellipsis. I am not particular whether you fill it or leave it without being filled; in either case you get the idea, that every one shall say. But then he has found that the apostle explains this in Romans xiv, 9-11: "We shall stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." Where is the judgment-seat of Christ? Jesus Christ says: "For judgment I am come into this world." Is he come from his judgment-seat? Is he come here for judgment, when his

judgment-seat is in another world? If the brother attempts to evade the force of that, let him explain the difficulty.

We have another that is extremely rich, Hebrews ii, 2. I begin at the first verse: "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" What was the word spoken by angels that was steadfast? Stephen says, Acts vii: "That the Jews received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it." Then the laws given to the children of Israel, amid the thunders and lightnings of Sinai, was the word spoken by angels; and the apostle affirms that, under the reign of that law, every transgression received a just recompense of reward. I hope the brother will not make endless punishment out of this text.

How shall we escape? Escape what? A just recompense of reward; a limited one like that of the Israelites, which is already gone by. God made man for a little time lower than the angels. Then what? To get away from this he says that God did create man a little lower than the angels. He gave him dominion over the cattle, etc.; and it remained so only while he was in Eden. The apostle did not say, we see yet all things put under him. They have been, but did not remain so. We see Jesus made a little lower than the angels. And what do we learn by that? We learn that Jesus shall accomplish this work; for he tasted death for every man, and shall bring all things into subjection to him. [*Time expired.*]



## MR. MOORE'S THIRD SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

I shall first call your attention to a fact in the closing part of the speech to which you have listened, before I refer to what preceded it. And, probably, it would be just as well to commence where my brother left off.

Turn, if you please, and mark specially the second chapter of Hebrews, which I now read: "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip; for if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" The point of contrast my brother misses entirely. It is the difference between the salvation that they enjoyed and the salvation that the individual is now offered. This one is called the great in contrast with that. That was temporary. It is known to every person that the Jewish people were specially a typical people. Their temporal rest was a typical rest, their temporary salvation a typical salvation. All of these were types of the great antitype, of the spiritual reign of Jesus Christ; and, hence, the "great salvation" is the salvation to be secured through Jesus Christ ultimately. These persons all enjoyed the salvation here. Paul, hence, exhorts them, in the sixth chapter, 3d verse, to go on to perfection; because, he says, if they do not they will lay the foundation for another reformation, or reach the point where it is impossible to renew them to repentance. Now, says he, if there was no escape when the law was properly executed, as it was, against rebellious Jews, how shall we escape if we neglect to accept the salvation offered to the world through Jesus Christ,

since God attested it according to his own will? I would remark here, that the contrast must be very striking. The one is temporal and typical, the other spiritual and anti-typical. The one has reference to time and the life-time of the man, the other has reference, not to time, but to the spiritual; not to the physical condition of the individual, but to his spiritual and eternal condition. One had reference to his relation to Moses and the land of Canaan, the other to Jesus Christ and the spiritual Canaan. You will notice another fact, that in the sixth verse his theory has compelled him to leave out an important little word, the most important in the verse. In the 7th verse: "Thou madest him a little lower than the angels, and crownedst him with glory and honor." 8th verse: "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet." That is not precisely the reading of this passage; the most important little word in that passage is left out. He says but "now." At this time, we do not see man as he was first made. My brother will not forget that he told us he was made in the image of God. Does he mean to prove by this passage that when God made him he made him bad? How will he avoid the conclusion, that God when he made him was wrong somehow?

I turn now to Isaiah xlv: "Surely shall *one* say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength." I am aware that this word *one* is a supplied word. It is written in italics. Allow me to read the marginal note which was written by the Seventy: "I have sworn by myself, that unto me every knee shall bow and every tongue shall swear; surely shall he say." "Surely shall say" is my brother's reading; "surely shall *he* say in the Lord is strength" is the marginal reading. That a singular noun or pronoun is to be supplied in this place must be manifest from the sequel: "Even to him shall men come; and all that

are incensed against him shall be ashamed." "To him." To whom? Here is the same word to be supplied: "All that are incensed against him," Jesus shall be ashamed of. The Apostle Paul, in quoting from this same prophet, in Romans xiv, tells us that he that believeth on me shall not be ashamed—"shall not be confounded." Peter says, and the prophet says, "Shall not make haste." It is the rock that God has laid in Zion, a corner-stone, wherein if the man believe he shall not be ashamed. But if he does not submit to the authority of Jesus Christ, he shall be ashamed. This is the positive form of statement, and there is the same absoluteness required for it that there is for what he has attempted to avoid in his criticism on Ezekiel xxxiii, 26. It would be well for you to read the eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel: "Yet the children of the people say, The way of the Lord is not equal. Now, is not my way equal? are not their ways unequal? When the righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth; for his iniquity shall he die." The Lord is now accounting for the death of the righteous man, that was a righteous man, and turns to be a wicked man. He says he turns to something that he was not before, and in refutation of those that said the "Lord's ways were not equal." I have not time to delay with this further now.

I return, and observe his reference to Romans xiv, 8, that we shall all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ. My brother made a mistake, and failed to get the gist of the quotation. I showed that the apostle, in connection with the judgment-seat of Christ, quoted Isaiah xiv, 23, and applied it to the judgment, and said that at that time "every knee should bow and every tongue should swear." Now, my brother says the judgment is here. I shall ask him: Does every knee bow here? Is that true? If

not, then one of two things is true: Either the Bible is false, or it must have reference to some other time beyond this world.

In his reference to 1 Peter i, he attempts to avoid the argument, making the word faith, as it occurs here, mean fidelity; and place it to God, instead of men. I am disposed to let the apostle speak for himself, and let the audience decide, from the natural use of the words, whether any such signification can be made to appear: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." It is a "living hope" only that does not die. Upon what does that hope terminate? What is the thing that the hope involves? Hope always looks out to something in the future. Paul says what a man sees he does not hope for. He hopes for what he does not see. There is something he does not now see, and that is the "inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." Where is it? "Reserved in heaven." For whom? "You who are kept by the power of God, through faith, unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time," "wherein,"—that is, in this salvation—"ye greatly rejoice, though now, for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations; that the trial of your faith, being much more precious than gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ. Whom having not seen, ye love, in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory," looking to the inheritance which is incorruptible through that faith. I leave the audience to decide whether the faith has reference to the man, or whether it means fidelity, and applies to God; whether it is

on this side of death, or on that side. Let this suffice here.

My brother read 2 Peter i, 10: "Give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall." He tells us that they were not in the spiritual kingdom now. I ask his attention to the first verse: "Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Savior Jesus Christ: grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord, according as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust."

I want to know whether they are not already made alive in the spiritual reign of Jesus Christ? "Having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust," and having been possessed, through the knowledge of Jesus Christ, of all things that appertain to godliness, are they not now in the spiritual kingdom? If not, to say that they shall never fall, would be simply folly. It is something they are not in, and which they are to enter by a compliance with the conditions involved.

I believe I have attended to every thing in the speech to which you have just listened.

As there are some persons here who did not hear the point in discussion, I will state that my brother is here to show you that the Scriptures teach that those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ will be ultimately holy and happy. To teach is one thing, to prove is quite another. I may cull

out, and sew together, and by patch-work prove almost any thing, but in order to find the teaching of the Bible, I must take the passage with the context, and harmonize it with the general scope of the teachings of the holy oracles. The proposition involves the salvation—not of the race, because I admit the salvation of the Christian and the infant, and they are not in the controversy—but of those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel. I am astonished that he will agree on one proposition and discuss another. He insists that the issue is whether the race shall be saved. We agree that some men will be saved. Those who maintain their integrity till death will be saved. They are not in the issue. Infants are cast out of the issue. But he wishes to prove that one single individual class included in the minor proposition, those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be ultimately holy and happy. This class, and this class alone, is he affirming, will be "ultimately holy and happy." I refer to this because there is an attempt to avoid the plain, square issue, because it is hard to approach. A man dislikes to come out and say that the man dying intoxicated, or the murderer, will be transported from the scenes on earth to the blissful mansions of rest. Take the case of a man in a neighboring town who had just imbrued his hands in the blood of his fellow man, and fell down beastly intoxicated and went into eternity. This man he affirms is in heaven. This is the man dying in willful disobedience to the Gospel that is to go into heaven. He does not like for me to tell you that, because he does not want this people to know that he claims that. But if it be true that he has gone to heaven, and as soon as he leaves the earth body enters into the spiritual rest, why did not Jesus, instead of saying, "Go preach the Gospel to every creature," say, "Tell the people that whoever dies must be happy eternally, and tell them

to see that they use well their sword, and keep it constantly red with the blood of men, for whoever kills most will save most?"

He inquired of me to-day, if when they reached heaven they would remain there. He did this on account of my calling your attention to the double character of his proposition. He proposes to prove that it is "ultimate, final." I say that God made man in his own image, and he will tell you after awhile what that image was, and I presume will not vary far from the truth. He made him in his own image. Surely, he did not make him a sinner. My brother is involved in another difficulty if he affirms this. You will remember that he spoke of a man bound on a table with a cancer on his foot, which the surgeons were amputating, and a man who came along proposing to kill them. And that is what God does. God answers to the surgeon, and you answer to the man with the cancer on the foot; you are on the table, and the surgeons are amputating it. My brother will have to assume that the doctors put that cancer on that man's foot; that they gave him the cancer in order that they might have the privilege of cutting off his leg. I want to know if the doctors are guilty of this? If so, ought they not be put in prison? The doctors are sometimes charged with giving medicine, that they may have a long case, but this would be an unheard-of proceeding; but that is what the illustration amounts to.

Then the well in the corner of the house. The well is the danger; that is sin and misery to which society is subjected in the world. The mother is God. The children are God's creatures. Now, I want to know who put the well there in the corner? who made it? We must get a little further back. He says the mother has a well in the corner of the house, and a neighbor inquires whether she is not afraid

the children will be drowned. She replies that only two have been drowned. I want to know whether God made the well, or whether it came by chance, and how it came there? He assumes the agency of man in the premises. When God made man, he made a man and not a machine; he made him with intelligence and moral powers. If he had not made him thus, he would not have been a man; and I will say with all due deference and veneration for the eternal God and his omnipotence, that he could make nothing else than what he did make, except he had made something else than a man; and to make him with intellectual powers able to reason, with moral powers susceptible of impression, with the capability of being addressed, of judging, deciding, of being influenced by motives, and of being held responsible for his action on account of these moral powers. On this very account God says that the righteous man that continues righteous shall be saved, but that if he turn away he shall not live, but die for his iniquity. He says of the wicked man, who turns away from his iniquity, that he will save him, because he exercises the moral powers he possesses and accepts the offers of divine mercy, and thus saves himself. Suppose there is every possible opportunity within the reach of the individual that will enable him to be saved. Suppose there is a prevailing epidemic here that has never failed to kill every case that it has attacked, and, I may say, that every body has it. A physician of superior skill has secured from *materia medica* a specific which has never failed to cure when used according to directions. He has procured the remedy and furnishes it at his own expense, and has produced testimonials demonstrating its infallible curative powers. He exhorts them to accept it, and to accept it as a free gift, and to apply it according to specific written directions, that they can not mistake, written so

man's agency is limited

legibly that the most ignorant may understand. The physician has accomplished now all he can do, unless he destroys the agency of the man and makes him a machine, funnels him, and pours down the medicine. He must destroy his manhood or agency, and make the man a machine to save him, unless he leaves it to his agency to use the medicine. This is precisely what God has done through Christ. He has brought the remedy, and shows them how to use it. He commands, exhorts, entreats them to accept and use it. If they will not, the responsibility is theirs, not his.

Upon this question of man's agency, I desire to read a little from a Universalist. I like sometimes to see brethren disputing among themselves, if they do so kindly. I trust Bro. Carlton will take it kindly. It is from an article written for the Star in the West, of January 15, by George H. Patrick: "All the attributes by God he has conferred on man, no difference in kind, only in degree; the one limited, the other unlimited. Free agency is one of the attributes possessed by God. That he conferred it on man in a limited degree we must infer from the fact that he has threatened us with punishment, and does inflict it upon us for doing certain things he has forbidden. He has conferred upon us certain physical powers, locomotion, light, etc., that we can use as our will and wishes may point, so long as he leaves us possessed of these faculties. If we are free to will and to do, and he conferred such powers upon us, how can he punish us for using them, if he foreknew how we would use them, for that would destroy our free agency? There would be no such thing as virtue if there was no vice. We must infer, then, that God, in creating man, conferred on him power to use all his faculties as his will and desire might dictate to him. So long as God leaves man in this world, it is as much an impossibility for God to control them

in any way, as in case of the physical impossibility stated." The author has qualified by the saving phraseology in a limited degree, but he has not told us the limitation, nor can he tell the limitation, that is placed on the agency of the finite being, except it be the limitation that God has placed in his own word. He always commands him as if he could obey; he always threatens as if he could hear; he always speaks to him as if he was a moral being with the ability to accept what God presents. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. CARLTON'S FOURTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and Christian Friends:*

The engagement grows more earnest. We have in this last speech some things that shall demand our attention before proceeding directly with our argument.

There is no contrast, we are told, in Hebrews ii, between the punishment under the law and that under the gospel, or under the reign of Christ. It is simply between the two salvations. "Now," said the apostle, "we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip: for if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward." There is one point. That settles the state of things under the old dispensation. "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" No contrast between the one and the other. What does it mean, then? This is too plain a misrepresentation to say any thing more about it. He says, however, that the salvation that is enjoyed by obedience under the law was temporal. Salvation depending on faith in Christ is endless felicity. There

he assumes what he is expected to prove, and unless he wades out to prove it he has nothing in opposition to my argument. Isaiah xlv, 25 : "I have sworn by myself, and the word is gone out of my mouth, that every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear, surely shall one say." Now what shall he surely say of me? Who would ever have dreamed of that to fill the ellipsis? That is too far-fetched to palm off upon any living man. We submit that to the congregation and to all persons who can read the English language. Has he attacked my point? Has he attempted to prove any thing in that direction? Has he denied that the judgment-seat of Christ is here where he comes to judge? Nothing of the kind. So that remains in full force and virtue. Is the inheritance that is incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away here in this world? No. Where is it? It is above. Were we begotten into it? We were begotten unto a lively hope unto that inheritance. He wants to know why I did not have the proposition read: Do the Holy Scriptures teach the final holiness and happiness of all mankind? I can tell the brother, because I could not get it so. That is the best of reasons. My brother would not meet me on that proposition, and I am glad that he would not, because it indicates progress. A few years ago they were willing to meet the Universalist on any proposition that affirmed the universal salvation of man. Now they must hew down an affirmative for us and get it as fragmentary as possible, and we must take that which suits them or they will not meet us at all. This one they framed for me, and I could get no other. I feel like Paul did when he met his friends, thanking God and taking courage. The day for exciting the prejudice of the people is past. There is only occasionally a man you can gull. There is only occasionally a mullet-head that you can excite against

it. Any person of good sense can perceive that the whole includes all its parts, and that I am just at the very work that is assigned me in my position in proving the ultimate holiness and happiness of the whole human race, as that takes in every individual of that race.

And then the doctor gave the man the cancer! Did I say so? Did I say God made man a sinner? No. What does he mean by that? Does not that look a little prejudicial? I think so. It looks like a man building up a cob-house and exhibiting his strength, and then kicking it over.

Then here is the bugbear of the whole thing: Some of the Universalists do not agree exactly with others. Then Universalism can not be true. That is a terrible thing. How is it in your church, brother? A few years ago the leaders in that church were Alexander Campbell and Dr. Sheppard, and the question arose of the annihilation of a part of mankind, instead of their endless punishment. Alexander Campbell came out and said: "The doctrine of annihilation is advocated by some of my own brethren, of whom I expected more good sense." Dr. Sheppard said: "The doctrine of endless punishment is both unreasonable and unscriptural." One says the other lacks good sense. The other says the former holds views unscriptural and unreasonable. I like to show that these brethren do not agree exactly.

And then the Universalists are wild because they say that man's agency is limited. My brother, we can travel around on the earth. Suppose you ask me to go with you to Jupiter's moons and have a little fun there. Can the brother go? No. Because his agency is limited.

Now we proceed with our main argument from the point where we left off. In regard to God's purposes revealed and terms involved in the Scriptures, Gene-

sis xii, 3: "I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Genesis xxvi, 4: "And in thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed." Genesis xxviii, 14: "Thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth; and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Galatians iii, 16-18: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many, but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, That the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, can not disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise." There was no penalty that could prevent that promise. The law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, can not disannul. The brother believes there is a law that prevents that promise, but the apostle says there is no law that shall prevent the fulfillment of that promise.

But once more; Acts iii, 25, 26: "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first, God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." "In thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed," turning away every one of you from your iniquity.

My next position is: That God's purpose shall be accomplished. Having shown that his purpose is the final happiness of all mankind, I now proceed to show the fulfillment. Isaiah xiv, 24: "The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so

shall it stand." Isaiah xlv, 9, 10: "Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." Isaiah lv, 8-11: "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord; for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it;" that is, the brother would say, if the man would only let God, he would do great things. Proverbs xix, 21: "The counsel of the Lord shall stand." Psalms lxxxvi, 9-12: "All nations whom thou hast made shall come to worship before thee, and glorify thy name, for thou art great." Why? Because man has this agency? Not exactly. But because God is able to bring that about without our aid. God reigns, says the apostle, in the exercise of that power by which he is able to subdue all things unto himself; for he is good enough to accomplish it, wise enough, powerful enough, able to accomplish it. What shall prevent his accomplishing it? Can any one tell?

We see, then, that God has purposed the final holiness of all mankind. God's purpose will be accomplished. Therefore, all mankind will be finally holy and happy.

Second syllogism: A perfect being will accom-

plish, by the use of any means which he has instituted, the specific object for which he instituted the means. God has instituted means for the salvation of all men; therefore, all mankind will be saved. Let the brother lay hold of these syllogisms, and undertake to show that they are unsound, and that they do not fairly present the argument which is before you in the Scriptures, which have been read in your hearing on this subject.

The next argument which I notice in support of this proposition I base on the divine paternity. God is the Father of all men. Luke iii, 38: "Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God." In tracing the genealogy in regard to man's origin, the Scriptures go back to God as the father. Acts xvii, 28, 29: The Apostle Paul, reasoning with the Athenians in regard to God, says: "Certain of your own poets have perceived an important truth;" and then he quotes from Aretas, which is not generally sufficiently understood. Aretas says, "In him we live, and move, and our being have, for we his offspring are." Aretas was a fellow-townsmen of Saul of Tarsus, and Paul was familiar with him and his writings. He then goes on: "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device." Here is the argument: Your poet has perceived the truth that we are the offspring of God. Why, then, not look up and worship him instead of worshipping silver, gold, and stone? God is a father, then, and is a perfect father; hence, he will perfectly perform the duties growing out of the parental relation. He who voluntarily confers existence upon another being, is bound by the most sacred obligations to make that existence a blessing. This duty is recognized in re-

gard to man in the Scriptures of truth. 1 Timothy v, 7, 8: "And these things give in charge, that they may be blameless. But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." The only justifiable excuse or apology that any father can have for failing to make all his children good and happy is this: that after having done all things in his power, he was unable to effect his desire. But God can not make this plea, for he perfectly knew the destiny of every individual before he created him, and all circumstances and events connected with his existence; and, hence, as he is infinite in wisdom and goodness, he would only bring those beings into existence to whom he foresaw that existence would be a final blessing. This is an argument which every individual in this large congregation can appreciate and understand.

Miss Catherine Beecher, in her *Appeal to the People*, page 287, says: "As, therefore, all concede that God has power to make man perfect at first, but that we are ruined through the sin of Adam, Universalists maintain that the very idea of the Creator as a benevolent being necessarily involves the certainty that he will, in the end, bring all the creatures he has made to a state of perfection, both in mental constitution and mental action. This argument is unanswerable." That is Miss Kate Beecher, and is pretty good sense—pretty sound. Can you perceive any flaw in it? Are you not all willing to say candidly and impartially concerning this matter, with the eminent John Foster, the great Baptist clergyman, "I find myself utterly unable to reconcile the idea of endless suffering with the divine goodness?" So will any other sensible man. The reason is, they never can be reconciled. There is no harmony between them. The only issue that can be made to harmo-



nize, or be perceived to be in harmony with the divine perfection, is that of the final holiness and happiness of all God's creation.

Again, I remark, there is another argument in support of this position. It is sometimes claimed that God would, but can not. He has suspended the destiny of mankind upon such terms and conditions, that he has not power to save, that the only way that God Almighty can renew, and save, and quicken the moral powers of man, and bring him into harmony with himself, is through the preaching of the Gospel; and as all are not saved here, they can not be in the future. I answer: The miracles in the Bible demonstrate God's power over man to be absolute, physical, mental, and moral, with a word instantly healing mental derangement and sinful practices. Matthew xii, 22: "Then was brought unto him one possessed with a devil, blind, and dumb: and he healed him, insomuch that the blind and dumb both spake and saw." Luke viii, 2: "And certain women, which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils." Behold the entire moral renovation of this woman by a word. Mark v, 17-20: "And they began to pray him to depart out of their coasts. And when he was come into the ship, he that had been possessed with the devil prayed him that he might be with him. Howbeit Jesus suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee. And he departed, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him: and all men did marvel." Mark i, 23-27: "And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I

know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him. And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What thing is this? what new doctrine is this? for with authority commandeth he even the unclean spirits, and they do obey him." Here is exhibited the power of God to save all men; for if he is able thus to quicken the moral faculties into active supremacy, he is able to save all sinners. If such an agency can be exerted by God under all the unfavorable influences that exist in this world, what is there to prevent God from removing man in the spirit world, and bringing mankind into all that is pure and lovely in the universe? All history proves God's ability to fit and bring man to perform the work he demands of him. Let us look at some instances presented in the Scriptures. Look at Abraham, Isaac, Saul, Daniel, Solomon. Has God ever failed in any attempt he has made, in any purpose he has unfolded to bring any individual of the race to perform the very work that he purposed that individual to do? Can you find an instance? Why, then, is not God able to accomplish his will at the time he has purposed it? The brother says if God possesses all this power, why is not this work done now? If he shows that God has revealed that it will be done to-night, I will believe it. God has revealed that it will be done. Ephesians i, 8-10: "Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him." He has purposed it in

himself, not purposed it in the contingencies of man's faith, or birth, or education. He has purposed it in himself, not now, not to-night; but that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him.

I proceed to notice another argument. The Scriptures, in addition to all this, notwithstanding the fact that all these opposing circumstances, and influences, and enemies to man's peace, and salvation, and happiness, exist, which the church has considered so great and insurmountable—the Holy Scriptures teach that all these enemies shall be destroyed, removed, banished. 1 John iii, 8: "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil."

Sin, shall be destroyed. Matthew xv, 13: "But he answered and said, Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." That is what is to be done with sin. It is to be rooted up and destroyed. Many believe in an endless hell, but hell is to be destroyed. Hosea xiii, 14: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes." Next, the devil. Hebrews ii, 14, 15: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them, who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."

Well, now, there is only one enemy more, and we may rest assured of that, because it is called the last one. 1 Corinthians xv, 26: "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." [*Time expired.*]

[MR. MOORE'S FOURTH SPEECH.]

*Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

I was called upon, at the beginning of the last speech, to show that the salvation in Christ is endless and conditional. I would submit this simple fact, that it is really not necessary that I should proceed to prove any thing or find the teaching. I am only here to prevent my friend from showing you that the Bible teaches what he has affirmed. He would be glad to get me out into the affirmative of the question to pass away the two days.

I will call your attention to a fact bearing upon this topic, however, though I am really under no obligation to do so. The young man who came to Jesus, Matthew xix, 16-24. I shall read four verses, commencing with the 21st: "Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me. But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions. Then said Jesus unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."

Here is the treasure to be secured, and that upon conditions so clearly stated, that I need not do more than read them: "Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me. But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions." Here the young man asked for the *condition* of eternal life, and this was the appropriate time to settle the question of

conditions. Doubtless the young man could have had nothing short of the endless felicities of another world before his mind. He was a Jew, an upright Jew, and was in the enjoyment of all the benefits, rights, and privileges of citizenship in the commonwealth of Israel. It could not have been some earthly advantage accruing out of relationship to Jesus, for he possessed all these; nor could it have been wealth, for he was rich; nor honor, for he was honorable. It lay beyond this. Now was the time for the Savior to tell him that he was mistaken in reference to this matter. When he asked him how he should obtain it, he should have told him that it is absolutely fixed, that the purpose of the infinite one can not be prevented by any power in the heavens or earth, and you shall have the eternal life at all events, and without any contingencies! But, instead of that, the Savior answered him as I have read. If eternal life is to be enjoyed by every individual of our race, absolutely and independently of any conditions, it should have been so stated here in answer to this young man's inquiry. For the statement of the conditions of the promise is most clear: First, he must keep the law; second, he must be practically benevolent. This is the clear indication of the conditions of the endless life—of the treasure in heaven—of the immortal life in another state. 2 Peter i, 10, 11. And I will make this statement before reading.

My brother's telling you that these passages do not relate to another life, ought not satisfy you that it is so. He must show that they do not. He has made a kind of wholesale disposition of every passage in that way. Let him take up those passages noted, and show you that what he asserts is true. Let him not deal in wholesale assumption longer. Let him go to the work of showing that his position is true, by an examination of the proposition. I have read

these passages before: I now read from 2 Corinthians v, 1-9: "For we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord: (for we walk by faith, not by sight:) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him." I also read, 2 Corinthians iv, 15-18: "For all things are for your sakes, that the abundant grace might through the thanksgiving of many redound to the glory of God. For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." Will you observe that "the things not seen are eternal," the things seen are "temporal?" He says the securing the things not seen is conditional. The conditions are stated so clearly that it is not necessary for me to repeat them. We have the building of God, the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

The ninth verse expresses the condition: "Wherefore we labor, that whether present (with the Lord) or absent (from the Lord) we may be accepted of him." The acceptance is based on the condition of the individuals laboring in harmony with his will. I ask attention to Romans v, 1: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Here justification, which means the pronouncing one innocent according to law, is promised upon the condition of faith. Surely if the man is not legally innocent before the bar of God, then, and there, he must be condemned. Hence, "he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi, 16. This reminds me that my brother calls attention to Romans xiv, 9-12, and says the judgment is here. I call his attention again to the fact, if it is here "every knee shall bow, and every tongue swear." Does every knee bow, and every tongue swear? Is this Scripture false? 2 Timothy iv, 8, I read Paul's concluding remarks to Timothy: "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me." Paul's crown was one to be received when he had finished his work, and you see from the passage that the crown promised to others is conditional, to be awarded to them all at the coming of the Lord, if they shall love his appearing. 1 Timothy vi, 13-19: "I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honor and power everlasting.

Amen. Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life."

Here again the true riches or good foundation against the time to come. The rich were to be instructed, first, not to be proud; second, not to trust in their riches, but to trust in God—"to do good and communicate." Hence, the eternal life and the good foundation against the time to come were based on conditions so clear that there can be no mistake. Luke xii, 33, 34: "Sell that ye have, and give alms; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth. For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." You will not fail to observe that while we remain in this world there are thieves, and the treasure may be stolen. The place where they are taught to secure this there is no moth to eat and no thieves to steal. It hangs on conditions clearly stated, "Provide for yourselves bags which wax not old, and treasures in the heavens." Again, Matthew vi, 19-21: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." Treasure in the incorruptible state can be secured only by obedience to God. 1 Timothy vi, 12: "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast

professed a good profession before many witnesses." Eternal life, according to this passage, is to be attained by the individual in the enjoyment of the spiritual life: upon the condition of heroically fighting till the victory is won. Without detaining you with further remarks on this point, let us turn back now to a consideration of the purpose of God. To do this, I shall embrace every thing that was presented.

Sin and misery do exist either in accordance with God's purpose or against it. The cancer is on the man's foot because the doctors put it there, or for some other reason; and it is his business to tell us how it got there before he frees the doctors from responsibility for cutting off the man's leg. If it be admitted that it existed in accordance with God's attributes, then, if sin and misery exist by God's own appointment, and in harmony with his attributes, and have existed for six thousand years, what principle of reason or revelation shall enable us to conclude that there must come a period when they will not be in harmony with his character, unchanging as it is? Surely there can be no such period, no such principle, unless it be assumed that the nature of sin and suffering shall change, or God shall change; but neither can change.

Second. If it be claimed that they exist in opposition to God's appointment, then their existence can be accounted for only by supposing that God either would not or could not prevent their existence. If you assume the former of these, then they may continue without end, since God's power was as great when sin and misery were introduced as it ever can be. If the latter be taken, then, since he is unchangeable, he never can or will do otherwise than allow their continuance. He would not absolutely prevent them, and, therefore, he will never do it if he is unchangeable.

Says God is the author  
of sin

Highes says nat. see  
Highes - Carpenter debate P. 38

MR. MOORE'S FOURTH SPEECH.

He did not, therefore he will not, if he be absolutely unchangeable. Universalism teaches that God has appointed them; that he is their author; that they constitute a part of the divine arrangement in regard to man. (See *Ballou on Atonement*, page 35.)

"But, perhaps the objector will say this denies the liberty of the will, and makes God the author of sin. To which I reply, desiring the reader to recollect what I have said of sin in showing its nature, by which it is discovered that God may be the innocent and holy cause of that which, in a limited sense, is sin; but as it regards the meaning of God, it is intended for good. It is not casting any disagreeable reflections on the Almighty to say he determined all things for good; and to believe he superintends all the affairs of the universe, not excepting sin, is a million times more to the honor of God than to believe he can not, or that he does not, when he can. If it should be granted that sin will finally terminate for good in the moral system, it will then be necessary to admit that God is the first cause, or we can not say that God is the author of all good. If we say that sin is not for the good of God's system, but is a damage, we must also say that God would have prevented its taking place if it had been in his power; if it were not in his power he is not Almighty; neither can we say he is supreme, in an unlimited sense, as he was not superior to the causes which produced sin."

I want now to state that my brother said at the Wilmington discussion, that man's body was the seat of sin; and the reason man is a sinner is because he has a fleshly nature, and that the flesh had gained an ascendancy over the spirit. That is what he means by saying "he was made a little while lower than the angels." He means by that to say to you that God made man with an animal body, subjected to sin,

Mr. King says God is the  
author of sin see King-Hobbs  
debate P. 14

and that sin was inherent in his body, developed itself in his history afterward; but it was inherent in the body, not in the spirit. If he does not bring this out in the future I shall be mistaken. It will be useless to say that he appointed it for good, and when that good is secured it must cease; that he appointed it for good because it was in harmony with his attributes. If good for a period, why not good endlessly? Universalists make this matter doubly absurd by teaching that God made man so that sin is a part of his being, and then teaching us that there is no escape from punishment due to the sinner, that there is no mercy. I read from *Pro and Con*, page 243: "In the government of God there is, there can be, no escape from deserved punishment—not even by repentance. No, not even by repentance. Jehovah has himself declared that he will by no means clear the guilty." If God will clear the guilty by the means of repentance, will he not be clearing them by some means? Bro. Carlton said in the Wilmington discussion, also, "Just as certainly as they sin they must suffer." Because the sin is implanted in the fleshly nature, and it continues to control them as long as the spirit continues in the body. God made the body. Then God is the author of sin. He punishes man for doing precisely what he could not help doing, since he was fated to it. It is a merciless system. I have answered this argument now as largely as I desire, and ask your attention for a little while to the subject of paternity.

I turn to read from Luke iii, 38: "Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God." He tries to show you by this that man is God's child in creation; that God is father to man because he is his Creator. If that is not true, let him explain it in his next speech. Now, if God is father to a being because he

made it, then since he made the cattle on a thousand hills, and the rivers of oil, he is their father; and if he must save what he is father of, he must save the animal, the insect, and the reptile, as well as man. This passage, however, only shows the origin or source of man, and is not intended to express his relationship spiritually. That is to be shown otherwise. *The son* are supplied words. My brother was careful to exclude the word *one* from Isaiah xlv, 24, because it was a supplied word. In this the words *the son* are supplied, and, according to him, should be left out. It merely was intended to show how man came to be, and not to tell us that God sustains the relation of father to us, or we the filial relation to him, such as you sustain to your child, or your child to you.

I have met this argument now as far as I feel inclined, because I think I have met it fully and fairly.

I ask your attention to the last argument—the purpose of God. He had stated this before, but he has now pursued it in a new line. If I comprehend his meaning in regard to the purpose of God, he means that it is absolute. I am ready to admit that God's will or purpose, in reference to his own independent action, may be regarded as absolute; but when it is God's purpose or will in regard to man it is not absolute, but, without exception, conditional. It is true that he will do in the armies of heaven according to his will. When it is spoken of in regard to God's action it is always spoken of absolutely. God controls his own action. Having created man in his own image, and given him moral power, he addresses him as a moral being, and presents his will to him, and demands obedience. That that will has not been obeyed is found in the simple fact that God attributes sin to all men; "for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Therefore all men have violated God's will. If God's will can be violated by the man in one

instance, he can do it in every instance throughout eternity. That is not all. It is clearly stated by the Savior that the will of the people prevented their salvation in his life-time. My brother quoted it: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wing, but ye would not!" "Ye would not." The will of the individual came in contact with the will of the Savior, and prevented his accomplishing what he would have done. He said: I would have gathered you, but you would not. The will of man is in antagonism and prevents. You can make much or little of it, as you like. The will of man prevented the will of God. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. CARLTON'S FIFTH SPEECH.]

*Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

We now proceed to introduce first some remarks in regard to what has been said, and then proceed with our main argument.

About two-thirds of my brother's last speech were occupied with quotations in regard to this everlasting and eternal life question. Did he show that the final or ultimate condition of any person was secured in consequence of his faith in this world? If he did, we hope he will develop that point.

Sin and misery exist here in this world. They either exist, he says, in accordance with the purpose of God, or in opposition to the purpose of God. Now, when I read the Scriptures, I go there for light upon these great subjects. I do not find that in the beginning God purposed that man should sin. If the brother has found any passage of Scripture that says

that God purposed man should sin, we will accept it. But the Bible reveals nothing in regard to it, one way or the other. We learn that God designed to make man just as he made him; and it is evident that he did so, because, after he created him, with all the objects surrounding him in the material universe, he surveyed the entire work and pronounced it very good. That is, it was what he designed it. I do not learn, then, that God purposed man should sin or purposed that he should not sin. I believe he purposed to place man in this state of being, and placed him here with the power of volition to choose good and refuse evil. That such is the fact, the Scriptures warrant us in believing. As he gave man this liberty to act, he made him liable to punishment for his disobedience, and rewards him for his obedience. That purpose is being carried forward. Hence, all this argument about sin getting in here without God's purpose, or with his purpose, has nothing to do with the question.

If God Almighty can not prevent its existence now, and he never will change, he never can prevent it. God has not told us that it will cease now. He has told us that it will cease at a certain period, and that is the reason I believe it will. That is the difference between my brother's theology and mine. I think his is mixed, and mine clear. He says that the Universalists teach that some are fore-ordained to sin. The Calvinists believe that, and I think they are as good Christians as the Arminians. There are a good many in your church who believe it. Your Bro. Smith, of Indianapolis, in a discussion with me at Winchester, said that God will accomplish his purpose, and that he could not help falling back on the old idea that God had determined to save a definite number. So there are some in your church, brother, who believe Calvinism just as much as there are in our church. What Father Ballou believed, does not

affect me. If you answer my argument, you will have enough to do.

But, then, Universalists are awful people, because they believe there is no escape from deserved punishment. Do you like sin so well that you want to roll it as a sweet morsel under the tongue? Do you expect to take the sweet and get rid of the bitter? They want to know if there is not some way to get rid of the punishment. They want to sin, and take the benefit of the bankrupt law. God Almighty says what a man soweth, that shall he also reap. There is where we find this doctrine, that the wicked shall be punished. "It is a merciless system." Just as merciless as God's system that he will render to every man according to his work, and will by no means clear the guilty. That is his own doctrine.

The richest of all rich things we have had yet is the revelation on the subject of the divine paternity—Luke iii, 38. The brother says the word son is supplied. I concede it is supplied; but what is implied? We go back to where the genealogy begins, in the twenty-fourth verse, where the word son occurs, *unius*. The word son only occurs at the beginning of the genealogy, but is implied between every other two. Do you not know this? [To Mr. Moore.] Yes, you do! [Laughter.] It is only named once, but is implied every other time; and he knows it all the time. [Laughter.] Then what? Does this show the relationship that exists between God and the human spirit? Instead of answering that, he says that it shows that God is the father of men, because he is their creator. Then it shows that he is the father of the cattle, because he is their creator. I did not say that. I said it was because God teaches that men are his offspring. Does he teach that the cattle or the dogs are his offspring? No! He says that man is his offspring. I made him after my likeness. "What

is man, that thou art mindful of him?" God says, He is my own immortal offspring, and therefore I am mindful of him. Did God say there was the same relationship existing between God and the brutes as between himself and man? Why did he make this shameful evasion of the written testimony of God? To the children of men he says, Your Father which is in heaven is perfect. Did he say to the dogs and cats, Your father which is in heaven is perfect? And what is all this done for? It is done to avoid the force of the argument which no man ever has, or can get rid of; and that is that "there is one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all; that God Almighty is the immortal Father of our immortal spirit; that he has constituted us his offspring, in his image and after his own likeness; and that being infinite in wisdom, he knew before bringing any one of us into existence the final destiny of every child he has brought into the world; and being infinitely good, if he foresaw that existence would be an endless curse, his goodness would have withheld existence." No earthly parent, worthy of having a child, would bring him into existence if he knew it would be a curse to him. And yet we are told that God Almighty has done it. Dr. Edwardes, in advocating endless torment, said: "The torments of the damned would give the saints a keener relish for the felicities of heaven." What, the suffering of one part give a relish to the rest! And God Almighty, knowing this, brought myriads of beings into existence with the eternal knowledge that they would finally land in hell, and suffer, world without end, and night without day; and yet turn around, and call that being good! If you call that good, what would you call the devil? How am I to distinguish between your God and your devil? Which one of them is the worst? If you carry out your theory, you can



not avoid the conclusion that God is as much worse than the devil as he is more powerful. There is no possibility of evading the conclusion.

We resume the subject on which we closed—the destruction of all the enemies of God. We have seen that the Holy Scriptures teach that sin shall be destroyed; that hell shall be destroyed; that the devil shall be destroyed; and that death shall be destroyed. Now, I inquire, what will prevent the final holiness and happiness of all mankind, when sin, hell, the devil, and death are all gone? In the absence of sinfulness, holiness; after hell, sorrow, and trouble are banished, peace and happiness will reign. After death is abolished, life immortal triumphs and sways the scepter of universal empire.

The next argument I present in support of the affirmative is: The Holy Scriptures teach that all men shall glorify God. Isaiah xliii, 7: "Even every one that is called by my name: for I have created him for my glory, I have formed him; yea, I have made him."

Theologians agree, after all their discussions and investigations in regard to the object that prompted creation, upon this fact, that there were two great objects that the Creator had in view when he brought man into existence. God Almighty was so glorious that he created myriads of inferior intelligences to glorify him, not to add to his own happiness, but to manifest his greatness and glory. The second object was to extend happiness to other beings. In the exhaustless and boundless fullness of God's eternal happiness, he delights in imparting enjoyment, and this prompted him to the creation of inferior intelligences, and hence he brought myriads of created immortals into being for the sake of extending happiness. Now, shall the objects God had thus in creating man be accomplished? and what will be the

result when they shall be so accomplished? First, God will be glorified. Secondly, All the intelligences that he has created will be happified. If he is not glorified, he fails in the object for which he created him. If he is not glorified to the greatest extent possible, there is a failure to secure the fullness of that purpose contemplated. If all sentient intelligences are not made happy, then God fails in imparting happiness to that extent to which happiness might be imparted, and hence falls short of accomplishing the fullness of the purpose in the dispensation of happiness which prompted him to create.

I want you to bear these things in mind for a moment, while we proceed a little further. Romans i, 21-24: "Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things: Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves." Romans iii, 23: "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."

I notice these facts now, First, That God created man to glorify him. Second, That man can not glorify God in sin. What kind of a being is God? I heard taught years ago, when I was a boy—and that was not long ago—that God created man to glorify him, and that he will do it; that God will certainly be glorified in every man that he has made, and that he will be glorified just as much in the endless sin and suffering of men as in their holiness and happiness. But there has been considerable progress on these ideas. The Scriptures are the same, but

we are increasing in our knowledge of them; and, hence, I heard a clergyman say recently, he did not believe God would be glorified as much in the damnation of man as in his salvation. I thanked God, and reported progress. Now we are enabled to see that God is not glorified by sin and suffering at all. Hence, we learn that, so far as man sins, he comes short of the glory of God; and as long as he continues in sin, so long he comes short of the glory of God. Then, if God made man for his own glory—and the Scriptures teach that he will glorify him—how is God glorified by him? How are earthly parents glorified in their children? by their disobedience and suffering? No; but by their being obedient and happy. God says: "If I am a father where is my honor? You are not glorifying me." There is a manufacturer. Let us go to Springfield, or some city where they are manufacturing reapers and mowers. The Champion Works, turn out a thousand reapers and mowers in a season. They are made to reap oats, barley, and other grains, and cut grass. These machines are sent out, and only a hundred out of the thousand answer the purpose, while the rest are failures. Are the inventors honored in the failures? No; they are disgraced; they are ashamed, and send their agents out to have them burned up. It is a burning disgrace to them. They are only honored when they do good work. God has made man to glorify him and enjoy him forever. We all believe that. We understand that to be the great end for which God created man. Is God glorified if man does not answer that end? So long as one man remains in sin, sorrow, and suffering, so long he falls short of glorifying him. If he does not glorify him, God fails in the object for which he created him; and no person can extricate God from that dilemma. He has brought man into being for

the purpose of imparting happiness. How far? Universally. Now, if, in the issue of this case, he fails to bring one of the human race to the enjoyment of holiness and happiness, God fails to secure the greatest possible amount of holiness and happiness where he might have produced it or caused it to exist. Hence, God fails in the object for which he created man, which is not admissible for a moment; and we do not concede any thing of the kind, but insist that an end shall be secured which will glorify God and happy all his creatures. Psalms 1, 23: "Whoso offereth praise, glorifieth me." Offering praise to God glorifies him. 1 Peter iv, 11: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ." John xv, 8: "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples." God, then, can only be glorified by man's conforming to his will, loving and serving him, and enjoying his own holiness and happiness. Now, we present a syllogism containing this argument: 1. Man can only glorify God in holiness and happiness. 2. All mankind shall glorify God. 3. Therefore, all mankind shall be ultimately holy and happy.

I wish you, friends, in summing up this matter, and going from this place to-night, candidly, seriously, and prayerfully, to weigh the Scriptures that have been presented before you, and the arguments, pro and con.

Look first at the great truths that were unfolded in regard to the infinite perfections of God; then his purpose in creating man; the Scriptures presented, unfolding that purpose to be universal blessedness in Christ; then, the fact that God's purpose shall be accomplished; that he reigns in the omnip-

otence of his own all-conquering power, by which he is able even to subdue all things unto himself. In addition to this, the fact, that all the enemies of the peace and happiness, all the hinderances to man's purity, and holiness, and happiness, shall be banished from the universe. In addition to this, that God has revealed himself to us as our Father; that his government is a parental government; that the justice he exercises is a parental justice, and the laws he administers, the laws of a parent; the object to be attained, the object of a good, kind, beneficent parent; and that, as an earthly parent will bring all his children to be good, if he possesses wisdom and ability to do it, God possesses infinitely more goodness, kindness, tenderness, and love than an earthly parent, and he has the wisdom and ability to accomplish all that he desires, designs, and purposes in regard to the ultimate and final well-being of all his creatures. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. MOORE'S FIFTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and Fellow-Citizens:*

I would call attention to this peculiar manner my brother has of disposing of Scripture, showing the conditionality of human happiness, both in time and eternity. He simply asserts that it refers to time. He did not deign to read one, or to show you that a single passage was not what I claimed it to be. And this is really the point of issue, as was made out in the morning: Does man's future happiness depend upon any conditions? He refuses to examine the evidences when they are adduced. He has noted them. He says they were read without comment. There was sufficient comment to show that they

referred to what was ultimate or endless. Enough was given to show their bearing. He fails to meet them, and tells us he passed them by in view of the simple fact that they have no bearing on the subject. I trust this audience will bear in mind that they had better examine for themselves before accepting his sheer assertions; and I am satisfied that those who shall hereafter read what has been said, will see their force upon this question.

He asks me to proceed to prove, however, that those conditions relate to the ultimate or everlasting state. This I have already showed you. He has simply asserted that they do not. Since that was made out as the issue, he ought to have taken them up and shown that they did not relate to the ultimate state. If he does not do this, I must take it for granted that it is because he can not show that they so relate. I now turn to what I was about to examine when my time expired. He argued on the promise God made to Abraham, and to his son Isaac, and repeated the narrative recorded in the twelfth, twenty-second, twenty-sixth and twenty-eighth chapters of Genesis. I want to simply refer to them. The Lord said, "In thy seed shall all the families, the kindreds, of the earth be blessed." He assumes in this case that we have an absolute promise, or, in other words, that it is a promise made without conditions, and that the promise must relate to the future and endless state. For he has admitted that what refers to this world is conditional. The others must, then, refer to the endless state. I shall read Acts iii, 25, 26: "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first, God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities."

Now mark, here is the promise made to Abraham, in the twelfth, twenty-second, twenty-sixth and twenty-eighth chapters of Genesis. My brother assumes—and necessarily assumes—that they relate to the endless state. Peter says: "Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities." How so? In fulfillment of the promise made to your fathers by the prophets in times past. He has raised up Jesus and sent him to bless you, in fulfillment of that promise. Observe, the promise was made to the Jews conditionally, because its fulfillment is found in the requirements of the gospel; also, Galatians iii, 8: "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed."

Here is the same promise absolute. My brother assumes that it must be so, to comport with the tenor of his argument. Ninth verse: "So, then, they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." Then the promise involved at least one condition, and that was faith; and if the individual did not possess faith, he was not blest with faithful Abraham, even though the promise was "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blest." I read from the same chapter, beginning at the fourteenth verse: "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."

When God promised to Abraham that in his seed

all the families of the earth should be blest, it was in Christ. "Not seeds, as of many," but seed as of one, Christ. The word seed meant Christ, and was fulfilled when Christ came, presenting the plan of salvation that God had intended from the beginning. I read further: "And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, can not disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise." I read now, beginning with the twenty-second verse: "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

That promise was that the blessing should be sent to all nations. Now, upon what conditions are you heirs according to the promise, if you be the promised seed? On what conditions are you the promised seed? If you are Christ's, when are you Christ's? If you have believed in him and abide in him. If this is not a conditional promise, I confess I don't know the meaning of words. In this same connection allow me to read Romans ix, 13: "Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon

the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness." Consequently the Gentile has the promise of being blest with the blessings involved in the promise made to Abraham, made to him before he was circumcised, provided he shall walk in faith. The promise that he should be the heir of the world was made through the righteousness of faith. I read verses 16-18 of the same chapter: "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed: not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all, (As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations,) before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as though they were; who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be." Also, verses 22, 23: "And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now, it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him."

I am disposed to let the argument upon that point rest here.

Again, he inquires for God's motives in making man; and I confess I can not tell, except simply what God has revealed. He has assumed that he made him to glorify God and enjoy him forever. Did he make him to glorify him unconditionally? Let him proceed to the proof of it. Is it conditionally that a man enjoys God now, or unconditionally? Is it the experience of any body that any one glorifies him and enjoys him unconditionally? Is it possible to conceive that any person shall glorify and enjoy him forever absolutely without conditions? No matter about the motive of God. Grant that it was that man might glorify and enjoy him forever. Was his

object to make man a machine? It must be conceded that the class of persons who die in their sins can not glorify him. Take, for instance, the man who died over at Winchester, the other day, after killing his neighbor. Where did he get his punishment? Did he glorify God and enjoy him forever? I make a single, solitary case of it, in order to bring the matter to a point. He says that man can not glorify God in sin. That only helps me. It shows that this man, dying in sin, could not glorify God till after he died. Furnish me the Scriptures, Bro. Carlton, that teach where a man, dying in his sins, will glorify God. Mark it down and show it to me. [Applause.] (Mr. Moore requested the audience not to make any demonstrations of applause.) The individual died in sin; he himself affirms that a man can not glorify God in sin. Then he has not glorified him when he dies. Now, where does the Bible teach that he will be freed from sin after death, and be prepared to glorify him? Upon this point I ask for some information, for if there be any Scripture bearing on that question, I know not where it is. God is not glorified unless universal happiness prevails, he says. I do not understand that that is necessarily the case. God, then, is not glorified now, because universal happiness does not now prevail. Misery exists. God must be very unhappy just now, for he tells us that it would destroy the happiness of God. If misery existed, no matter whether it is for one moment, for a finite or infinite period, it would make him unhappy while it exists, and just as unhappy now as if it existed in eternity. That God is infinitely happy now who would doubt? That he is now glorified, who will doubt? That all men do not glorify him I grant. That those who die in sin shall never glorify him I insist. There is not the least intimation in the Bible that a change will be effected after they have passed from this world.

My brother read from Psalms 1, 23. I did not find the reading as he had it. 1 Peter iv, 11, is the next passage quoted, and I turn to that. He says, as every man has received the gift, so minister the same one to another. He makes an application to every body of what is addressed to the faithful. Peter is addressing the saints. This is the class of persons he is addressing in the eleventh verse: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ; to whom be praise and dominion forever and ever. Amen." His object in quoting this was to prove that mankind universally glorify God. You will see that it is a failure, for it is an address only to the elect, who had obtained like precious faith with the apostles, the brethren, and the saints that Peter addresses. These glorify God. This passage affords no evidence in the world. Again, we are referred to John xv, 8: "Herein is my Father glorified that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples." Jesus addresses exclusively his disciples, as you will see by reading from the beginning of the chapter. He quotes it to prove that all men bear fruit, and on it built his syllogism. But he proves his minor proposition by these quotations, which apply exclusively and alone to Christians.

(Bro. Carlton.)—Those passages were quoted to show *how* God is glorified.

(Mr. Moore.)—But that is assumed without any evidence in the case at all.

How do the wicked glorify God? Psalms 1, 23: "Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me." There is a condition. Then observe another condition: "And to him that ordereth the conversation aright, will I show the salvation of God." Now, my brother, show the passages in your next speech that teach that all men

will offer praise to God. Will those who die in willful disobedience do it?

In regard to the paternity argument, he attempts to excite sympathy. He insists that God is the father of the human race, in the same sense that a man is the father of his children. It is a matter of indifference to me whether the one or the other is true. His point of sympathy is a failure. Allow me to illustrate this: A human parent would not have destroyed the antediluvians, had they been his children, as God did. He destroyed all, from the greatest to the least, saving only eight, who submitted to his requirements. I want to know if any father would sweep his children with the besom of destruction—all who were disobedient? Man acts passionately toward his children, not always rationally. He allows sympathy to override reason; on that very account my brother has the advantage in sympathy, but it is only an animal sympathy, not intellectual. Again, all the cities of the plain were destroyed. And yet the logic of my brother brings him to this: According to his logic, a man ought to be as wicked as he can, in order to get somebody to kill him, and then get God to take him to heaven. That is the very best thing he could do. It is very strange to me, Bro. Carlton, that a man of your caliber can not see better than that! [Laughter.] [*Time expired.*]

## SECOND DAY.

*Wednesday, April 27, 9 o'clock A. M.*

Opened with prayer by the Rev. Mr. Crosley.

[MR. CARLTON'S SIXTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and Respected Friends :*

We come again this morning for the purpose of renewing our investigation. I propose first, to notice some things that were said by my brother opposite. He says I fail to answer him. Indeed! I thought he was on the negative; and it was his business to follow me. Then he informs us, that the promises that were made by God to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were conditional promises, and the law fulfilled these promises by the infliction of its penalties. You will remember we noted the argument of the Apostle Paul, in particular where he says the law which was four hundred and thirty years after the promises were given can not disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. Again, the apostle raises the question: "Is the law, then, against the promises? God forbid!" Then we are to understand that, let the penalty of the law be what it may, there is nothing in the working of the law, if its penalties be fully inflicted, that shall prevent the fulfillment of these promises, given four hundred and thirty years before the law. Hence, there is no difficulty in the way in that direction. The brother makes the quotation: "So, then, they that be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." That is what we were advocating all the time: that the individual that is of faith is blessed now. Does it read, or can there be found a passage that reads: So, then, they that believe now shall enjoy the endless felicities of heaven in consequence of that faith? That is entirely an-

other thing. But he says this promise of God to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was fulfilled when Christ came and presented the plan of salvation. Indeed! The promise that in Christ all nations, families, and kindreds of the earth shall be blessed, was fulfilled 1800 years ago! Is not that obviously a mistake? Were all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth blessed 1800 years ago with a spiritual salvation by being turned away from their iniquities? That will not do. But, then, the apostle says to the Galatians, for "ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" and then Bro. Moore turns to me, with the very wise expression, which I enjoyed hugely, "Yes, by faith, not by creation, Bro. Carlton." The brother knows very well that the apostle was speaking of a different thing altogether. He was not talking about our being the offspring of God; not of that hallowed relationship which exists with our Father, God; but of that resemblance, that characteristic resemblance, that exists between the true Christian and God, so that the individual becomes the child of God by being like him; as Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount: "I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you: that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." Were they not his children already? Yes. There the word children is used in both these significations. They were the children of their Father anyhow. Every person is the child of his father, let him act as he will. But if he follows that father, imitates that father, he is his child by imitation, as well as in the sense of being his offspring. This matter is all clear in the Scriptures, and I need not labor it.

That mankind are created to glorify God, and enjoy

him forever, is granted, said Bro. Moore. Very well, then, God made man to glorify him and enjoy him forever. Will he do it? Bro. Moore says, No. God, then, made man with a certain definite, fixed purpose; but man will not answer that purpose. God shall fail of accomplishing the object for which he created man. Well, now, any doctrine save that which teaches the ultimate holiness and happiness of the race fails just there. It shows that God himself must suffer an endless defeat and endure endless disappointment. That does not satisfy me. I do not believe it. As God is admitted to be infinite in wisdom, before he brought man into being he saw his destiny and all the influences that would operate on him through all periods of his existence, and, consequently, if he foresaw that some would not glorify him forever, he would not have made them to enjoy and glorify him forever. Would he? Is he acting as a wise God, if he acts thus? All can perceive the inconsistency of such a position as this. "But those that die in their sins do not get their punishment in this world." I do not design to say much about punishment in this part of the discussion, because we are talking about salvation now. The subject of punishment will come up for the next two days. We will now talk about salvation. But I just want to notice, occasionally, when the brother runs right squarely against the truth of heaven, to show that he does not understand the subject of punishment. God says, in Jeremiah ix, 23, 24: "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches: but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord." He says God does not administer judg-

ment in this world; God says he does. We leave you to settle the controversy between them.

The next point I wish to notice is the *cheering*. There was a number of persons over in that part of the house that seemed to belong to the shingle clapping committee, that cheered at the prospect of the endless damnation of some of their fellow-men. That was encouraging. It reminds me of a clergyman over in Darke County, who labored strenuously to prove endless punishment, but sometimes failed to answer the objections advanced. On one occasion he attended a meeting, the subject under consideration being Lazarus and the rich man. When the passage was read, "And in hell he lifted up his voice, being in torment," he shouted right out in meeting, "Thank God, there is proof that one man has gone to hell!" [Laughter.] Some of these brethren had a good morsel, because they thought Bro. Moore was going to prove endless damnation.

He says, "Bro. Carlton says that man's sinning will destroy the happiness of God." Bro. Carlton never said or intimated such a thing. Bro. Carlton has taught from the beginning of this discussion that God is perfectly and independently happy in and of himself. He then says that I quoted no Scripture to prove that all should glorify God. I quoted Psalms lxxxvi, 9, 10: "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name. For thou art great, and doest wondrous things: thou art God alone." "All nations." How many? All the nations of God's creation? I think that would include all mankind. But, then, it will not do to compare God with earthly parents, because earthly parents would not do as bad as God does. Man would not drown his children as God drowned the antediluvians. Well, now, earthly parents act toward their children, in disciplining them, in that



manner which they believe to be the very best calculated to promote their welfare and punish them for their good. What does God punish his children for? Even the severest punishment he ever used or ever will use? What is his object? Is it a malignant and devilish purpose? Is it a good or bad purpose? Why did he take the antediluvians away? It was for a good purpose. Did he take them away from sin and suffering here? God's existence is not measured here by the present life, but he is carrying forward his work. All time is present with him. God has time and space to accomplish all his works. He knows how, and when, and where to conduct, with all his children, in the manner that shall be best calculated to promote their welfare. Does the brother deny that God's government over his children is instituted to promote their good; and if he fails to secure the good of all the governed, does he not fail in the object for which it was instituted? It is well to think about these things.

But there was an individual over in Winchester that killed a man the other day. Take that wicked man to heaven? Let us look at this question a little. The brother will endeavor to make Universalism perfectly absurd and repulsive with this idea that God punishes the wicked or takes them away from this world to a better condition in the next world. That would be horrible—it would not do. If children were quarreling out of doors, would it be a bad thing for the parent to call them into the house and give them better lessons, and train them to obedience and goodness? Would not that be terrible? Let us look at the other side of the question a little. The only thing that makes an appearance of inconsistency in this, is blending error with truth. What is the error? The idea that the judgment is in another world, and people are not punished in this world; and consequently

the man who is wicked here, if he is not to be punished, will be encouraged to go on in sin. We do not admit your error, that the wicked go unpunished. The Bible says that, though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished. God will render to every man according to his work. We do not admit that any man goes unwhipped of justice, or unpunished for his sins. God says that he renders "justice and judgment in the earth." Let us look on the other side of the question for a moment. Here is a man burning with malice and revenge. He wants to avenge himself on his neighbor, and so he sends that neighbor, while in the commission of a wicked deed, out of the world, impenitent, according to the common use of that term. This man repents, joins the church. Suppose he is arrested and put into prison. He sends for the clergy, is converted, and swung off the gallows, singing, "I am bound for the kingdom, will you go to glory with me?" And when he gets up there into heaven, he looks down in hell on his neighbor, and shouts, "Look there, didn't I give it to him? I sent him there; I fixed him." That is comforting, is n't it? That is the other side of the question.

I proceed now with my affirmative argument. Instead of having this idea of infinite cruelty and revenge in the mind of men, that God is a being of malevolence and retaliation, we must go away from the scene of passion, and enmity, and self-righteousness, and come up to the table-land where Jesus stood; come up to the Christian standard and to Christian principles. Let us look for a little while at the spirit of God, as manifested by Jesus Christ, and we will perceive, that the final holiness and happiness of mankind, is the only result that will harmonize with such a spirit or character as Christ manifested the Father. Matthew v, 43-48: "Ye have heard that it hath been

said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies: bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

Is that the spirit of God? Does God act that way? Then where is his vindictive vengeance toward the antediluvians, toward the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, toward any body else? Does God do good to them that hate him? Is he unchangeably good? Then where is his malignity? Where is the spirit of retaliation which would make him do any thing toward any person that was not calculated to do him good. I am reminded of a circumstance that occurred in a Sabbath-school once, where Miss Harriet Beecher was a Sabbath-school teacher. In teaching this lesson to her class, she instructed them to love their enemies, and do good to those that hated them. She told them that Jesus did so. "But," said one little girl, "does God do so?" "No," said Miss Beecher, "he does not do so." "But," said she, "why does not God do so?" There is always one way of silencing children—telling them they are too young to understand. She told the little girl that, but it did not satisfy her. She hesitated a moment, and then exclaimed, "O Miss Beecher, I see now why God does not do so, it is because God is not a Christian." The great trouble with theologians is that their God is not a Christian. You will have to

give up your Christianity, or make your God a Christian, Bro. Moore. It will be done just as rapidly as the doctrine of endless punishment is dying out of the minds of the people. Christ was in God, just as certainly as God is in Christ; and as certainly as God requires us to do good to those that hate us, he does good to those that hate him. What will be the result? Just what we might anticipate, as the Scriptures reveal. He who requires us to overcome evil with good, will operate on the same beneficent principle, until all evil is overcome with good, and banished from the universe, and good alone reigns supreme and immortal. To show that what we are claiming is his teaching, we read further: "That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. And if ye love them that love you, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only"—you Christians must do better than that, because Christ does, because God does. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." This reveals perfect goodness, kindness, and love; loving even his enemies, and doing good to them that hate him. Pursue that line of conduct, and no other result is possible but that of the ultimate purification and ingathering of all mankind. Luke vi, 31-36: "And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise. For if ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? for sinners also love those that love them. And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye? for sinners also do even the same." Does not God do better than the sinner? Should not Christians do better than the sinner?

Luke vi, 34-36: "And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners

also lend to sinners, to receive as much again. But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful." This instruction is important to us. The Great Teacher, who came from the bosom of the Father, is the brightness of the Father's glory, the express image of his person. In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily; and he so fully manifested God in the flesh, that he said to Philip, "If ye have seen me, ye have seen the Father." "In him was life, and the life of Christ was the light of men." (John i: 16.) The life of Christ exhibits to us the character of God, unfolds the infinite love of God, and shows us the Father. What is there in that spirit and character that would leave any endlessly unsaved and unblest? that would stop in the efforts of infinite goodness and love, and leave one unreclaimed and unsaved? Would not that infinite goodness, that prompted God to commence the work of the redemption and salvation of the world, continue to operate in him "who is without variable-ness or shadow of turning," until the last wanderer was reclaimed, and the last prodigal brought home to happiness and heaven?

I now pass to the teaching of the Scriptures in regard to the signification of the Christian ordinance of baptism. What does baptism mean? What is its signification? Of what is it the figure; what reality does it represent? Romans vi, 3-18: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk

in the newness of life." What made the apostle think about death here? Baptism represents something about death. Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death. You say that represents the mode of baptism. I am not responsible for that; I did not make the Bible. You say that would represent immersion. I believe that, too. Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism. What is the idea we get here? Christ literally died, and was buried, and ascended up to a higher life. Then baptism represents death, and burial, and the resurrection? Yes. What truth does it teach? It teaches that the life beyond death is a sinless and holy life. Then the individual who conforms to the figure should live a sinless and holy life after baptism? Yes. Then I can see a meaning in baptism. Romans vi, 5: "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." The spiritual life which the believer lives here should be in the likeness of Christ's spiritual life after his resurrection. Well, that will do. Then there is some beauty and significance in baptism. Romans vi, 6, 7: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin." What is the point? Baptism represents the laying off of the body, and the coming up of the spiritual life? Yes. Baptism is the figure of a reality? Yes. Well, is that a reality? Persons who are conforming to this figure do not believe in the reality. Bro. Moore does not believe in it. He insists on immersion, but does not believe in what is signified by it. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. MOORE'S SIXTH SPEECH.]

*Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :*

I will not refer to Bro. Carlton's argument on baptism until it is concluded. I might dispose of it by saying, as he did of mine, that it is very clear, and that it is decidedly rich. Such is his mode of disposing of arguments that he can not dispose of any other way. So he treated of these conditions of salvation which I have referred to. This morning he says that I was to follow him. I inquire of this audience if I did not follow him, and was not following when I noticed this? Did he not submit the idea that the entire matter hung on the contingency of future happiness? Did he not admit the importance of showing that there was a contingency? In compliance with his own request I submitted the evidences, and those evidences stand unanswered before this audience, and will so stand till the end of the discussion, if that were to continue till he was as old as Methusaleh, because Bro. Carlton is not prepared to refute them. I would now, if time allowed me to do so, turn over and read a quantity more of the same kind, showing, if possible, still more conclusively, that the entire matter hangs upon conditions. Indeed, he has not made an argument from the beginning till now, nor will he ever in any discussion—and I am informed he has held over forty—yet in all of them he has not made an argument without involving this principle of contingency. *Condition or no condition* is universally the point—that is the issue, and the *only* issue, in the matter. If it be found, in the first place, that there are contingencies, and, in the second place, that all persons do not submit to them, then, as a matter of consequence, they do not enjoy the advantages that would result from compliance with them. Then the question

is: Are there conditions? Second, do men obey them? That is all there is of it. I have submitted the evidences of conditions, I have shown that they actually do exist, that they do not relate to the present life, but to the eternal or future state, and, therefore, unless he can show us that men submit, they are not blest ultimately. If they do so—the class he affirms about—they must do it after they die, because he admits, by the wording of the proposition, that they have not at the time they die.

In regard to the promise that God made, he has referred to it without effect, so far as I am able to perceive, except to cover an inglorious retreat. I believe, of all the men I have ever met in my life, my brother has the greatest ability to retreat. He reminds me of Sigel. During the war, it was said, he could fight best retreating.

I read the passage from Galatians iii, again: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ." I called Bro. Carlton's attention to the fact here that we are the children of God "by faith," and not by grace. I did that incidentally, then I proceeded to the argument. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." The promise contemplated the entire nations; families, and kindreds of the earth as embraced in this phraseology. But the promise is to all men: "In thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blest." Now, how? "If ye be Christ's," then are ye the promised seed and "heirs according to the promise." How heirs according to the promise? On what condition? My brother says it is an absolute thing. He says they are the children of God by creation in their spiritual

nature. Does the apostle say so? He says you are heirs of the promise in case you are the seed of Abraham. Who are the seed of Abraham? The preceding verse tells when you are Christ's—if you believe in him and obey him. The whole matter rests in your obeying Christ and believing in him. And then he stated that I said that the promise was fulfilled. So the apostle says: "God hath so fulfilled." So Peter in Acts iii: "Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities." Have I not the right to say what the apostle said before me? God contemplated sending a Savior. For I read in Romans iv: "Seed, not seeds as of many, but of thy seed, which is Christ." He did send him to bless all the families of the earth, not *absolutely*, but *conditionally*, and when this Son, Jesus Christ, had completed his part of the work, he had in such case presented to the world the fulfillment of the promise, and now the world must accept what God offers to Christians. This proves to my mind that God is not such a great tyrant after all, even supposing he should damn some one, because he has made the rich provision of the gospel, and told man how to use it, and calls on him to take it, and tells him of his danger, but he will not accept it. Suppose a father prepares provisions for his children, clothing and food, and gives explicit directions for their use, exhorts, entreats, and persuades them to make use of them, and they persistently refuse to eat. If they die, is the father to blame for it? Remember the illustration that I introduced last night. For Christ represents himself, in Matthew ix, 14, as a physician. The physician has prepared a remedy; he presents it in the gospel, and so explicitly that a man can not be mistaken as to what it is. He asks them to accept the infallible cure, giving them power to accept. Suppose they persistently re-

fuse to accept the conditions, who is to blame if they die in their sins and suffer the consequences? Not the Father or Jesus Christ. The man himself must be. But if God made man for his glory and does not save every one of them ultimately, it is a defeat. I confess I do n't see it in this light. If God made the race for his glory, he made them what they are; and as I remarked, if he had made them any thing else they would not have been men; it was necessary to make man a moral, responsible being, with power to accept God's offers, or subjects of government. Now, being subjects of government, they can obey the laws of government or not, or else they become machines. If they do, as a legitimate consequence of their government, they enjoy happiness. In case they reject the counsels, and disobey the laws, it is the business of the executive officers to see that they are executed. I am reminded now that the subject of punishment was noticed again. He says he does not now intend to say much about it. I am satisfied he does not care to say much about it, for it is a difficult matter for him to rid himself of the difficulties lying in the way of this subject of punishment.

He has told you to-day, as he has also on other occasions, that at the time the individual leaves the earth body, it enters the spirit body. The first is death, the second is the resurrection. He uses Romans vi, literally, which says: "He that is dead is free from sin;" that is, death is the savior. Hence, all the punishment an individual receives is this side of the time when the spirit leaves the earth body; and yet he has told you in his last speech that the individual would commit sin if he could get rid of the punishment. I would inquire where this man got his punishment that died at Winchester? He went down to death. The spirit left the earth-body

under the influence of sin. Where did he receive his punishment?

But I am reminded of another statement of my brother, that if the children get to quarreling out of doors, the father will call them into the house; and who would blame him for it? What does he mean by it? Why, if we creatures down in this world commit sin, God will kill us all and take us home to his house, home to glory. A great wonder he did not kill the whole world a long time ago. I am really astonished at Bro. Carlton; he is weaker than I ever saw him in my life before, and this is the fourth discussion I have had with him. The calling of his children up to glory—is that the punishment? That is a grand idea—that God punishes the wicked villain who kills his neighbor by taking him straight to glory.

He dislikes the idea of my showing that Universalists do not agree among themselves. He referred to the statement made by Brothers Campbell and Sheppard. I have not had access to the Skinner and Campbell debate, and am not prepared to answer that. From the language quoted, I suppose that Sheppard must have been a Materialist, which is another phase of infidelity. In order to escape from punishment, they make man all matter, so that when he is raised up, he is to be resolved into his original element. In the *Star in the West*, E. L. Rexford says: "The denomination is to be congratulated that the theory that makes death the Savior of men, instead of Christ, is dying out. The sooner it becomes a Universalist tradition, the better it will be for all concerned." And again: "It offends the judgment to say that a soul cut down in its sins passes immediately into the equal enjoyment of heaven."

This is Mr. Rexford's view. I put the question

of Mr. Rexford to my brother here, What evidence have you that the soul is not the same soul one moment after its separation from the body, that it was at the moment it did separate; and if it be so, the soul which influenced the hand to kill its victim would do so the moment afterward? But he gets up a caricature about a penitent on the scaffold, who looks down to hell, and says: "Do you see him? I sent him down there." There is no child here who knows enough to go to school who does not know that no orthodox ever taught that. They require repentance, as Jesus said: "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Paul, in Acts xvii, 30, says: "But now God commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

I ask attention to the fact that all are not God's children. John viii, 38-44: "I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father. They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father. Jesus saith unto them, If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham. But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God: this did not Abraham. Ye do the deeds of your father. Then said they to him, We be not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God. Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me. Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye can not hear my word. Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth,

because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." My brother would say that they have God as their father. What does Jesus say? He says, "If God were your father, ye would love me." We have the clearest evidence in the passages read that they are not all the children of God. John viii, 21-25: "Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins: whither I go, ye can not come. Then said the Jews, Will he kill himself? because he saith, Whither I go, ye can not come. And he said unto them, Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world. I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." He was addressing a class of persons in their sins. John vii, 33-36: "They answered him, We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free? Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house forever: but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

We have now the class of persons that "die in their sins." He says, "I am going away"—and that going away was his passing from the earth to the heavens—"where I go you can not come." That very class that my brother affirms about, who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Jesus Christ. He admits that much himself, because he said that an individual can not glorify God in his sins. If he dies in his sins, he can not glorify God till he is dead. Then, when will he?

I ask your attention now to the examination of the last speech, beginning at what he assumes is the

teaching in Matthew v. Let us see whether there is any thing of his proposition in the Scripture read. He inquires: Shall we do like God? Yes. How did God do? He loved his enemies. He sent his rain and sunlight on them. But he did more than this—he sent a Savior to save them, upon the conditions that that Savior proposed to them. He demonstrated his love by sending his Son, that whosoever believed on him might not perish, but have everlasting life. I can show my love to an enemy by manifesting that I am disposed to do him good, by action and by word. Suppose he refuses to accept what I offer. Suppose the man refuses to receive the sun and the rain, and gropes with his eyes shut. And yet God made the light; but the man will not open his eyes to see. God made man to receive Christianity, and he made Christianity for him; but if he does not receive it, he is like a man groping in blindness when the sun is in his meridian glory in the heavens.

How are you to be perfect? "As your Father which is in heaven is perfect." As a matter of course, my brother did not mean that they were to be perfect in power and wisdom, but perfect in moral conduct. That is precisely what I am contending for. The man who is so, will be the child of his Father in heaven. He says every body is the child of the Father, whether perfect or not. I have answered that, and need not give it any further attention.

I ask your attention now to the reading of Ecclesiastes vii, 15: "All things have I seen in the days of my vanity: there is a just man that perisheth in his righteousness, and there is a wicked man that prolongeth his life in his wickedness." I read from the lxxiii Psalm, that exhibits clearly David's opinion of punishment on the earth: "Truly God is good to Israel, even to such as are of a clean heart. But as

for me, my feet were almost gone; my steps had well nigh slipped. For I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked. For there are no bands in their death: but their strength is firm. They are not in trouble as other men; neither are they plagued like other men. Therefore pride compasseth them about as a chain; violence covereth them as a garment. Their eyes stand out with fatness: they have more than heart could wish. They are corrupt, and speak wickedly concerning oppression; they speak loftily. They set their mouth against the heavens, and their tongue walketh through the earth. Therefore his people return hither: and waters of a full cup are wrung out to them. And they say, How doth God know? and is there knowledge in the Most High? Behold, these are the ungodly, who prosper in the world; they increase in riches. Verily I have cleansed my heart in vain, and washed my hands in innocency. For all the day long have I been plagued, and chastened every morning. If I say, I will speak thus, behold I should offend against the generation of thy children. When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me: until I went into the sanctuary of God; then understood I their end. Surely thou didst set them in slippery places: thou castedst them down into destruction." When he thought to solve this extremely difficult problem, the things in the world, where he saw the bad man prospering and the good man in difficulty, it was too painful for him—until he went into the sanctuary. Then he understood "their end:" "Surely thou didst set them in slippery places; thou castedst them down into destruction." And I would remark to my brother, that we have a little word here that means ultimate, the last part, the ultimate or end of it. [*Time expired.*]

## [MR. CARLTON'S SEVENTH SPEECH.]

*Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

My brother wants you to understand that I was acting inconsistently in not following him in his ramblings, because I had demanded of him to show evidence of contingency in regard to man's happiness. He did not show the evidence called for, and therefore I did not follow him. I asked for proof that man's immortal destiny was based upon contingency. We had no labor in that direction, so I did not follow the kind we had.

Then, I am like Gen. Sigel. Was not Gen. Sigel a true man? Did he not do good service? Did he not do a noble work for a good cause? I am not ashamed to be compared to Gen. Sigel, or any such a man. That does not hurt my feelings a bit.

But, then, mankind are only the children of God by faith in Christ, not by creation. Still, I simply refer to the testimony we presented from the Scriptures in tracing man's origin directly to God, and the additional testimony of the apostle, that we are his offspring. If that does not prove that we are his offspring, no language can do it. There is a sense in which some are children of God by faith. This is the privilege of all, and a blessed one it is, and one intimately connected with our peace and happiness. While we are all the children of God, as being his offspring, we all ought to be his followers as dear children. All are his children; but some are disobedient children. I would ask the brother, now that as he contends that some of the human race are children of the devil, how did they become children of the devil? I think he will find himself in a difficulty here.

He refers to me as a person who debates so much. I do not know who is to blame for that. I am here



because I was challenged to come here. I was debating with a man once who insisted that part of mankind were children of the devil. I asked him how they became children of the devil. He said by listening to the devil. But, who was their father before they listened to the devil? He said, "They had n't any." [Laughter.] Said I, "My dear brother, I sympathize readily with orphans, and always pity a child who has lost his father very much, but how much worse I should feel for a poor child who never had any father." [Laughter.] It is supremely ridiculous—the extremes to which these men are driven to evade the plain teaching of the word of God. He says Jesus did not teach that all were the children of God, or any, until they imitated God and became the children of God by faith in Christ. Jesus said to them, "Do this, so that you may become the children of your Father which is in heaven." Were they not the children of God, whether they did that or not? What is the conclusion? The difference is, if they did not do that, they would be disobedient children; if they did it, they would be obedient. What right has God to govern any of us, if he is not our father? If a part of mankind are the offspring of the devil, what right has God to govern the devil's children? If they are the children of the devil, they are bound, by the principles of the divine government, to obey their father, the devil. The Scriptures teach that we are the children of God, and hence we should love and serve him as the kindest and best of fathers.

"God is not such a great tyrant, after all, if he should happen to damn somebody." I know that hurts. I know it pains. Alexander Campbell said, long ago, that "the state of public opinion was such that a man could not stand up before an assembly and advocate the doctrine of eternal punishment without appearing cruel." I am glad it is so. People

are human, and they are becoming Christian. The more learned and Christianized of the ministry are quitting it, of all denominations.

But, then, "it is the individual's fault." Look at the article, if you please, of Dr. True, in the *Methodist Quarterly*, a year ago last April, and see what he says on that subject. He says it is well enough that man should be held responsible, if a man is not required to take too great a responsibility. If too great a responsibility is thrown on him, it destroys the confidence of mankind in revelation itself. That is Methodism, and Dr. True knew it. Many of the Methodist clergy, all over the country, preach eternal punishment no more than I do. They are learning better; they are urging the people to serve God from higher motives and worthier aspirations. "God not much of a tyrant if he does damn" a few millions of his own offspring! What would make him a tyrant? Can you tell?

But, then, Bro. Carlton interprets Romans vi, 7: "He that is dead, is freed from sin," literally, but he lays down his own rule—"that we are to take the natural and literal meaning of every word, unless the writer tells us that he has used it in a different sense." Has he told you he has used it in a different sense there? What is the apostle talking about? He is talking about the literal, and from the literal illustrating the spiritual. What is his argument? The individual who has been baptized ought to live a sinless life, because he has represented death and the resurrection; because the person who has literally died is raised free from sin. It is easy to see in what sense the apostle has used death. Let him take the declaration of the apostle that the dead is freed from sin; the tyrant has lost his grip; sin has no more influence over him; he is no longer liable to sin; he no longer wants to sin. In the name of reason and

justice, what should you pursue him and lash him for?

But, then, Carlton's views are ridiculous, that a man passes from this world into another world, and progresses onward and upward, nearer and nearer to God. That is a dreadful idea. What is the brother's idea? He has not told you his views yet: that when a man dies he goes to purgatory. That is his doctrine. They do not go to heaven or hell when they die, but go to the heathen hades, a smoky place, some kind of a half comfortable and half miserable place; there they remain age after age, and then they are all turned out of that place. Is that the place Paul spoke of when he said he would rather depart and be with Christ? Is Christ there?

He does not know much about Campbell and Sheppard. I know about them. Dr. Sheppard believed in the annihilation of the wicked. That is what many of your people believe. Campbell said he lacked good sense. Sheppard said Campbell did not teach doctrine that is reasonable or scriptural. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Yes. Jesus said, "Suppose ye that those on whom the tower of Siloam fell, were sinners more than all others?" That is temporal punishment. What has that to do with the question? Just about as much as making cheese on the Western Reserve has to do with man's immortal destiny, and no more.

But, then, the passage in John, "Whither I go ye can not come." He says it is in the future tense; but it is in the present—ye can not come. That is not the literal translation of it yet. "Ye are not able to come." They were not ready to go then, and in the thirteenth chapter he uses the same language to his disciples, and says: "As I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye can not come." So now I say unto you, did they go to endless punishment because they

were not able to go where Jesus was? That will do to talk about if a man has nothing else. I propose now to pursue this argument further in regard to baptism: "For he that is dead, is free from sin." I know the theology of the churches generally is, that sin pursues an individual and follows him endlessly. But Revelation says he is freed from sin. Well, now, if we be dead with Christ spiritually, figuratively, we believe we shall also live with him, knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. "For in that he died, he died unto sin once, but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin; but yield yourselves unto God as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." Romans vi, 7-13: "Yield yourselves unto God." How? As those that are alive from the dead. You Christians ought to live spiritual lives here, like those who have passed from death, living spiritual lives in the spirit world. Ephesians iv, 20-22: "But ye have not so learned Christ; if so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus: that ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts." The old man representing the body of sin, the new man the resurrection body. 1 Corinthians xv, 29: "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?" What was the difficulty here? The Corinthian brethren, some of them, rejected the doctrine of the resurrection. They said it was past, and denied it; hence, the apostle said: Some of you say there is no resurrection of the dead; and he pro-

ceeds to argue the fact of the resurrection, and, concluding his argument on this point, he refers to the ordinance of baptism as practiced among them, and said: If you do not believe that the dead are raised to a higher life, what do you mean by baptism? What does it teach then? Just as certainly as it teaches that the baptized individual should live a pure life, it shows that the individual who has literally died, is free from sin, and has entered a sinless life. Is that said of some people, and not true of all? The brother conceded I was not through; let him take hold and answer it now.

The next argument to which I invite your attention is based on Romans v, 19: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Here you discover the important truth presented by the apostle, that as many as were made sinners through Adam shall be made righteous through the Lord Jesus Christ. Look at the extent and comprehensiveness of this language; that it is the same persons, and same number of persons that were made sinners, that shall be made righteous. This position is very emphatic; just as many as were made sinners by Adam's disobedience shall be made righteous through the obedience of Jesus Christ. On the above passage Dr. Adam Clarke well remarks: "The salvation from sin here is as extensive and complete as the condemnation of sin. Death is conquered, hell disappointed, the devil confounded, and sin totally destroyed. Here is glory to him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us kings and priests; to God the Father be glory and dominion forever and ever. The Lord God omnipotent reigneth, amen and amen!" Dr. Adam Clark well remarks, the meaning is here "the many;" just as many as were made sinners by Adam shall

be saved by Christ. This shows the final ingathering of all, the universal righteousness of mankind through the mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The next argument I present is based on this fact, that God gave the kingdom to his Son for the express purpose of having him reconcile all mankind unto himself, and thus make them all holy and happy. Dan. ii, 44: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Dan. vii, 13, 14: I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Col. i, 19, 20: "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." 1 John iv, 14: "And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world, 1 Cor. xv, 24-28: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, All things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son

also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

Can any thing be more fully complete and comprehensive than the evidence here adduced from the Holy Scriptures upon this very point, that God gave the kingdom to his Son to reconcile all things unto him, whether things in earth or things in heaven; that God qualified and prepared him with all fullness, with every requisite qualification for the accomplishment of the work of reconciling all, whether in earth or heaven; and that he shall continue to reign until he hath put down all rule, and authority, and power, until all shall be subdued to him; then shall come the end of his reign, his work having been completed, and he shall deliver up the work to his Father, that God may be all in all. If a man had not a creed to defend, would he ever have dreamed that any were left out? But these creeds are wonderful things. John xii, 32: "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." The brother need not fear that any body will be driven; this whole system is a system of divine attraction—I will *draw* all men unto me. The Evangelist says he said: "If I be lifted up, signifying what death he should die," just as certainly, then, as I be lifted up on the cross, I will draw all men unto me. But, says the brother, there are some that die in disobedience to the gospel of Jesus Christ. Jesus knew that, but he says, I will draw all men unto me. Did he mean them, too? If he did not, he did not mean what he said. They were a part of the "all men." And when he had sent him to be the Savior of the world, did not God know all the conditions in which men would exist, and have a perfect knowledge of all the difficulties to be surmounted and the obstacles to be overcome to accomplish this work? Did he not commission and send his Son to be the Savior of the world? Do we believe the testimony of the

holy prophet, who spake as the Holy Spirit gave him utterance, as in Isaiah liii, 11: "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied." What would satisfy him? What will satisfy the blessed Son of God, the Savior of the world? What will satisfy him who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God? What will satisfy him but finishing the work that the Father gave him to do, or gathering home, purifying and happyfying all those for whom, by the grace of God, he tasted death and gave himself a ransom? This will complete the work. This will finish the Savior's mission. This will bring in the last lapsed intelligence, reconciled to God, in sweet submission before the Prince Immanuel, reconciled to God by him, and he shall deliver them up to God, even the Father, and he himself become subject to the Father, and God be all in all. This is precisely salvation as I understand it, and as I teach. [*Time expired.*]

---

[MR. MOORE'S SEVENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, Respected Audience:*

I am happy to have the privilege of seeing my brother attempting to approach something as nearly like what may be regarded as a scriptural argument as he is capable of bringing up. I shall as faithfully follow him as time will permit, after I have alluded to the remark he made at the beginning. You remember that I called your attention to the fact that he, with a simple assertion, had disposed of every thing brought to support the idea that this was a conditional matter in relation to time and eternity. He says the reason he did not attend to it was because I

had not made an effort at the immortal destiny. Bro. Carlton, that is what I did precisely; and I challenge you to come to that. It will not do to tell this people that; they will examine for themselves, and when you have disposed of these, I will furnish you quadruple as many. The next time he will tell you the same thing. This is the fourth time I have debated with him, two days each time, and I have tried to induce him to come out, but he never did. I never could bring him to examine those passages. I am not at all sure that he will, but would be glad to see him try. I want to keep it before his mind, that we want those passages examined.

The remarks made in regard to God as father, and Christians as children, I believe have been sufficiently responded to before. He assumes again that they are the children of God by creation, on account of their having been made by him, and because they are intellectual and moral beings. He has not very clearly defined what he means by that. We have shown that Jesus said, "Ye are of your father, the devil." He gets up a difficulty as to whose children they were before they were the devil's children. He has great sympathy for those who have no father. This reminds me of Father Haines, who met a couple of young men who asked him if he had heard that the devil was dead. He replied that he had not heard it. "Well," said they, "he died last night." He walked up, and placing his hands on them, said, "Poor, fatherless children." [Laughter.] I have answered his argument, and disposed of all he said. That is, substantially, all there is in it. When God made man he made him in his own image, but man sought out many inventions, sinned against God, and lost the image of God; then he became the devil's child. Before he sinned, he was God's child. If you desire the use of that word, I have no objection to it. While he is in sin,

he is the devil's child. So the Savior taught. He denied that they were God's children; for he said, If God was your father you would love me, but you do not do that; and thus prove that God is not your father. He inquires what right God has to rule over the devil's children, if they be his. I would inquire what right the President of the United States has to rule over the rebel in arms against the government of the United States? He must remember that God is a ruler as well as a father—he is a judge as well as a creator; he has a government, and subjects of that government must submit to it; and if they *will* not, he must execute them; just as the government of the United States executed rebels.

But, there is too much responsibility given to man. He refers to what the Methodist preachers preach on that subject. I have not had access to the *Quarterly*. But I will venture to assume that if Mr. True was properly interpreted in the light of the subject matter, you would find him entirely consistent. I remember reading a controversy contained in the *Star in the West* and the *Christian Advocate*. The *Star in the West* insisted that the editor of the *Advocate* was denying the endless punishment of the wicked; and I remember that Mr. Merrill retorted sharply, and showed up the fallacies of the other's reasoning most perfectly. I would not be surprised, if Mr. True was here, he would be glad to vindicate himself against my brother's assertion. I am here not to vindicate these men, but the Bible. It is a great wonder to me that, in this view of the case, the Lord did not put a sword into the hands of the apostles and send them out to kill and slay, especially all the willfully disobedient, the idolater, the liar, the whoremonger, and every base man, because he is of no value to the world, and will be an infinite gainer, because he will be sent to glory.

I now ask your attention to Romans vi. I have now twice heard my brother make this argument, at Wilmington and here. I do not see the force of it. If I was with him in private, I would talk to him, and see if I could understand what point he attempts to make. It may be my dullness, and it is, if there is any point in it. He has assumed that baptism is a figure. A figure of what? Of death and the resurrection. Let us read the passage, and see what the apostle means. Romans vi, 3-7: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized in Jesus Christ were baptized unto his death," etc. How does it come that this word *death* is to be used *literally* in the seventh verse, and *figuratively* in the third and fourth? By what rule of exegesis does he make it a figure in the two and a reality in the other? I am not satisfied with assumption—I want some reason. "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should also walk in newness of life." That is, that they should render continued obedience to the Gospel. I believe that is true. I do not see any thing wrong about it. I do not think any orthodox will object to that. I read further: "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him." He assumes that this "old man" is the mortal body. But did you notice, Bro. Carlton, that this is in the present tense passive? The persons addressed are the individuals whose old man is crucified. To suit your reasoning, it ought to read, Knowing this that our old man *will be* crucified; but it says, "*is* crucified with him."

That the body of sin—that is to say, that the leading elements, or disposition of antagonism to God and his holy law—might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin, that is, from the time that

the body of the old man was crucified. It would be folly for him to speak of their serving sin in the future state, because then they can not sin. How ridiculous such an exhortation would be with regard to a future sinless state! He has different rules of exegesis from any I have ever seen in my life. The seventh verse is a reason for what is stated in the sixth, that is, that the old man is crucified. Our condition of sin and consequent opposition to God has been crucified, and our love of it taken away, and we are made to love God. That is the meaning of that verse. And why is that? For, says he, he that is dead is free from sin; he that has crucified the old man and put him off is dead to sin, he does not live any longer in it or in the practice of it. He will not find a commentator but what gives the same idea. I have a large number of them. He has read from Adam Clarke, and I would be willing to risk the interpretation of this verse with him even. Again, if we be dead with Christ—"If we be dead?" Yes. Who were those persons that he hypothecates were dead? Himself and the Christians at Rome he was addressing. "If we be dead with Christ, we believe we shall also live with him." Will it be only a world of faith when we get there? That is contrary to John's teaching, for he says, "We shall know even as we are known." We shall be transferred from the world of faith to the world of knowledge, and Paul says that these dead men believe they will live with him. He proceeds to say, "Knowing that Christ that is risen" has conquered death and lives for evermore, and we that believe in him shall gain the glorious and immortal resurrection that he has secured for us that believe, and, consequently, if we have crucified the old man, we live in hope of that everlasting fruition. Death hath no more dominion over Christ. "For in that he died, he died unto sin once, and in that he lived, he

lived unto God." That is the way Christ died—he died unto sin once—literally, always. I reckon this is to be dead. Indeed! You reckon this is to be literally dead? That is the meaning my brother makes out of it. You living men at Rome, who are dead and in the hades he tells you I believe in, and tells you the wicked are in a smoky region somewhere, always reckon yourselves to be dead unto sin, and hence, he says, you are alive unto God through Jesus Christ, you are begotten to the new life, and hence are raised to walk in newness of life. Let not sin reign, therefore, in your mortal bodies, that you should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin, but yield yourselves unto God as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God. Indeed! Who are these? Those dead men up at Rome that Paul has written to, who have gone through death and reached the immortal world, and Paul is addressing them! Is he? Such is the force of my brother's exegesis. Pooh! [Laughter.] I will wait till he tries it again.

He says that Luke xiii, 14; has no more reference to the endless destiny of man than the making of cheese on the Western Reserve has to do with it. That is quite a fine rhetorical flourish, an easy way to get rid of the passage. Why did n't he take hold of the passage and show it? He makes a point on the word likewise—shall all likewise perish—or the tower of Siloam shall fall upon you. In a similar way, or somewhere, you will perish. He fails to come up to the divine law that reaches every man. God has commanded all men every-where to repent, and assigns as a reason that he has appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness. John viii, 7. He files exception to this merely that they "are not able" to follow him now, and then he unfortunately

tells you that the same expression is used in the thirteenth chapter in addressing his disciples. Not quite, my brother. Why did n't you tell all?—you told a part of the truth; let me beseech you to tell all the truth. He says, You can not follow me now. That is the language to the disciples, and that is the difference. To the one it is without qualification, and to the other the clear statement that they shall come hereafter.

I proceed to the argument in Romans v, 17-19: "For if by one man's offense death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Therefore, as by the offense 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 sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." The disobedience of how many? One? My brother does not believe that. For he says that sin was inherent in the flesh, and not in the spirit, and, consequently, man would have sinned as a natural result of his organization. But Paul says, it is sin that produced death. Let us read the next verse: "That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." But there is a phrase in there that spoils his interpretation of it—"grace reigns through righteousness." Hence, the condition, if the individual is righteous the grace will reign to the person that is righteous. But what does the nineteenth verse mean? All men were brought under condemnation by the representative man in Eden. What is now the case? Another righteous man dies, and what was lost by the first was gained by the second. All persons who arrive at years of

discretion commit sins of their own for which they answer. They get rid of this through the righteousness of Jesus Christ. The first has reference only to Adamic sin. Daniel ii, 44: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Now I want you to notice, that this was to be set up "in the days of these kings"—at least if he takes the ground that most do. According to my recollection, in the Wilmington discussion, he told us that the kingdom was set up at the day of Pentecost, after Jesus had ascended to heaven; and that was "the days of these kings." Assuming that this is the truth in the case, you will not forget that entrance into this kingdom, that was to consume all others, was on a condition stated by Jesus himself: "Except a man be born again, he can not enter into the kingdom." What God says "can not be" my brother will hardly say can be. It is only the individual who submits to the divine arrangement and is born again, that can enter, but the individual who is not born again is conquered by the sword of his wrath. Hence, we are informed by David, in the second Psalm, that he will rule with a rod of iron. He exhorts, consequently, that they should "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth, lest ye perish in the way when his anger is kindled but a little." Romans xiv, 9, 10. He informs us that at the name Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess; but that is when we appear before the judgment-seat of Christ. Now is the offer of mercy made. All such as are born again through these instrumentalities and agencies are conquered and subjected to him, and submit to his divine government. But those who persistently refuse

to obey the Lord to the last day, shall be crushed with the rod of his wrath—shall be trodden down in that day, when his vengeance shall be poured out on a guilty world. I agree that he will conquer, but it does not follow that they will be made willing and happy subjects of the divine government. What government ever made a citizen out of a stubborn and willful rebel to the last hour? It may coerce him, subjugate him, but to make him a good and happy citizen is utterly out of the question.

Colossians i, 19, 20: "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." You will remark that the subjugation is by himself. In the next verse he says: "If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven." Here the conditions come in again, and the success depends on the individual continuing in the faith grounded and settled, and not being moved away from the hope of the gospel. I turn to John iv, 11-14: "The woman said unto him, Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep: from whence then hast thou that living water? Art thou greater than our father Jacob, which gave us the well, and drank thereof himself, and his children, and his cattle? Jesus answered and said unto her, Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again: but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." [*Time expired.*]

The announcement was made that during the remaining days of the discussion it would be continued



three hours in the morning and two in the evening.  
Adjourned with the benediction.

*Wednesday, April 27, 7 o'clock P. M.*

Opened with prayer.

[MR. CARLTON'S EIGHTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, Respected Auditors:*

Once more we appear before you, in the prosecution of the discussion, and I propose, first, to examine some things that were presented by my brother, Mr. Moore. He tells you that I will not try to answer those passages that he introduced to show that man's immortal destiny is suspended upon contingency. He did not use that language exactly—he speaks of the conditionality of salvation. The subject on which I invited him to introduce testimony was to show that man's immortal destiny is suspended upon contingency; but as he claims he has done what he was asked to do, we will understand that he presented these Scriptures for the purpose of meeting the case in hand. I shall, during the present examination, notice those passages that the brother claims answers the purpose. But, before I enter on that, I propose to notice some things in the last speech, in the order in which they were presented. After denying that all mankind are the children of God, and after asserting that man becomes the child of God only by faith in Christ Jesus, he says he concedes that before a man sins he is the child of God. Very good. Then all mankind are born the children of God; and they become the children of the devil afterwards by sinning—that is, characteristically. Hence, upon that point there is no diversity of opinion, as I understand it.

*No here admits there is a devil. They could not become the children of the devil if there was no devil.*

Why did not Christ put a sword into the hands of his disciples, and say, Go forth among the nations of the earth, and kill every body, especially the wicked? I suppose there was a very good reason for his not doing so. He said: "The Son of Man is come, not to destroy men's lives, but to save them." He had a different mission to perform entirely. Then he took up the subject of baptism—my argument based on the signification of it; but he fails to perceive its meaning—he can not perceive the argument at all. I know that he complained a good deal of the imperfection of his eye-sight; and I think he shall have to complain now of the want of spiritual perception.

(Mr. Moore.)—I do, most certainly.

The next point is in regard to those dying in their sins. Jesus said, "Whither I go, thither ye are not able to come." And I showed, that, in the thirteenth chapter of John, the Savior said to his disciples: "I go away, and whither I go ye are not able to come." The brother says he does not use the same language; but he says in the conversation: "As I said unto the Jews, so now I say unto you, Whither I go ye are not able to come." If he did not intend the same thing, why did he say, "As I said unto the Jews, so now I say to you?" And as he did say that, he remarked afterwards, that "ye shall follow me afterwards." He did not say that the Jews should not follow him afterwards. He gives them to understand that his meaning was the same in both cases. He refers to the former conversation, and says, "As I said to them, so I say to you." Romans v, 17-19. Yes; "for, as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." What does that mean? It does not mean what it says, because that would not answer my brother's

doctrine. He would have it: "As by the disobedience of one many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall some be made righteous."

But, then, he says, the Scriptures teach that Christ shall subdue all things unto himself: "It does not mean that all shall be subdued willingly—some one to be trodden down under his feet, and ruled with a rod of iron." I call attention to the 15th chapter of Corinthians, where the same subjection is applied to the Son; and the same terms employed as to his subjection unto the Father. That answers that question. In regard to the nature of the subjection I call attention again to Colossians i, 19, 20: "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." Showing that the subjugation is a reconciliation. 1 John iv, 14: "And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world." How is he going to save them? That is not the point under consideration. What did God send his Son for? is the point. I quoted it in proof of the object of sending his Son. He sent him to save the world. And then I raised the question, Will Jesus accomplish what God sent him to do? That was the point. The brother can answer that or let it remain just as it is.

Now we come to those passages introduced to show that the immortal destiny of mankind is based on contingencies or uncertainties. The first passage to which our attention is called is Matthew xix, 16-29, where the young man came, and asked what good thing he should do to inherit eternal life. Jesus said, Keep the commandments, etc. Well, now, the brother labors here to show that the young man was to accept the condition upon which he was to receive

his immortal destiny or endless felicity; and this was selling off his goods, and giving them to the poor. Is that the condition upon which our immortal destiny is based, my brother? Have you tried it? Have you educated your brethren to do it? Not one of them. You have not given them the first lesson yet. You can not find a Christian minister on earth to-day who believes that is the condition on which heaven is to be obtained, for they do not understand it in that way. And if you read further along, you find that Jesus explains this. He meant the kingdom of heaven by the word heaven. Those who trusted in riches were not prepared to enjoy the blessings of his spiritual reign. Is that the ultimate state? If so, who can be saved? Is that man's immortal destiny? 2 Corinthians v, 1-9: what is said about securing man's immortal destiny by contingencies? Do you see any thing? Is there any intimation about an uncertainty regarding it? If there is, I will frankly confess you can see something that I can not see. [Mr. Moore here requested Mr. Carlton to read the ninth verse.] I am very willing to do it, or to read any other portion of the Scriptures: "Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted (or approbated) of him." The apostle desired to have the approbation of heaven, that bringing us greater peace than any thing else, imparting a peace that surely he could realize in no other way. Is that an ultimate state, or finality? 2 Timothy iv, 6-8: "For I am now ready to be offered," etc.; "henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness," etc. Does the brother understand that that crown of righteousness is man's immortal destiny? How is that, my brother—is the crown of righteousness man's immortal destiny? You do not believe it is. I want to sift these passages. They are glorious passages. They prove

important facts. But the question is as to the finality or ultimate.

The first thing I want to notice in regard to the crown is the point the brother makes—henceforth, from this time, he said it was not there before—consequently, in consequence of his having done that the crown was laid up—that is not the sense. The word does not mean henceforth, it means remaining. I have done thus and so in this world. What more, what remains? A crown of righteousness in the future. The meaning is not from henceforth, nor is the sense accordingly; the word means *remaining*. I want to notice a similar use of the word crown and see if it is used to denote man's ultimate destiny. Philippians iv, 1: "Therefore, my brethren dearly beloved and longed for, my joy and crown, so stand fast in the Lord, my dearly beloved." The brethren here at Philippi were the apostle's crown. Were the dearly beloved brethren at Philippi the Apostle Paul's immortal destiny? Then, 1 Thess. ii, 19: "For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?" Who were the crown of the apostle here? The brethren at Thessalonica. Were they the apostles' immortal destiny? How ridiculous! There is a beautiful signification in it, but it does not mean what he says it does. Rev. iii, 11: "Behold, I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." Is there danger of one man taking another's immortal destiny? There can not be any thing more ridiculous than such an interpretation of Scripture. 1 Tim. vi, 17-19: "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store

for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life."

I suppose he quoted this to show that this was the *aionion*, life, the endless life; it is *ontos*, signifying real or true life. Their minds were on earthly things, and he taught them to lay hold on real or spiritual life. What is there in regard to man's immortal destiny? I want to remark here that I passed these by because I saw nothing in them settling man's immortal destiny as being suspended on contingency. I thought my brother threw them in as chunks to obstruct my way. I really did not think they taught any such thing at all. But he brought them up again and again before I thought he was serious about it, but I have now taken them up and examined them.

Luke xii, 34, is the next passage referred to: "For, where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." Does that settle the immortal destiny of any body? What does it say about the final condition of any one? If you can see any thing in it you can see more than I can. The next and closing passage in the list was the seventy-third Psalm. Let us examine into what the psalmist says. He says he considered the case of the wicked. Well; what did he find? The wicked were not in trouble like the righteous—they had more than heart could wish. I ask, Did David, when he made these declarations, understand the real condition of the wicked? Did he understand the merits of the case when he said they had all that heart could wish? Yes, the brother takes this in all seriousness, and says that David says, "In vain have I washed my hands in innocency." Yes, he said; "As far as this world is concerned the wicked had a better case than the righteous." That is encouraging to bring people into the church, is it not? That is like what the apostles taught, that "great peace have they," etc.; very much like the testimony of divine inspiration,

which says: "In keeping his commandments there is great reward, and whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the word, this man shall be blessed in his deed." What was the experience of David after he had made such an expression? David did believe once that sin would happify man, and, like others, when he believed that error he went into sin. And what was his experience when he continued on in sin? Did he find that he had more than heart could wish? Did his eye stand out with fatness? Let him tell his own story. He said: "The sorrows of death compassed me about, and the pains of hell got hold upon me; I found trouble and sorrow." Did not you find wickedness made a man happy? No. I found the way of "the transgressor is hard." "There is no peace to the wicked;" "they are like the troubled sea when it can not rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt." Then he says: "Great is thy mercy toward me, O Lord; thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell." He said he "patiently waited for the Lord, and he inclined unto him and heard his cry." He brought him up also out of an horrible pit, out of the miry clay, and set his feet on a rock, and established his goings. God took him out of it and put a new song in his mouth, even praise unto our God. What then? He says he was afflicted, and after he had been afflicted he learned to keep the commandments of God, and that in keeping them there is great reward. He says in that same Psalm that he was as ignorant as a beast when he thought sin would make a man happier than righteousness. I believe any man is as ignorant as a brute who believes sin will happify man more than righteousness. We have had this array of passages to prove that man's immortal destiny is suspended upon contingency. That is as clear as mud.

*Admits the resurrection  
Hughes denies the resurrection  
See Hughes Debate PK 97, 413, 114,*

*Over*  
My next argument is that the Scriptures teach that all the dead shall be raised and all the living changed. *Over*  
Acts xxiv, 13-15: "Neither can they prove the things whereof they now accuse me. But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets: and have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." I Cor. xv, 15-22: "Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Same, 51-52: "Behold I show you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; (for the trumpet shall sound;) and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." I Thess. iv, 13-18: "But I would not have you to be ignorant brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of

John Hughes denies a  
resurrection of the body  
see Hughes - Bar friends  
debate pp. 97, 413, 414

140 THE DESTINY OF MAN.

the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words."

Thus we have the direct testimony of the Scriptures in regard to the universality of the resurrection from the dead.

The next argument I introduce is: In the final resurrection all will be immortal or deathless. I Cor. xv, 51-54: "Behold, I show you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." Isaiah xxv, 6-8: "And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it."

The second point on the subject of the resurrection that we made and sustained from the direct testimony of the Scriptures, that in the final resurrection man shall be raised to his ultimate condition, for it will be a condition of deathlessness. [Time expired.]

[MR. MOORE'S EIGHTH SPEECH.]

*Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

I am glad Bro. Carlton has taken up the passages he did; I am sorry he made one or two mistakes. He read Ecclesiastes ix, 15, and Psalm lxxiii, and commented as if I had read these to prove the contingency and conditionality of the immortal destiny of men. I did this only to show that there was an inadequate punishment of sin here, in connection with the murder case, and his showing that the willfully disobedient shall be ultimately holy and happy. In the next place he has failed to notice a number of passages that I read. I shall review him briefly. The young man came to Jesus—a Pharisee, as he doubtless was, who believed in future rewards and punishments, who was in the enjoyment of all that a man can possess as the lineal descendant of Abraham—with the question "What shall I do to enjoy eternal life?" He asked this question with regard to what lay beyond this life, for he was rich and popular, and conversant with the Pharisaic ideas. Taking the circumstances into consideration, no man without a theory to maintain can refer the question to any thing but the future state; the ultimate destiny. With this question before him, and knowing the heart of that young man, and knowing his sentiments, if that view was incorrect, it was now the time for the Savior to correct him; on the contrary, he simply answers his question in reference to what the young man contemplated; and told him what should be done. He replied, "This have I done, what lack I yet?" To put him to the severest possible test, to determine whether he was in earnest and disposed to give up the entire world for the end asked for, Jesus tells him to sell all he has, and give to the poor, and come and fol-

low him, that he may have treasure in heaven. I simply submit to this audience, with this brief review of the passage, whether it can mean less than the ultimate destiny of the individual asking the question? He parries this, however, in another way, and says that I have not attempted to teach this lesson practically. Possibly he is not as fully acquainted with my teaching as he might be. I have certainly insisted on my hearers selling enough to take care of the poor, and this is the thing involved. The poor are to be taken care of, even at the sacrifice of property. In thus doing, the individual lays up a treasure in the heavens.

He passes over entirely 2 Peter i, 10, 11, the address made to the disciples, individuals who were now in the earthly kingdom, the kingdom established here and in progress; and he tells them that in order to secure abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom, they must do the things named, beginning at the fifth verse; "for," said he, "if ye do these things, ye shall never fall." I would ask him, has Jesus two kingdoms—I mean two immortal kingdoms? If these individuals are in the kingdom here, was there another kingdom called the immortal kingdom, into which they were to enter? Or, what kingdom was it they were promised an entrance into—those were in the kingdom now here—if not the immortal kingdom? for while it may be granted that the kingdom founded in the days of the Cæsars was the immortal kingdom, yet it was in its progress and not perfect, and will not be till Jesus returns to the earth to take his people home. Paul says, in 1 Corinthians xi, that the Son will deliver up his kingdom to the Father, that he may be all in all; unto this everlasting, perfected kingdom. An entrance into it is based on a full compliance with the specified conditions. He read 2 Corinthians v, 1-9. You could not fail to see how

it bothered him to cover over and hide the difficulties he was under. He said if the earthly tabernacle was destroyed, we have a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, etc. Surely here is a contrast between the body here, and the future body; this side of death, and that side of death. No one can doubt this. Now, says he, while I remain in this, I groan and desire to be clothed upon with the house in heaven. In other words, that, having put off this body, I shall fail to secure that other body over there, intimating that it was a matter of some doubt, or that there was a possibility of making a failure in regard to it. Still further, in the ninth verse he says: Wherefore we labor that whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him. Whether in this body or out of it, whether in the flesh or in the immortal house, in the future or eternal state, we labor now. Why? Because of the contingency, because the thing is not positively certain, until I shall have concluded the earthly labor. We labor that we may be accepted—grant that it means approbation—that is exactly the same thing as to be saved and brought into everlasting blessedness. The apostle says the approbation hung on his completing the work, and for that reason he did work; and if an individual can be holy and happy without the approbation of Jesus Christ, my brother may claim the passage, and not till then. He forgot the closing part of 2 Corinthians iv, which I called his attention to. I read it again, beginning at the sixteenth verse: "For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." The outward man and the inward man, the body and the spirit. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory: while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things

which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." You will pardon me from throwing in a few remarks just now, concerning affliction, which will meet a good deal that was said in his last speech in regard to the difference between the suffering of the righteous and the wicked in this world. You will remember that Jesus, in Mark x, 28, 29, told his disciples that they should receive a hundred-fold now in this present life, but must endure persecutions. Paul tells us he had endured persecutions more than all—he had suffered the loss of all things. Philippians iii, 8. Also, in 2 Cor. xi, he says he had been beaten eight times publicly, shipwrecked, in prison, suffered the loss of friendships, been dragged out of the city of Ephesus dead; suffered all this for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ. Compare the sufferings of the Apostle Paul with the wicked Nero, who lived contemporaneously with him, and who finally took his life, and you see the difference between the good and bad here. Read also Heb. xi, 33-38: "Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection: and others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; of whom the world was not worthy: they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth."

I ask your attention to the ten persecutions that followed after the commencement of the propagation

of the Gospel, resulting in the destruction of at least one million of the disciples and followers of Jesus Christ, who gave their lives a sacrifice to his cause in the midst of the merciless mob that thirsted for their blood; and then tell me that the righteous enjoy their good and the wicked their evil here. Compare the past as well as the present of the church.

I have wandered from my original purpose, and I return to the Corinthian letter, to finish what I begun. "For our light affliction"—it is astonishing that he should say our *light* affliction, after all his sufferings—"worketh out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." It works it out conditionally: "While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen." What are they? Why, "the things which are seen are temporal, and the things that are not seen, are eternal;" and consequently while the individual lifts up his eye beyond the temporal, the transient, the fading, the fleeting, the dying things of this world, to the immortal and ultimate state, and continues to work under these light afflictions as a disciple of Jesus Christ, he works out that unfading and glorious crown that he shall wear forever and ever, in heaven.

I ask my brother's attention to another that he passed over unfortunately—I Peter i—in which we are told they were "begotten to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time;" and that this incorruptible crown is "fadeless, undying, endless, ultimate." There can be no doubt that it is to be obtained through faith. So says the apostle. I call your attention again—for he passed over them—to Luke xii, 33, 34, and Matthew, parallel passages, in which Jesus says to his disciples, "Lay ye not up treasures on earth,"—here is the word which means the sphere on which we live. And why

lay not up treasures here? Because "thieves break through and steal." But "lay up your treasure in heaven." Why? Because "neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and thieves break not through and steal." Why lay up there, and not here? For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also. I ask him to reconcile this idea of incorruptibility—because there is no moth, nor rust, nothing that produces mutation, when it is laid up in heaven; and hence they have that treasure on condition of *laying it up there*. Also, 1 Cor. ix, 24-27: "Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain. And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible. I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air: but I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." Revelations xxii, 14: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates of the city." Revelations xxi, which contains a description of the new Jerusalem, its streets of gold, etc.; its immortal glories and ineffable splendors; which had no need of the sun, or of the moon, for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. Then tell me that it is not the immortal destiny, and does not hang upon their doing his commandments. I have done with this now, yet I have quantity more that I have not named, and when he has concluded the examination of these, they shall be forthcoming.

I desire to call your attention back a moment to the passage that I had passed over accidentally, until I was looking over my notes this evening, when it came before me. I desire, honestly and honorably,

to notice every passage. Ephesians i, 8-10: "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will," etc.; "that in the dispensation of the fullness of time he might gather together in one all things in Christ," etc. Is there any thing determining definitely the ultimate condition of those dying in willful disobedience to the Gospel? Nothing, unless it be in the tenth verse. By the "gathering together of all things" he means to say he will gather together all mankind. Of things—of what things? Of things in Christ. Exactly. Whatever is in Christ will be gathered in this great gathering, and only what is in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him. All things which are in Christ will be gathered in; in whom we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things, according to the counsel of his own will. This is the divine arrangement revealed to us in the Bible. These persons had obtained an inheritance, being predestinated, according to the revealed plan of God, having accepted it themselves, and made it theirs by adopting it. But now I have to remark this much more in regard to the will of God; that when it is spoken of in reference to divine action, it may be regarded as absolute, and hence it is said, "I will do all my pleasure;" but when spoken of in regard to man, it is in no case, so far as I am aware, spoken of in this light. On the contrary, we have it clearly stated in Matthew xxiii, 37: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together; even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" The will of man opposed the will of God. I may also remark, that God expresses his will in his divine commands. He forbids covetousness, murder, incest, etc. Men have been guilty of them all, and, therefore, have broken the will of God.



In Matthew vii, 21, Jesus says: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." The individual must accept the benefit of the divine will by obeying the conditions expressed.

The devil destroyed; sin destroyed; the works of the devil destroyed; every root that the heavenly Father hath not planted destroyed. These were referred to last night, probably. I have only to say, that it hangs on the meaning of this word destroy. Does it mean annihilated? To say that these are all annihilated would include an infinite quantity of things annihilated. Does he mean the devil and sin, and the works of the devil, are annihilated? Does he mean this is to be done absolutely? These passages by no means prove it. He read Hebrews ii, 14: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Destroy the devil? Annihilate him? There is no such idea in the word destroy. But that he might cut off the power the devil had over humanity, and take away the power he had of locking humanity in the grave, raising himself from the grave, leaving death in the tomb, and showing that man could be brought up to the immortal throne. He did that personally. And still you and I have to die yet. We die, not as the ancients, for they died without hope. He lamented, in the words of the poet:

"And we, the brave, the mighty, and the wise,  
Bloom, fade, and fall, and then succeeds  
A long, dark, deep, oblivious sleep—a sleep which  
No propitious power dispels, nor changing seasons, nor revolving years."

This was the second reign. Christ arose triumph-

ant, carrying away the key, and leaving the tomb an empty chrysalis, and showing man the way. So he, in the same way, proposes to overcome the enemies of man on the conditions given to us.

To the subject of the resurrection of the dead our attention is called. All the dead are raised. He assumed, in this case, that they are raised to immortal life. Let me ask your attention to the reading of the passage—John v, 28, 29: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." We have, then, in the resurrection, two classes of individuals, just as distinct as they are here precisely; and it is affirmed of the one, that when they rise, they will rise to damnation; of the other, that they will rise to life. I shall proceed to the examination of the passages that he has introduced here. I Corinthians xv, 20-22: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." What does he mean to prove by this passage on the resurrection of the dead? Read the next verse: "Every man in his own order: they that are Christ's, at his coming." Every man in his own proper band, or the band to which he belongs. If he is a wicked man, he rises with the wicked, and is separated from the righteous, and the righteous separated from the wicked. This comports with John v, 28, 29, and I Corinthians xv, 51, 52. Notice this little word "we," for the address is directly to Christians, the personal pronoun including the individuals addressed, with the apostle. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. CARLTON'S NINTH SPEECH.]

*Brother Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

The brother informs us that he introduced Eccl. ii, 15, and Psalm lxxiii, not to prove any thing about the contingency of man's immortal destiny, but that the rewards and punishments of the present life are inadequate. That looks to me like a pretty hard business, for a man to prove that God does not do justice in this world when he says he does. It is a work I would not undertake, and he is welcome to all the glory and honor that he will gain by it. He introduced Matt. xix, 16-23, and says the young man that came to Jesus was a Pharisee, he supposes, and, doubtless, a believer in future rewards and punishments. That is your supposition. Is your supposition what the Bible teaches? I thought we were laboring after what the Bible teaches. You suppose he was what you want him to be. But, unless you could make it appear what the young man did intend by this life that he questioned Jesus about, it would not prove any thing for you to assume that Jesus meant any thing in reference to that immortal life. You must assume that this Pharisee understood more about Christ than his own disciples did, even his death and resurrection. That is not admissible.

But has Jesus two kingdoms? Let us see. In Matt. xiii, Jesus said the kingdom of heaven is like a net cast into the sea, which gathers of every kind; when it was full they drew it to shore and gathered the good into vessels and cast the bad away. In Rev. xxi, 27, we find another kingdom: "And there shall in nowise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." One gathered all kinds, the other only one kind.

Were there two kingdoms, or only one? Can the brother explain that? 11 Cor. v, 1-9: The apostle did say that "we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God," etc. He was very confident about that. He says we know that; yet the brother, in order to bring in his contingency, said he did not know any thing about it. It was still undecided, and he never expected it would be decided till he came to judgment. In the opening of the chapter he said he knew it, but at the last he said he did not. I have seen persons driven to pitiful things to make their point, but this way of explaining passages beats any thing I ever saw. He also says that, though our outward man perishes, our inward man is renewed; but tell us again, will you, that the wicked enjoy life more than the righteous? "The wicked flee when no man pursueth, but the righteous are bold as a lion." My brother, you are fond of analogy and philosophy; the same causes produce the same effect. If serving God in this world makes a man miserable, serving him in the next world will make him perfectly miserable. When a man is perfectly wicked he will be perfectly happy if it makes him happy in this world. He will be perfectly happy in the next, and you can not evade it. But, then, let us look at the purpose of God as introduced in the argument, Ephesians i, 8-10, where he undertakes to answer one of my arguments: "Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ," etc. How does he get along with it? He believes where God's purpose depends on divine action for fulfillment it is absolute, and its fulfillment is certain. Well, now, on what has he based

this ingathering of all things in Christ? Has he based it on the contingency of where a man shall be born, or on his faith? He has made known his will; according to his good pleasure purposed a contingency? purposed an uncertainty? No. Purposed in himself, that is where he has purposed it. That is absolute, then; there is no danger of that failing. That will is absolute, and that purpose is sure of accomplishment, and that gathers together all things in one. He says, how do you get along with this? it means to gather those that are gathered already! He says he is going to gather in Christ all that are in him. Jesus' mission for eighteen hundred years has been gathering persons that are in Christ, not gathering others into him. That will not do. But then Jesus said, in Matt. xxiii: "How often would I have gathered thy children together, but ye would not!" Was that a finality? Is that a man's ultimate condition? No, he does not pretend it is. He brings that to show that the subordinate can triumph over the supreme, but he knows it is not so. He knows the supreme will triumph. The invitation was presented to them, which they did not obey; that has no relation to the ultimate.

Well, then, what next? How are these enemies of man to be destroyed? What do you make out of it? He says they are to be taken away and rendered powerless. That will do just as well. The word does really signify that they shall be rendered powerless. Well, then, death, hell, and the devil and sin shall be rendered powerless, and no more have any dominion over man. I have no objection to that; it will do well enough.

Then, he makes an argument against the resurrection. Our first argument was that all mankind will be raised from the dead; and what argument does he make against the resurrection of all mankind? So

*Admits the resurrection*

*John Hughes denies such a resurrection. See his*

MR. CARLTON'S NINTH SPEECH.

153

*See below*  
 my first point on the final resurrection of the dead is gained by his concession that all will be raised from the dead. What is the second point? That they are raised to immortality—this mortal shall put on immortality, deathlessness; that the raised will be in a condition where they can die no more. Is that denied? There was nothing said about it in the last speech. We do not know whether he will deny it or not. How does he undertake to operate against the successful issue of this affirmative? Why, that in the final resurrection there are two classes; but, alas, in the final resurrection you can not find two classes? Where are the two classes? As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. Are there two classes made alive in Christ? I guess not. I guess you do not find a class of wicked in Christ; and work as long as you live, and you will have to give it over without accomplishing it, to prove that one individual will be raised to immortality out of Christ. What, then, is presented to your attention?—a spiritual resurrection, substituted to begot the mind in regard to the final resurrection of mankind to immortality. This, certainly, is a glorious argument for a minister of the Gospel to make, from John v, 28, 29: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice," etc. What resurrection is this describing? If you go back to the twenty-fourth verse of this chapter, you get the subject matter that Jesus is pressing: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come unto condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live." There is the resurrection. Well, now, what death is Jesus talking about? What kind of a life has the individual entered into that has become a

*John Hughes denies such a resurrection. See his debate with G. A. Spangenberg pp. 97, 413, 414.*

Dem. 12

believer in Jesus? He has entered a spiritual life; he has come from spiritual death. Then, the death that Jesus is talking of is the spiritual death, and the resurrection is the spiritual resurrection. We have the terms clearly and distinctly stated: "For the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live." What dead are referred to? They that were dead in trespasses and sins; and those who obeyed it were raised up into the enjoyment of life and peace. Any reader of the Scriptures understands that. Then he proceeds right along on the same subject. Does he tell us he has changed the subject or the meaning of the terms? Not a word of it. We are bound by the brother's rule, laid down at the opening of the discussion, unless he gives us to understand that he changes the use of the terms, which he has not done. Not only is that the fact, but it is conceded, almost universally, by persons who themselves are believers in endless punishment, that this passage is parallel with Dan. xii, 2, as Adam Clarke suggests. Now, if you will get the time of that, you will understand both these passages. When were these persons to rise from the dust of the earth? Commence at the beginning of Dan. xii: "And at that time shall Michael stand up, and the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." Connected with this, and making it a simultaneous event, he says, next verse: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

The time of this coming forth was when the Gospel was preached by Jesus Christ and his apostles, when

this quickening took place, by which those that had been living in obedience came forth justified to this resurrection of life, and those who were doing evil came forth to greater damnation, or the resurrection of damnation. How clear and plain; but read Daniel further, and it becomes clearer and fuller. He says: Until a time and times and a half time. Daniel did not know any thing more about the end of the world than the Millerites, so he asks for a more definite answer. The angel says further: "And when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished." When was the power of the holy people scattered? In A. D. 70. The angel came from heaven, then, being the interpreter, all these wonders were finished. Michael delivered "every one whose name was written in the book." Then was a time of trouble, such as had never been till that time. And Jesus says, No, nor ever shall be, "when ye shall see the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place, then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains." They did flee according to the signs given them by Jesus. Then was the power of the holy people scattered and the daily sacrifice taken away; then many that slept in the dust awoke, some to life, and some to shame and contempt. Then some came forth—meaning they awoke to spiritual life or condemnation. What has that to do with the ultimate or immortal destiny of mankind? It is another subject altogether. If the brother wishes more light on this subject, I will call his attention to another thing. Wherever there is any thing said about the punishment of any body, there is nothing said about the resurrection of any body to immortality. The subjects of punishment and the final resurrection are never connected in the Bible.

We proceed with our tenth argument. It is the third on the subject of the resurrection. First, all

Rain. 8: 20, 21

will be raised; second, all will be raised to a deathless existence; third, the raised will be as the angels in heaven, and equal to them. Romans viii, 20, 21: "For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." The same beings that were made subject to this vanity will be brought into a glorious liberty. I want to notice further, in connection with this, the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, who came to abolish death, and bring life and immortality to light on the subject of the immortal resurrection. Matthew xxii, 23-33: "The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him, saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. Now there were with us seven brethren: and the first, when he had married a wife, deceased, and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother: likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seventh. And last of all the woman died also. Therefore in the resurrection, whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her. Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. And when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine." Matthew xii, 23-38. Also Luke xx, 27-38. Now we have presented three points

touching the subject of the resurrection and the ultimate condition, or immortality. The first is, that all shall be raised from the dead; the second, that they shall be raised to a deathless existence. This mortal shall put on (Athanasian) deathlessness. The third point is, that they shall put on the glorious condition of the angels in heaven. Jesus has taught us, that in the resurrection they are as the angels in heaven. They can die no more. They are children of God, not on account of the place where they are born, or on account of what they believed in some other world, but by virtue of being children of the resurrection; and, in connection with this fact, that they are raised in Christ; in connection with this, that as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall bear the image of the heavenly; that in Christ all are made alive, and bear the heavenly likeness or image. Now we ask you about man's ultimate state. We concede, and have conceded all the while, that there are enlightened persons here and unenlightened, infants and adults, Christians and infidels, those who have failed to live a religious life now, and there are persons who live and die in disobedience to the Gospel of Christ; and we have labored all the time to show you the blessings of obedience, and the joy and happiness that the Christian realizes in this world, in the special salvation in which God is a special Savior of those that believe; but beyond the darkness of this life, beyond the existence of man in the inferior condition in which he is placed, a little lower than the angels; for the time, beyond the reign of sin, beyond the place where we are subject to temptation, beyond the world where we are liable to sin, beyond the place where sin exists, beyond the discipline of rewards and punishments, stands forth in bold relief, in the Scriptures of truth, the immortal resurrection, the other state of existence for man. The Scriptures

unfold two states of existence for man. The first is primary—a state of vanity in which God subjected him here, making him a little lower than the angels—the existence in the animal body; the other, his condition in the heavenly. As that state was represented by the first Adam, so this is represented by the second Adam. As is the earthly, such are that are earthly; and as is the heavenly, such will be the heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. But the apostle says: “The purpose and grace of God was manifested by the appearing of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.” The purpose of God was unfolded by the appearing of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Now, what kind of a life beyond death did Jesus bring to light by his appearance? Was it a life of peace and joy and felicity, as an ultimate condition of a portion of the race, and a life of agony and woe for the rest? By whose appearing is such a life as that manifested? By nobody, that there is a miserable eternity for any one. The only future life brought to light is brought to light in Jesus, and that is a holy, happy, and sinless life. It is the only future life I believe in, or that I ever did or ever expect to believe in, in this world or the future. There is no manifestation of any other life.

Consider the argument that has been brought to establish this proposition. Not only that this class or that class shall be redeemed and purified, but that all shall be happy, and brought to this ultimate and glorious condition; and the testimony from the Old and New Testament Scriptures, time after time, and passage after passage, reiterated and clearly set forth the fact of the ultimate ingathering of all things in Christ, and the resurrection in Christ of all that die

in Adam. What language shall we ask for, that can be more explicit, and more plain, and more clear, and more positive, and more reliable than these testimonies that we have presented from the word of God? With these, dear friends, your speaker is satisfied. With these bright lights illumining the grave, and shining upon the future, his soul is filled with joy that is unspeakable and full of glory; and he goes forth to-night, trusting in the goodness and the love of his heavenly Father and your Father, of his God and your God, feeling that his trust is well-founded.  
[Time expired.]

[MR. MOORE'S NINTH SPEECH.]

*Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

I desire to state as succinctly as I can, some counter arguments against the proposition that you have attended to. I do this now, that in my brother's last speech he shall have an opportunity to reply to them. First, the uncertainty of the doctrine he pleads is against the view. Not one in a thousand at any period of the world's history ever believed it. Second, a thousand to one of the learning and talent of the world, from the days of the apostles to this day, have been unbelievers in the doctrine of this proposition, that those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, will be ultimately holy and happy. Third, in the first two centuries of the Christian Era, no one ever dreamed of the doctrine, notwithstanding this period includes the apostolic age. Jesus and the apostles lived among the people. The Pharisees, who believed in future rewards and punishments, believed the punishment of the wicked was endless. Instead of correcting that belief, then so popular and universal among the Jews, Paul said he was a Pharisee,

touching the subject of the resurrection, and besides this, neither Jesus nor the apostles ever rebuked the Jews for holding the doctrine, but in the concluding half of the sixteenth chapter of Luke, Jesus said there was a certain rich man, and a certain poor man lying at his gate. Both died. One of them was carried by angels to Abraham's bosom, the other lifted up his eyes in hell, being in torment; saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom, and asked that he might be sent to him, that he might afford relief. Through the entire teaching of the passage, you will not fail to observe the impress of the Pharisaic idea, that in the future condition there is an impassable gulf that never can be bridged over; for Abraham replied, Thou in thy life-time receivedst thy good things and Lazarus evil things. Now thou art tormented and he is comforted; besides this, there is an impassable gulf between us, which renders it impossible for one to cross. You will remember that this view was taken by the Pharisees, and is presented by Josephus, in the article on Hades, as the true doctrine of the Pharisees.

The second is, that Universalism, unintentionally, I hope, offers a premium on sin, because it offers glory to sinners sooner than good men. He tells us that a man who kills another, or takes another's goods, will enjoy eternal bliss with the righteous. Was it for this reason God destroyed the antediluvians and left a Noah? destroyed the Sodomites and left a Lot? destroyed the Apostle Paul and left a Nero? destroyed millions of Christians and left their persecutors? No, no. Did he destroy the cities of the plain and the cities of antiquity, in order to take to glory the wicked who were too bad to stay on the earth?

In addition to this, as a fourth item: it is a merciless system. Man suffers all his crimes deserve, my brother says. He does not tell us where the willfully disobedient man who dies in his disobedience gets his

punishment—as, for instance, a suicide, who has gone to eternity. He tells us that he must be punished to the full for his crimes; if he does, there is no forgiveness. If you owe me one hundred dollars, and pay principal and interest to the last cent, it would be the highest nonsense to say I pardoned you that note. Pardon is out of the question, according to the doctrine of my brother. Again, Christ's sufferings were not only useless, but unmerciful, because he had nothing to suffer for. It did not relieve the world from any of its sufferings; hence, it was only malignance that could have inflicted the sufferings that Jesus bore.

Next, it elevates punishment. Dr. Williamson, in the *Star in the West*, says, on this question: "But, suppose a man does not love his enemies but hates them, does not Jesus provide that he shall be punished for it? No. He has nothing to do with rendering evil for evil; he knows that hatred is an evil, and that a man's own sin will correct him." You will not fail to see that sin is not taken away by Jesus Christ, but by the evil in the sin; that is, the pain is in the suffering, the suffering in the disease, the evil in the evil. The evil, you say, suffers, but the greater suffering the sooner it will be over, and you should give the patient a dose of medicine to increase the agony that he might get over it sooner. It simply elevates punishment to the position of a Savior.

Again, according to this, death is a Savior. Romans vi, 7: "For he that is dead is freed from sin." He makes it apply to the natural death. He says sin inheres only in the body, and hence, when the body dies, the spirit is freed from sin. In a letter from Bro. Carlton, written to me last November, he says that when the spirit leaves the earth body it enters the immortal body. The proposition admits that the willfully disobedient are not saved at the moment that

death finds them and takes them away, but just then this wicked man moves out of his earth body, leaving his sin, and instantly enters into his immortal body, or saved state. Then death takes a sinner home, and not Christ. In the same letter he says, substantially, sin and the condemnation of sin and suffering for sin exist only in the earthly state. Second, when a man dies he enters the spirit world through the resurrection. Third, in the spirit world there is no sin, or sinning, or temptation to sin, hence there can be nothing to prompt punishment but revenge.

From this we gather that there is neither sin nor suffering beyond death. A man, by his own hand, commits suicide. How does he receive a just recompense of reward for his crime? Whenever he goes out of his earth body he is freed from sin and suffering. Then why not, when life is melancholy, cut the throat or stab the heart, and let the spirit free? The doctrine furnishes a strong motive to commit suicide, because it offers the individual, at the instant of death, an immortal blessedness in heaven. Only let a man kill himself, and he instantly enters the felicities of the immortal sphere; hence, to kill the race, would be to save the race and secure the triumphs of divine grace.

I have submitted these among the objections in the shape of arguments which militate against the teachings of his proposition, and now proceed to the review of the last speech.

He refers to Eccl. and to the seventy-third Psalm, in which the psalmist tells us the wicked have no bands in their death. You have heard him say, substantially, that when David asserted this he was a fool, and that it was not true. Did the prophet intend to say that he was a fool? That when human existence was measured alone by the time between the cradle and the grave, and he attempted to solve the intricate problem of this difference, then, and then only, did he

perceive that it was impossible to see how it could be done, and he found there was no advantage in being innocent. When was it he saw that he was a fool for taking this view of it? When he went to the house of God and saw the end of the wicked—the ultimate or finality of the wicked. He then saw what foolishness it was to attempt to explain these things by assuming that men are rewarded and punished for all their crimes and doings in this world. That is the substance of it.

Solomon says the righteous man, by his righteousness, is brought to death, and the wicked man prolongeth his wickedness. Nehemiah says, "The Lord has punished us less than our crimes deserve." So that there is an inequality in punishments in this world. Take it in this neighborhood. I could point out individual instances that clearly illustrate the force of it, and show the impossibility of explaining this difference between men in this world upon any natural principle of reason. It can only be explained on the supposition that there is another state of rewards and punishments, of righteous retributions.

But in regard to wickedness producing happiness in this world, I do not admit that it produces happiness; it affords sensual pleasure that men seek after. But when a man dies he is cut off from these sources of gratification. I should not be surprised if this was one of the great punishments in the future. The individual who loves strong drink, for instance, will not be able to procure the means of this gratification.

Again, that Jesus has two kingdoms. He attempts to prove that when the net was let down it gathered both good and bad, but that in the ultimate kingdom it is only the good. I told you that the kingdom established in the days of these kings had its inception then; it is in progress now, and will be till it attains perfection. When that is the case, the Lord



will take out all things that work evil. Matthew xii, 47-50: "Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into sea, and gathered every kind: which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." This was the conclusion of the fishing. You observe that the net was drawn to the shore, and then the separation made. This will explain the fact, that the kingdom is in a progressive state now, but then will be perfect. While in its progressive state, some bad men get into it; but when it is sifted, and the bad taken out, they will be cast away, for then cometh the end, the finality, the ultimate. Ephesians i, 10, is adverted to. The emphasis was on the closing phrase of the preceding verse—"which he hath purposed in himself." To be sure he purposed in himself; but what did he purpose and reveal to the world: that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." 2 Corinthians v, 17-20. Then it was the divine arrangement, without calling any body to his assistance. The divine mind arranged it, and it was fixed by him. The mere fact, that God purposes a plan himself, does not determine whether there are conditions in it in regard to the person for whom it is planned. But in the dispensation of the fullness of time; or, in other words, at the completion of the ages, when all shall have been completed, he "shall gather together in one all things in Christ." My brother says "all things that are already gathered together." Not quite; they are not gathered together yet. They are separated now, some in heaven and

some in earth. This comports with 1 Thessalonians iv, 14-17: "For if we believe that Jesus died, and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

Here is the collecting together of the living and the dead, of these on earth, and those in heaven, in the fullness of the dispensations. Who are the children of Christ? "All the children of God by faith in Christ;" so Paul says. He refers to the fact that the will of God is not obeyed. He refers to the passage I quoted in Matthew, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets," etc., "how often would I have gathered you," etc., but "ye would not." I would inquire again if the will of God was not here overcome by the will of man? He says, "I would, but ye would not." Their will was that they should not be gathered. God did not force them. It was not absolute when related to human action, as the passage shows, and since men have committed sin, and violated law, it is a demonstration that men have acted counter to the will of God, and nullified it, so far as they were concerned, when it related to human action. To these things, he has given no attention. He took up one and dropped it as if it really burnt him.

He says the destruction of the devil, sin, etc., means that they are rendered powerless; therefore, sin and the devil continue to be, but they are "powerless." Grant it. They are powerless, so far as the true Chris-

tian is concerned. Man has now the power, and there is nothing in heaven or earth able to separate him from his Maker, except himself. He can do it by placing himself in opposition to God.

The resurrection again. He calls attention to I Corinthians xv, 20, 21. He emphasizes "in Christ." My brother knows that the preposition "*in*" is *eis* in Greek, and the relation it shows to the word makes its translation. Does it show the relation of place, or agency? I read this passage: "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection from the dead." The same preposition in the passage is translated *by*. It expresses agency, as you see. The next verse: For since by Adam, or in Adam, all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive, is the English version, but it is *eis* in both these instances. And I ask any scholar if the relation shown is not the relation of agency, and whenever it is the relation of agency, it should be translated by the English word *by*. It should be translated: As by Adam all die, even so by Christ all shall be made alive; but every man in his own order, or proper band, as Macknight translates it. We have now two bands; those that are Christ's at his coming, and some other men not indicated here. We are left to the conclusion, from the associated ideas, that it is the wicked, or those that are not his.

This brings me to a review of John v, 28, 29. I submit some difficulties that arise in my mind. They that have done good in those graves they were in. But what were those graves? I do not know whether I understand my brother or not, but I know that some of his brethren said it was merely in an anti-spiritual life or state of sin. Those are the graves they were in. Now, think of a man doing good in the graves of sin! Those that have done good in the graves of sin to the resurrection of life, and those

that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation. This, to my mind, is superlative nonsense. He insists that it must have reference to this, because the twenty-fifth verse relates to the spiritual change, and I propose to see whether this is so. Does this word dead here mean those literally dead? I am aware that some commentators have taken the ground occupied by my brother. But, with due deference to other men, I take a different view of the passage. Jesus had just been working miracles, casting out demons, curing the sick, raising the dead; and, having accomplished these works, he is in-conversation with these people among whom these miracles have been wrought, and says: "The hour is coming when some of the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live"—not come forth simply, but shall live. That was true of Lazarus and others that Jesus raised from death; and it was simply true that the hour had then come that those in the graves, to which Jesus went, heard his voice, and came forth and lived. That is literally true, my brother; the literal meaning of the word dead. [*Time expired.*]

---

[MR. CARLTON'S TENTH SPEECH.]

*Brother Moderators, and Respected Auditors:*

We proceed to notice a few things mentioned by the brother before summing up the arguments on the affirmative. In regard to this long tirade of abuse of the Universalists and misrepresentation of Universalism, we shall take no notice at all, only to remark that the French infidel philosophers at one time became very wise, and they resolved that any thing that could be ridiculed was false, and the first thing they knew the resolution proved them false themselves, be-

cause they could be ridiculed. If we were here to ridicule each other's views, we could give you some views of the doctrine of endless punishment and its concomitant errors; but we are here to show what the Scriptures prove. The brother is welcome to make all he can out of that. That matter of Lazarus has nothing to do with us, and we shall not occupy our time with it at present.

He refers again to the resurrection. Matt. xxiii: Still the idea that man's will did defeat the Supreme will. He does not believe that. He believes that Jesus was willing to gather them, and proclaimed the Gospel to them. I ask the brother if he believes man's will defeated God's purpose? He will tell you no. All that talk does not amount to any thing. He does not believe that man's will could defeat God's purpose any more than I do. He does not believe that God Almighty purposes that those individuals should turn, then, or else he believes they would. He knows there is really no difference of opinion between us in regard to that. How does he believe the matter will be arranged in regard to the government of the world and the accomplishment of God's purposes? He believes that whatever God has purposed in himself shall be fulfilled, that there is no opposing power, that he reigns God alone. But that the means then used for the conversion of the Jews they rejected, and so we agree. But if God had purposed the accomplishment of that thing, it would certainly have been done. I want to say one word in regard to that letter, for it is one of the most unmanly things I ever knew performed by any man, and particularly by a minister of the Gospel. Bro. Moore wrote to me, last winter, aside from all discussion, but for the sake of the study of the Scriptures, and wished a little private correspondence, and in comparing notes I wrote him the letter that he read to-night. It is one of the most dishon-

orable and ungentlemanly tricks I ever knew to be perpetrated by any live man, minister or layman. There is nothing in it that I deny—it was all true; but that is not the point. I only accuse him of the ungentlemanly trick. I would not have read publicly one of the letters he wrote me in that correspondence for my right arm. That is the little principle there is in a Universalist.

John v, 28, 29. How does he attempt to make it out now that this was a literal resurrection? He perceives that he was caught by his own rule in the interpretation of the Scriptures, and, in order to defend himself, and make this a resurrection from literal death, he has to take a position which no interpreter of the Scriptures of any denomination under heaven, orthodox or heterodox, as far as I know, ever took: that the death spoken of in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses was a literal death. But he must take that position or be floored; so he takes it. Jesus said: "Whosoever heareth my words, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life." That means a man who is literally dead. Oh, shame, where is thy blush! I am ashamed for my brother, who is driven to such an extreme. "Whosoever heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." Every reader, laymen, clergyman, commentator, and critic, for the last 1800 years, has understood that he referred to the spiritual condition. Suffice it to say that the most eminent Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Baptists, Methodists, and all other denominations, as far as I have examined, have conceded frankly and freely, that that can mean nothing else except a moral and spiritual death. The Gospel was preached to them, and they heard it. Those that loved and received his word, entered into the enjoyment of that

life and salvation in which God is the special Savior of those that believe. Those that heed his word shall enter into this life that he was speaking of. To concede this clear and obvious fact takes away the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth verses, and defeats the only argument he has on the subject of the resurrection; so he makes that spiritual death a literal death; but he can not do that—the testimony of the interpreters is against him. What next? He does not know that he understands Bro. Carlton in regard to this matter about what the graves were; but the idea of any one doing good in a grave of ignorance and sin is supremely ridiculous. Let us look at it. Let us take the case of that Italian captain, Cornelius. Peter preached to him. He was converted and baptized. Was he baptized for the remission of his sins? The brother will not answer; but he believes that. He will concede that to his congregation on the Sabbath. What had he been doing before he was baptized for the remission of sins? He was a devout man, and prayed to God always, and gave alms to the people. He was such a good man that God sent an angel from heaven, who said to him: "Thy prayers and alms are come up for a memorial to God." He sent for Simon Peter to preach to him. He had been doing good; but he was not a Christian, and had not come forth to the elevated condition of the Christian. He came forth from that grave to the resurrection of life; and he was not alone, but others were aroused by the preaching of the Gospel, who did not obey, but came forth to the resurrection of damnation. So much for that, then.

Now we call your attention to the recapitulation of the argument that has been presented. In the first place, we came together yesterday morning, and entered on the discussion of the subject, I affirming

that the Holy Scriptures teach that those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ will be ultimately holy and happy. I have taken the language of Scripture, the testimony concerning the whole race, including all its classes and conditions of men. The first argument we presented in support of the affirmation of the ultimate holiness and happiness of the race, we based on the divine character, presenting the truth that God has, in addition to his four essential attributes, seven perfections of moral character: infinite goodness, wisdom, justice, truth, holiness, mercy, and immutability. These constitute an infinitely perfect moral character in God, one that all intelligences can admire, venerate, and love, and will, just as they approach him. Our Methodist brethren used to sing a good hymn, and I hope they do yet:

"Did all the world my Savior know,  
Sure all the world would love him too."

The reason they do not love and trust him as dear children, is because they have been deluded for ages in regard to his character. They know him not. They regard him as a passionate and vindictive being, and they can not love him, and do not try to. If they only understood God as he has revealed himself, they could not but love him. But just as fast as the knowledge of the Lord God extends they love him, and will continue to, until all shall know him, from the least even unto the greatest, whom to know is life eternal. The fact that God possesses these moral perfections is granted by my brother.

Our second proposition is, that God proposed the ultimate holiness and happiness of all mankind. We presented the Scriptures in the progress of the discussion, and shall not pause to recapitulate. While on this subject, we labored on the idea taught in the

Confession of Faith, that the chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him forever. The brother concedes that is what God made us for.

Our third argument was based on the fact that the Scriptures teach us that God's purpose shall be accomplished. This we established by proofs from the Scriptures. Just as certain as God lives, his counsel shall stand; he will do his pleasure. As he has spoken, so shall it stand, and his thoughts shall come to pass. The brother differs from this only in this, that he contends that God has sometimes a will which is not an absolute purpose, and will not be accomplished. To that we never objected, and do not. But, that God has purposed a time when his purposes shall be fulfilled, we believe, and then they will be accomplished, and that there is no power in the universe that can prevent it. We take the position now that there has been no power in the universe that has defeated God's purpose in one particular instance; that whatever he has purposed, has been done; that what he has purposed in the future, shall be done. We are satisfied on that point.

The fourth argument we presented was based on the divine paternity; that God is the Father of all men; and the argument we presented was this: That, as God is not only a perfect being but a perfect Father, he will perfectly perform the obligations growing out of the parental relation; and that, as an earthly parent would bring all his children to be good and obedient, if he possessed the power, God, having the ability, will bring all his children to be good and obedient.

The sixth argument was based on the fact, that all men shall glorify God. In connection with this, we showed the object of God in creation, and how only man can glorify God, and that is in holiness and happiness; that God never was glorified by man in any other way, and never can be; and that the Scriptures

are clear and positive that all the nations of God's creation shall come and worship before him and glorify his name.

Our seventh argument was based on the fact, that the ultimate holiness and happiness of all mankind is the only result that will harmonize with the divine goodness. Under this head, we presented the goodness of God, the spirit that animates the breast of heaven's eternal King, as manifest in the life of our Lord Jesus Christ; that he is good to the unthankful and the evil, and that he is without variableness or shadow of turning; that he always will be good to all, and that whatever he does with us and for us, at any time, or under any circumstances, is in accordance with his infinite goodness, and his designs of accomplishing our good; that no other conceivable motive on the part of God can be in harmony with the character of God manifested in Christ. What answer have we to that argument? Perhaps the brother will show you what answer he has given. I am certain I do not know.

The eighth argument was based on the teaching of the Scriptures in regard to the signification of baptism; or its meaning in the Scriptures; that the baptized were buried with Christ by baptism into death, and that we should reckon ourselves to be dead to sin and live as those that are alive from the dead; showing that it was the duty of a Christian to live a pure and holy life; and that the power of this ordinance of baptism consists in the appreciation of the substance of it; the baptism was itself the figure. The brother could not see the point, and therefore did not attempt to answer; it remains unanswered.

The next argument we presented was based on the direct testimony of the Scriptures in regard to the fact that universal righteousness should be instituted through our Lord Jesus Christ, based on Ro-

mans v, 19, in which we claimed it was conceded by Adam Clarke and others, that it meant "the many," and as many as were made sinners through the disobedience of Adam should be made righteous through the obedience of Christ. How does he get out of that? First, by claiming that only a number would live and be saved; but he saw that would not do, and took another tack, and claimed that they would be made righteous from the guilt of Adam's transgression. It might be interesting to show that we ever had any thing to do with the guilt of Adam's transgression. God teaches us in the Scriptures that he will render to every man according to his own work. He never told you he would render to you according to Adam's work. "Now, by the obedience of Christ shall the many of mankind be made righteous"—made righteous through the obedience of Christ. With that we are satisfied, and our point is secured, our affirmative sustained.

After having presented these arguments, we next took up the subject of the final resurrection of the dead. But before I labor upon that, I want to present one point that is in my mind, that is, to evade the force of the fact that in the immortal resurrection there is no resurrection out of Christ. He told you the word translated in was *eis*. Not quite; not quite. (*Gar en to Adam.*) *En, Epsilon, Nu*, are the Greek letters that spell it. As in, not *eis*; by, not *dia*, through; but in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. In Alexander Campbell's discussion with McCullough, Campbell says: "Every definition of the word *en* can be resolved into the word in; the only legitimate signification of the Greek word *en* is in." And that is the word, sure. I will suppose that the brother did not know that it was not *eis*; I will suppose he did not know that it was *en*, but it is true, nevertheless.

"For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." And will any man be miserable and wretched and wicked in Christ? No, sir! For as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. For as in Adam all die, so the same shall all be made alive. All, then, will be raised from the dead, and raised in Christ, and raised in the heavenly image. Yes, said the apostle in this same chapter: "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised,"—where? In endless corruption? No; "it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power. It is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory." Did the apostle say any were raised out of glory? Read the entire fifteenth chapter, containing the grand revelation by the apostle on the subject of the future life. Has he intimated that there is any resurrection there that is not in Christ? No hint of any thing of the kind; yet the brother wants you to understand it is only the Christian that is raised here. How does he attempt to make that out? He says they rise in their own orders. How many orders are there? Christ, the first fruits; afterward, they that are Christ's at his coming. You say that is only two. What is the other one? The brother infers, because his creed places him under the necessity of inferring, that there is another band or order out of Christ. The apostle not only does not mention them, but leaves no room for them: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." That is enough to secure it, let the orders be what they may. But the brother insists upon it, every man in his own order. How many orders does the apostle present? Two; Christ and those that are his at his coming. Does he mention any other class—does he imply any other class? No. "Then cometh the end."

The end of what? When he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God the Father, when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. Where is the rule of your devil, then? Then cometh the end of his kingdom! No; the end of his reign. The kingdom does not end, but he delivers it up to the Father, and having done that, sees the ultimate and final condition. Next, after having subjected all things to himself, then cometh the end when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to the Father, and he himself become subject to him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. This is the consummation; this is the completion; this is the finality; this is the ultimate. Did the brother labor to show that some would be subdued so unwillingly? No; the same terms are employed as are used in regard to Jesus' subjection to the Father—one just as cordial and happifying as the other. And thus, bringing all things that are in heaven and earth, all reconciled to God, all conformed to Jesus, all raised in him, all possessing his Spirit, and delivered by him to the Father, and God becomes all in all; then the vision of the revelator is realized in the Revelation of St. John v, 13, when he was in the rapt, spiritual, glorious vision on the Isle of Patmos; when he saw the Almighty Father sitting on the throne with the book of the destiny of the world sealed and in his right hand; when he saw the weeping of the nations of the earth because no man was found in heaven or on earth, or under the earth that was able to open the book; and then one of the elders cried, "Weep not; behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David, hath prevailed to open the book and loose the seven seals thereof." And when Jesus opens the seal of the book of the destiny of the world, the redeemed rejoiced and cried, "Thou art worthy, for thou hast redeemed us

out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. The angels joined in acclamations of praise to the Redeemer; and "every creature which is in heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." And the elders said Amen, and here we say, Amen, glory to God! [*Time expired.*]

---

[MR. MOORE'S TENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and Respected Friends:*

He introduced an argument, based on Matthew xxii, 23-33. I will not read it all now, as I want to get at the gist of the matter. I ask you to consider the facts. There were the Sadducees, that denied the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and the existence of either angel or spirit, coming to Jesus with this question: There was a woman among us who, according to law, had seven brothers as husbands. They supposed the relation of husband would continue in the next world as in this, and they wished to know whose wife she would be in the resurrection. Jesus responded in this language: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven." Luke xx, 32-38. You will notice a slight difference in the reading of these passages. The one introduces more than the other, and hence the limiting words that Luke uses. He bases his argument on the statement that they are "as the angels," because they are the children of the resurrection. But who are they that

are called "the children of the resurrection?" He says those that are "accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead." These qualifying words are not employed by the other evangelists. In the next world there will be no marriages or marriage relations; and those that are worthy to obtain that world, shall be as angels of God, being the children of the resurrection. We have now the entire matter before us. But there is, in connection with this, another fact, to which I ask your attention briefly. It is this: that in the twelfth chapter of Matthew, there is reference made to the sin against the Holy Spirit. (Mr. Carlton objected to this, as new matter, which he had no right to introduce in the closing speech. The point was submitted to the moderators, and Mr. Carlton's objection sustained.)

I begin, now, where he began. He refers to "the tirade of abuse" that he is unwilling to notice. I was sorry to hear Bro. Carlton use that phraseology; for in the remarks I made, I used no abuse. Nor did it seem to me as a "tirade." Inasmuch as he has seen fit to simply pass it by in this way, my reply is equally short. I do not conceive that I have been guilty of a tirade of abuse, or of misrepresentation; and I shall surely be willing, that not only this audience, but the readers of our prospective book, if it shall be the privilege of the people to read it, shall decide whether there was abuse in it.

The second point was Luke xvi, in regard to Lazarus. He said that, inasmuch as I would have it up, and it was a dead beat with me, he would not answer it. Probably it is safe for him not to notice it at all, and I prophesy he never will make more than a glancing reply to it. Third, God's purpose not defeated by man's will. I think I stated to you, that when God's purpose had reference to human action, the history of the case was that it was always conditional. I

showed you that, in this case, it had reference to man's action, and the individual defeated God's will by his will. I showed that the divine will was indicated in the prohibitions of murder, idolatry, etc. Yet men commit murder, and are guilty of all these crimes. This law here is an expression of the divine will; and this being true, the divine will was not absolute in regard to human action, but contingent. God required man to do that, or not do it, as the case may be, according to the nature of the law, and yet men did violate, both positively and negatively, the divine will involved in the divine requirements.

In the fourth place, I refer to a matter that is unpleasant to me, and have only to say, that I am sorry that my brother has used language that I never would have used, in regard to any person, in a public discussion, much less toward him. I quoted, to be sure, some passages from a letter received from him, I believe, in October. But the correspondence, extending over a period of four years, was never a "private correspondence," and I did not think it a crime, or breach of decorum, to read in the discussion an extract, especially on the subject in reference to which those letters were written. But if I am mistaken, I will abide the condemnation of this community, as well as the readers of the book; but so far as I am concerned, I feel that I have not trampled on the principles of propriety in regard to private communications. If I have, I confess ignorance in the premises. He has stated, however, that "it was the most ungentlemanly conduct"—and I believe he used the word "meanest," act—that he had ever known any opponent guilty of in his life. He is welcome to that phraseology. I fear it betrayed the spirit induced by his theory. I have no feeling in the matter; I only regret that he felt as he did feel. I do not regret having read it, because I believe I did right in reading



it. He states that it is his sentiment, and hence, I have only read to you from a letter in a continued correspondence of a long period, and bearing on the doctrine of the question, and not a private matter. All of my letters to him, he was at liberty to use, and he is so now. He may read one and all of them here, and every-where else if he will.

John v, 25. My explanation of this, that the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live, is answered by simply assuming that it is a monstrosity, it is such a wonderful departure from the ages! That may be possible; that may be the case. Does it follow that it is wrong? Is it not sometimes the case that one is right, and all others are wrong? Would it not have been better to take it up and show the inconclusiveness of the position occupied, without appealing to commentators? I have read commentators who took the same view. I do not know whether I would have received it or not, without the aid of commentators. This strikes my mind as the most reasonable and consistent view of the passage that any man can give. He tells them, in view of the miracles that had been wrought: "Now you see this wonderful phenomenon of the dead coming to life at the voice of God, but the day is coming when all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, all shall come forth; they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation;" a universal resurrection of mankind. But it is, "All that are in their graves." My brother, will you observe that there were only a few resurrected in that day, and there has been no period from that time to this in which all of any condition were resurrected? Jesus said that *all* would be raised. He refers you to Cornelius, as an instance of resurrection from a grave of sin. He says there were many also resurrected to damnation, but he left

us with that word. I hoped that he would give us the name of some one that was resurrected to damnation, but he has not furnished us with it.

We have now gone over, as far as I observe, all the points, except the review. First, the attributes. We have answered that, by showing you, from the attributes themselves, that since sin exists now, and has existed for a period of six thousand years, it existed, first, either in harmony with the attributes, or, secondly, in antagonism. If in harmony with the attributes, then, since God never changes, it may exist endlessly in harmony with his attributes. Secondly, if in antagonism, they exist in antagonism, either because God can not avoid it, or because he will not avoid it. If because he can not avoid it, since he is infinite in power now, there never will be a time when he can avoid it. If it is because he will not help it, and his will does not change, his will will never be different. This is a very brief and succinct statement on the topic of the attributes.

The next is, the purpose of God. He assumed in this case that the purpose of God was absolute, and that the holiness and happiness of men hung on no conditions whatever. In view of this, he wanted me to show that there were conditions. I proceeded at once to show, from 1 Peter i, 3-7, that the "incorruptible inheritance," reserved in heaven, was for the individual "kept by the power of God through faith," and that the "abundant entrance" hung upon their doing the things he had named in the preceding part, and upon their continuing to the end; and that the laying up the treasure where moth or rust can not corrupt, and where thieves can not break through and steal, hung on the individual's promptly and constantly attempting to lay it up there. Hence, the destiny of the individual was involved in his securing this unfading and incorruptible inheritance in the heavens.

He attempted to examine a few of those passages that I had quoted and called his attention to, and pressed him to examine. But he left the larger portion. We had a number of others, and invited his attention to them again, but, up to this time, they stand unanswered, and without any attempt to answer them. I will tell you more than that; until the day of final accounts; until you are all called to stand before the judge of the quick and dead, to answer to God for the deeds done in the body, they will stand unanswered.

Next, in the third place, that the purpose of God shall be accomplished; by which he means to assume that it will be accomplished absolutely; that it is without contingency. I have shown you that when the purpose of God relates to God's own action, then it is absolute, but when it relates to human action, it is always contingent; and I have read one passage and referred to numerous passages that are so fresh in your memories that I think it scarcely worth while to stop to consider them. I stated this, however, that God's prohibitions and commandments are expressions of his will or purpose, and when, in these prohibitions, he forbids covetousness, murder, idolatry, etc., he commands that men shall render obedience, love God, love his neighbor—every one of which men have violated. Hence, when God's will is expressed in regard to human action, history demonstrates that his will is not absolute, but conditional. He has expressed what he desires them to do, and leaves it to their agency to determine whether it will be done or not.

The fourth point: "God's purposes have always been done." The purpose of God shall be accomplished, was the argument. I confess, between the third and fourth, I see no material difference. In answer to this, I have shown you just now, in the preceding remarks, that it has not been done when it related to man's action.

Fifth, the paternity of God. That God being the creator or father, as he assumes, of the human family, hanging on the fact that men are moral beings, that being the case, they are the children of God; and that, as a father, he is under obligations to provide for his children. I have shown you that God has made provision for the entire race, and that, as a physician who has secured a complete remedy for a prevailing disease that has baffled the skill of all, and put it into the hands of all, with directions for use, with exhortations and entreaties to use it, God, like this physician, has put into the hands of all men a divine remedy for sin, and exhorted, entreated, and persuaded them to use it, and he has given all the means of using what he has provided for all men. But men do not choose to use it; and, therefore, they are not saved. Suppose a father provides for his family, and places on the table all that is necessary for the children. There is plenty—who is to blame if they do not eat? He must destroy the moral agency and freedom of the mind if he forces them to eat. So with the individual who refuses to take what God has provided. God can not force him to accept it, and leave him a moral being. If God's paternity must save a man, in doing so it destroys man, and makes a machine.

That all men were made to glorify God is the sixth argument; and it is claimed that it is admitted. Suppose that all men are created to glorify God, and enjoy him forever. They are not so unconditionally. The conditions I need not repeat. It hangs on that question of the conditions. He made men to glorify him and enjoy him forever, conditionally; and then he presents the conditions. Some men use them; but a great many will not use them.

Seventh.—The only result that will harmonize with God's goodness is the ultimate holiness and happi-

ness of all mankind. I have shown, and it must not be forgotten, that God is not only a Father or Creator, but he is, at the same time, Governor, and hence he must require the execution of penalties. He must demand obedience to laws, and leave his subjects with the moral powers that he has given them, and when they persistently refuse the use of the moral powers they have, in becoming good citizens, they must receive the penalty, and bear it.

His eighth point is the signification of baptism. As I stated before: if you have acumen enough to see the exact force of this, you have been able to see more than I have. He assumes that the seventh verse in Romans means literal death. I have noticed it, and shown that it could mean no such thing, but had direct reference to the individual's sins, and that the apostle was talking to living men, and not dead men, and that the application was, that when the individual crucified the old man, and put on the new, he should cultivate holiness, and walk uprightly before God, and that the only life which it was a type of at all was the life which Christ Jesus is leading in the heavens; that we obtained it after having done the will of God; for in Hebrews he says, "I came to do thy will;" and again, "Thy will be done," when he was about to be crucified. In Romans v, 19, he made what I conceive to be a misrepresentation of Adam Clarke, although I don't think he intended to do so: "Thus we find that the salvation from sin here is as extensive and complete as the condemnation of sin. Death is conquered, hell disappointed, the devil confounded, and sin totally destroyed. Here is glory to him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood," etc. Now, it was not that Adam Clarke had here reached the conclusion that all men would be ultimately holy and happy, but he was opposing the old Augustinian the-

ory of a special atonement. He had reached the conclusion that there was an atonement made for all, and that all might be saved, and, consequently, there was a way open to the enjoyment of the everlasting blessedness of heaven. Turn to his comment on the concluding part of the 15th verse:

"Hath abounded unto many."—That is, Christ Jesus died for every man; salvation is free for all; saving grace is tendered to every soul; and a measure of the divine light is actually communicated to every heart. And as the grace is offered, so it may be received; and hence the apostle says, verse 17: "They which received abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by Christ Jesus." By receiving is undoubtedly meant, not only the act of receiving, but retaining and improving the grace which they receive; and as all may receive, so all may improve and retain the grace they do receive; and consequently all may be eternally saved. But of multitudes Christ still may say: "They will not come unto me, that they might have life."

You will observe that he most palpably garbled this man in his quotation, and showed only a part of the truth, as I submitted this morning.

I return to the subject of the transgression of man, and the provision made for it. The second part of the verse relates alone to the gain secured by the second Adam; that we are agents, represented by Adam. The rebel States were represented by their leaders, and their infants suffered by the acts of the leaders. We enjoy the salvation by accepting the offer on the conditions upon which the Redeemer offers it, and hence it is "by the gift of righteousness" that we are to gain a glorious crown in heaven.

The final resurrection.—"En" and "eis." Originally these were the same. My brother will find that clearly stated in Anthon's Greek Grammar. I hold

here *Dr. MacKnight on the Epistles*. He gives a large list of the Greek prepositions, *en, eis*, etc.. Any gentleman can have the book to examine at his leisure. What I have before stated is true. The relation of agency is here involved. That being the case, the preposition should be "by."

The last, and final, is the concluding portion of the twenty-eighth verse of I Corinthians xv, "that God may be all in all." We frequently use that phraseology ourselves; not that the thing we speak of is in every thing. It is the intention here merely to say that God is supreme, that he has conquered all his foes. This is accomplished through Jesus Christ, and when he has done this God will again reach the point in which his government and power will be undisputed in the universe. And yet, it by no means follows that those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel will be ultimately holy and happy.

I have examined every point that has been introduced, except the glowing and eloquent conclusion by the quotation from Revelations, touching the unsealing of the book by the Lion of the tribe of Judah. He refers this to the immortal state. Is he not aware that in connection with the same scene, in the nineteenth and twentieth chapters, we have the awful scene of the doom of the wicked: their assignment to the lake of fire and brimstone, which is the second death? It would have spoiled his rhetorical flight if he had noticed this as well. I thank you for your kindness. [*Time expired.*]

Closed with the benediction.

## SECOND PROPOSITION.

---

*Do the Holy Scriptures teach that any of the human family will suffer endless punishment?*

---

ELD. W. D. MOORE AFFIRMS.

REV. S. P. CARLTON DENIES.

---

Thursday, April 28th, 1870.

THIRD DAY.

*Thursday, April 28, 9 o'clock A. M.*

Meeting opened by prayer.

It was stated by one of the moderators that the discussion on the first proposition ended last evening, and that the discussion for the next two days was to be on the following proposition: "DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT ANY OF THE HUMAN FAMILY WILL SUFFER ENDLESS PUNISHMENT?" Bro. Moore affirms, and Bro. Carlton denies. Each speech to be one-half hour in length, and the discussion continuing three hours in the morning and two in the afternoon.

[MR. MOORE'S FIRST SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and Respected Auditors:*

It is needless to repeat the proposition so soon after its having been read. I have no prelude or exordium prepared as a preface to what I propose to say. I have not time to consume in this way, had I it prepared. The importance of the proposition will not fail to be apprehended by every individual upon its reading. It has direct reference, as you perceive at once, to what mankind ought to be more interested about than any other subject within the circle of human thought. The ultimate destiny or final condition, what is to become of a portion of our race? It is first necessary that we may comprehend precisely what we are expected to do as affirm-

ant, and that it may be seen precisely what is to be responded to, what arguments bear upon the question, and what do not, to get a clear and definite understanding of the terms of the proposition. In making this statement I am not presuming on the ignorance of the people at all, for they are sufficiently intelligent to understand this, provided they would take the pains to analyze, and bring out, and fix in their own minds the things contained in the proposition. But all might not have this caution, and hence I will now notice the phrases of which this proposition is composed. The first one of the leading, important phrases is, "The Holy Scriptures." It will be seen that the Holy Scriptures is to be the only admissible witness in the case; whatever else may be introduced can only, as before remarked on the former proposition, be used as corroborative or incidental evidence, and shall be accepted and acceptable only as it harmonizes with what the leading witness testifies in the premises. The question, then, is, What does the Bible say? Not what we may prove by the Bible, but, What is the clear and explicit teaching of the Scriptures? This leads me to repeat that one of the most common rules of interpretation, never to be overlooked, is that, in order to understand any passage of the Scripture, it is necessary not only to understand it in its terms, but also to understand it in its contextual signification. We are to determine whether the words of it are to be taken literally or otherwise from its context; whether the language is direct or indirect. It will not be forgotten that we have these two classes of evidence, the direct testimony and the indirect. The indirect sometimes has as much force as the direct. Neither of them can with propriety be set aside without good and substantial reasons. I exclude from my affirmation, as you will see by another phrase, all our race

except a class. The intimation is from the reading of the proposition, that I do not propose an affirmation of endless punishment of the whole race. It is simply to read in the declarative instead of the interrogatory. "The Holy Scriptures teach that some of the human family will suffer endless punishment." This is substantially its reading. Now the question is, What part? What "some" is it? Who are those that I propose to affirm shall suffer endless punishment? I mean to say that I include in the class those embraced in the proposition of my brother, "Those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ." And it will be to me a matter of indifference, and I shall certainly have no time to give attention to any thing that may be introduced bearing upon any other part of our race, except the part indicated by the phrase, "Those that die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ." In the first place, I affirm their endless punishment. I may remark, in addition, by way still further of definition, that it is the individual who willfully, with ample opportunity to know, and refuses to examine, or having examined refuses to submit to the plain, clear, and explicit requirements of the word of God, and indulges in the gratification of his lower passions and animal nature; in drunkenness, in the gratification of the lusts, appetites, and desires of the flesh, that rushes off in corruption until he is sunk into its lowest depths, and dies without repentance or reformation. I trust these observations will be sufficient, as far as the class is concerned. Hoping that you are now prepared to understand the nature of the proposition so far, we come to the last phrase, "Endless punishment." This it is scarcely necessary to define. Punishment without end, continual or perpetual punishment, will be the doom of such individuals. I must say that

the subject can not admit of an appeal to the passions, the mere animal of our nature; it is of too momentous a character to admit of trifling, any sarcasm, or any thing that would divert the calm, cool, and reflecting mind to come to its conclusions by the clearest and most palpable mode of reasoning. It demands to be treated in a dignified and solemn manner. No man should judge in this matter, or in the investigation of any religious principle, by his prejudices, by his prepossessions, but by his enlightened judgment and the word of God. He should know that if a proposition be true, it is of the utmost importance that he should understand it, so that the motive force of the doctrine, whatever that motive force might be, would be added to all the other motives to obedience, and which influences each to tarry not in the barren mountains of sin, but to follow on and embrace at once the golden opportunities that heaven affords, submitting to the authority of Jesus Christ, and engaging in his service, persevering to the end, and reaping the reward of eternal life.

*1st arg*  
*unch*  
My first argument I base on the following Scriptures. John iii, 18: "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." Mark xvi, 16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." John iii, 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." Hebrews xi, 6: "But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him."

First, the class spoken of in these passages are con-

demned now. Second, they shall be indefinitely and unconditionally. Third, they shall not enjoy life or union with God—for the word life means union with God. You will not forget the emphasis of Bro. Carlton, when this "shall be" occurred in the promise made to Abraham, "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blest." He bases one of his arguments for the ultimate holiness and happiness of all, upon this positive expression "shall be," and insisted that it was positive, absolute; and unless he shall be able to show good reason why this same phrase in this place is limited on account of its association, it will be against him. I may insist, that it is equally absolute here as there: "Shall be damned." Now, what shall it be? Conditional, contingent, depending on circumstances; or shall it, like that, be absolute? Fourth, God's wrath shall abide, or continue, without limit. Fifth, they have not the power to please God, for "without faith it is impossible to please him." All these are true of the willfully disobedient; at the instant death separates them from this probationary state, they pass beyond the line between the temporary, and the eternal, condemned under God's wrath, with no power to please God. From these facts I am driven to the conclusion that, since they have passed into the endless or unchangeable state, from the temporary to the eternal, in such condition as now named, they must suffer endless punishment, being in the changeless state. Now I admit, and call your attention to the fact, that this argument is not claimed as direct testimony, but indirect; notwithstanding, it is of such importance as to demand a careful consideration and answer.

*2nd*  
My second argument is based on 1 Peter iv, 17: "For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" This is

answered by Paul, 2 Thessalonians i, 6-10: "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day." I want to remark of this word "end." It is from the Greek word "*telos*," which means generally "ultimate, final, the last." That being true, we have the question asked by Peter, what is the end, or ultimate, or final condition of those that do not obey the Lord Jesus Christ?

Here is the direct answer to the question of Peter, "What shall be the end, the ultimate, of those that obey not the Gospel?" Paul says, "Everlasting destruction." When shall that occur? He says, "When he shall come to be glorified in the saints, and to be admired of all them that believe in that day"—in the day of his coming, and of the universal admiration and glory of his saints.

The next passage is Romans vi, 20-22: "For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness. What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death. But now, being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." That word death means cutting off, cutting loose from God the fountain of life. The everlasting life, and the everlasting death, are placed in antithesis, of which I shall speak hereafter. But the point here is that it is the end of

sin, the ultimate, and final condition. Hebrews vi, 7, 8: "For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God: but that which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned." Whose end or ultimate state is to be burned. The end, *telos*, of a thing, is final, and the ultimate, or finality of the class named, is death, everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord. Their ultimate state is destruction, endless punishment. The use of the word *telos*, you may find amply sustained by an examination of any good concordance. The definition of *telos* by Donnegan, Liddell & Scott, and Macknight, may be seen to harmonize with the statements I have made.

My third argument, as I desire to get them in closely together, is from Hebrews vi, 4-6: "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame."

The apostate here is clearly marked out, and it is affirmed of him that the perfect apostate is in a condition in which it is impossible to renew him to repentance. I read Mark iii, 29, to harmonize with this: "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." "He hath never forgiveness." Also, Matt. xii, 31, 32: "Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be



forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." You will remember the definition the brother gave to "this world" and "that world," when he reviewed the twenty-second chapter of Matthew last night. "This world," when speaking of the resurrection of the woman which had seven husbands, meant this state of existence; "that world" meant, in his parlance, the next state, the resurrection state. There is as good reason that it means this state and that state here, as in Matt. xxii. We then have the language, They never have forgiveness in this state of existence or that state of existence. Paul says that it is impossible to renew them to repentance. 11 Peter ii, 12-14: "But these, as natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption; and shall receive the reward of unrighteousness, as they that count it pleasure to riot in the day-time. Spots they are and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you; having eyes full of adultery, and that can not cease from sin; beguiling unstable souls: an heart they have exercised with covetous practices, cursed children." Here we have the statement that they *can not* cease from sin, and that they are cursed children, and that they shall utterly perish in their own corruption. Then, the class of whom we are speaking "can not cease from sin," they are "cursed children," "wells without water, clouds driven by the tempest," "it is impossible to renew them to repentance;" they shall utterly perish in their own corruption. They have never forgiveness in this world or in that. If this does not establish indirectly the endlessness of their punishment, I confess I am not prepared to understand what words would establish it, unless it can

be shown that men, impenitent, sinful, corrupt, and degraded, without being pardoned or relieved from their sins, can be ultimately holy and happy. We are taught that it is impossible to renew to repentance the class spoken of. I call your attention, and the attention of my brother, to these Scriptures, and invite a candid examination of them.

Argument fourth is based on antithesis. The law of antithesis needs now to be stated. I have not now the book that I wish to read from, *Crabb's Synonyms*, but shall have hereafter. Antithesis is a Greek word composed of two words, *anti* and *themis*, and means opposition. See *Donnegan's Lexicon*, also Liddell & Scott. It is synonymous with "contrast." Contrast is derived from *contra* and *sto*, and means to stand against. Comparison is from the word *comparo*, putting together equal things—the things compared must be alike in quality but different in degree. Contrast, things taken in the same degree but opposite in quality. They are taken in the same degree and to the same extent, but opposite in quality. See *Crabb's Synonyms*, page 135; also, *Campbell and Skinner's Debate*, page 195, as quoted by Elder Hobbs in a debate with Mr. King, at Des Moines, Iowa; page 128. Mr. Campbell said the words on both sides of the antithesis are taken in the same extent of meaning. To this, Mr. Skinner replied: "I have never denied the law of antithesis." I hope you may not forget that words antithesized are equal in extent but opposite in quality. You will see that punishment for sins is opposite in quality to happiness. If they are antithesized, they are to be taken in the same extent; that is, if the happiness is endless, the punishment must be endless. With this law, thus stated, let us refer to the following Scriptures, Dan. xii, 2, 3: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting con-

tempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." Now, we have here, to be sure, the word "many," which, it may be insisted, is one of the pronomial adjectives, and indefinite in idea; but Dr. Clarke, to whom my brother likes to refer, also Dr. Macknight, makes "the many" mean, or include, the race, the many taken together. All that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake. Some of these that sleep shall awake to everlasting life. You will remark here that life is the contrast or antithesis of contempt. Everlasting life is the antithesis of everlasting contempt. Everlasting communicates the idea of duration, since they are alike in extent and differ in quality. If everlasting life means endless life, then everlasting contempt must mean endless contempt. [*Time expired.*]

---

[MR. CARLTON'S FIRST SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

It has already been remarked that we enter this morning upon a discussion of a different proposition. Bro. Moore now affirms, while it becomes my duty to follow him; and I intend to speak at length in regard to the subject matter now involved in the controversy, in order to approach this investigation with candor and sincerity,—for I have perfectly considered these things; and, in addition to this, I would remark, that the brother stated in the former part of the discussion that the doctrine ought to be so clearly stated, and set forth in such a light, as to place it beyond all question. Let this be borne in mind, then, in regard to this doctrine of the endless suffering of some of the human race.

We shall have occasion to call your attention to this point, from time to time. Is the doctrine of the endless punishment of any of our race taught in the Holy Scriptures? If such a doctrine as this is taught there, really, it ought to be presented so clearly and so plainly that none could question it. If the great God of the universe, in establishing his government over our race, affixed a penalty so terrible, so tremendous, to his law, that penalty should have been revealed, not only in his word, so plainly that "he who runs may read," but should have been written on all his works. Every spear of grass, every leaf in the forest, and every flower that opens its lovely petals to the light, and exhales its odorous effluvia to regale the senses, should shine forth and bear on every breeze the terrible sentence of the divine law: "Endless agony is the penalty of human transgression."

But is it so? No. It ought to be written in letters of fire in the very firmament, in every language and tongue that is spoken by the inhabitants of the earth, that all might read, and none could fail to understand that inevitable and inextricable difficulty and calamity in which man has been involved, in consequence of transgression. But what is the fact in the case? Instead of that, we find it nowhere written. I deny, at the very outset, that God Almighty has ever revealed it anywhere, in any of his works, or any of his revelations. This congregation had the right to demand of a person occupying the position of my brother opposite, that he should bring you clear and positive testimony of the Scriptures, showing that God had, in an unmistakable, unambiguous language, attached this penalty to the law. But in this argument, and all his arguments, he has introduced not a single one direct, but as inferences.

Has God left the inhabitants of the earth to guess out, to spell out, or infer what the penalty of the di-

vine law is? I do not believe that. Then, let us look at the testimony that is introduced, and examine its character in regard to establishing the proposition now under consideration. First, John iii, 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him." Life! What does that mean? We are treated, you know, to a great deal of antithesis in this chapter, and everlasting life is placed in contrast with something else. What is the everlasting life? He infers that it is endless felicity in heaven; that it is the ultimate, final condition. In John v, 24, Jesus says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

Has he everlasting life? He believes on Jesus that life he may have to-day and lose to-morrow! What does it mean? It does not mean any thing else, he says, but the endless happiness of heaven. Is that clear? Has he established that? Is it not very obvious to every student of the New Testament Scriptures that the phrase "everlasting life" generally, if not always, signifies spiritual life? And "He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life: he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life;"—can not receive a knowledge of the Lord, because he has not that faith that brings him in possession of it. How clear and plain! Is it to-day? It means endless extent; co-existent with the Lord.

Mark xvi, 16: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." Here is a contrast again. What does this mean? When and where is the individual saved that believes and is baptized? In 1 Corinthians xv, 1, 2, Paul says: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you

the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain." If you believe sincerely and truly, you are saved. It is the present salvation, as you will discover, without pointing at all to the future salvation. You are saved. The believer is saved when he believes this. Jesus says, "He that believeth, hath everlasting life."

More than this, in this section of the Gospel by John, Jesus says: "He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already." The same word in the Greek: "He that believeth not, is condemned already." What is the condemnation?—"And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved." What evidence is there of endless punishment beyond the grave? Well, then, the individual that believes not, "The wrath of God abideth on him." John iii, 36. Certainly it does, while he is in this state of darkness, but does it read, It shall endlessly abide on him? I have not seen that.

Once more; argument second. 1 Peter iv, 17: "For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" We shall probably have some Scripture introduced to prove that there is judgment beyond the present life; but here is the testimony of Peter, saying it commenced eighteen hundred years ago. That will do pretty well in that direction. If it be true that judgment commenced eighteen hundred years ago, that will do for the kind of judgment in the place where it is; but what shall the end be? Verse eigh-

teen: "And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" You notice, in connection with this subject, judgment had been commenced eighteen hundred years ago; hence, reference is had to the condition of the ungodly and sinner, where they shall appear. There is no controversy, so far as I know, in regard to the special application of this passage of Scripture. The righteous were scarcely saved from the calamity that came upon that people at the destruction of Jerusalem. There is where the ungodly and sinner appeared. There we are told, that—in 2 Thessalonians i, 6—"Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulations to them that trouble you." How? To whom was he writing? To the Christian church at Thessalonica. 2 Thessalonians i, 7-9: "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." The church at Thessalonica were to rest, with other Christians, when this visitation was to take place. Now, who were those persons that disturbed or persecuted them? Were they Pharisees, and were there Jews then at Thessalonica? Let us go to the seventeenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and read: "Now, when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews." And when Paul preached unto the people, "as his manner was," some of them believed; "But the Jews which believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason, and sought to bring them

out to the people. And when they found them not, they drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also; whom Jason hath received." They were going to punish him, because he had entertained these agitators of the Jews' community.

Now, when is the time to be when the power of the persecutor is to be broken? When is that to be done? When the judgment of God is instituted and Jesus Christ has relieved the church from these persecutions. And when is it to be done? Is it to be done in the future, or has it been done? He denies that it has been done, and centuries ago, even in the year seventy of the Christian era. Now, what does that prove in regard to endless punishment? I presume that he is driven here for lack of argument; and you notice that he places emphasis louder and still louder on everlasting. Well, everlasting is a great word, and means lasting ever, and, evidently, does not signify always in every case. There is so much for the meaning of the word ever. Jonah was in hell forever, and was delivered from it before he preached to the Ninevites; for he did it successfully, for they repented. Does that word there mean endless? But, then, he tells us, that the word end means finality. Well, let me turn back to Ecclesiastes, and the wise man says: "It is better to go to the house of mourning, than to go to the house of feasting: for that is the end of all men." Well, now, that means finality, or ultimate, does it? Then the last, ultimate, or finality of all men is the house of mourning. Well, that is one way of establishing a proposition. But there are found others (Romans vi, 20-22), who were guilty of certain abominations; and the apostle says: "The end of those things is death." What death, my brother? What the end of? It is the death

of the body. Is that the ultimate, the immortal condition of mankind? Well, what do you want to prove in regard to that? That there is such a thing as endless death? Well, wade out there, will you? Go out in the deep water, and try it on once in awhile. But in Hebrews vi, 7, 8, the apostle speaks about the earth: that being dressed by men, receives the rain that descends off upon it, and produces the fruits necessary for man, and receives the blessing of God. But that ground which bears thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned. Well, that is finality, is it? That is the last of that land—it is to be burned! Let us look at this matter a little further. I do not know whether my brother has had any experience in farming; but I have had a little. As there are so many farmers here, it is interesting to be talking about farms. Here is a piece of land that is cultivated, and in good condition to bring forth and produce a good crop; but there is a piece of land covered with briers and thorns, and is rejected; not cropped. Now, what is to be done? Its end is to be burned. What does the farmer do in burning it? There is simply dry brush, or he lops over the briers and thorns, and then burns it. That burns the land all over by the dry brush, and with that the green is burned to the roots. In the fall he turns it over, and is thus able to get it in good condition for bearing a good crop; and then sows the seed; and that comes after the end—after the end, or destiny, or doom of this burning. Well, that won't do for endless punishment. But we have another evidence, in Hebrews vi, 4-6: "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them

again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." It is impossible. God Almighty has undertaken the work, he tells us, of saving the world; but here is a part of the job too hard for omnipotence. God Almighty can not do that. This is impossible for him to do. Do you understand the Scriptures that way? You say the word impossible is there. I do not deny it. But the idea that it is impossible for God to reclaim his children! Look, in all seriousness. We have an explanation in regard to things, thus: "With God all things are possible." But what things are impossible with God?

But that won't establish the endless punishment of the human race. What next? "Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost." How is he going to derive any comfort from that? Well, it reads: "He hath never forgiveness." Well, that means, not ever. As ever means for an age, never means not for an age. That can not help him. What next? "Neither in this world, nor the world to come." Well, the word *aion* means age. Neither in this age, nor the age to come. This language was uttered by Jesus in the Jewish age; and this age was commonly represented as the reign of Messiah, or the Gospel age. But then there is another verse here, and another word, which is *aionios*; that is, he is in danger of eternal damnation. Yes, *aion*, or age; lasting condemnation. Well, that does not prove it. Well, but then Mr. Carlton used "this world" and the words "world to come" to denote present life, and resurrection life, and now he makes it to mean the same thing here. Did Jesus use it to mean the same thing here? Did he mean the resurrection state, when he used it here? No. Jesus said: "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage."

That word resurrection; he did not apply here to the resurrection of the dead. Once more: Jesus said, "I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Now, how much shall be forgiven unto men? All sin and blasphemy. But here is a certain sin that was not to be forgiven within a specified time, and it was to be regarded as a presumptuous sin. Is any thing said about being endless? Not a word. But it is found that Peter makes mention of certain persons "that can not cease from sin." Well, he understands this in an absolute sense—that the person can not cease from sin. Well, suppose we understand it that way, that is, in the present tense. Does it say he never shall be able to, in any time, or in the future? No, simply can not now; in the present tense; nothing more nor less. But they are "cursed children." Granted, every sinner is cursed. But does it read that they are endlessly cursed, or shall be? My brother, that is just what you are required to prove; which you are assuming all the time. But, then, to those persons "the mist of darkness is reserved forever." How long is that, my brother? You can not prove endless from that. God said in regard to the fire burning upon the altar, that the people should kindle in olden time, "it shall never go out;" and there has been no fire there for nearly three thousand years. Did he mean that it should be burning endlessly on that altar? "If this does not establish the endless punishment of the wicked, what can?" Well, I will concede there is nothing in the Bible can. I knew that before. There is no disappointment to me in that direction. I am

just as well satisfied with the Bible, that he can not establish that doctrine, as this does not, and you know it does not—you are wading out, and feeling your way cautiously, to see what I will do with that; and you are preparing something that you think will be stronger. Let us have the strongest. Give us the best in the shop. These people are waiting to receive it. Some of them are anxious; have a great appetite. Some of them will go away feeling greatly disappointed, if you do not prove it. I am not of that class, because I do not think you can come within a thousand miles of it. Then he has introduced the law of antithesis, or contrast. Now he contrasts, he says, happiness and rewards with punishments. Happiness with misery. Is endless happiness there contrasted with misery? there is the point. Let us have it, then; he says he has got it. We have not got it yet; and when he thinks it is produced, we will examine the bantling. Daniel xii, 2, 3: "And many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise, shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." He has now assumed, that this denotes an everlasting resurrection at the end of time; for many signifies all mankind. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. MOORE'S SECOND SPEECH.]

*Messrs. Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

A short review of the last speech may be necessary now, before proceeding with the argument. You will not forget that my brother, in the preceding part of this discussion, urged, as a powerful motive to

reformation, the fear of the punishments that were here in this world, finite and limited. He admits, this morning, the exceeding terribleness of endless punishment. It strikes me he ought to see in it a terrible motive to induce men to obedience. He admits that punishment is an appeal to the fears of men, and is a motive to obedience, and if some punishment is effective, the infinite punishment, resulting from constant and perpetual disobedience, would be still greater.

He states that my argument is an inference. To this I reply that I observed there were two classes of testimony, the direct and the indirect. The first argument was an indirect argument; I did not name the others. The last one is direct and conclusive. I do not believe that any doctrine should be accepted, unless from testimony so clear and plain that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein.

Third. Everlasting life means spiritual life. I propose to do one thing. If my brother finds this word everlasting in the English, or the Greek word, of which it is a translation, meaning spiritual, I shall concede to him a victory at this point. It has reference always to duration, a portion of duration, or duration limited or unlimited. It never means any thing else—never means spiritual. We have other words for that. The Greek *πνευμα* expresses that idea, but the word *αιων*, *αιωνιος*, never means that at all.

Mark xvi, 16: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." "What is damnation?" He simply proposes the question, and then refers to John i, that men love darkness rather than light, and to be in darkness is to be in condemnation, and all that is meant is, that unless a man believes he shall be in darkness, or shall be in damnation. I simply sub-

mit whether the force of the Lord's language in the case, addressed as it was to individuals already in sin, had reference to any such thing.

Passing by hastily, I call your attention to another remark, and to his reference to 2 Thess. i, 6-10. "And to you who are troubled rest with us;" that is, they were to rest from the persecuting power at the time when he assumes he would come to destroy the city of Jerusalem, and refers you to Acts xvii, 1, a simple reference to the fact that there was a persecution raised against the disciples for preaching the gospel there. But what bearing it can have on the question here, in this passage, I can not tell. You will notice that it reads, "it shall occur in the day when he shall come to be glorified in his saints;" that is, the time when their punishment, or "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power" was to occur. I shall have occasion to refer to this word everlasting at the proper time. You will see it is when Jesus comes to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe, that is the time when these things are to occur. Was that at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem? I leave this audience, with their knowledge of the facts, to answer.

He admits the force of the little word *telos* here, by referring you to Ecclesiastes, the end of all men; that is, it is better to go to the house of mourning, and this is the end of all men. The word is there used in a special sense. The general idea is this: It is better to go where there is mourning, because this is the ultimate condition to which every man shall be brought. Is not that the truth in the case? He is just speaking of the last condition of man in this world. It is the ultimate state of the individual when this is the thing he is speaking about. There is no mistake about it, nor can he find a single excep-

Dr. Macknight on  
Heb. vi. 8, concerning the  
farm.

210

THE DESTINY OF MAN.

tion. He will find the duplicate of it some time, but we are prepared for the duplicate also, and shall be ready to respond when the proper time comes.

The same thing in Romans vi, 20-21, where the end of those things is death, the ultimate is cutting off or death. Do not forget that this is the meaning of the word. It is the ultimate, or last, or finality. That which is final, ultimate, must, from necessity, be endless. He has admitted that, in the former proposition, in affirming the endless holiness and happiness of those who die in disobedience, he meant to affirm that they would be so endlessly. Hence, ultimate meant endless. And when I find a word that means the same thing, I make him my witness and his proposition my testimony as to the fact that it is endless. Hebrews vi, 8. I have often been amused at Bro. Carlton with this. I have tried with all the powers I possess to get the scales off his eyes; for I am sure they are gathered over them very thickly. I have sometimes thought he did not know as much about farming as he supposes. I was raised on a farm, and worked for years on one. Let me read Dr. Macknight's comment on this verse. He says: "A principal part of the Eastern agriculture consists in leading rills of water from ponds, fountains, and brooks, to render the fields fruitful. When this is neglected, the land is scorched by the heat and drought of the climate, and so, being burned up, is altogether sterile. The apostle's meaning is, that as land which is unfruitful under every method of culture, will at length be deserted by the husbandman, and burnt up with drought; so those who apostatize from the Gospel, after having believed it to be from God, on the evidence mentioned in the fourth and fifth verses, will be justly given up by God and man as incorrigible."

The very words of the passage itself, as you will not fail to perceive, force upon you the same general idea.

Eye of a needle

MR. MOORE'S SECOND SPEECH.

211

He says: "For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God: but that which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned." Now, after a piece of land has received this blessing, and every means of cultivation has been used to make it productive, and still it brings forth only briers and thorns, what would you do with it? Would you plow or till it any longer? No man would who understands farming, for he would feel that it was a waste of time, and he would abandon it as incorrigible and unfruitful. That is the meaning of the apostle here. That which bears thorns after it has been cultivated, is nigh unto cursing, and its end is burning up with the drought. That is precisely the condition of the apostate, who turns away from God, and denies and denounces Jesus Christ, whom he refuses to accept on the testimonies that God has given. He places himself in a condition in which it is impossible to renew him to repentance. That reminds me that my brother and the Bible are in antagonism, and the only thing he has done is to make the Scriptures collide. Jesus says all things are possible with God; Paul says it is impossible. This would be gratifying to skeptics, to find that all things are possible in one place and in another that they are not. The disciples were making inquiry in regard to a statement the Savior had made about the young man that was going away from him after receiving the answer to the question, what good thing he should do to inherit eternal life. He told him, and because it involved self-sacrifice, which the young man was unwilling to make, Jesus said, "How hardly shall a rich man enter the kingdom of heaven. It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God." The disciples were



needle's eye

amazed, and said: "Who, then, can be saved?" Jesus said, "With men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible." The rich man may be saved. On what condition? If he do what that young man was commanded to do. In order to gain eternal life, he was commanded to sell all the property he had, and come and follow him. Then it would be possible for Jesus. He was to be saved on conditions, and not absolutely, if you please. Well, now, it is simply impossible for a certain class to be saved. But what class? A class of apostates, who had been experimentally acquainted with Christianity from its Alpha to its Omega, so far as comprehending it was concerned, and then turned away and denounced Jesus, and trampled on his blood, and done things hateful to God, placing themselves in the impossible condition, whose end is burning. So said the apostle. If this is not direct testimony, Bro. Carlton, I do not know what direct testimony is.

He refers again to "this world" and "that world," and wants to know if Jesus said he meant the resurrection. It does not make any difference. He has no reason in the world to interpret this world and that world in that way. They are to be interpreted as phrases. What do they mean? He says it means this state of existence and that state of existence. If this be so, then there is no good reason why the same phrases should not have the same meaning in other places; and he has given no reason at all. Then in Matthew xii, Mark iii, and Luke x, it must mean this state of existence and that state. And this corresponds with Mark's statement. My brother says it does not mean always. What, then, does express endlessness? Is not this an absolute negative? Take, if you please, not ever; probably it is a contraction of these two words. Does that not express an absolute and universal negative? Let him give

you something that does express it; and I challenge him to furnish any language stronger to express a universal negative.

The apostle says: "They can not cease from sin." He does a vast deal with emphasis. I have observed that Bro. Carlton has one peculiar ability, that I have sometimes envied. He can, by a twinkle of the eye, a shrug of the shoulder, and a peculiarly wise look, make the impression on some persons, that he has answered an argument, when he has not touched it at all. [Laughter.] Now, see here, sir, it is not only stated that they can not cease from sin, but that they shall utterly perish in their own corruption. What does that mean? They are wells without water, clouds carried by the tempest. He noted these things, but forgot that other that says this same class shall utterly perish in their own corruption. Try it again, Bro. Carlton!

I am reminded of this peculiar phraseology that he so frequently uses. In his criticism he said: "Now, you know this does not prove the endlessness of punishment." "You know that." What did he mean by this? Did he mean to say, that I had been trying to deceive you, that I really knew better than I was saying, and acted dishonestly in advocating what I knew to be false? I do not believe he meant that. I do not think he meant to charge me with unmanliness in that direction. Yet it was simply an *ad hominem* argument, and not on the subject.

I am ready now to pursue the argument that I left—the antithetical. In those passages he has called attention to, I think he has so far failed as to need scarcely any reply. "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, some to shame and everlasting contempt." Do you observe that everlasting life and everlasting shame and contempt are placed in antithesis? Ever-

lasting life is on this side; everlasting contempt on that side. The law of antithesis says they are different in quality, as contempt is different from life, for the quality is in the noun, and the extent in the adjective everlasting, which means endless. Everlasting life, then, is endless life, and everlasting contempt is endless contempt; and there is no logic that can avoid it. If that does not prove the endlessness of it, I challenge him to prove there is endless life in heaven for any body. I am prepared to read you another, now. The extent of eternal life may be gathered from John x, 27, 28: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." The eternal life promised to his sheep in the passage is, it must be conceded, to be taken to signify endless life. This, then, defines the meaning of this phrase. Now, since that is the case, everlasting shame and contempt must, by the aforesaid law, be taken to mean endless shame and contempt. If Bro. Carlton admits the correctness of the law of antithesis, then our controversy must end, until he has shown that endless does not mean endless. If he is able to show this, I hope he will do so. He need not controvert the conclusion, unless he can deny the premises. This, I am satisfied, he will never be able to do.

John iii, 14-17—another antithetical passage: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him

might be saved." The fifteenth verse contains the antithesis: "Whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life." Then, as a matter of course, those who do not believe in him shall perish. Then we have the contrast—the antithesis: those who do not believe shall perish; those who do believe shall have everlasting life. Will those who believe on him have an endless life? If he admits they will, then, since those that do not believe on him are antithesized with those that do believe on him, and it is to be taken in the same extent, they must suffer an endless perishing, an endless death. This view is corroborated by the fact that the serpent was the type of Christ; the poison was the type of sin; their physical death a type of spiritual death produced by sin. The salvation or cure the man enjoyed in obedience to the command of Moses was a type of the salvation from sin through obedience to Christ. Fourth.—The fall and death there of the wicked Jew, and his exclusion thereby from the earthly rest of the obedient Jew, who followed Moses to the promised land, is a type of the fall, death, and exclusion of the willfully disobedient from the heavenly Canaan, the happy home of those who held out steadfast and firm unto the end of this wilderness journey.

Revelations xiv, 10-13: "The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus. And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write,

Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them."

This passage is very plain. The destiny of the righteous and the wicked are here plainly contrasted, and the scene of the text is laid beyond death, beyond this life of toil and labor. The symbol of the torment of the wicked—the smoke of their torment ascends forever and ever—shows that their torment was endless, and to this extent must the righteous rest from their labors and be blessed. You also observe, from the fourth chapter, that there remains, therefore, a rest to the people of God; and further, the writer says, therefore we labor to enter into that rest, lest any man seem to come short of it, or fall through the same example of unbelief. The rest referred to must be a rest beyond the time of labor; and every one knows that this world is a world of toil, of labor, and no man while he remains in the world is free from the labor. He only is free from it who dies; and hence it is written, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord." From henceforth, from the time they died, they rest from their labors, and their works do follow them. Precisely contemporaneous with this, and to the same extent, the smoke of the torment of the wicked, that will not obey the Gospel of Jesus Christ continues. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. CARLTON'S SECOND SPEECH.]

*Brother Moderators, and Respected Friends:*

He says I was very particular to urge the fear of punishment as a motive to obedience. I have done but little in that direction in my life. I do not know that I ever done a good act in my life from fear of

punishment. I can not remember that I have ever performed a good act from fear, and that is one reason why I preach so little about fear; because I have long since become satisfied that you can never make a man better by exciting his fears. "We love God because he first loved us;" and if we are Christians at all, it is because we "love righteousness and hate iniquity." It is not because we are afraid of the penitentiary, here or hereafter. If I had used that motive in discussion, there might have been a point in what he said, but I do not admit the correctness of it. There must be a greater motive in endless punishment, then. I doubt that very much. I do not believe it. I believe he thinks so, but I believe he is mistaken. If you will extend a plank two feet from the earth to a distant point, well supported, and ask your child to walk that plank a certain distance, and you will give him a reward, he will be likely to start; but place the plank one hundred feet in the air, and tell him you will give him a horse if he will walk it, he will not undertake it. This idea of great danger intimidates and enfeebles men, and they do not do as well as they would without it. The next remark is that he does not believe that any doctrine ought to be believed unless it is clear and plain. That will do pretty well. Where is your doctrine of endless punishment, then? If it is very clear and plain, why can not you find something that teaches it?

But is there any evidence that the phrase "everlasting life" denotes spiritual life anywhere in the Bible? Let us see. Jesus says: "Whosoever heareth my words and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life." Does it mean that he has got life for a certain length of time, or does it refer solely to the quality of the life? Does it refer solely to the fact that the individual is made spiritually alive now?

Once more. "Be not deceived," says the apostle, "God is not mocked. Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. He that soweth to the flesh shall reap corruption." Is there any thing said about the length of time? No. "But he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting." He can not have it endlessly. It can not refer to the duration. But he that soweth to the spirit shall reap spiritual life; the crop, or the kind that he sows, is the idea, referring to the quality, and not to the duration. If this is not plain from these passages, I need not quote more. Mark xvi, 16, is again introduced in connection with John. Now, does this mean that he that believeth not is damned already, and did he mean, when he said, "This is your condemnation," did he mean, really, now—that this was their condemnation, that light was come into the world? If he did not mean exactly what he said, will you guess what he did mean? Jesus is easily understood. He says, "This is your condemnation." He did not say it was something else, in another world.

And then he has read a large portion of Acts xvii, in regard to those persecuting Jews. He seems to think, after all, that they were the persons going to be destroyed, and there is one thing he can not understand in connection with it—he does not know why, when Jesus came and established his kingdom, he is admired in all them that believe. If he will read the history of the early Christians, he will understand it. He was much admired, and glorified in them in their faith unto death.

But their end is death. It means the ultimate, and Bro. Carlton has gone to Ecclesiastes to show there is a passage there that proves the house of mourning is the end. "Ultimate is the last," he says, "that beyond which there is nothing." Is there nothing to all men beyond the house of mourning? I guess

there is. My brother believes there is, and so do I. Neither of us has any idea, in our sober moments, that the house of mourning is the last, or ultimate, to any person, either good or bad. The ultimate is beyond that.

Then we come to the comments of Dr. Macknight, and Dr. Macknight has given us a lecture on farming, such as every farmer that ever lived knows to be incorrect. Where is the land that the farmers have abandoned utterly and hopelessly? Where is it? Will the brother find it? Is it the worn-out lands of old Virginia, which the Yankees are cultivating and restoring? Where is it? Is it in the land of Idumea? Here is land that was burned. I read, now, in regard to the judgment in the olden time, Isaiah xxxiv and xxxv: "Come near, ye nations, to hear; and hearken, ye people: let the earth hear, and all that is therein; the world, and all things that come forth of it. For the indignation of the Lord is upon all nations, and his fury upon all their armies; he hath utterly destroyed them." Then that is the last of the nations of the earth. They were utterly destroyed three thousand years ago. There has been nobody since then, because utter destruction denotes finality. That is the ultimate, is it? "He hath delivered them," that is, the nations of the earth, "to the slaughter. Their slain also shall be cast out, and their stink shall come up out of their carcasses, and the mountains shall be melted with their blood. And all the thos of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig-tree. For my sword shall be bathed in heaven; behold, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment. The sword of the Lord is filled with blood, it is made fat with fatness, and with the blood of lambs

and goats, with the fat of the kidneys of rams: for the Lord hath a sacrifice in Bozrah, and a great slaughter in the land of Idumea. And the unicorns shall come down with them, and the bullocks with the bulls; and their land shall be soaked with blood, and their dust made fat with fatness. For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion. And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night or day; the smoke thereof shall go up forever." There is your chosen phrase for endless punishment! "From generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it forever and ever. But the cormorant and the bittern shall possess it; the owl also and the raven shall dwell in it: and he shall stretch out upon it the line of confusion, and the stones of emptiness. They shall call the nobles thereof to the kingdom, but none shall be there, and all her princes shall be nothing. And thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses thereof: and it shall be a habitation of dragons, and a court for owls. The wild beasts of the desert shall also meet with the wild beasts of the island, and the satyr shall cry to his fellow; the screech owl also shall rest there, and find for herself a place of rest. There shall the great owl make her nest, and lay, and hatch, and gather under her shadow: there shall the vultures also be gathered, every one with her mate. Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read: no one of these shall fail, none shall want her mate: for my mouth it hath commanded, and his spirit it hath gathered them. And he hath cast the lot for them, and his hand hath divided it unto them by line: they shall possess it forever, from generation to generation shall they dwell therein. The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert

shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing: the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon; they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God. Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees. Say to them that are of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not: behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompense; he will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water: in the habitation of dragons, where each lay, shall be grass with reeds and rushes. And a highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, it shall not be found there; but the redeemed shall walk there: and the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." After all that utter destruction, and the smoke of their torment forever, all this thing is to be restored. That looks a good deal like endless punishment! I have read the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth chapter, because the brother likes to have things taken in connection, and that shows the whole thing.

The next case of antithesis, Daniel xii, 2. Now, if this everlasting life is endless, then the shame and contempt is endless. This "if," that is the trouble.

He places the time of this rising at the end of time, or beyond the present state of existence. Now, when do the Scriptures teach that this was to take place? Commence at the first verse of the chapter: "And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince that standeth for thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time; and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." The commentators are agreed on that point, that this Michael that was to stand up was Jesus Christ. The trouble was the calamity that came upon that people eighteen hundred years ago. Those whose names were written in the book were the faithful disciples of Jesus. Daniel did not pretend to know when these things should take place. He inquired of the angel, and the angel said, It shall be for a time, times, and a half time. Daniel could not understand that, and asked him to explain, and he said: "When he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people." Their power was scattered in the year of our Lord 70. Every one that shall be found written in the book shall be delivered, and many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake—all these things were to take place when he should have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people. Some shall awake to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. That prediction was fulfilled eighteen hundred years ago, God Almighty's messenger from heaven for the enlightenment of the world, through Daniel, being the authority. How much does that prove endless punishment? How much does that prove it has reference to a resurrection to immortality? Can you see any evidence there? If you can, retain it till after this congregation is dismissed, and let me have it, I will be obliged.

Now, if everlasting life means endless life, then everlasting destruction means endless destruction. But where does he get any authority for placing them in antithesis? He quotes the everlasting life as a reward placed in antithesis, or antithetic relation with everlasting destruction as a punishment. If he will prove the endless life is the reward, that the endless happiness of heaven is the compensation to man for believing in this world, then he will begin to show something in regard to making the punishment co-extensive with it. But so far from its being the fact, the Scriptures teach that, after we have done all we can do, we have only done our duty. When the dying Cowper, was about to pass to the other world, a friend said: "You are going to your reward." He replied: "I am going to receive mercy." That was the Christian spirit. The Pharisical spirit is that of Parson Brownlow, who, in a political speech a few years ago, strutting up with all the pomp of the Pharisee, he says: "If the books are kept accurately up there, I think there is a small balance in my favor." [Laughter.] That is the Pharisee's spirit. The Christian looks to the immortal blessedness of heaven as a display of the divine goodness and mercy, and not as any thing he is entitled to for what he has done. Let us try this matter a moment, about what great beings we are, and what a wonderful work we are doing in this world, that we get the infinite God in debt so much to us that it will take him through the endless ages of eternity to pay us off. I would not be boastful at all, though I try to do exactly right, and I believe I have aimed at that all my life, and I feel that every step of my progress in life, so far, God has not only abundantly paid me for all the attention I have given to investigate his truth, and all the good I have done, but he has given me ten thousand blessings more than I have earned, or ever expect to earn. I

am in debt to God at every step, and always will be, and I have no hopes of ever getting him in debt to me. It does not require an endless heaven to pay me for what I can do. I believe in the endless life, and endless felicity of heaven, but not as a reward. I believe in the punishment which the Scriptures teach as the retribution for sin, but I do not believe in the endlessness of it, and that is just the point we are investigating now.

Well, now, "whosoever believeth on him shall not perish, but have everlasting life." Well, what shall he have in consequence of his faith? He enters into the enjoyment of life; he shall not perish. Well, what is the perishing? The perishing is that which is retribution or punishment for his neglect to search the Scriptures and gain the truth, and possess and enjoy it, and do good with it. The perishing is the punishment he receives for his neglect and disobedience. All that is contrasted with the blessings which he receives as the reward for his obedience. Neither of them is endless. I frankly confess that neither of them is endless. The Scriptures do not teach that the reward of obedience is an endless reward. I never had any faith in that direction.

But, Rev. xiv, 10. There are persons found here who were tormented day and night forever and ever. That is answered in the thirty-fourth chapter of Isaiah, in regard to the people of Idumea, the smoke of whose torment ascended up forever and ever. He says this refers to the future state, because it is followed by the language: "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them." How does he know that refers to a scene beyond literal death? He infers that. Why? Because it is a necessary inference to make something for his case. Let us examine this case.

Let us examine this use of that text for a moment. If it refers to a future blessedness, to be enjoyed by the Christian, why does the divine Spirit say, "from henceforth?" Was it not just as true before that time, that the righteous were blest, as it is true since? What is the signification of "from henceforth?" We would like a little light on that subject. The fact is, there is meaning in this language. There is significance—there is a reason why he said "from henceforth." What is it? Go back to the sixth of Romans: "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin." The individual that is dead unto sin, dies indeed; he dies to sin, but is alive unto God. Well, now, blessed are the dead that die to sin from henceforth. Now, I can understand why it was. They had been bitterly persecuted before the time referred to, and here the power of the persecutor was going to be broken, and the Church blest and put in the enjoyment of their faith. Write "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: they rest from their labors forever," an enjoyment which was not vouchsafed to the early Christians. If the brother will take it to the future world, let him go at "henceforth," and explain it, which no man has ever done yet.

Hebrews iv. Attention is called to the rest that remains to the people of God. That is a favorite subject with me. I delight in that. Let us look at this matter now, "lest any of you come short of it;" because those to whom it was first preached entered not in because of unbelief; but we, which have believed, do enter in. What, the rest before the labor? Or, is not the labor here in this world, and the rest up yonder? He says "we do enter the rest" by believing the truth. Our souls are filled with joy unspeakable, and full of glory; for if Joshua had given them rest, he would not have spoken of another day.

He says Heb. 4 should read Joshua instead of Jesus. correct

He does not believe in a reward.

I know it reads Jesus; but the brother knows it ought to read Joshua. That it is a present and special rest is evident from the fact that the apostle adds, "We which have believed do enter in." Here is the rest for the people of God. Is that the endless rest of heaven? The apostle cuts that off.

Romans ii, 6-11. I suppose this is quoted for the purpose of using the words immortality and eternal life. This is generally quoted for the purpose of showing that immortality and endless life must be sought for; but, unfortunately, the word translated immortality here is not *athanasian*. It is not the word that denotes continued existence; but *aphtharsia*, a word that denotes incorruptness. And they that seek incorruptness, what is the reward to them? Spiritual life. Yes, said Jesus, "I am come that they might have life, and have it more abundantly." This blessing he vouchsafes to the believer, the sincere follower. He has life in him, and the life he lives is a life of faith in the Son of God.

Now, in summing up this matter, we want you to consider where the evidence—the proof—is that has been presented to establish the endlessness of the punishment of any body. Have you seen any of it? I have not.

I turn, then, to consider the teaching of the Scriptures in regard to punishment, by way of a negative argument. We look now at the time that God placed our race on the earth—the first human pair. He institutes a government over them. He does not leave them in the dark in regard to the principles of his government, nor the nature of the penalty affixed to transgression. He says: Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat, because if you do, I want you to understand you are on probation here; and after your race shall have been run, and you shall have left this world, you will be brought to a great

judgment-seat; and there the dread decision will be made. Your case will be investigated; and if you have disobeyed me, you will find your home in endless sorrow and burning. Did he say so? Let us see. God does not hoodwink the first human pair. He says: "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." I know the serpent told them they should not surely die; but the serpent lied. God being true, they did die, just when he said they should. How long does he tell them that the punishment for their disobedience should follow—endlessly? No, sir! Until thou return to the ground. [*Time expired.*]

---

[MR. MOORE'S THIRD SPEECH.]

*Messrs. Moderators, and Respected Auditors:*

I shall proceed to conclude the argument on antitheses before examining the remarks of the last speech. I had just read Romans ii, 6-11. I turn to Rev. xx, 10: "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever." This is contrasted with the New Jerusalem, the happy home of the righteous, whose names were found in the Lamb's book of life. Here the persons whose names were in the Lamb's book of life on the one side, and those that are wicked and abominable, as Rev. xxi, 7, 8, will show, are placed on the other side in contrast. One of them, it is said, shall enjoy the benefits of the new city described in the twenty-first chapter, while the other is to endure the torments of the fire and brimstone. I read now Rev. xxi, 27: "And there shall in nowise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomina-



tion, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." Also xxii, 14, 15: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." The time when this is to occur is described Rev. xxi, 1-5: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write: for these words are true and faithful." First, then, there will be a new heaven and a new earth. Second, there shall be no sea. Is there a sea? Third, the new Jerusalem, with its jasper walls, with its river of the water of life, flowing from beneath the throne of God, through the streets of it, fringed by the tree of life. Fourth, all tears are wiped away, sorrow and pain are no more. Fifth, "All things are new." Sixth, the wicked cast into the burning lake. Seventh, no more night there, and no sun, for the Lord God and the Lamb is the light of the city. This comports with Matthew xxv, 31-33: He will separate between the good and the bad; he will place the righteous on his right, and the wicked on his left,

New Heaven

and say to those on his right, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;" and to those on his left, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Without detaining you with much criticism, let me return and observe that these scenes and events indicated by this must lie beyond the present. We have still the same heavens and earth. We have not yet the new Jerusalem described in Revelations xxi. There are still tears on the faces of men. Pain is in the body of men. All things are not new, but seem as they did of old: the sun shines, the moon still keeps her place, and the stars nightly gem the skies. The wicked are yet among the righteous; separation has not yet been made. These things, then, from the necessity of the case, lie beyond this state of existence, and can only occur "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." The contrast is so perfect and complete, that I do not need to enlarge further. You have, hence, the saved here in the new Jerusalem, wherein dwelleth righteousness, with a right to the tree of life, and to enter into the heavenly city, and all the immunities and advantages accruing therefrom; while the wicked are cast away, turned into the home of the devil and his angels; and into it all men are cast who are ultimately disobedient. Here is the ultimate state and final condition, and, from the necessities of the case, *endless*.

Matthew states the antithesis between the wicked and the righteous again, after the description that I have referred to, beginning with the 31st verse, in which the Son of man on the throne of his glory, as

the judge of the universal assembling, separates the good and the bad. The final sentence is in the 46th verse: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." The word eternal in the last clause is the same in Greek with the word everlasting in the first clause. They signify eternal duration, and is executed at the time when Jesus shall separate between the good and the bad, and the duration of the condition of each is expressed by this word *aionios*, everlasting, eternal, endless.

I shall now return, and examine the matter contained in the speech to which you have just listened. "I never did a good act through fear," said Bro. Carlton. I presume to say, that, as a matter of course, he had reference to slavish fear. In Ecclesiastes xii, Solomon says, that "to fear God, and keep the commandments, is the whole duty of man;" and if my brother has never feared God, he had better begin soon, or he will not do his duty. And Paul says, we should "fear of entering into his rest, lest any should come short of it." The fear that is spoken of is to prompt the individual as a motive to labor to enter into that rest. I turn back to examine the chapter, so as to note the criticism he has offered. It depends merely on the present tense of the verb, which expresses merely a general truth. You are aware that it is a law of the English language, that a general truth is to be expressed by the present tense. That is the kind of truth that is expressed in the present instance. My brother knows that, and every man does who knows any thing of the force and structure of the English language. Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the Gospel preached, as well as unto them. But the word preached—that is, to the Jews in the wilderness—did not profit them,

not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. Gospel means glad tidings. What glad tidings? A promise made of a rest in this world; and to preach that to them was to preach the Gospel. Temporal rest for them was the type of the rest for us. Ours, then, must be something else than temporal. It is antitypical, and, if temporal, it can not be antitypical. If the one is temporal, the other must be endless and eternal. If the one is in time, the other must be in eternity. The Gospel preached to them has reference to temporal rest; the Gospel preached to us had reference to eternal rest. When God completed the work of creation, he rested, for rest follows the completion of work. The man rests when he has completed his work; and only when his work is done can he be said to enter into his rest. I inquire whether it is possible to suppose that the Christian entered into his rest before his work is accomplished? Will he not continue to work until his work is accomplished? I read now Hebrews iii, 14: "For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end." If we do something according to divine requirement, we are partakers of Christ. This is conditional, and it must be held unto the end. Paul says, in 2 Timothy iv, 7, 8: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." Do you observe, he continues to work on, and he says his work was finished. When he was about to die he rested now from the persecutions, trials, and afflictions of this world, and his works follow him, and will follow him, and continue to increase in the aggregate quantity of good, until the last generation of mankind shall be called home by the last

great trump of God, and then, and not till then, can the ultimate quantity of good accomplished by this great man be seen; and, for that very reason, it is impossible to present to an assembled universe of finite intelligence a just judgment of God; and, for this reason, he has "appointed a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained," as stated by Paul, in Acts xvii. Then the "rest remains," and those that believe do enter into it prospectively. It is a matter of prospect, as it was with those Israelites when they heard the Gospel. The Gospel is preached to us that believe, and we believe as they did from the wilderness. They believed they would have the rest; so do we, if we comply with the conditions. See eleventh verse: "Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest." Why? "Lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief." What does he mean? He refers to the fact that the Israelites, in their journeyings, on account of their infidelity in the promises of God, fell in the wilderness; all of them over twenty years of age, except Caleb and Joshua, fell in the wilderness, because they were not worthy. "Forty years ye shall wander, for you shall not enter in, because you are not worthy; but your wives and little ones, them will I bring into this land." Their unbelief caused them to fall short of the promised land. Your unbelief will cause you to fall short of the celestial land, promised to them that accept his will. I shall take it as granted that I have answered that point, and I do not know that I shall be at all called upon to refer to the matter any more to the conclusion of the debate.

The illustration about the motive or influence of fear on the man, I had overlooked. When speaking on that subject he made an illustration in regard to the boy walking the plank two feet high and another

one hundred feet high. To my mind there was no point in it. Here are dangers ahead, and not dangers that the individual walks upon. He threatens the transgressor with punishment after the transgression is completed. Hence, he has mistaken the whole matter. He makes the idea of walking the plank the punishment or suffering. If that is not the case there is no point in it. But you see the punishment is what follows after he has walked the whole length of the plank, and hence the idea of the plank has nothing to do with it. The question is the motive in punishment to be endured after the plank is removed. Will it have a greater influence if the danger is at the end than in the other case? Will the individual be more likely to be deterred from walking on the plank? The plank is an easy one because it harmonizes with the flesh. It is consequently very low down. When you place the motive at the end of the plank—a simple, trifling whipping that will not amount to any thing in the world—will that be as powerful a motive to induce the man to walk on the plank as it would if the punishment was to lose his citizenship and every blessing that could be conferred upon him? Let him have the benefit of his plank. I am glad he introduced it, for it has only helped me.

He attempts to make out that the everlasting life is to be enjoyed within the circle of life here. Has he not learned the fact that everlasting life is in Jesus Christ? Colossians iii, 1-4: "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." On what condition? Why, on the condition that they set their affections on things above and not on things on the

earth. Again, John i: "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." Again, in the fifth chapter: "In him is eternal life," and again, "that it is life to believe in the only begotten Son of God." Let me mark a circle. Let it embrace the life. If an individual is outside of the circle he is in death. The circle of eternal life is in Jesus. The endless pleasures of heaven are in him, and that is the reason why when the individual flees from sin he is brought within this divine periphery, and just as long as he remains obedient continues in possession, and no man can take it from him. Suppose he becomes an infidel and puts himself outside of the divine circle, outside of the eternal life. He knows the life may be enjoyed now, and continued to be enjoyed through the eternal cycles, but only on condition of his continuing where the life is.

Where is hopelessly worn-out land? I was glad to hear that poetic description that the prophet gave of the church. I have only to say that it is a poetic description, and every body knows that the language of prophecy is to be taken metaphorically and in view of the object contemplated. Here we have a literal statement of the thing presented in Hebrews vi, 8, and so clear and plain was the comment of Dr. Mac-knight, that I think further criticism is useless. You know, and every one knows, that when land has received all the dressing and cultivating it is possible to give it, and still will produce nothing, every sensible man would abandon it as worthless. That represents the person who, after having believed in Jesus Christ, denounces him and becomes an apostate, and that is the end of such a man.

The future happiness is not a matter of debt, not a result of works. I am aware that God can never be in debt to man as debt and credit. But I have this to say, that the salvation in this life is spoken of as a

salvation of grace, while the salvation beyond this life is spoken of as depending on obedience to the Gospel. Philippians ii, 12: "Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but how much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." They were good men, they were Christian men, they were in the proper condition, and what of it? They were in the enjoyment of the benefits of the redemption and in possession of the eternal life in Christ, because they were in him. But he says to them, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." What can a passage of this kind, addressed to such a class of persons, mean, unless it means that the salvation was to be secured by working it out according to God's good pleasure? Hebrews ~~vi~~, 8, 9: "Though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered. And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." How many does he propose to save? Just simply those that obey him.

<sup>2</sup> Peter i, 5: "And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness," etc.; for if you do these things an entrance shall be administered unto you. Hence, the enjoyment of the benefits of the everlasting, the ultimate, salvation hangs upon the individual doing these things.

Revelations xxii, 14: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city"—that is, into the new Jerusalem. That, we have shown you, was the contrast of the lake of fire, the ultimate condition of those that were brought up through tribulation, and had washed their robes and were made meet for the Master's use. I would

not positively demand of God, as a matter of right, even life here. God gave life to all things, and so far as debt is concerned, I ask nothing; but I do insist that God offers mercy to the rebel who has no right to ask it; and let me say that the individual that rebelled against this government forfeited his right of American citizenship, except the right to be executed as a criminal, as every man acquainted with the nature of law knows; but when the government saw fit to offer to the criminal pardon, it was a gracious act; and his citizenship, after he receives the benefits of the gracious mercy, depends upon his continuance in well-doing, his conformity to the requisitions of the laws of his country; and hence, in the same way, when the rebel to the government of Almighty God has forfeited every right, he is offered pardon, it is a gracious act, and his perfection as a citizen of the divine government, and his enjoyment of the benefits of citizenship depends upon his continuance in good works, as the entire tenor of the Sacred Scriptures imports. [*Time expired.*]

---

[MR. CARLTON'S THIRD SPEECH.]

*Brother Moderators, and Respected Auditors:*

Quotations were made from Revelations xx, 10, connected with Revelations xxi, 22, in regard to the new Jerusalem and the condition of those outside of this new Jerusalem, and he says this refers to the final home of man. Afterward these scenes are closed, and then there are classes not having an opportunity to enter this city. He teaches that this new Jerusalem is heaven. There is some difficulty in the way of understanding this to be heaven. "And I John saw the new Jerusalem, the

holy city, coming down from God out of heaven." What! heaven coming out of heaven? How is that? Where did it come to? It came here where we are. "And then I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." Any body can see from this that the new Jerusalem is not heaven itself; and the fact, that at a certain time there were certain persons outside of the new Jerusalem, does not go far to prove that they will be endlessly outside of heaven. It is terribly strained. Nothing to justify it. And then the stars are still shining. Does he want us to understand that the literal stars are going to cease to shine after awhile? If he is going to understand these Scriptures in the literal sense, in regard to these stars, where are they going to fall to? I know there have been persons who have understood these passages in a literal sense in regard to the stars falling. A few years ago, when the meteors fell, there was a little boy that insisted they were stars. He said he knew they were stars, for his mother had brought some of them in, and put them in the bureau; and he said they were as good as ever, only some of the corners were knocked off a little. [Laughter.] Does he want us to understand that he believes the literal stars are going to fall? If he believes any thing of the kind, will he tell us where they are going to fall to? A person may sometimes talk a great deal without saying any thing. But in Matthew xxv, 31-46, we have the parable of the sheep and the goats, which he quotes. I suppose he means an argument by that. "When the Son of man shall come in the glory of his father, and the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall

separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on his left." He wants us to understand, rather by implication, that this refers to the final judgment at the close of time, when there are two classes to be judged, one represented by the sheep, the other by the goats; and these are to be separated, and the righteous are to be blessed, and the wicked are to be turned into everlasting fire. He can not claim this Scripture in the sense in which he introduces it. It is when the Son of man was to come that this was to take place. "For the Son of man was to come in the glory of his father, with his angels, to reward every man according to his work." (See Matthew xvi, 27, 28.) "Verily, I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." There were some there that were not to die till he should commence this work. Then this judgment was to transpire, but it was accomplished 1800 years ago. That is not the only difficulty that lies in the way of the common interpretation or application of this passage of Scripture. In this final judgment he says there are two classes, but in this judgment there are three classes. "Then shall the judge say to them on the right hand, Come, ye blessed of my father, etc." "Inasmuch as ye"—you righteous—"did it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye did it unto me." "Then shall the judge say unto those on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, etc." "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not unto me." The righteous on the right, the wicked on the left, and the disciples are represented as a third and entirely different class. That spoils the whole thing for your final judgment. And then what about the salvation by faith? For there is not a word said

Math. 24

about any one's being put there on the right hand because they believed on the Lord Jesus Christ. I suppose that is omitted because they did not believe in him. They were not believers in Christ at all. There is a very good reason why there was nothing said about their faith. But "these my brethren" were the faithful. But the parable of the sheep and goats concludes with the forty-sixth verse: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Everlasting punishment—how long is everlasting? If we take the time now for duration, Jonah was punished with everlasting punishment. How long? Three days and three nights. The Israelites possessed the land of Canaan for an everlasting inheritance. They have not been there for thousands of years. The Aaronic priesthood was to be an everlasting priesthood, which terminated eighteen hundred years ago, or else Jesus Christ was an impostor. These are things to be looked at in the Scripture about the use of the English word everlasting.

Now, what about the life which was said to be in contrast with it—eternal life? Well, eternal has just the same signification as everlasting, precisely, nothing more and nothing less. But the brother intimates that his power and thunder are found in the Greek. Then let us go to the Greek. It is the same word, *aiouios*, that is employed in both cases. Very well, insist, if you please, that the original is the same in both instances, and then what does it mean? I notice in reading the Scriptures that in Matthew xxxiv, 3, we find the noun from which this adjective is derived. "And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" I know many persons suppose that means the literal

world; but it has no more reference to the end of this literal world than it would have for us to talk about dinner. The word does not denote the world, it is a word the utmost force of which denotes time, and not a planet, a world, or mode of being. The word is *aionos*. What was to be the sign of these things and the termination of the *aionos*? There is the noun now in xxv, 46. Jesus employs the adjective *aionios* and applies it to punishment. They had asked him what should be the sign of the end of the period denoted by the noun, and he tells them, but uses the adjective derived from the same noun which, we are told, denotes endless duration. By virtue of what rule of criticism can a power exist in the adjective which does not inhere in the noun from which it is derived?

Then he thinks I am a wicked kind of man, because I have not acted from fear; and Solomon says: "The whole duty of man is to fear God and keep his commandments." Did not you understand me? I was talking about the fear of punishment, and I said I was not conscious to-day that I had ever performed a good action in my life from the fear of punishment; and then he tells me I must fear God—that is, reverence him, and keep his commandments. That is what I believe, and endeavor, by the grace of God, to do.

But the temporal rest of the Jews, in Hebrews iv, is the type of heaven, our final and endless rest. That is a type, and our heaven is the antitype. The prospect, then, is encouraging. Here start the children of Israel from the land of bondage—having been emancipated—for the promised land of Canaan. They wander through the wilderness forty years, and but two of those that start for Canaan enter it. He encourages all the people he can to start for heaven, and the antitype would encourage us to believe that

two of all who ever started will get there. That is a pretty encouraging prospect. Where did he learn that the land of Canaan is the type of heaven? He might learn from the Scriptures, very readily, that it is a type of the rest and spiritual blessing which the believer enjoyed, that were contrasted with the blessings enjoyed in the land flowing with milk and honey. The one, he says, is temporal, and the other is endless. Another inference.

But God Almighty ceased to work—God quit work six thousand years ago. Are you serious? Has there been a moment in the endless past that God has been idle? Is he not incessantly working? Who denies that? Look at the work God Almighty has been carrying on in the last six thousand years, and when has he been idle? Tell us the moment when God has been idle! I do not find any time. I do not believe there was a moment of time. God is always active. He teaches us to be always active. I know some people like this idea about heaven's being a place to do nothing, and one great trouble in the various branches of the Christian Church is, that the idea has been, unfortunately, impressed on their minds by the clergy, that heaven is a great loafer hall, where people will lounge away their time; and so they go to church, and fall asleep there, and that is the next thing to heaven. They like to sing

"Where congregations ne'er break up,  
And Sabbaths never end."

God is a being of ceaseless energy and activity, and heaven is a place of unceasing progress, and the Christian should learn that he ought to go to work. What is meant by rest? It is not lounging around in idleness, and doing nothing, and enjoying oneself. All that is meant by God's resting from the work of creation is, his delighting in what he had done. It

was the satisfaction of having it as he would have it ; and the rest that remains for the Christian is the consolation of so living, so acting, as that he will be satisfied with his work, and enjoy himself in the blessed employment the divine Master had given him to do. That is the Christian rest. It is not laziness—it is not doing nothing ; and that rest every person enters into, just as soon as he does any thing right. Just as soon as he begins the service of the Lord, he begins to rest ; he does not cease to labor for God, and never will.

We have a precious morsel laid by. We are promised a rich time when it is introduced, and that is the reason why God can not judge mankind in this world. It will be rich when it comes.

Everlasting life ! A long, long time we were treated with the lesson on the blessings of faith, and obedience to the Gospel, all of which we fully receive, and most cordially indorse. But does that prove that any body will suffer endless punishment ?

Now we go back to show what the Scriptures teach in regard to the subject of the divine judgments—God's punishing the world, administering justice, rewarding the obedient, and punishing the disobedient. We have seen how it was in the case of the first pair, when God began to govern them. We have seen that in Eden there was peace, and love, and joy, rest and happiness. Why ? The first pair were obeying God. They lived in obedience to every law, and all was happiness, as the result of obedience to God, so governing them and rewarding them for their obedience. I love to contemplate the felicity of our first pair in Eden, when the angels of heaven were ascending and descending ; when God Almighty conversed with man from day to day ; when all was physical ease and health ; when all was mental peace and domestic quiet. That was a glorious and happy state of things they enjoyed in obedi-

*no suffering or punishment after death*

ence to the laws of God. God was rewarding them here. His laws they disobeyed ; and just as soon as they disobeyed, the rest is destroyed. Just as soon as they disobey, they are driven out of Eden ; they are involved in trouble and sorrow. They suffer for their disobedience, and God told them their sufferings should continue until the death of the body. No intimation of any punishment or suffering beyond that. Would not here have been a good place for God to have revealed the penalty of transgression ? Do you not believe he did ? Cain is presented as the next instance of disobedience. He wickedly murders his brother. Does God tell him, according to the common idea, or faith, "Cain, you are a probationer here, that is all ; after death I will bring you to judgment ? You will find punishment in another world." Did he tell him so ? "Cain, where is thy brother ?" He says : "I know not ; am I my brother's keeper ?" Did God tell him, "I will call the witnesses, and investigate the case in the day of judgment ?" "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground ;" I have the evidence. "A fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth ;" and in the anguish of his soul he exclaimed : "My punishment is greater than I can bear." No hint of any judgment beyond this life.

Now come in four thousand years of the Old Testament history, and you will find that as individuals and as nations obeyed the commandments of the living God, they are blessed and rewarded ; blessed in their basket and in their store, in their coming in and in their going out, in their lying down and in their rising up. The blessings of God flow full, free and abundant. As a man disobeys, or as a nation disobeys, the statutes of the Most High, God punishes them ; the reward of their hand is given them. Divine revelation comes to the servant of God



instructing the people: "Say ye to the righteous it shall be well with him, for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked! it shall be ill with him, for the reward of his hands shall be given him." Psalms ix, 15, 16: "The Lord is known by the judgment which he executeth." Remember that word, Bro. Moore—which he executeth. It is in progress. He is known by the judgment which he executeth, not by what he has said he will do in eternity. "The wicked is snared in the work of his own hands." "The wicked shall be turned into hell and all the nations that forget God." Stop, says one, here is that word hell. Yes; we said last night that David was turned into hell, but he can explain what it was. I was wicked and I was turned into hell. All the nations that forget God shall be turned into hell. Read the history of the nations of the earth, and find the nation that has forgotten God and failed to administer justice, and see if God has not turned it into hell, not excepting our own nation. We were turned into sorrow and trouble; deep, terrible sorrow was our punishment in consequence of forgetting God. Jeremiah, in the ninth chapter, unfolds the principle of the administration of justice: "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, nor the rich man glory in his riches, nor the strong man glory in his might; but he that glorieth let him glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me; that I am the Lord, and do exercise loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord."

Look at the case of the wise man, Solomon. David said to him: "Solomon, my son, remember now the God of thy fathers; serve him with a perfect heart, and with a willing mind. If thou seek him he will be found of thee, and if thou forsake him he will cast thee off forever." Solomon forsook God. God cast

him off forever. Look at the condition in which Solomon was when God had cast him off. He forsook the living God—that God before whom he had bowed when he said: "The heaven, even the heaven of heavens, can not contain thee." He bowed down and worshiped idols. God cast him off. What was his faith in God; his hope in the future? What did he believe? Time and chance, said he, happen to all men. Poor fool! He thought the world was governed by chance. Did he believe there was a God reigning that would reward the righteous and punish the wicked? "One event happeneth to the wicked and the righteous." That is not all. "Man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity." Do n't you believe in the future existence? No; I have lost all that. What then? "As dieth a man, so dieth a beast; both die and go to the same place." There is where his faith was. That was the deep darkness in which he was involved. He sought happiness in sin, and found it was vanity of vanities. All was vanity. After God had cast him off forever, and he had suffered all this error, and gloom, and misery, he now comes to himself; he comes back and teaches a lesson to all the world—he teaches the youth, "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth, when the evil days come not"—you then had evil days by forsaking God—aye more, "when the years draw nigh when thou shalt say, I have no pleasure in them." That man, with all his wealth, found no pleasure in consequence of *sin*. [*Time expired.*]

*Thursday, April 28, 7 o'clock P. M.*

Opened by prayer.

[MR. MOORE'S FOURTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and Friendly Auditors :*

I shall briefly glance at the speech that some of you at least heard this morning, and make such comments on it as seems to me to be essential. To do this I first call your attention to the fact that the New Jerusalem spoken of in Revelation xxi, and the lake of fire and brimstone into which the beast and the false prophet are cast, death and hell, and all whose names were not written in the Lamb's book of life, that these lay beyond this life necessarily, in the future and endless state, for reasons that have been assigned. (1.) Among others, the fact that there would be no day and no night, no need of the light of the sun or moon; (2.) There would be no sea there; (3.) That all things would become new; (4.) That there was a complete separation between the good and the bad, each assigned to his own place. The righteous were permitted to inhabit the New Jerusalem, the capital and metropolis of the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness exclusively. Here are reasons assigned why this thing could not be connected with this temporary state of ours. Such a city as is here described, either in fact or metaphor, never has existed upon this earth. If my brother makes it a metaphor, let him do so. It must be admitted that the metaphor or figure can not be equal to that of which it is the figure. And since these things have never existed in fact or figure in this world, and can not exist in fact or figure here, and the fact, that if this be a figure, the reality must transcend the figure; then, it must exist somewhere in the ultimate and final state, and hence is endless.

And further to corroborate this, read Rev. xxii, 11: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still." This is said after they have been assigned their respective places and their final abodes. The import of the phraseology is—for the expression "let him" is equivalent to "shall be"—the filthy shall be filthy still. Then the condition into which the individual enters is a fixed one; if bad to this time, he remains bad, filthy, and corrupt; and he remains so endlessly. On the contrary, if he has secured the character of a good and holy man, his state is still fixed; that having cultivated and educated himself up to the point through all the trials and afflictions of this world, when he gets to the better world there will be no motive sufficiently strong to call him away. He will be fixedly righteous and consequently happy. I believe I have attended to all that I need to say in reference to that. The only thing he referred to was, what he conceived to be an absurdity—that the New Jerusalem came down from God out of heaven; that is, heaven came down out of heaven. This latter clause I did not say. It was only presented as a burlesque. I need only call your attention to it, for you will perceive that it is not assumed that heaven came out of heaven, but the New Jerusalem did, and it became the metropolis of the new earth in which there was no sea. The Lord God became the light of it; there was no need of the sun, moon, and stars. This reminds me of the question whether I believe the stars will be literally destroyed? I do not suppose they will be literally destroyed, neither did I submit such a thought as this; but that in this new condition there is no need of the light of the sun, or of the moon, or stars, for it is stated that the Lord God and the Lamb are the light thereof.

Next, Matthew xxv, 31, when the Savior shall come in his second advent, on the throne of his glory, to separate the good and the bad, as a shepherd divides between the sheep and the goats, inviting the righteous to life everlasting, and condemning the wicked to everlasting punishment. I simply give the circumstances, without reading the passage; that has been done once. He inquires when these things occurred; and then reads from Matthew xvi, 28, in which it is said that he shall come in the glory of his Father, with his holy angels. Now, when will this coming of the Son of Man occur? We are told what will happen then, and that is, that he will reward every man according to his works. You will notice, that my brother attempts, in the next verse, to show you that this must all have occurred during the lifetime of some of the individuals then living; and hence, that the righteous man was made perfect and complete, that Christ did come, and did reward every man, and my brother too, as a matter of course. Unless he is not a man, he must have been among the individuals rewarded, for he states that he will then "reward every man according to his works." The reason of this is because of the language following: "Verily, I say unto you, there be some standing here that shall not taste of death." Here an entirely new subject is opened up. Turn to Mark viii, 38. That corresponds to Matthew xvi, 27; while the ninth chapter begins a new subject, and corresponds to Matthew xvi, 28. There is a difference: in the one case, he is to come to commence his reign; in the other, he comes to reward his people, according to their works. But the word generation, I may remark, does not necessarily mean, in this case, the lifetime of an individual, a period of thirty or forty years. It is sometimes so used; possibly it may be granted to be the general signification; but it is

meaning of the word  
generation, as used in  
Matt. 24 & 25.

otherwise used in the Scriptures. Jesus said: "Ye generation of vipers." Did he mean the length of the lifetime of the individual—thirty-three and one-third years? No! He meant a race or class of persons. In Philippians the same word is translated nation—"a holy nation." To be sure, the word itself means the genealogy, or the continuance of the records of the family, and literally signifies the ages of the ages, and involves all the time. This is precisely the fact; and hence, when it is said, in Matthew xxiv, in the criticism that was made, that all these things shall come to pass before this generation passes away, we are not necessarily to infer, in that case, that the period of a generation was thirty, forty, or sixty, or seventy years. It was the continual existence of the Jewish people, as a separate nationality. That continues to the present time. They are just as distinct now as they were eighteen hundred years ago; and they are a standing miracle, attesting the divine providence of God, and the truth of the divine oracles.

He refers to Matt. xxiv, 3, which contains merely the questions which the Savior discussed throughout the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters. What shall be the sign of thy coming? and when shall these things be? and of the end of the world? The disciples were interested about these three events. I may say that he could not have had reference to the end of the Jewish polity, because they did not believe that it would ever end. They expected some one to be sent who would take the throne, and establish the kingdom forever; and it would have been the consummation of folly for those having this idea of their national existence to have asked him, "When shall the end of this nation be?" or, "When shall be the destruction of the Jewish metropolis?" Hence, "world" is literally what you ordinarily mean by the

generation

word; the idea, that the common scholar would get in the reading of the passage; "When shall the end of the world be?" And until this matter is further examined, I will give it no further attention.

He continues with the twenty-fifth chapter, and says that my plan of argument requires that there be but two classes present, the righteous, or the sheep, and the wicked, or the goats; that the one is on the right, and the other on the left; that there are only these two classes in the judgment-day, according to the argument. I accept it. "Now," says he, "in this passage there are three classes." Indeed! How did he find them? Most remarkable discovery! He finds that Jesus said to the sheep: "Enter into the kingdom prepared for you, because you fed, clothed, and administered to the wants of these my brethren. Because you did it to the least of my brethren, you did it to me;" that is to say, "Here you are, on the right hand, and you did it to some other third class assumed." On the contrary, it is this: He says to an individual on the right hand, "Enter into the joy of thy Lord, because you did works of benevolence for these brethren of mine." He says this to all of them, because they all did alike, not only to these, but to men generally. If it had not been for the necessity of the case, to avoid the force of the conclusion, my brother would never have thought of that, even with his prolific imagination; and he has certainly as great an imagination as Milton ever had, and I am astonished he has not long since been a poet. For the same reason the others are sent away unto punishment, because they did not do the same to the least of his brethren. This does not destroy the force of the argument. Do you observe that it is the time when he comes with his holy angels? Did this occur at the destruction of the city of Jerusalem? It did not literally. Did it figuratively? If so, what

was the figure? Was Titus, who led the Roman armies, who swept with the besom of destruction that ancient capital, and destroyed more than a million of souls—was he a symbol, or representation of Jesus Christ, whose character you have heard him exhibit during this discussion? And of his angels, who represented those blood-thirsty soldiers, led on by a more blood-thirsty general, who continued their ravages until they had ransacked all the land of Israel, and entered even the metropolis, and the temple itself, and dragged from the houses all the gold laid up there? Are these fit types of the holy angels? Holy angels! Now Jesus, in Matt. xxiv, 15, as if to prevent this idea, said: "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place," and this is conceded to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman army under Titus. "If any man says to you, Lo! here is Christ, or lo! there, believe it not." "If they shall say, He is in the desert, go not forth." As much as to say: "If they tell you that Jesus Christ comes, then do not believe it." But, on the contrary, "when you see that, fly to the mountains." Well, you remember, also, that when Jesus comes he will gather his people together. Instead of gathering his people together on his right, and blessing them, and placing the wicked on the left, there was a scattering of his people. They were told to flee to the mountains—be absent from the destroying power that is brought against Jerusalem.

The "rest that remains" was the next. I had noted Hebrews iv, 1-11. He says it is not very encouraging. I can not help that, if it is even so. He says there were only two saved who passed over Jordan—only two men over twenty years of age. The Lord said he would bring in their women and children, and he did bring them in. How many others did he

*of them say how is being? don't believe*

bring? Those who believed God, and followed the direction of the leaders. He has not attempted to deny that the temporal Canaan was the type of the rest of the people of God, and that rest that remains for them, and which they do not enter into. Paul says that "we labor to enter into it, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief."

Then it was illustrated, that God, when he had completed the creation, ceased from his work, and rested from it. He makes light of this, and says he does not believe God ever rested from his work. That is he does not believe the Bible. I would not have charged him with disbelieving the Bible if he had not admitted it. I prefer to believe the writer in Genesis rather than to believe Bro. Carlton. It is said that the Lord then rested from his labor when he had finished his work, and thus set an example, and required men to keep the memorial day from then until he sent Jesus, who, for the purpose of regeneration, instituted a new day as a commemoration of the new creation. He says just as soon as any one does any thing that God requires him to do, that soon he enters into his rest, and this rest is heaven with him. This differs most positively from the language of the Spirit. The apostle says, Let us labor that we may enter into rest, lest any of us seem to come short of it. Again, in Revelations xiv, 13, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them." 2 Timothy iv, Paul says: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day." The brother attempted to whittle this away, by saying that the word "henceforth" means "from this time in the world." If, in

death, I say to you, from this time henceforth I have a home in heaven, then I mean my home is not on the earth. From what time was Paul's crown secure? From the time that he died and his fight was over, and he had laid his armor down. Then, and not till then.

The negative argument that was introduced, involving the rewarding and punishing, insisting that this is all accomplished here; if this is reliable, then they were not all rewarded according to their iniquities, Ezra ix, 13, 14: "And after all that is come upon us for our evil deeds, and for our great trespass, seeing that thou our God hast punished us less than our iniquities deserve, and hast given us such deliverance as this; should we again break thy commandments, and join in affinity with the people of these abominations? wouldest not thou be angry with us till thou hadst consumed us, so that there should be no remnant nor escaping?" That is the Babylonian captivity, and the difficulties they had in rebuilding the temple. I add to this another fact, that the sufferings of the ancient worthies was the contrary of this statement. Hebrews xi, 36-40. They suffered who were not guilty. The sufferings of the ancient Christians were not on account of their sins, but because they were righteous. Matthew v, 10-12: "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." [*Time expired.*]

## [MR. CARLTON'S FOURTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

My brother attempted, in a previous speech, to make it appear that the new Jerusalem was heaven. Now he concedes that the new Jerusalem came down out of heaven. He says I was inconsistent in making it appear that it came down out of heaven. Has he made it any better? The Revelator says: "And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." That was in Eden, you know; but this was under a new dispensation when this was written, when it could not be said his habitation was with men. But as men return to God, through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, God's dwelling-place, or tabernacle, is with them, and they become his people, as of old. This was the fact with regard to the institution of the new Jerusalem. But it loses its sense to make this out as heaven, and the whole scene as in the future state. If you will carefully examine it, you will find that the whole scene was here on this earth.

The account of the beast and the false prophet being cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, and the conflict of the remnant with him that sat upon the horse, and the fowls that were filled with the flesh of them that were slain—is that in the future world? The whole scene of this lake of fire and brimstone lay in this world.

Now for his direct testimony. Revelations xxii, 11: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and

he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still." What was that quoted for? To show that it was an ultimate—a finality. Are we now to depend upon the word "still" to express endless duration? An adverb of time present to express endless duration? We read, upon a certain occasion, when the disciples were on a missionary tour, they left a little town, but Paul and Timotheus abode there still. Do you suppose they are yet, and will endlessly remain, there? He uses the word still to denote endless duration. This is powerful! wonderful! What is the fact? Jesus said, by the angel that he sent to deliver his message to John on the isle of Patmos—after having appointed the work he was to do, he said, "Behold I come quickly." Now, when the revelation was given to Daniel, he was told to seal the sayings of the prophecy of the book, for the time was not yet come. He had pointed forward to trials and tribulations in the future. But when the Revelator was on the isle of Patmos, it was said to him: "Seal not the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand." "Behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me." What for? To give to every man according as his work shall be. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still." Why? Because the time has come now when the judgment was to be instituted. Just as if an individual should take a trip to California, Nebraska, or anywhere else, and while he was there, he would receive a letter from home, saying that those whom he had left in charge of his business were not discharging their duties; and that it was best that he should be at home to see about it. What shall he do? He will write home, saying: "Behold I come quickly. Let those who have followed my directions, and who have

been good and obedient remain in my employ still, and he that is disobedient, let him be disobedient still. When I come I will set the matter right." Do you suppose those persons remain endlessly in his employ? or were endlessly unruly? This evidently refers to the time when Christ's work was to begin. So this proves the doctrine of endless punishment with a vengeance!

The next point is, that the brother does not believe literally that the stars are going to be destroyed, or fall. Well, then, what does it mean where it speaks of their destruction?

Matthew xxv, 31, is brought up again—the parable of the sheep and goats. Now, it will be remarked, he says, that this could not have taken place at the time of the destruction of the Jewish nation, because the holy angels were not there. By the by, the word "holy" angels does not occur. It is in the English, but not in the Greek at all; neither the word holy, nor any word corresponding with it.

Well, then, in the next place, "Bro. Carlton has a very fruitful imagination." Why? Because "he has found three classes of persons to be judged, when there are only two." Let us examine this matter more closely. It is an important matter, because this parable has been held on to for so many ages, that it is important that it may be rightly understood: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was an hun-

gered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? when saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Were not the persons addressed one class, and his brethren another? "Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: for I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee?" Then he said to the wicked, "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal."

Can any person fail to perceive that "these my brethren" constitute a class different from those first addressed, while the wicked were another class? It is impossible for any person to evade the conclusion that there are three classes pointed out here. If we want to get the true meaning of this matter, we will see that the judgment of God is to begin at the house of God with "these my brethren." In the next place, when Jesus was going away he sent forth his disciples

penniless and helpless into the world to propagate the truth of the Gospel; he said unto them, that "whosoever should give to one of the least of these a cup of cold water to drink in his name should not lose his reward." Well, now, the Gentiles that befriended the disciples when they went forth on their mission of mercy, and fed them when they were hungry, and clothed them when naked, and visited them when in prison, were approbated by Jesus for such a course. But when he came to the Jewish people who, instead of befriending them by clothing or feeding them, persecuted them, Jesus disapprobated their course, and to these he said "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." The course pursued by the Gentiles was approved, and they were received into the kingdom, while the others were banished.

Next, we notice xvi, 27: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works."

Well, if he came then—that is, if he did what he says he did, then "Bro. Carlton and every body else must know he was not the Son of man." Well, there is wisdom. Did Jesus say he was going to render to every man according to his work at that particular time when he came? What further? See the twenty-eighth verse: "Verily, I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Now, when was he going to come in his reign? Before some of them died. What was he going to do? Reward every man according to his works. Has every man received according to his works? No. Why? Because the work of Christ is progressing and these rewards are still being given to men, but

before the completion of that reign every one shall have received according to his work.

Then, "The word generation sometimes means more than forty years." Very well, supposing he did mean more than forty years. When Jesus said, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom," does it mean the lifetime of those standing by, or the existence of a race? There's the point.

Now let us notice another point. He says, in referring to the twenty-fourth chapter, that the people were expecting Jesus to come soon, and if they cried, Lo! here is Christ, or lo! there is Christ, they were commanded to believe it not. Why did he tell them to believe it not? "Because he was not coming in that generation." There is what Bro. Moore thinks, and that is a mistake. He did not want them to suppose he was to come in body, in person, again. Hence, he says, if they say "Lo! here is Christ, or lo! there is Christ, believe it not." "Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not." Why? Because I am not coming in that way. "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." When was it to take place? During this generation. He did not deny that he was going to come during their lifetime, but not, as they thought, because some of them thought he was coming again with a visible body. But then he said, "Bro. Carlton would not have dared to tell you he did not believe the Bible, but I will tell you myself." That's very modest. I asked the question, When did God cease to be active? I don't believe he ever did. Do any of you believe God ever ceased to come? You will answer "No"—every one of you. How, then, will we understand the phrase that he "ceased from



his work?" What did he cease from? Let us see if it be possible that he ceased from his work. If he did, I would like to see some testimony on the point. Here is the testimony offered: "God having finished the work, he ceased therefrom." He ceased from what work? Why the work of that particular time—the work of creation. But is not God living, and acting, and working, just as certainly since that time, and every moment since that time, as he was during that time, or any other period before? Who denies that? It was that work he ceased from when it was completed, then did something else. I guess "Bro. Carlton" do n't disbelieve the Bible much.

But what has he done by the way of explaining "henceforth?" "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them." Why, he slid off on to Timothy, and tried to call your attention to something else. Try to call that up the next time, brother.

Again, "It is not best for Bro. Carlton to show that the Scriptures teach any thing else, as it would involve him in a contradiction." Have I not shown that God, in instituting his government over men, revealed the law, to which were attached rewards and penalties? This law was delivered to the children of men, and our first parents were told that they should suffer for their disobedience: "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The Lord executeth justice and judgment in the earth. Now, Bro. Moore says plainly that this is not so. But what I have said, God Almighty spake by the prophet as the Spirit gave him utterance. Why is it not so? Because in the one hundred and third Psalm, he says, we read: "He hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities." Does that prove that God does not reward and punish people in this

world? Suppose we take it in a literal sense. Suppose at a certain time persons are not punished as their iniquities deserve, does that prove that persons will not be punished in this world for their sins? Suppose we turn to Psalm ciii, and read, beginning at the eighth verse: "The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide." The brother thinks he will. "Neither will he keep his anger forever. He hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities." Does the Psalmist mean by that, that God does not punish these as they deserve? Let us read on and see what he does mean. "For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his mercy toward them that fear him. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us. Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust." Now, what is the fact taught in this lesson? That God's dealings toward men have not been limited by man's deserts. Though he rewards abundantly, or punishes for our deeds, yet he does not confine his actions toward us simply by our guilt or deserts, and notwithstanding the fact that he punishes, yet he abounds in mercy and goodness to such an extent as to remove our sins and iniquities as far from us as the east is from the west. That was one way of showing that God does not punish people in this world.

But then, "the Christians died from persecutions in the days of the apostles, and their suffering was not punishment for sin." Most certainly not. What, then, do we learn from this? We learn that punishment is suffering, but that all suffering is not punishment. Let us look at this. Look at the dreadful sufferings of the Lord Jesus Christ. Yet, with all

the sufferings Jesus endured, even in that agony in Gethsemane, when he sweat, as it were, great drops of blood, and prayed, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt," and in all he suffered in that ignominious death on the cross, Jesus was not punished for sins committed by himself, or any body else. He was an innocent being, and could not be punished. Nevertheless, he suffered.

Well, "Bro. Carlton" understood all that, but does that prove that the human race will suffer endless punishment?

Now we proceed with our negative argument where we left off. We closed with the case of Solomon. He had returned from his wandering and darkness, and to his God again, and instead of saying now that man has no prominence above the beast, and that both die and go to the same place, he has received faith and confidence in God, and hope in the future, and instead of saying, "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" he perceives the truth now, that though the body die, the immortal spirit would not die. He did believe that both died and went to the same place, but now he saith, "Man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets." "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

We have seen that the Old Testament Scriptures reveal the fact that God renders justice and judgment in the earth, and in confirmation of this, I want to call attention to a passage of Scripture in Hebrews ii, 1, 2: "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every trans-

gression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward." What does that mean? What does Paul say was true under the reign of that law? That every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward. Now, Paul is either mistaken, or states that which is not true, or else the application you make of the passage is incorrect. Yes, David, in the one hundred and third Psalm, is mistaken, or you are mistaken, or Paul is, and it would not take me long to decide which it is. [Laughter.]

We notice, then, that the recompense is gone by, and that it was a just recompense. If the recompense to come afterward is any thing more than a just recompense, in what way is it to be so? Now, what recompense is to be inflicted under the Gospel, if that was true under the law? "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him?" The brother says, "Escape endless punishment;" but what is Paul talking about? Is he talking about endless punishment? He is talking about a just recompense of reward. Well, what are we to understand, from his teaching, is a just recompense of reward? A limited or unlimited punishment? That which he calls a just recompense of reward is limited, and in this world, and one that he says has already gone by. Then, if they received a just and adequate punishment, how shall we escape a just and adequate punishment for our neglect "of this great salvation?" Simply implying, in that form of speech, that we shall not escape at all.

We will now call attention to the twenty-third chapter of the prophecy of Isaiah, fifth verse, where you will find this language: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and

shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." I know there are many persons that will concede with Bishop Warburton, and Doctor John, and many others, that though the Old Testament Scriptures do not teach the doctrine of endless punishment, and yet claim the whole thing was changed when the Gospel was introduced. But what did the prophet say, who spake as the Holy Spirit gave him utterance, in respect to the place where Jesus Christ should administer justice and judgment? That was the King who should be raised up to execute justice and judgment in the earth.

This closes up the administration of justice under the old dispensation. Now we are prepared to examine the rewards and punishments under the new dispensation, or under the reign of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The brother has made a quotation from the Acts of the Apostles, xvi, 20-31: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every-where to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Now, what is the day of judgment under the reign of Christ—the day of judgment that God hath instituted, in the which he should judge the world, or reign over the world by Jesus Christ? What is that day? We find in the examination of this subject in the Scriptures, that the term day is used with considerable latitude. In Genesis it is said, "In six days God created the heavens and the earth;" and again, that "These be the generations of the heavens and the earth in the day that he created them." There the one day denotes just as long a period as the other six. Again, notice the day of temptation

in the wilderness was forty years. As we go to the eleventh chapter of the prophecy of Isaiah, tenth verse, we find this language: "And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious." In that day this person who shall stand up for an ensign is Jesus Christ; the people are the Israelites, and the Gentiles are the rest of mankind. Now, how long is Jesus Christ to stand up as an ensign? You would answer, the length of his entire reign. Now we have the day of judgment under Jesus Christ. It is the time of his reign. *[Time expired.]*

[MR. MOORE'S FIFTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and Respected Auditors:*

After looking over my notes, I observe that every single point that has been raised in the last speech will come up as I proceed with my argument. I therefore deem it useless to spend time just now in a formal reply, when I know they will, in due time, be fully attended to.

I proceed at once to notice the fifth argument. After stating that we have, in the first place, shown you that individuals who do not believe in the name of the only begotten of the Father, do not, and can not, enjoy life, abide under the wrath of God, are now condemned, and shall be damned; and that they can not please God, or come to God; and for these reasons, the indirect testimony of these passages is, that in this condition they must remain endlessly, unless my brother could show that there would be a change effected upon them after they have passed into the next state.

The second argument was based on the Scriptures,

showing us that it is impossible to renew a certain class to repentance. They were cursed children, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption. In the next place, there were those who had committed sin, that had never forgiveness in this world, or the world to come; and we agreed with Bro. Carlton, that this world and that world meant this state of existence and that state of existence, or this world and the next. We noticed, in the next place, that the end or ultimate of the wicked was to be burning; that it was death, which means a cutting off from God—punishment, with everlasting destruction.

In the next place, we introduced a number of passages containing antithesis, but really only a few of the many that place the destiny of the righteous and the wicked in contrast, opposite in nature, but equal in extent; and the extent is the duration; and the word is the word that etymologically means endless, as I propose to show after a little. Having completed this course of argument, I am prepared to enter on the consideration of the fifth argument—the punishment of the wicked in *gehenna*, hell, is after death; hence in the ultimate or endless state. I want to show you that this punishment is after death, and not before. If I succeed in doing this, then it follows that it is in the ultimate or final state, and therefore endless. Matthew x, 28: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." In hell, *gehenna*. Luke xii, 4, 5: "And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him." Cast into *gehenna*, hell. It only needs a few remarks to show you the force of

these passages. First, "Soul," in the passages, can not mean animal life, because men have power to take animal life, but this passage says they have not "power to kill the soul." Second, God is presented as the object of fear—fear him that can destroy both soul and body in hell. Hebrews xii, 28: "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which can not be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear." The fear of God is clearly taught here. Also in Ecclesiastes xii, 13, 14: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Again, 1 Peter ii, 17: "Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king." The fear of God is plainly taught. The Savior says: "Fear him that can destroy both soul and body in hell." You are also taught not to fear man; and hence, it could not be man that was to be feared. Revelations ii, 10: "Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." You will observe that the crown of life hangs upon their being faithful unto death. Hebrews xiii, 6: "So that we may boldly say, The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me." Jesus says: "Fear not him that can kill the body." The apostle says, Fear not man, or what man can do unto you. He can take your lives, your property, your liberty, but do not fear him, or be influenced by him to renounce your integrity to God. On the contrary, the passages noted teach you to fear God, for the reason that he can destroy soul and body in hell. This shows you

that the destruction of the soul and body is to be accomplished after the destruction of the body; for it is after they have killed the body, and "have no more that they can do." But this person they are to fear is one who can do something after the body is killed; that is, destroy the soul and body in hell; and hence, the *gehenna* of the wicked is, after death. Fourth. The word *able*, in this place, means willing, as you will perceive by reading Hebrews vii, 25: "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." Philippians iii, 20, 21: "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." The word *able* here means willing, and may be substituted for that word; and whatever word makes good sense when it is put in the place of another is, by the rules of exegesis, regarded as a correct definition of the word.

Again, in the fifth place, the word *gehenna* occurs in the following places, and in these places it is utterly out of the question for it to denote a place which the individual enters in this world. Matt. v, 22: "But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire;" that is, the fire of *gehenna*. V, 29, 30: "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell," or *gehenna*. Matt. x, 18: "And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from

thee: it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire." Mark ix, 43-47: "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire." Luke xii, 45, represents the same. Now it is a matter of very clear import here that the body is to be cast into the *gehenna*, and it is better for you to cast away the sins that lie nearest your heart than to enjoy them during life, and after that to be cast soul and body into the *gehenna* of fire, where the individual shall enter if he is found to be wicked, as we have read from Matthew xxv, also from Revelations xx, 10.

I present, as the sixth argument, the language in 2 Peter iii, 3-9: "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But, beloved, be not ignorant of

this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."

The subject of judgment is here clearly vindicated, and it is shown that it is utterly impossible for the judgment, as presented in this case, which is the perdition of ungodly men, to be the judgment in the reign of Christ, of which my brother has been talking to-night. No one would presume to deny that Jesus, in his divine government, exercises judgment and righteousness; but his government is conditional, that it is extending, and will be finally completed and perfected, and that he will crush out all his enemies, and judge all the inhabitants of the planet at the day of judgment, is as clearly revealed as any other truth in the Bible. I read again, beginning at the tenth verse: "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless."

You observe that this comports with the teachings of Revelation xxi and xxii: That we have now a new

heavens and a new earth, and those individuals possessing godliness and holy conversation, who conducted themselves according to the divine requirements, enter into the enjoyment of the new heavens and earth in the ultimate state after the consummation of the old heavens and old earth. In connection with this, 1 Cor. xv, 54-57: "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

The final victory over all the foes of men is given through the Lord Jesus, and if the individual has not secured the Lord Jesus as Savior during his lifetime, he has no person to give him the victory; and besides, the promise is made to those who are denominated the disciples or saints. Isaiah xxv: 6-12, refers to the same event: "And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees," etc. "He will swallow up death in victory: and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces: and the rebuke of his people shall be taken away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it." He will swallow up death in victory as the ultimate of his plan, which is in progress. He will destroy death, which is the last enemy, and deliver up the kingdom to his Father. In connection with this read Revelation xxi, 1-5, showing the connection of the events themselves. The twenty-fifth of Isaiah my brother applied to the resurrection state. The same things are indicated here and must apply to the same ultimate state. But in this case you will observe the following passage

from Revelations: "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." This is to occur at the same time when he will wipe the tears from the faces of those that are in the new Jerusalem, and from the time that my brother says is the ultimate or final state, in his criticism on Isaiah xxv.

My seventh argument is based on Luke xvi, 19-31: "There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: and there was a certain beggar, named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you can not; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence. Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house: for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And

he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent: and he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." It does not say he spake this parable, as in other places, but he begins it as a history. Whether it is given as a history or a parable, the circumstances are clearly set forth. The Jewish idea of Hades was that it was a place where the spirits of the departed all went to. The spirits of the good were in one department, called Paradise, and the spirits of the wicked were in another department, called *gehenna*. Tartarus is used by Peter, who speaks of the wicked being consigned to Tartarus, or that department where they were in misery, and remain there in this condition until the time of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began, when they should again be brought forth, and before the universe adjudged guilty, and consigned to their final place. This was the Jewish idea, and the Scriptures did not contradict it. The whole scene, in the Jewish mind, would be beyond this life, and it would be to them the representation of the condition of the righteous and the wicked in the future and ultimate, and hence, endless state.

Matthew xiii, 47-50. "Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind: which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels; but cast the bad away. So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth."

Here we have the ultimate condition represented in a parable. You will notice that it is said, "So

shall it be in the end of the world." The separation between the good and the bad is the separation between the righteous and the wicked. That is to be at the end of the world. The wicked are to be cast into the furnace of fire; their ultimate and final state after the separation is made at the end of this dispensation.

I notice, now, the eighth argument, which is cumulative, and brings up the subject of the judgment. I now affirm that there is to be a day of future general judgment. While I admit special judgments for special acts through the past dispensation of God, I now affirm, over and above that, a future day of general judgment, in which every individual will be, not a mere spectator, but a personally interested individual. Acts xvii, 30-32: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; and now commandeth all men every-where to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." This will enable me to answer one point made in the last speech. My brother told you, substantially, that this word "day" is very indefinite, and I agree that it is, as far as length of time is concerned; but the word day means a complete period. He tells you it is the Christian dispensation—the whole of the Christian dispensation, from the time Christ entered upon his reign till he shall deliver it up to his father. But will you observe, in the discourse delivered by the Apostle Paul, a number of years after Christ had commenced his reign, he uses the words "God has appointed a day in which he will judge the world?" It ought to read, according to my brother's assumption, "A day in which he has judged the world." The Christian dispensation was in progress, and had been a number

of years, when that was spoken. Why, then, did he say that he *will* judge the world in that day? [*Time expired.*]

[MR. CARLTON'S FIFTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and Christian Friends:*

The brother informs us he is going to introduce a new argument, and his new argument is one that says that the wicked will be punished in *gehenna* after literal death. That is the point he makes now. To support this position he calls your attention to Matthew x, 28: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." That is, in *gehenna*. Then he assumes, in the first place, that this denotes the destruction of the entire being. Let us see if that is so. We want to understand ourselves. He affirms that the destruction of the soul and body is the destruction of the entire being. What is man? What kind of a being is man? We go back to the beginning of Genesis. God created man in his own image and after his own likeness. What kind of a being is God? The world's Redeemer, when he came forth to bear testimony to the truth, said, God is a spirit. Then if he made a being in his likeness, he made a spiritual being. Subsequently we are informed in this account of creation in regard to the formation of the body, and then of God's placing the living spirit in the body, and after the spirit was placed in the body then the soul was produced. He places life in the bodies he had made, and man became a living soul. The soul was produced by the union of the spirit with the body. That is the account of the creation of man. Now we come to the New Testament Script-



Carlton's definition of spirit,  
soul and body.

ures. The Apostle Paul says: "The word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of the soul and spirit"—dividing asunder the same thing—"and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Also, 1 Thessalonians v, 23: "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Your whole *pneuma*, *psuche*, and *soma*; that is what kind of a being man is—spirit, soul, and body. As God made man a spirit, when he made him, his essential being is spirit. The body is the earthly tabernacle in which the spirit dwells while here. The spirit is the animator of the body while it dwells in it; and the body is the thing animated; and the soul is the physical, or animal life. This being the account of revelation in regard to man, a man might be destroyed soul and body both, and live immortally in heaven afterward. What is there to prevent it? That comes about as far from everlasting misery, if all claimed is true, as he was before he commenced. But we want to proceed a little further in this matter. The next idea is that the place in which the soul and body are in danger of being destroyed is *gehenna*. The body is exposed to the same destruction as the soul, and he has got the place of destruction in the spirit world. Is the body in danger of being destroyed in the eternal world? *Gehenna* in the spirit world! Is the body going there? Let us look a little further in regard to this term *gehenna*, for this is the word he introduces to denote a place of endless punishment. I ask him what word denoted a place of endless punishment in the old Scriptures, where the word *gehenna* does not occur? We trace up this word, now, to see. Dr. George Campbell says, in his appendix

to the New Testament, "*Gehenna* occurs neither in the Septuagint Greek of the Old Testament, nor in any classic author extant in the world." Then what was the name of the place of endless punishment before *gehenna* was used? They did not have any. Then this endless punishment was not revealed for four thousand years of the world's history. I have offered George Campbell's notes, indorsed and approved by Alexander Campbell. "There being no word in our language corresponding to the word Hades, he is obliged to retain and explain it. He always translated the term *gehenna* by the term hell. Alexander Campbell says we have uniformly followed his method in the books which he did not translate, and consequently, where the word hell is found in this translation, the reader may be assured it is *gehenna* in the original. It occurs just twelve times in the New Testament, and, as it was better understood in Judea than in any other country, and among the Jews than among any other people, we find it never adopted in any letter or communication to the Gentiles." We find the word was never taught to the Gentiles, and we are Gentiles. It is only employed by two persons in the entire Bible, from beginning to end. One of these persons is Jesus, and the other James. The Apostle Paul, who wrote a large portion of the New Testament Scriptures, and who says that he had not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God, never used the word. Neither does it occur in the writings of any other persons in the New Testament, except Matthew, Mark, Luke, and James. In Matthew, Mark, and Luke, it is simply the repetition of the few instances in which Jesus used the word. And to get the meaning of this word, we must find the sense in which Jesus used it, so that we are to learn how the people were justified in understanding it. Having made these remarks in

regard to this term, *gehenna*, and having called on the brother to show, that up to this time, when this word was used by Jesus Christ, that no person, Jew or Gentile, on the footstool of God, ever used it to denote a place of endless punishment, we proceed next to examine the text more critically: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." Well, now, he says this term soul can not mean the animal life, because they had power to destroy that. If Jesus says they could not destroy the soul, and it is a word which does denote the animal life, it is evident it does not refer to the existence of man beyond the existence of animal life. There is the point. Instead of gaining any thing, you have lost that much. Go back to Matthew xvi. You will find this word *psuche* is used. "Whosoever will save his life, shall lose it." It does not mean his being—his spirit—but his animal life.

What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own life? A man could not take any of the goods of this world with him, if he should gain them. That is all it means; but there is a great noise made to frighten people about it. Could not these people take the animal life—these persecuting Jews—to whose persecutions the language which was addressed to the disciples referred? He told them: "I say unto you, Fear not them that kill the body." Could the persecuting Jews do that? Had they power to take their life? That is the point. Had they power to take the animal life of the disciples that they were persecuting? I call your attention to John xvii, 28-31: "Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover. Pilate then went out unto them, and said, What accusation bring ye against this man?"

They answered, and said unto him, If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up unto thee. Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him, and judge him according to your law. The Jews therefore said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death." The Jews could not take the animal life; therefore they brought him to the Roman authorities. They were in subjection to the Romans. They had not taken the power entirely away from them; but allowed them to try minor offenses; but they could not inflict the death penalty. They could scourge them; but could do nothing further. When they put to death, they must deliver them over to the Romans. These persecutors could not put them to death.

The next point is, Does this word kill not always denote to take the life of the individual? We find the word *apoktenao*. Donnegan's Greek Lexicon defines it, "to kill, slay, slaughter, render miserable, remove, take away." See also Schleusne, Liddell & Scott: "To kill, to slay, to take away, to remove, to beat almost to death, to tease or plague." Here we have the definitions of the word *apoktenao*. But fear him who is able to destroy the body and the animal life in *gehenna*. Or, fear him who, after the body has been wearied and afflicted, has power to cast into *gehenna*—fear him! Well, but what were those persons in danger of in this literal fire of *gehenna*? They were exposed to the danger of *gehenna*, punishment. Were they in danger of being destroyed in the literal valley of the son of Hinnom, near Jerusalem? Jeremiah xix, 12: "Thus will I do unto this place, saith the Lord, and to the inhabitants thereof, and even make this city as Tophet." It might be interesting, did time permit, to follow up the history of this word, and show that in the Old Testament Scriptures there is a phrase, *gee hinnom*,

worms in gehenna, says  
Carlton

*i. e.*, the valley of Hinnom; very frequently, *gee ben hinnom*, the valley of the son of Hinnom. This place was a place of abomination, and slaughter, and misery, and death, and idolatry, and filth; a burning fire and worms were continually feeding on the dead bodies in that valley. King Josiah was sent, by divine commandment, to defile that place. There is a prediction in Jeremiah xix, in regard to the judgment that was to come on the Jewish city and the Jewish people, and then we come to this, and that is, that the Jews were exposed, when they should have filled up the cup of their iniquity, and the wrath of God is about to come upon them, in Matthew iii, 7: "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Here the judgment was hanging right over them. And to this guilty people Jesus says, How can you escape the damnation of *gehenna*? How can you escape being involved in this calamity when Jerusalem shall be rendered as Tophet? It is said, that *gehenna* became a symbol to the Jews for any thing loathsome and disgraceful, particularly an ignominious death. That is exactly what they suffered, and what the disciples were doomed to suffer, in case they did not obey the master; and also those who went back with the hypocrite, and those who were not converted to Christianity. The Gentiles gathered from the east and the west, from the north and the south; and Jesus said: "The children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." That transpired eighteen hundred years ago. This is brought up to prove endless punishment; but it is the best he can do, and we do not complain.

What is the next point? On the day of judgment God has instituted. Acts xvii, 30-32. He has told you when that day will be. Does he deny that God is ruling the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ?

Does he deny that this time is the time of Christ's kingdom? When he does this, and undertakes to show there is a day of judgment in the immortal state, we are with him. Until then, we let the matter rest.

Next, an effort is made to drag in the new Jerusalem, with the final resurrection day; but not a word is said about the resurrection day. How does he undertake to make this out? He goes to the place where the apostle treats of the resurrection (1 Corinthians xv), and says that the apostle quotes Isaiah. "When this mortal shall have put on immortality," etc., "then shall be fulfilled what was spoken by the prophet, that death shall be swallowed up in victory, and the tears wiped from all faces." When the tears are wiped from all faces, who suffers endless punishment? Yes, yes; tell us, will you? How much proof have we of the endless suffering of any body? These declarations exclude the very idea that any body is suffering at all.

Argument seventh. Luke, in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. "Jesus does not say that he was speaking a parable to them." Well, some of the ancient copies of the Bible do say, "Another parable spake he unto them." We now propose to look at this text which has been so long relied upon, and mainly relied upon in the various branches of the Church that believe in endless punishment, to teach this doctrine. The brother takes the position that this was a history. We will dispose of that in its proper time; and we propose to see what Jesus taught. When I go to meeting, I go early so as to hear the text, and not only that but all the rest of the sermon. We propose to examine this Gibraltar of the advocates of endless punishment. In making our attack upon this stronghold, we shall examine the entire sermon of Jesus, and show what he was teach-

ing. The sermon commences, Luke xv, 1: "Then drew near all the publicans and sinners to hear him." Here the publicans and sinners had drawn near to hear Jesus. The Scribes and Pharisees were standing with them. The self-righteous religionists of the day condemned Jesus because he was instructing the sinners, and gathering them to the kingdom. Jesus begins by the parable of the lost sheep. "What man of you, having a hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and neighbors, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost. I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance." They claimed they were the sheep, and were at home. Jesus condemns them, and justifies himself in leaving them and going after the sinners. Well, now, he enforces the same idea by another parable of the lost piece of silver, that the woman lights a candle and searches for. There is another parable illustrating the same idea. In both these parables Jesus condemns the Jews and justifies himself in going after the Gentiles. The next is the parable of the Prodigal Son. True, it does not say it is a parable, but it is. The law of that country was such that a boy might demand his part of the estate at any time, and the father must give it to him; and Jesus makes this parable to suit. He spends his substance in riotous living. That represents the sinner's wandering. Is he then informed that a miserable eternity awaits him? There arises a mighty famine in that land. There he suffered, and the suffering he had was the degradation he was brought

into. He was set not only to feed hogs, but was hired out to feed hogs for somebody else. But after he had suffered in this way till his suffering produced the desired effect, he looked toward home, and said, "How many hired servants of my father have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger! I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants. And he arose, and came to his father. But when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. But the father said to his servants, Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: and bring hither the fatted calf, and kill it; and let us eat, and be merry: for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found." This is one of the most encouraging things in the Gospel. "The father saw him while he was yet a great way off," that is, just as far as he went. "And they began to be merry." Then the elder brother came, and hearing the music and dancing, inquired what it meant. He was told that his brother had returned. This fellow was like a great many people now. "What! that boy come back? I will have nothing to do with him." "If he is going to be saved, I do n't want to be." The father says, "Come in, your brother has come." Will he own him as brother? O, no! He did not say my brother, but this thy son. Well, what does the younger brother represent? These publicans and sinners. Where is the elder brother? Why, these Scribes and Pharisees, condemning God in receiving the prodigal when he returns. The elder

brother is angry, and stands outside the house when the Gentiles are brought in.

Next we have the parable of the steward, who is brought before his master, and charged with wasting his master's goods, and a voice comes, Give an account of thy stewardship. What was the condition of the Jews? They had been intrusted with the vineyard of the Lord, but had refused to yield the fruit of the vineyard. He sent his servants, but them they illtreated some and killed others. Last of all he sent his only son, saying, they will reverence my son. But thinking to seize the inheritance, they took the son, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him. What will the lord of those husbandmen do? He will miserably destroy them, and let the vineyard out to others. The kingdom shall be taken from you. You must give up your stewardship. You have been unfaithful, and others shall be put in charge.

Then comes in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, illustrating the subject. The sermon is not done yet. "There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom." Abraham's bosom. What was that? The common idea is that it was heaven. Who told you that it was heaven? There is not a hint in the Bible to justify that. What was he talking about? The kingdom of faith. Was there any thing in that to represent it? They were to sit down in the kingdom of faith. In what faith? Did they enjoy? "The Scriptures, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through the faith preached before

their gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blest." In that, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob rested or reclined. The Gentiles were to be brought into the faith. Abraham is represented as the chief one at the feast. The custom of feasts in that country was and is yet, the chief one sits down resting on his left elbow; and the nearest friend reclines near him, and rests on his breast. So it was at the feast where Jesus was, and John rested on Jesus' breast or on his bosom. So these outcast Gentiles are brought to the Gospel feast, for they should rest on Abraham's bosom. Who can not understand that? "The rich man also died, and was buried, and being in agony, in hades, he lifted up his eyes, and saw Abraham afar off"—he was a great way from his father—"and Lazarus in his bosom;" the Gentiles, that you are not willing should come in at all, have come in here, and are enjoying this faith with Abraham, and you are cast out. That is what the parable represents. "Well, if Jesus spoke of hades as a place of punishment after death, did not he indorse the ideas?" No, he refers them to the Scriptures, instead of the Pagan view of the matter.

[*Time expired.*]

## FOURTH DAY.

*Friday, April 29, 9 o'clock A. M.*

The session was opened with prayer by Mr. De Wolf.

[MR. MOORE'S SIXTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and Respected Friends :*

I am before you again, for the purpose of continuing the investigation of the subject to which most, if not all of you, listened on last evening.

The first thing I desire to call your attention to is the peculiar capability of Bro. Carlton in passing by an argument ; and I have referred to this a time or two. He tells you that he does not believe it, and that somebody else did not believe it ; and does this with a remarkably wise look, accompanied with a toss of the head and a shrug of the shoulder, without any further attempt to meet the argument ; but just throws it aside, as if it were not worthy of any thing further. You will please carefully notice that peculiar characteristic of the brother. The sentence, "What has that to do with the question?" has become a by-word with him. With this he answers my arguments. I only call your attention to this to have you fix your mind upon the fact, that you may see that his answers to these arguments are not answers ; but rather assumptions. He assumes so because he do n't believe something, or somebody else do n't believe so. It is not because it is not so.

He told you last night that all suffering is not punishment. I ask, then, what is the balance, over and above that amount which is for punishment, endured by humanity for? How does it happen that it occurs? What motive prompted it? It can not be for

the sin of the individual; so that the suffering is not owed to him. Jesus did not sin, and righteous men did not sin, to produce the suffering they have endured. Since they did not, their suffering does not mitigate a single pain of the guilty, for they suffered because of their integrity and uprightness. Then the pains Jesus suffered did not relieve yours and mine. Not at all. I ask you, in view of these facts, to keep your minds ready, and your ears open, to hear him tell you what this balance of suffering, which he concedes to exist, is for. What prompted it? What purpose is subserved by it? What good is gained by it? Is it not rather the result of the most perfect tyranny we could possibly imagine, while the individual suffers who is not guilty?

I ask your attention, next, to this simple fact, too well understood and known in the observation of men, that the tendency of crime is to lessen the suffering. The individual who continues to sin on for a period has less suffering for sin than when he begins. Stealing a pin—the first act of a thief—hurts the soul worse than burglary or murder after he continues a number of years in crime. This is what the Apostle Paul says of a certain class, that they are "past feeling, having given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness." Where does he get his punishment? He is "past feeling." He can not suffer. Take the covetous man, who has given all his time and energies to amass riches, robbing the poor, taking clothing and food from the orphan and widow, to increase his wealth. If you make him feel badly at all, it is when you make him pay what he owes. But I need not dwell on this.

The next thing to which I will refer—and which, probably, may not come up again if not noticed now, is the attempt to avoid the argument I based upon

the fact, that we are to fear, not those who have power to kill the body, and after that had nothing they could do, but rather to fear him who could destroy both soul and body in hell. But passing that by, he tells you that the soul means the animal life. I am ready to admit that the word "*psuche*" means—and probably that is its primary and literal meaning—animal life. But the question is not, is it sometimes so? but, is it so in this place? Because the word means one thing sometimes, does it necessarily always mean the same? I propose to direct your attention to a few passages of Scripture that directly illustrate this. In Psalm ciii, 1, the psalmist says: "Bless the Lord, O my soul: and all that is within me bless his holy name." Suppose now, I substitute the definition for the word itself, and make David to say: "Bless the Lord, O my animal life: and all that is within me bless his holy name." The simple use of this definition of the word shows its absurdity sufficiently without another word of criticism. Take another example. In 1 Samuel xviii, 1: "And it came to pass, when he had made an end of speaking unto Saul, that the soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul." That is, the animal life of Jonathan was knit with the animal life of David. It is a wonder, that when Jonathan fell on Gilboa, with his father, and lost his animal life, that David did not lose his animal life too. Again, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul;" that is, the law of the Lord is perfect, converting the animal life.

Again, the word *psuche* occurs in the New Testament one hundred and five times; *nevisih*, its equivalent, in the Old Testament five hundred and thirty-two times. *Psuche* is translated fifty-eight times in the New Testament by the word soul, forty times by the word life, three times by the word live, and a few

times in different ways that I have not gathered up. 1 Corinthians xv, 45: "And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living (*psuche*) soul." The first man was made a living animal life. Is that true? Does it not rather mean that the first man Adam was made a living man? It takes it all to constitute a man. In Psalm xvi, 10, David says: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell." That is, my animal life in hades. Ezekiel xviii, 20: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." That is, the animal life shall die. Acts ii, 41: "And the same day there was added unto them about three thousand souls." That is, three thousand animal lives. I thought they had to put off the old man, with his animal deeds. Again, Acts xxvii, 37: "And we were in all in the ship two hundred three-score and sixteen souls." That is, there were two hundred three-score and sixteen animal lives in the ship. Did the apostle mean that? Again, 1 Peter iii, 30: "Wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved." That is, eight animal lives. I thought there were a great many more than eight animal lives saved from the deluge, in the ark. Numbers xv, 30: "That soul shall be cut off from Israel." That animal life that is guilty of crime shall be cut off from Israel. Acts iii, 23: "Every soul that will not hear that prophet shall be destroyed from among the people." (The quotation of Peter himself is from Deuteronomy.) That is, every animal life that will not hear Jesus Christ shall be destroyed. Colossians iii, 23: "And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily as to the Lord." The word heartily is—*ex phuche*—literally every soul. Then ye do it from the soul, or from your animal life, as unto the Lord.

Hebrews xii, 3: "For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds." "In your

minds." We have here the same word *psuche*—"faint in your animal lives." I will not stop for the purpose of introducing other passages. Enough has been presented showing that it does not, and can not, mean animal life always, and certainly not in the passage we are considering. Matthew xii, that I have already called attention to, is one of those particular places. It does not there mean animal life, but something that man can not touch, and something that the Lord disposes of, and that, too, after man's life has been taken. So states these writers I have quoted. I conceive this to answer the difficulty that has been urged, and shall, for the present, detain you no longer on that point.

Hebrews ii, 1, 2: "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" It is urged that the apostle says the word spoken by angels has been already received most positively. My brother will notice that it is a hypothetical statement of the apostle. He says, "Therefore if the word spoken by angels." He means simply this—that if the law demanded the execution of criminals according to the law. It will not be forgotten that the Jewish institution was a fleshly institution. Its law was the law of Sinai; its rewards were earthly, its punishments were earthly. Every thing was confined to the earth, and hence there was nothing offered in heaven—nothing beyond this life, either in the way of punishments or blessings, so far as that law was concerned. But does not every person who knows the history of that people, know that the law was not always executed? The individual that gathered

sticks upon the Sabbath-day, to make a fire, was guilty, and the law demanded his execution the next day. Were they all killed? Now, then, he calls attention to the fact. If that was so, and the righteous decision of the Governor of the Universe demanded the execution of the palpably guilty, how shall we, if we neglect so great salvation? That was a greater salvation than the other. To present this more forcibly, I ask you to hear me read from the tenth chapter of the Hebrew letter, the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth verses: "He that despised Moses' law died"—that is, was executed—"without mercy under two or three witnesses." That was the highest possible penalty this side of eternal death. Now, that was inflicted then. This was spoken with regard to angels. The next verse reads: "Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?" He proposes this in the form of an interrogation, as a matter of course, but it is one of those peculiar forms of logic that presents the conclusion in the form of a question, the meaning of which is that the penalty shall be increased proportionally to the increase of the crime. The former was a neglect of the law delivered by man, the latter the trampling under foot the Son of God, and neglecting that grace which has reference to eternal things. The one is finite, belonging to time; the other is spiritual, belonging to eternity. Hence, the penalty shall not only cover time, but eternity, from the necessity of the case, in order that it be a just recompense of reward. Matthew xxv, 46: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." Again, I would say that the word *kolasin* occurs twice in the New Testa-



*Kolasin, rendered  
"pruning" by universalists*

ment; here, and in 1 John iv, 18, in which place it is translated "torment" instead of punishment, and hence the attempt at criticism upon the word *kolasin*, that my brother offered yesterday, avails him nothing. Indeed, suppose it to be the mere act of pruning? He represents the wicked as cut off. That which is cut off from the parent stem dies, precisely as God, in the judgment, cuts off the wicked from the divine center of life and good, and he dies, and this death is the second death. I was intending to detain you a little while longer, with another remark or two connected with the last speech, but must wait until it comes up again. I have only to say, in regard to Luke xvi, 19, concerning the clause referring to the rich man and Lazarus, that the Vatican, Alexandrian, and Sinaitic manuscripts, the oldest manuscripts of the original Scriptures extant in the world, none of them called it a parable. I have all three of these manuscripts presented under the writing of Tischendorf, who secured the Sinaitic Codex, and I submit it for my brother's examination, if he desires. He told you that some of the old manuscripts did state at the head that it was a parable. He can not find it in either of the three oldest manuscripts extant—one of them running back, probably, to the middle of the third century. It is simply a statement of fact, so far as we are able to gather from it, that there was a certain rich man, and whether a statement or parable, there were rich men, and it was true, literally, that rich men died. If that be true, it is equally true that poor men died. These things being true, it was true, too—or else the Savior told a falsehood—that the poor man was in happiness, for Abraham's bosom was the equivalent to the Greek Paradise, in the Old Testament writings. The garden of Eden, Abraham's bosom, and similar phrases, had the signification that the word paradise had, and was an apartment of the Jewish *shéol*, which was the

*Judgment*

same as hades. It presents the matter so clearly, that we can not avoid the conclusion that after death the two individuals, representatives of two different classes, are, one in torment and the other in happiness, and a "gulf" between them which can not be passed, whether it be the impassable gulf between the Jew and Gentile or not. Who were the five brethren of the Jew? For he said he had five brethren left behind, whom he wanted to be warned of this place of torment. Who were those five brethren? If the one means Jew, and the other Gentile, and the Jew in torment wants somebody sent back to his five brethren, who are they? If the rich man represents the Jew, then he has five brethren who unfortunately were going to the same place of torment. I will say to you, and to my brother here, that the Lord Jesus and the Jews never had a controversy concerning the Gentiles during his life, and he can not find a word of it. On the contrary, when Jesus sent out his disciples, he sent them after the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and said: "Go not in the way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any of the cities of Samaria." The controversy was not about the Gentiles at all.

*P. 274*  
I return to the argument I was making on Acts xxiv, 25. And as Paul reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, he simply explains this as referring to the beginning of the Christian dispensation after it had been in operation a number of years. But a little while before Paul died, he said, in reasoning before a Roman emperor, that the judgment "is to come," not that it is now in progress, and began when Christ's dispensation did, but "to come," and that comports with the other statement before the Areopagites, Acts xvii, 31: "Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world by that man whom he hath ordained."

The judgment was not then progressing, but was in the future. Again in Matthew x, 14, 15: "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city."

I hope your attention will be fixed on the simple fact here, that in the day of judgment the inhabitants of the city of Sodom and Gomorrah shall be present with the inhabitants of those cities against whom the dust of the feet of the apostles was to be shaken off. Surely this was not at the destruction of Jerusalem. Were the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah there? and was it more tolerable for them than for the wicked Jews? On the contrary, they were gone into eternity, and these inhabitants must go there. Hence the judgment can only occur in the eternal world where the inhabitants of those cities had gone. Psalm xcvi, 13: "Before the Lord: for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth: he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth." Matthew xii, 42: "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation"—(you will mark here that it does not say the inhabitants of Nineveh had been in judgment, but will rise in judgment with them. Hence they shall both stand in the judgment)—"and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here. The queen of the South shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here." The queen of the South and the Ninevites were in eternity, and how was it possible for them to rise in judgment with that generation, unless that generation had gone where the queen

and Ninevites had gone? Again, 2 Timothy iv, 1: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead" (or the living and the dead) "at his appearing and his kingdom." Where does he appear? This appearing I shall unfold presently, and show where it will be, and this will enable us to identify it and fix it beyond a doubt at the end of this state of existence. John xii, 47, 48. This submits the rule of judgment. "And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words," (or the words that I have spoken,) "hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." That is, in the day Paul said he would judge men, the day he referred to when he reasoned before Felix of righteousness, temperance, and a judgment to come—the judgment in which the Ninevites were to rise with those of that generation, and condemn them. Ecclesiastes xi, 9, 10: "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes: but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment. Therefore remove sorrow from thy heart, and put away evil from thy flesh: for childhood and youth are vanity." Here it is plainly seen that the judgment is to occur at the close of life. Again, Ecclesiastes xii, 13: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandment: for this is the whole duty of man." Why? "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil."

Now I submit, in the first place, that the judgment must be in the future for these reasons: (1.) Christ is at the present acting as mediator, and so long as he

continues to act as mediator, it is inconsistent for him to act in the office of judge at the same time. He must cease to be mediator before he can properly and strictly enter upon judgment. (2.) In the second place, for another important reason; that the actions of men are not ripe for judgment, for the work of a Paul is still going on. No man that lives or ever lived exerts so great an influence on the minds and hearts of the sons of men as the Apostle Paul, who lived eighteen hundred years ago. And these works he is still doing. Though dead, they follow him, and will come up in judgment to crown him with everlasting glory. While this is so the work of a Nero is going on, and this wicked spirit, that sowed discord, and spread misery throughout the world, can not be judged until the influence of his life has ceased. So with those who sowed the seeds of infidelity. Take, for instance, Thomas Paine. Though he did not exert so great an influence in his lifetime, yet his works, published by his friends after his death, are still making infidels every year. The work of Thomas Paine is not yet done, nor can it be said to be completed until the final trump shall sound, when it shall be declared that time shall be no more. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. CARLTON'S SIXTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

You will remember I closed last evening while examining the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. I propose to call it up again and devote considerable time to it, because so much dependence is placed upon it. We find the parable was used by Jesus, in that memorable sermon, to represent the condition of the Jews and Gentiles. Dr. Lightfoot says, whoever believes

this not to be a parable, but a true story, let him believe also those little friars, whose trade it is to show the monuments at Jerusalem to pilgrims, and point exactly to the place where the house of the "rich glutton" stood. Most accurate keepers of antiquity indeed! who, after so many hundreds of years, such overthrows of Jerusalem, such devastations and changes, can rake out of the rubbish the place of so private a house, and such a one too, that never had any being, but merely in parable. And that it was a parable, not only the consent of all expositors may assure us, but the thing itself speaks it. The main scope and design of it seems this—to hint the destruction of the unbelieving Jews, who, though they had Moses and the prophets, did not believe them—nay, would not believe, though one (even Jesus) arose from the dead. For that conclusion of the parable abundantly evidenceth what it aimed at: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets," etc. *Heb. and Talm. Exerc.* in Luke xvi, 19.

The next point I want to call your attention to is the origin of the parable. Not only that it is a parable, but its origin. We have seen that Jesus was discussing, and used parables for illustration.

Dr. Whitby says: "That this is only a parable, and not a real history of what was actually done, is evident: (1.) Because we find this very parable in the *Gemara Babylonicum*, whence it is cited by Mr. Sheringham, in the preface to his *Foma*."

Dr. Whitby tells us this parable was found in *Gemara Babylonicum*, which is understood by scholars to be a book of heathen parables that was extant among the Babylonians, and was brought by the Jews in the return from their captivity, four hundred years before the birth of Jesus Christ. As this parable was extant Jesus employed it in illustrating his subject, as though I should use one of the fables of Æsop, for

Dr. George Campbell says  
"hades" is rendered hell  
10 times out of eleven

298

THE DESTINY OF MAN.

instance, that of the "rude boy" which the old man found upon his apple-tree. Dr. Clapp, of New Orleans, an eminent and learned divine, whose praise is in all the churches, tells us that he found a learned Jewish Rabbi there who said he had read this parable in the *Gemara*. The question is, if it was a parable four hundred years before Jesus was born, when did it become history?

P. 299  
The next point to which I wish to call attention is, that the idea of two compartments in hades is merely a heathen idea. Dr. George Campbell, an eminent Presbyterian divine in Scotland, and one of the most learned Bible critics in any denomination, says: "As to the word hades, which occurs in eleven places of the New Testament, and is rendered hell in all, except one, where it is translated grave, it is quite common, and frequently used by the seventy, in the translation of the Old Testament." In my judgment it ought never in Scripture be rendered hell, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by Christians." *Prel. Diss.* vi, part II, 2. I want to know if the word rendered there hades, denotes endless punishment. I do not know what he pretended it did for. Probably because he supposed the rest of you would know no better.

Dr. Campbell continues: "In the Old Testament the corresponding word is *sheol*, which signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery." What does that word *sheol* denote? Simply the state of the dead without respect to their goodness or badness, happiness or misery. Hence, you can not prove any person went into misery after death, from the Old Testament Scriptures.

I want to notice another thing in the Old Testament Scriptures, that the state of the dead, or invisible world, was never divided into two different com-

Doctrines of endless punishment  
ment were in the world  
at the birth of Christ

MR. CARLTON'S SIXTH SPEECH.

299

partments. They spoke of the dead being gathered to their fathers. It is said of Abraham, that he died full of years, and was gathered to his people. Where were they? Did they think some had gone to one place and some to another? No. The idea of misery or endless punishment after death is not contained in the Old Testament Scriptures, as I have already shown. Bishop Warburton, Paley and Dr. Jahn, concede this. Now, my brother and I concede that the doctrine of endless punishment was in the world at the time of the birth of Jesus Christ, and not being taught by Divine authority, where did it come from? He says he is going to show us. He will show us that Josephus says the Jews believed in endless punishment. Well, admit it, but from whence did they derive it? It did not come from the Scriptures. I will here read you another quotation from Dr. Campbell: "But it will be objected that Dives is represented as being in torment in hades, and that, consequently, the state of the condemned, or what is called hell, is fitly enough denoted by this term." "This is the only passage," says Dr. Campbell, "in Holy Writ, which seems to give countenance to the opinion that hades sometimes means the same thing as *gehenna*." In reply to all objections derived from this one passage, it is to be noted:

First, That before the captivity, and the Macedonian and Roman conquests, the Jews observed the most profound silence upon the state of the deceased, as to their happiness or misery. They spoke of it simply as a place of silence, darkness, and inactivity.

Second, But after the Hebrews mingled with the Greeks and Romans, they insensibly slid into their use of terms, and adopted some of their ideas on such subjects as those on which their own oracles were silent.

Now, on what subject does he say they were si-

lent? The subject of punishment after death. And he says, after the Hebrews mingled with the Greeks and Romans, they adopted their notions on the subject on which they were before silent; that is, on the subject of punishment after death. Very well. From that we could find where this doctrine of endless punishment came from, if we could not find it in the Bible. The Jews borrowed the doctrine of endless punishment from the heathen. It is from the heathen, which is not only taught by Dr. George Campbell, but indorsed by Alexander Campbell, the founder of the church of which my brother is an honored member. These being the facts in the case, what can he get to prove his doctrine from the heathen parable of the rich man and Lazarus? Jesus used it to illustrate the subject he was talking about. What subject was he talking on? The condition of the Jews and Gentiles. And my brother says Jesus raised no controversy with the Jews and Gentiles about doctrine. It is curious my brother should talk in that way. He was certainly driven to extreme necessity. In Matthew xv, 1, 2, it is said: "Then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him. And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." We are all agreed, that the facts in the Scriptures here show that they found fault with Jesus because he was teaching publicans and sinners, and Jesus reproves them, and shows that Lazarus (the Gentiles) was to be brought in, and the rich man (the Jews) was to be cast out. And if you will notice the tracing up of this parable, you will find that it represents almost, in Bible language, the high priests, in its description of the rich man clothed in purple and fine linen, who were partakers at the altar, and had the tit-bits of every sacrifice, faring sumptuously every day, spiritually and temporarily,

But, did Jesus indorse this heathen parable? No; but, on the contrary, he condemns it before he gets through, because he says: "They have Moses and the prophets: let them hear them." Who had Moses and the prophets? Nobody under the heavens but the Jews.

The remarks about all suffering not being punishment, and the remarks on *psuche*, and the remarks on the undoubted fact that there is a judgment, shall claim no attention at our hand whatever, for this reason: that we presented the Bible doctrine on *psuche* and on the judgment.

The point we are discussing is not whether there is a judgment. The point is the issue—the ultimate—what is the last of all? If the brother wants to discuss that we will take it up. What does the Bible teach with regard to where God judges men? He says it must be hereafter. Why must it be? Because your theory requires it. Without that your theology is gone by the board. But did Jesus say there was a judgment beyond this world? No! But you say it must be. Why? Because God does not now know how guilty Tom Paine is. He has not done his work yet, and God can not tell how wicked Tom Paine has been, or how much he should be punished, until his work is done. When will that be? After the last man on the earth has died, that he may know how terrible has been the influence of Tom Paine's life. Why? Because of the millions who go down to hell in consequence of having read his works. The influence that has been working will then only have begun to be realized. And when will the extent of that influence have been reached? Not at any time; because it is going on endlessly, and God can never tell how guilty Tom Paine will be; and thus it will go on endlessly, and he will not be punished at all. [Laughter.] For the same reason

that he can not judge Tom Paine, he can not judge any other man. That's philosophy with a vengeance! [Renewed laughter.]

What is the argument we have now with regard to the strict eternity of punishment? The brother raised himself on his toes here, and I thought it was coming; but when he reached his greatest height, he said it must be endless, from the very nature of the case. [Laughter.] Now, there is the proof. Is that the Bible proof? Well, that is just as near as he can prove it, unless he can get out a stronger emphasis.

Well, then, he goes on to examine the Greek word *kolasis*, and I call this congregation to witness that I did not make any remark or comment on the word, and only read the passage in which it is contained.

When he gets done with that, we will take up the word *aionos*, and examine that, to see if it is used in the adjective form. Acts xxiv, 25: "As Paul reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come," etc. He says it was a judgment to come. Certainly it was. But was it a far distant judgment? Did the apostle discourse to him about a judgment in the immortal state. *Mellontas*. What does that mean? About to come. He discoursed to him of righteousness, temperance, and judgment about to come—an impending calamity to which he was exposed; and as it was thus drawing near, Felix trembled. Did he say any thing to him about judgment after he should die? Let us have the evidence, if you have any.

What is the next point? Well, it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city. Well, what is the day of judgment for Sodom and Gomorrah? The Bible gives an account of it, and says they were overthrown

in a moment. The brother would have us believe that the punishment of the people of Sodom and Gomorrah was endless punishment; but God said by the prophet: "For the punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people is greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom, that was overthrown as in a moment, and no hands stayed on her." How could their punishment be greater than that of the people of Sodom, if the punishment of those of Sodom was an endless punishment? Does not the brother know that Dr. Adam Clarke, and other commentators, are willing to grant the correctness of this interpretation. The idea that it should be more intolerable with these people than those of Sodom, and that their punishment was endless; or, in other words, that their punishment was less severe than the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah, every school-boy knows can not be so. The peculiar language employed affords a pretext to keep some minds away from the truth.

But the queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it. Why? Because here was Jesus preaching to them, and they repented not, while the people of Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonah. What was the fact here? Evidently, they were overthrown; but would rise up and condemn them. How was that to be? *Ans.* Their example would condemn them. Here is a greater than Jonah, and you do not repent; and there was the queen of the south, who came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and here is a greater than Solomon, that is, Jesus; and her example in coming so great a distance to hear Solomon condemns you, for the Son of God came down from heaven to bear testimony to the truth, and you do not believe him. That is just what there is about it. Can he prove that any of them are going to be raised up, and

Reply  
on P. 312

brought to judgment? If he can, it will be to the point.

But in Ecclesiastes it is written: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Certainly. But when did he say he was going to bring them to judgment. God says: "I will render justice and judgment in the earth." And in Proverbs xi, 31: "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed on the earth: much more the wicked and the sinner." Did he say there was judgment anywhere else? If you have any Scripture on this point, brother, let us have it. It is just what this congregation is waiting for.

Then I want to call attention to the particular quotation from the Epistle to Timothy iv, i: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and dead at his appearing and his kingdom." Let us look at the idea of judging the quick and dead by that man whom he hath ordained. In Acts x, 42, you will find this language: "And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead." We find, then, that Jesus was the man that was to judge, and that he was to judge two classes, the quick and the dead. It will be our next object to find who the "quick and dead" are. We go to the second chapter of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, first verse, and we have this language: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." There we find both classes right together. The dead were those who were dead in trespasses and sins. What two classes were to be judged? The quick and the dead, or the wicked and the righteous.

Now, when do the Scriptures teach that he is going to commence this work of judging the quick and dead? In the fourth chapter of first Peter you will find, from this same Peter who taught by divine authority, that Jesus was to be the judge of the quick and dead. Speaking of certain persons who had got into the church, he says: "Wherein they think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you: who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead." Now, why did Jesus Christ get ready to judge the quick and dead eighteen hundred years ago if he is not going to commence the work for millions of years yet to come?

Let us go a little further. In the seventeenth verse he says: "For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God." Who are the house of God? In Ephesians ii, 12, speaking of those who had been converts, he says: "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." Then, in the nineteenth verse of the same chapter, he adds: "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord." Then the Christians were the house of God, and judgment must begin at the house of God; and if it first begin at us, what shall become of them that obey not the Gospel of God? and "if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?"

Now, we have found that Jesus Christ was to be the judge of the quick and dead, and that he got

ready eighteen hundred years ago. He then began that work. How long is it to continue? Paul says he shall judge them at his appearing—the appearing of his kingdom—and it is to be carried on through his kingdom. During this time he shall rule the world by righteousness in Jesus Christ. Let us notice Revelations xx, 12, 13, with regard to the time when the judgment shall be: “And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.” What dead were those? Not those who were involved in literal death. They were not standing in judgment. What class, then? The wicked—those who were dead in trespasses and sins. “And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works.” Now, Daniel saw, in his vision, one come to the Ancient of days, and there was given him a kingdom, etc. He sat upon the throne, and the judgment did set, and the books were opened. Judgment was commenced, and will cease when his kingdom ends.

Jesus says: “Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.” The books were opened. What books? The books out of which mankind are to be judged. Paul informs us that those who had not the written revelation were not judged by the word, but by the light of nature. “For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing,

or else excusing one another: for as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law.” That was the first law—the book of nature. As the poet says:

“This older Scripture, writ by God's own hand.”

What a beautiful lesson here! The book of God in nature! What class shall be judged by this older Scripture, written by God's own hand? The heathen. The law of nature was the only law they had, and they were judged by it. The Jews had only the law, and not the Gospel; hence they were judged only by the law.

Another book was opened. What book is that? The Gospel—the Lamb's book of life. Those that have the Gospel, are to be judged by the Gospel.

Here, then, are three books opened, from which the quick and the dead are to be judged. What has that to do with another state of existence, and what evidence is there in all this to prove that any of the human family will suffer endless punishment? [*Time expired.*]

[MR. MOORE'S SEVENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and Respected Friends:*

I observed this before, that to me it was a matter of indifference, so far as the import of the passage is concerned, whether it be granted that this sixteenth of Luke is parable or history. Every man knows, who knows any thing of the nature of the parable, that it can not have an existence without facts to be founded on. There must have been, then, a rich man, and a poor man; there must have been purple and fine linen;



the rich man must have fared sumptuously; there must have been dogs, gates, and houses. All these things were literal, or else there could not have been a parable instituted possibly. It will be conceded that there were rich men; that rich men had fared sumptuously; that there had been poor men; that they had suffered; that both the rich men and poor men had actually died; these are things that must be conceded. Besides this, can it be possible that Jesus used this with no facts to found it on? Is it possible that there is no place of torment into which the wicked shall go at death? If the place in which he was is this side of death, then am I mistaken in placing it afterward. The Savior placed it beyond. I leave you with this. I will remark of Dr. George Campbell, that my brother uses him just as he uses every other authority he takes up, quoting just such a portion of him as suits his case, and leaving out the rest. I do not think he would regard that as fair, if it were himself, to take a part of what he had said, when something left out would change the meaning of all, if read together. It is not using an author fairly. Dr. George Campbell believed in the doctrine of future endless punishment, and yet, from the reading of the passage, one would be constrained to believe that he was not an advocate of it, but believed in the ultimate holiness and happiness of all. I would be glad to read two or three passages if I had time. I will read a section from his comment on hades: "For the same reason that it does violence to the original to translate either the Hebrew word *sheol*, which the seventy translated *hades*, or the Greek word *hades*, by the English word *hell*, so it destroys the sense of many passages to render it by the term *grave*. Although this term may occur in the Hebrew idiom, sometimes expressing their sense of *hades*, or its Hebrew representative, *keber*, this now is very far from being the

case." Now, he would have you believe that Mr. Campbell did not admit the existence of such an idea in the Old Testament Scriptures as that of future rewards and punishments. He says, there are allusions to these things in the Old Testament Scriptures. Thus we find Jonah speaking of *hades*, with a number of other quotations that I shall not now read.

I pass on, beginning with the second part of the argument. After the Jews came in contact with the Greeks and Romans they changed some of their terms. They changed their ideas of *hades*, of the unseen world. Suppose that they adopted that—suppose that they borrowed it; that Jesus Christ and his apostles, knowing that these ideas were existing at that day, did not at any time correct it by showing that it was false, that it was a heathen fable, and had no foundation except superstition. Hence, the abodes of Elysium and Tartarus became familiar among the Jews; and as the Greeks and Romans had their gardens and fields of delights in *hades*, and their *tartarus* in the same region, so the Jews assimilated to them, and had their garden of Eden, or *paradise*, and their *gehenna*, all within the boundaries of *hades*. So Abraham's bosom, or *paradise*, was the abode of the happy separated spirits, and *tartarus*, or *gehenna*, was the abode of the wicked. Even Peter, a Jew and an apostle of Jesus Christ, adopts their word *tartarus*, and says that God cast the angels that sinned "down to *tartarus*." In the common version it is *hell*, but in the original it is neither *gehenna* nor *hades*, but *tartarus*. Now, the fact is, that these terms being thus introduced, must have had some of the ideas of the people that first used them attached to them. And that there is in the Christian revelation a degree of happiness and a degree of misery allotted to disembodied spirits is beyond doubt or disputation; and,

also, that perfect happiness and misery, or happiness and misery in their highest degree, do not commence until the reunion of spirits to their bodies at the resurrection, is a common idea and clearly taught in the Christian books. In hades, then, the receptacle of all the dead, there are "rewards and punishments."

Now, I ask if you have any confidence in quotations made by my brother, when in both cases, that of Adam Clarke and Dr. George Campbell, he has garbled. I have not access to some of the books he has read, but I think that he has dealt as unfairly with them. It is not because he intended it, but because, like a horse blind of one eye going across a bridge, he sees only with the other, scapes on the one side, and falls over on the other. That is precisely the case with my brother. First he admits the teachings of Josephus. I shall not now stop to read that. I am reminded that he tells you again that it does really mean the Jew and the Gentile. I stated before, that Jesus, at no time during his ministry, ever had an argument with a Jew touching the condition of the Gentiles. I challenge him to produce it. It is true, this fifteenth chapter begins as he reads it, but there is not a word about the Gentile there. There is not an instance in which he quotes the word Gentile except it is when he quotes from one of their old prophets something which they accepted as well as he. He reads the beginning of the fifteenth chapter of Luke: "Then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him." To be sure, but were they Gentiles? Not a word about it. He spake a parable unto them concerning the lost sheep. You are aware that Jewish society was divided into classes, the upper class and the lower classes. Jesus associated himself with the lower classes. When he chose the twelve in Matthew, and also in Luke, to preach the Gospel of the kingdom, he forbid their going into the way of

the Gentiles or Samaritans, or to have any communication with them. And he said: "As you go, say, Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." This is the most that was done during the lifetime of the Savior. There was no dispute except in regard to his associating with the lower classes, whom aristocracy regarded as degraded. But these persons were all Jews.

But my brother finds another fact—that Jesus denied the truth taught in the parable after he used it. Why did he use it, if he did not mean to indorse it? How did he deny the teaching of it? He says: "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." You remember that he makes the man in torment, the man that Jesus addresses—that is, the man that requests Abraham afar off, "where Lazarus the Gentile" was, to send Lazarus to him now. He wants that some one be sent back to his brethren; and since the rich man represents the Jew, I ask who his brethren are? It is Jews first, last, and all the time, when it suits; but when it does not, any thing and every thing that the taste of the man or the wants of the case demand. I can prove any thing in that way. They had Moses and the prophets, and he says none but Jews had this. Does he not know that the Bible had been translated into Greek two hundred and fifty years before, and circulated widely before that time? I think he does know it. I want to know who those five brethren were, if the one was a Jew and the other a Gentile? Who were the brethren that were in danger? He did just what I predicted in regard to the subject of the judgment. He says, "I will say nothing about it." He could not keep off of it very well, and he then undertakes a few of the passages, and handles them after his fashion, merely assuming, for your sake and his own, and especially that of his cause, that they mean judgments in this

*mellontos* (Acts 24:25), that shall come soon, referring to the judgment

world, when the fact is, every passage I quoted refers to the judgment "to come" somewhere in the future. He says this word *mellontos* means "that shall come soon." The absurdity of this is seen, in the first place, in the effects that it produced on the Roman Governor. If Paul had spoken of the destruction of the Jewish people, it would not have made him tremble so much, since he was a Roman Governor. The effect produced on the Roman Governor is a contradiction of it. Why did it make him tremble? Because he saw that he was a wicked man, a guilty man. I will read some passages in which this word *mellontos*, or *mello*, occurs. While it may mean near at hand in some instances in which it occurs, it is put indefinitely in the future. "Herod will seek the young child"—that is an indefinite future. "Flee from the wrath to come." Again: "Which was for to come." That is, "This is the individual which was for to come"—that is, he had been prophesied several hundred years before. Again, in Matthew xii, 32: "Neither in this world, nor in the world to come." Matthew xxv, 31: "The Son of Man shall come"—that is, indefinitely in the future. If I had time to read, it would be the same from beginning to end; and there are, perhaps, one hundred and fifty places where it occurs. It is simply an indefinite future. When Felix heard that there was a future judgment, where he would be judged, it made him tremble. On my brother's supposition, he would rather have laughed at the idea of the Jews being destroyed and scattered. "Now," however, he says, "is the judgment of this world." This passage is in John xii, 31. Here he was speaking of the judgment that men were about to make against him. The judgment of this world was the decision that Pilate and Herod made against Jesus Christ. Now was the judgment of this world made against him.

"Now shall the prince of this world be cast out." That is all there is of it.

I return, now, to take up my argument upon the judgment. Luke xiii, 24: "Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able. When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are: then shall ye begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets. But he shall say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out. And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God." Commentators universally concede that this is the final collection of humanity, for he refers to the points of the compass, which in the Scriptures means the entire earth. Hence, all the righteous shall come and sit down in the kingdom of God, and the wicked cast out. "Then," said he, "you shall mourn. You are excluded, and the door shut. The door of mercy is closed." It is the finality. The children of God saved, and with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom. The wicked cast out, and the door shut forever. Romans ii, 6-10: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and

anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile: but glory, honor, and peace, to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile." When is that to occur? Also, 16: "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel." When is that to be done? We have heard it said by Jesus, in John xii, 48, "I judge no man. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him. The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." And now, what day is that? Paul says: "God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath appointed." That is the judgment to come; when he will judge the living and the dead at his appearing, when he shall come in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels.

Hebrews ix, 24-27: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." This fixes the matter so plainly, that there is no chance of making a mistake in regard to it—that it is after death.

Romans xiv, 9-12: "For to this end Christ both died and rose and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living. But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the

Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." My brother referred this to the final judgment. 2 Corinthians v, 9, 10: "Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him. For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." From this I conclude that there is a judgment after death; second, that all are subjects of the judgment; and hence, that all will be subjects in that great day that lies yet in the future. The correctness of the foregoing will be evinced further by connecting other events that are to occur simultaneously. First. The personal coming of Christ with the holy angels. Acts i, 11: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." There can be no mistake that the angel testified to the personal and literal coming of Jesus Christ. That was to be an event so fixed, so plain, that it is impossible to make a mistake. In connection with this, I read Mark viii, 28: "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." Shall he be ashamed at what time? "When he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." My brother told you, on a former occasion, that the word holy angels was not in this passage. That shows his knowledge of the Scripture, and his use of it. It is also in Matthew xxv, 31. He told you it was not holy angels; but simply his angels. Yet you perceive that the word really does occur.

I Thessalonians iv, 14-17: "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself"—for the sake of identification and fixedness—"shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: when we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." In connection with this, I ask your attention to the fact that all the dead are to be raised. John v, 28, 29: "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Revelation xx, 12: "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works."

I refer to the statements of my brother in regard to the law of judgment, and shall not accept it. But we have the book opened, when all the dead stand together, and the Judge has collected all the sleeping millions, whose ashes were scattered throughout the world. *[Time expired.]*

*Continued on p. 330*

[MR. CARLTON'S SEVENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and Christian Friends:*

The parable of the rich man and Lazarus is again called up. I want to know if he has undertaken to show that Dr. Whitby is incorrect in his statement that that parable was a Babylonish parable; that it was extant four hundred years before the birth of Christ, and that Jesus used it as an illustration. He does not attempt any thing of that kind. But how does he undertake to get along with this matter? Why the parable is founded in facts: There were rich men; there were men that died. Well, if there were rich men, and men that died, then is there not a place of torment for wicked men to go into after they die? Assuming that this follows. In Judges vi, we have a parable of the trees holding a political convention. They chose the cedar for king, and not being an office-seeker, the cedar declined the nomination. That would not be fashionable nowadays. Then the fir-tree was chosen, and the fir-tree declined, and finally they chose the bramble-bush. Well, said the bramble, if you will have me for king, get down here under my shade, if not let fire come out of the bramble, and devour the cedars of Lebanon. Now there were trees, there is fire, there are bramble-bushes; then, is it not true that they held a convention to choose a king? These things follow if the others are true. Why not? My dear friends, there is wisdom almost unparalleled. But did not Jesus indorse this parable, if it was a heathen parable? He used it without indorsing it. Did not Jesus use a great many things without indorsing them? Did not he say, "Ye can not serve God and Mammon." Do you believe he indorsed the heathen idea about Mammon being the god of riches? You

know better. You know he did not indorse any thing of the kind. He used their terms in speaking of the demons that possessed the people. Did not Jesus know there were no departed spirits living in those persons?—That disembodied spirits did not get into these sick people? He used their terms. Bro. Moore says he did not teach them; they were a humbug. Not directly, but indirectly. Did he teach in regard to other things that they were not so? Not directly, but indirectly. Did he teach the wrong of human slavery? Not directly, but he taught principles that would destroy slavery forever. He tells you I garbled and misrepresented Dr. Campbell. Did I attempt to make you believe that Dr. Campbell believed in universal salvation? I told you before I read that he was orthodox authority. I never tried to make you believe that any man believed in universal salvation who did not. I told you he was an eminent Presbyterian divine, and I showed you his concession in regard to the meaning of the word *hades*. Has he shown you that Dr. Campbell did not concede that? Let him show that I ever garbled or misrepresented any man under heaven. All this is necessary to get rid of this authority, but it will not accomplish that end.

Well, then, if this does mean the Jew and the Gentile, "who were the five brethren?" Dr. Adam Clarke says it is not to be expected that parables are to run on all fours. They are competent to the thing that they are intended to represent, and by throwing the idea of the five brethren into the parable, the subject can be illustrated, and it gave Jesus an opportunity to commend Moses and the prophets, instead of leaving them to take the heathen notions of the future state.

Next follows the argument of the judgment. "When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath

shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without and knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall say unto you, I know you not." Do you suppose that refers to a future judgment? Does that concern us? Did he ever teach in our streets? Did he cast out demons among us? I want to show that it referred to scenes that transpired in that generation, and concerned the persons he addressed. But he told them they should see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom, at the time he accomplished to scatter the power of the people eighteen hundred years ago. What has that to do with a judgment beyond the final resurrection?

But, then, they shall all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ. When? When he will judge the secrets of men according to the Gospel. When does the Gospel teach that he will judge? He has appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man he has appointed. When is it? Jesus says, "Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me." My reward is with me eighteen hundred years ago! And when did the prophet teach that he should judge the people? "Behold, I raise up unto you a righteous king who shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." How much does this prove in regard to a judgment in eternity?

In connection with this, we take 2 Corinthians v, 10, that we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ. The idea is generally labored here to show that is a judgment in another state of existence, according to the deeds done in the body here. There can not be a greater misunderstanding, in regard to any portion of the word of God, than there has been in regard to that particular passage. We propose to examine it for a moment. "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may

2. Cor. 5:10  
 receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." Leaving out the supplied words, it reads "shall receive in the body." If you take the Greek word translated here in, it is *dia*, signifying through, *i. e.* through the body. How much does that prove a judgment beyond the present state of existence?

The next passage is Hebrews ix, 23-27. Special dependence is placed on the twenty-seventh verse: "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment"—endeavoring to impress upon your minds that ancient delusion that has rested down on those ignorant of the Scriptures for generations past, that this teaches a judgment after death; and as it is appointed unto men once to die, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many. He was talking about the death represented by the high priests in their offerings; and so Christ was offered. The corresponding conjunctions, as, so; as the one thing was done, so the other; as these offerings under the law, so Christ was offered. Was Christ's death a literal common death, or a sacrificial death? A sacrificial death. Was that the common death of mankind? Can not any body see better than that? But to get the matter a little more clearly in your minds, let us read a little further. On this subject I ask you to read the ninth and tenth chapters of Hebrews, to see if you can learn that both deaths referred to were sacrificial, and were for sin. "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never, with those sacrifices which they offered"—who offered? Offered by the high priests. What did they offer? "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." "Wherefore, when he cometh into the world"—where is the antecedent of he? It is Christ. The antecedent of they is the high

priests, the men; and, the antecedent of he, is Christ. What was the judgment that followed the offering by the high priest? God required him to go forth, and spread forth his hands, and pronounce this blessing: "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee; the Lord lift up his countenance, and be gracious unto thee; the Lord make his face to shine upon thee, and give thee peace." That was the judgment that followed the offering; so, as it was appointed unto men once to die, after this the decision, the crisis; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him will he appear, etc. There was no suffering following that, any more than there was following the judgment by the high priest.

Forty years ago I would not have been surprised at this. To-day I am astonished, perfectly astonished, that the brother does not know better.

Acts i, 11: "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." How does this come up? Jesus, standing conversing with the men of Galilee in open day, ascends up, up; the cloud receives him out of their sight. Now the brother tells you he is to descend from heaven in flaming fire, and he quotes the Scripture that he is to come in the same manner as he went. It is just as different from that manner as any thing that can be imagined. He then refers to Thessalonians, where he finds that he shall descend with the voice of the archangel. Is that the way he went up? Not a bit of that, either. Neither of those will do; you must try again.

And then he turns off to another one of the evangelists, and finds the word holy in connection with angels, and tells you I denied that the word holy was found there, and that I was mistaken; then, after he gets over his excitement, he tells you that the word holy does not occur where I said it did not. That is

just what I thought. If he will examine the Greek of Matthew xxv, 31, he will see whether the word holy is there or not.

Then he goes back again, and dwells on everlasting punishment. I want to say to this congregation that it avails but little to run around and beat about the bush, and talk about a thousand and one things that do not concern the issue. There are only two points between us that can not be lost sight of. Every thinking man is aware of this fact, and the examination of these points every hearer demands that we shall now attend to. These must not be overlooked. Does the term relied upon to prove the duration denote strict eternity? Can the Greek words *aion*, *aionos*, be relied upon to prove endless duration? Do they signify endless duration when applied to punishment? That is the great point. We have seen that the English word everlasting is an indefinite word, and can not be relied upon. It may be longer or shorter. Is the word *aionos* applied to *kolasis*? Is that the word that denotes endless duration, when it is applied to the punishment of the wicked? That is the question you demand, and I demand, from my brother. He can not get us from it. He has taken the position that *gehenna* denotes a place of endless punishment. He says the people used it then to signify a place of endless punishment, and Jesus used the word without explaining it, and hence the people were bound thus to understand him. He used the term in the sense in which they used it. Then I ask one question more: Can you produce any evidence that at the time of the present ministry of Christ, either Jew or Gentile used the word *gehenna* to denote a place of endless punishment? Does *gehenna* signify a place of endless punishment in the Scriptures? Does the word *aionos* mean endless duration?

These are the two points before us. On the solution of them must depend the whole question. There is no use talking about judgment. I believe that as much as he does. I believe a great deal more than he does, that men will suffer for sin. The question is, whether any body will suffer endless punishment? Do these terms denote endless duration? or did the people in that age use the word *gehenna* to denote a place of eternal punishment? Was that the meaning or signification of the term employed? But while the brother is getting ready for a grand rally, to stand or fall, as his case must, I call attention to another thing in connection with this subject of punishment. What do the Scriptures teach that God punishes for? What is the object of punishment? God's government is paternal. He governs as a father. How does he govern his children? With malice? How does he punish them? With a feeling of retaliation and revenge, or as a father? What object has a good parent in punishing a disobedient child? To gratify the vindictive vengeance of the father? No; but for the good of the child. God has created man to glorify and enjoy him forever. He has instituted a government over him for the good of the governed. He has annexed rewards to his law. What for? To encourage obedience. To secure what end? The good of the governed. He has annexed a penalty. What for? To discourage disobedience. What for? To promote the good of the governed. God does not contradict himself. There is no one part of his action that is inconsistent with any other part. And can you believe he has affixed a penalty to his law, the infliction of which will defeat the object for which the government was instituted? That is, inconsistent with the object for which the law was given, and inconsistent with the object for which the rewards were annexed to the



law? Do you believe that the Bible teaches any thing of that kind? I am very certain that I do not; that I find no evidence of this; that I am taught in the Scriptures that God chastises us for our profit. The apostle says, in Hebrews xii: "We have had fathers according to the flesh, who corrected us, and we gave them reverence. For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." Then there is an afterward to the chastisements of God; and if there is an afterward to God's punishment, it is not endless punishment.

I more than intimated in my last speech, that the doctrine of endless punishment was purely of heathen origin. I showed this by Dr. Campbell; not but he believed in it; but showed where it came from. Cicero, one of the most learned and eloquent of the heathen orators, in his sixth oration, says it was on this account that the ancients invented their infernal punishments of the dead: to keep the wicked in some awe in this life, who, without them, would have no dread of death itself. Polybus, an ancient Greek historian, tells us, that since the multitude is ever fickle and capricious, full of lawless passions and irrational and violent resentments, there is no way left to keep them in order but by the terror of future punishment, and all the pompous circumstances that attend such kind of fiction. On which account, the ancients acted, in my opinion, with great penetration when they contrived to bring in those notions of the gods and a future state into the popular belief. Strabo, another Greek writer, speaks thus: "It is impossible to govern women and the gross body

*Barltan says Tertullian was the first to teach the doctrine of future punishment*

of the people, and to keep them pious, holy, and virtuous by the precepts of philosophy. This can only be done by the fear of the gods, which is raised and supported by ancient fictions and modern prodigies. The apparatus of the ancient mythologies was an engine which the legislators employed as bugbears to strike terror into the childish imagination of the multitude." Bishop Lowth says: "It is evident that Homer first, and Virgil after him, derived their notions of the infernal regions from the Cimmerian caves of Campania."

We might continue our quotations in regard to this doctrine; but I remark here, that while there is nothing said of the doctrine of eternal punishment in the Old Testament Scriptures, and while we find the doctrine extant in the time of Jesus, we find it taught in writings between the time of Malachi and the coming of Jesus, a period of about four hundred years. It was taught by the Egyptian Jews, who had learned it from the Egyptians. And hence we see why it was that Josephus was enabled to say that the Jews believed in such notions about hades.

I remark now, we can find no trace of the doctrine of endless punishment in the Christian church for the first two centuries, notwithstanding the multitudes that came into the Christian church from the heathen. The first bold advocate of this doctrine, and who taught the strict eternity of future punishment, was Tertullian, a presbyter of Carthage, in the third century. He was a convert from the heathen, and brought it in, in its spirit. If we were on the spirit of the doctrine, I might read a quotation to show the spirit which he imbibed, and which contained in general that doctrine.

Now, the doctrine of endless punishment not being taught in the Old Testament Scriptures, having been borrowed from the heathen, and Jesus Christ comes

to open up a new and living way, proclaiming the glad tidings of great joy, which should be unto all people, I ask, upon which of these foundations does he establish his doctrine? Does he take the granite substratum of the Hebrew revelation? Does he come saying: "Think not I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am come, not to destroy, but to fulfill. It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one jot or tittle to pass till all be fulfilled." Did Jesus come adopting paganism as a base on which he rears the glorious superstructure of Christianity? or does he take Judaism, rejecting the doctrine of endless punishment? "But," says the brother, "he did not condemn the Pharisees when they taught it." Jesus said to his disciples: "Beware of the leaven of the Sadducees and the Pharisees." What did the Sadducees believe? Future annihilation. Jesus said, do not take that. What did the Pharisees believe? Endless punishment. Jesus said, do not take that. Here were three doctrines in the world eighteen hundred years ago. The Sadducees taught annihilation. They were strict materialists, believing neither in spirits, nor angels, nor the resurrection. Jesus rejects their doctrine. The Pharisees, joining with the heathen, believed in future endless punishment. Jesus says to his followers: Do not believe that doctrine. What did he teach? [*Time expired.*]

[MR. MOORE'S EIGHTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, and Christian Friends:*

While it is fresh in your minds, I will call your attention to the concluding remark of the last speech, that the Savior warned his disciples not to receive the

doctrine of the Pharisees concerning future endless punishment. I hope he will tell you in his next speech when Jesus said that. I have not read it, and do not know where the passage stands.

I shall proceed immediately with the argument that I had before you when I sat down. At his coming the dead shall be raised, was the point I was submitting. I first presented testimony to show that there was a judgment beyond death. However, before doing that I will give attention to the passage criticised, and the only one he has attempted to reply to really, Hebrews ix, 24-27. I shall also comment on the tenth chapter. He assumes that the persons here referred to were the Jewish high priests, and the death spoken of, the death that they died. It is impossible to be their literal death that is referred to, because they did not die a sacrificial death at all. In the second place, as you are aware, the sacrifice was killed by the high priest outside of the court of the temple, before he went into the holy place to appear in the presence of God for the people. The high priest did not die at all, and hence, it could not have been a contrast between the death of Christ and that of the high priest personally. Secondly, if it was the sacrifice that was offered out yonder, that was offered every year; and, "so Christ was once offered," is the reading. Then, if he was offered "so," then he ought to have been offered yearly. "So" means to the same degree, to the same extent—such is the nature of the comparison here. It would have required Christ to have died every year for the last eighteen hundred years. But "he died once," and only once. It could not have meant the Jewish high priests, because they did not die, and the only comparison instituted between the death of Christ and others, is the death of men—of the race. "It is appointed unto men once to die." It embraces the universal generic

idea of man. "It is appointed unto man once to die." It was appointed unto the Jewish high priest to offer the sacrifice every year, consequently, in thirty years, if he lived, he would offer it thirty times. There were thirty deaths, then, if he lived that long. "It is appointed unto men once to die," after this the judgment. "So Christ was once offered in the end of the world," or made a sacrifice for the sins of the world, and unto them that look for him he will appear the second time. How? Without a sin-offering. He came first to make a sin-offering, and made that sin-offering; he will come the next time without any sin-offering. He has, therefore, warned us of the necessity of making preparation, for the judgment lies beyond the appointed death, and at the time when he will come without the sin-offering. He will come then as the judge. He came first to make the atonement. To-day he still offers mercy; then the door of mercy will be closed, and all humanity that will not have accepted the divine offers of mercy will be cut off from it according to the general teachings of the Scriptures.

The passage in 2 Corinthians v, 10, was also criticised. The apostle, in this passage, says: "We must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." We must. Why does he say that? Because he had said in the first part of this chapter: "Here in the body we are absent from the Lord," and he was not prepared to decide whether it would be better to remain in the body or to die and be present with the Lord. I am in a-straight between two whether to die and go to Christ or to live for your good. This you will find in Philippians first chapter. Now, he continues, "seeing these things, we are willing to be absent from the body and present with the Lord. Wherefore we labor, that whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him." For that purpose, after

we have left all—after we have gone away from the flesh, we labor to be accepted of the Lord, whether present or absent. As a reason why he would labor so that he might be accepted of the Lord when he was absent from the body, and as a motive to prompt others to work to that same end, he tells them: "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." The criticism I shall pay no further attention to. The plain, clear statement here does not need any criticism, and it is perfectly certain that my brother's cause demands the change. I give you King James and his forty translators in lieu of Bro. Carlton, and let you decide which you will prefer. I have several translations here, among them Tischendorf's text, and the translation of that eminent scholar, who has accomplished more for the Bible than any other one man. I have the Diaglott, Campbell, Macknight, and several others, on the Scriptures, and might read them had I time to do so. They all agree with me. He refers to the coming of Christ. I read you, "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Shall come in like manner; my brother tries to show that that is not true. At one time it is said he shall come with his holy angels, at another time he comes some other way. Does that contradict the fact that he will come in like manner as he went into heaven? In the next place, is it a contradiction of the fact, that he did not go into heaven with the angels? The question is, Did he personally go into heaven? If he did, he will personally return, and as they saw him go upward through the cerulean above to his final and everlasting home, so the same person will again return, and when he returns personally he will judge the

*comes to change our bodies*

world in righteousness in that day God has appointed.

So, likewise, the quotation made from Thess. iv, 16, 17: also, 2 Thess. i, 6-10, and a variety of others. As my brother does not condescend to note these, realizing that he shall not be able to answer them, I will not repeat them.

*Judg-  
ment*

Revelation i, 7: "Behold he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him." I want to know, ladies and gentlemen, whether your eyes have seen him personally? The passage says so. The angel told the disciples that he would himself come, "And the Lord himself will descend with a shout, and he shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, and will come with the holy angels in the glory of his Father." He will come personally in his glory with all his holy angels. He will come personally, then, and every eye shall see him. Just as certainly as you are men, and have not seen him, that advent has not been made; and just as certainly as that advent has not been made, just so certainly the judgment is beyond, for it is to occur when he comes. He will come as the lightning athwart the heavens. Matthew xxiv, 26, 27: "Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." This appearance has never occurred. He, therefore, in his personal manifestation has never appeared.

Fifth. When he comes, he will change the body of his saints. Philippians iii, 20, 21: "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." In

Corinthians xv, 51, 52, we find the same thing; for from the beginning of the twenty-first verse to the conclusion, he is speaking only of the disciples, and uses only the pronoun we. "He shall come as the lightning shineth from the east to the west. The dead saints shall be raised incorruptible, and the living saints shall be changed."

He will be accompanied by ten thousand of his saints, and all his holy angels, Jude i, 14, 15, "To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly of their deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." Matthew xvi, 27: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." He will come at the time of the fulfillment of all things spoken by the mouth of all the holy prophets. Acts iii, 21: "When he will send Jesus Christ, whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all the holy apostles and prophets since the world began." The salvation of men is one of the things to be accomplished then; if that was fulfilled, and every thing complete, there would be nothing to come for. But all things are not fulfilled, and therefore he has not come yet, and the revelation of his righteous government, in its perfected state, is not yet made.

2 Thessalonians ii, 6-10: "And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders,

and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."

This was an anticipation of the man of sin, who must be developed in his time, and was then withholden by the Roman Cæsars. He said he would be revealed, and he says, in the eighth verse: "Then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." Protestants regard this Wicked one as the Roman Catholic institution; the Roman Catholics regard it as the Protestants of the present age. In either case they are not yet entirely destroyed. Neither of them is consumed by the power of the Lord's mouth. The power of Romanism has been wasting for more than three hundred years, and when the Lord does come, that power will be destroyed, and, in my brother's meaning of that term, it shall be no more.

At that time his mediatorship shall cease, 1 Corinthians xv, 24: "Then cometh the end when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father: when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power." Hebrews ix, 28: "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him, shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." He no more comes as mediator—he no more offers an atonement. He no more appears as a babe in the manger, or a mangled man on the cross.

Colossians iii, 4: "Then shall you also appear with him in glory." 1 Thess. iv, 13-17; I have already read this. When the last trump shall sound, the living shall not anticipate the dead. The dead in Christ shall rise first.

Finally, he will execute the wicked. Matthew xxv, 31-46; also, 2 Timothy iv, 1-8. I have read these,

and shall not repeat them. I ask your attention to Romans ii, 8, 9: "But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile." When is that to occur? Read the sixteenth verse: "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel." The execution of the wicked, then, I conclude, is final, because at the conclusion of the age, after Jesus has left the immortal throne, he there will receive his saints, execute the wicked, and turn them from the presence of the Lord, where the smoke of their torment ascends up forever and ever. In Revelations xxii, 11, he says they that are in this condition shall continue in it.

I enter, now, on the consideration of what my brother challenged me to. I have been approaching it as rapidly as I have been able to—the meaning of *aion*. I base an argument on this to prove further the endless punishment. I call your attention first to the definition of *aionios*. *Aion* is the noun; *aionios* is the adjective. I read from the *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*: "These important Greek words have become so far introduced as to claim notice here." Then he refers to the history of the controversy between Mr. Palfrey, of Charlestown, Massachusetts, and Mr. Stewart, of Andover, who published an exegetical essay on the meaning of these words. *Aion* is a derivative from *aei*, always, and *on*, the present participle of *emi*, to be. Its primary signification is always being, or which is the same thing, everlasting. Crabbe, in his book of synonyms, upon this subject, presents this word everlasting as a synonym of eternal and endless, and tells us that the strength of the words eternal and everlasting are greater than endless; and endless means that which

has a being without an end in the future, without reference to the past, while everlasting and eternal mean having neither beginning nor end. I read further: "However, it may be defined strictly duration, without any considerations, and without end." That is the meaning of it.

Another author says it is a noun of that kind which, in its own nature, denotes collection and a multitude of things. He then refers to quite a number of authors. I commence to read again, at another section: "We have already seen that the proper signification of *aion* is that which always exists, etc. It is a law of language that a word may be used figuratively to mean less than its literal meaning, but never to mean more than is contained within the periphery of the circle of its literal meaning." A word may be used figuratively to include any part of the literal meaning, but can never transcend the outer limit of the literal signification. But it often occurs in law, poetry, or fiction. When the author desires to express his thoughts by way of hyperbole, he heightens every circumstance to the highest possible degree, making it appear above its real meaning. He chooses the strongest words, that mean more than he could express by any other means, and so uses them in this way to accomplish his object. Every rhetorician knows this. McIntosh says that "the first, or primary and literal meaning of a word, is the widest or most extensive signification the word can have." The second, or figurative sense, can not transcend the literal, and must always be kept within the limits of the literal sense. *[Time expired.]*

*Continued on p. 343*

[MR. CARLTON'S EIGHTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

We arise to examine the speech which you have just heard. We are first told that Jesus did not condemn the doctrine of the Pharisees. In establishing the fact which we claimed, we read Matthew xvi, 6-12: "Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. And they reasoned among themselves, saying, It is because we have taken no bread. Which when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have brought no bread? Do ye not yet understand, neither remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? Neither the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? How is it that ye do not understand that I spake it not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." Jesus warns his disciples to beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees; that is, of the doctrine of annihilation and of endless punishment. These were the two doctrines that they taught. That will do pretty well. Ask yourselves the question, while we are right here: If Jesus and his apostles taught the same doctrine the Pharisees did, why did they persecute them unto death? Can you answer? Would not they have joined in with them as evangelical brethren, and gone along together.

The next point is on Hebrews ix, 27. It does not denote the death of the high priest, because the high priest did not die. So Paul says, in the first of the

tenth chapter, that it was not the very image of the thing itself. He provided for that. If the priest had literally died and risen, it would not have been a figure, but the substance. But he represented in a figure, by the beast's dying, and the priest taking the blood, and going in, and sprinkling the mercy-seat. There was a figure. Now, Jesus offers himself as the high priest offered the blood of the beast. He offers his own body, and ascends into heaven itself, to appear in the presence of God for us. They appeared in the figurative presence; Jesus in the literal presence, in heaven itself. But the brother says there is a difficulty in understanding the passage, because the apostle says the high priest died once a year, and he would have suffered often. But the apostle says he hath appeared once in the end of the world to put away sin. It only makes it plainer and still plainer, as having no reference to literal death. But then he says, it is the term that means man. But there is a qualifying word—as it is appointed unto *tous anthropos*, unto the man that made the offering, the priest, so Christ was once offered, and the second time he was to appear unto salvation. I think it is very clear.

In regard to all that has been said on the subject of the second coming of Christ, or any other coming, there is an endless diversity of opinion among other denominations, as well as my brother's, which is not regarded as evangelical, as well as my own. We are not going to stop to speak on that. It is not on the subject. But we urge him to speak on that which the people have come to hear, and having approached it, we propose to examine and comment on what he presents in favor of endless punishment. He bases it on one of the pillars where it must rest, on the meaning of the term applied to punishment, and on the word applied as the name of the place, *gehenna*.

He perceives this. These are the only points at issue. What is the meaning of the word *aion*? He says it signifies endless. Why? Because the word is formed from *aei*, always, and *on*, which signifies being. The word *aei* occurs in the following instances: Mark xv, 8, "As he had ever done unto them." That is, as he had endlessly done unto them? Not quite. Acts vi, 51: "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost." Had they been endlessly resisting the Holy Ghost? I think not. 2 Corinthians vi, 10: "As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing." Had they been endlessly rejoicing? 2 Corinthians iv, 11: "We which live are always delivered unto death." Were they endlessly delivered unto death, or delivered to endless death? Hebrews iii, 10: "They do always err in their heart." Did they do so endlessly?

Not in one instance in which the word occurs in the Scriptures has it the signification of endless duration. In every instance it means ever, not always. Having noticed that now in regard to the meaning of *aei*, we turn to examine the definition of the term by a lexicographer, and, in connection with that, the Scriptural usage which he says, corresponds with the scientific definition of *Aion*, *Aionos*, *Aionios*, *Aionon*, and *Aionion*.

Donegan: *Aion*, time, a space of time; lifetime; the ordinary period of man's life; the age of man, man's estate; a long period of time, eternity.

Schrevelius, English Edition: *Aion*, an age, a period of time, indefinite duration, time whether longer or shorter; past, present or future.

Schleusner, English Edition: *Aion*, any space of time, whether longer or shorter; past, present or future, to be determined by the persons or things spoken of, and the scope of the subjects; the life or age of man; any space in which we measure human life from birth to death.

Packhurst: *Aion* denotes duration of time, but with great variety.

Bishop Pearce: An age, in the proper meaning of *Aion*.

Alexander Campbell: The radical idea of *Aion*, is indefinite duration.

Dr. Macknight says: These words, *Aion* and *Aionion*, being ambiguous, are always to be understood according to the nature and circumstance of the things to which they are applied. I must be so candid as to acknowledge that the use of these terms, forever, eternal, and everlasting, in other passages of Scripture, shows that they who understand these words in a limited sense, when applied to punishment, put no forced interpretation upon them.

Dr. Watts, says: *Aion* does not mean endless when applied to punishment.

Bible use of these words: John ix, 32, Since the world began, *ek ton Aionon*. Romans xvi, 25, Which was kept secret since the world began, *Aionios*. Matthew xxiv, 3, 13, 39 and 40, *Sunteleia tou Aionos*, end of eternity. Plural use of the word. 1 Corinthians ii, 7, The hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world began, *pro tou Aionion*. Ephesians iii, 9, The mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, *Apotin Aionion*. 1 Corinthians x, 11, Now, all these things happened unto them for ensamples, and they are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come, *ton Aionion*. Hebrews ix, 26, But now, once in the end of the world, *Sunteleia tou Aionion*, hath he appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself, ends of the ages.

Did Christ come once in the ends of the eternities? Eighteen hundred years ago that time was.

Well if these terms do not denote eternity, what do they mean? Indefinite duration, says Mr. Campbell;

terms that are ambiguous, says Mr. Schleusner and Dr. Macknight. Dr. Watts, who believed in endless punishment himself, says the word does not mean endless when applied to punishment; and Dr. Macknight says those who understand them so, do not put any forced interpretation upon them. Where is your evidence of endless punishment based on the word *aionios*? In plain terms, you have not got any. Words that are indefinite, and words that are ambiguous to be relied on to denote the strict eternity of future punishment! Yes, yes! All over the breadth of the land your speaker is called a heretic and denied the Christian name, because he will not swallow down that heathen doctrine. I am not ashamed of my doctrine, and stand before the people, as Paul did, to declare, after the manner which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers.

What was it in regard to this end to be, this plural here? These things happened unto them for ensamples upon whom the ends of the ages are come. The ends of what ages? The latter end of the Jewish dispensation, and the first part of the Christian dispensation. Jesus hath appeared once in the end of the ages? The closing end of the Jewish age, and the first end of the Christian age. If we do understand that—we must try before we understand that—we have got to shake out the last relic of Paganism we have in the Christian Church. It is going fast, and I thank God for it; I thank God, and take courage, that this Paganism is being shaken out. God promised anciently that he would shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place. The truth of God will remain. These dogmas that were borrowed by the Jews from Pagans, have got to be shaken out. They are going. Where is the doctrine of infant damnation, of total depravity, and a thousand others that crept into the Church, and have



eclipsed the beauty and glory of the truth? They are dying out. So with this doctrine of endless punishment. It has got to go with the rest, and I am the last one that will mourn.

But, then, Aristotle understood the Greek, and Aristotle says *aion* means a period beyond which there is neither space nor time; beyond which there is nothing. Aristotle used the word in that signification; then why did he attach the word *aidios* to it in his writings? That is only adding one word to another to multiply the same thing; for *aidios* is derived from *ai*, and has the force of it only. It is only repeating, like forever and ever. We find a passage in the *De Mundo* of Aristotle, "*Ex aionos atermonos eis cteron aiona.*" What does he use *atermonos* for? Why does he try to add something to this term, if he thought it denoted endless duration itself? When he expresses the idea of from one interminable *aion* to another interminable *aion*, he gets a word to add force to the word *aion*, and add a meaning which it did not have itself. Aristotle employs the word, just like the other Greeks, in an ambiguous sense, and leaves all its significations to be understood by the thing to which it is applied. A strained effort to make it appear that the Greeks themselves used it to denote endless duration, it will not answer. Not only that, but the Greeks, when they came into the Church, and the early fathers in the Church, all speak of eternal punishment and eternal destruction. Such as Irenæus, Ignatius, and Origen use the words everlasting punishment and everlasting destruction, but not one of them believed in endless misery. It is very evident that Irenæus believed in the annihilation of the wicked, and Origen believed in universal salvation, and they both speak of eternal punishment and eternal destruction, but neither of them believed in endless punishment.

It may be sufficient for us to remark here, in conclusion, that these words can not be relied upon, as we have already seen, to prove the eternity of any thing. I am asked sometimes: "Mr. Carlton, if you can not admit that *aion* and *aionios* denote endless when applied to punishment, how would you express the idea of endless duration at all? It is applied to God." So it is; but do we get the idea that God is interminable in his existence because that word is applied to him? If we had no stronger term than that, we would not believe that God would exist always. We have other terms, for example, *athanasia*, deathlessness. There is where we get the idea that God always lives and always exists. And having that fact established, we may use a word that is ambiguous, and apply it to him to express that very idea, but that adjective does not convey that force in and of itself.

I am sometime asked if I believe in endless life in the future. Yes; but not because that word is applied to it. *Akatalutos* is applied to life—an indestructible life. The word incorruptible, or incorruption, *aphtharton*, is applied to life and happiness, but never to punishment. We have terms enough to denote the endless existence of God, and of life and happiness, without using these indefinite, ambiguous words; but these indefinite, ambiguous words are the only ones applied to punishment. There is no word that denotes strict endless duration, that is ever applied to the punishment of any body in the Holy Scriptures. I am aware that this presents a different aspect of the case from what many of you anticipated when you came here. But I am a believer in discussions. He, however, tells you I have had a great many debates. I am willing to spend and be spent, and I feel my physical strength is sometimes nearly gone. Let it go. By and by mortality shall be swallowed up of life, and the greatest

blessing I think I can do to mankind on the earth, is to unfold the unsearchable riches of Christ, and the deathless love of our heavenly Father; to teach the world that we have one Father; that there is one God and Father of all, who is over all, and in all, and with all a perfect parent's affection he has brought us into existence, every-where caring for us; that he is a God to all. His tender mercies are over all his works; that he is without variableness or shadow of turning; that not only through the lapse of ages to come to us here, but in that endless future that awaits us, the same loving, tender Father will reign over us, and his tender mercies will be over all his works. [*Time expired.*]

Friday Evening, 7 o'clock.

Opened with prayer.

[MR. MOORE'S NINTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

Bro. Carlton says that Jesus did not indorse the doctrine of the Pharisees, and to establish this he reads Matthew xvi, 6-12, just as though I had said he did indorse the doctrine of the Pharisees in that general sense. I never hinted that. I have said that he indorsed the sentiment of the Pharisees touching the resurrection of the dead, of the existence of angel and spirit, and a future state of rewards and punishments. I told you this was the case, and called your attention to Luke xvi, Matthew xiii, and a variety of other instances. The general doctrines of the Pharisees and Sadducees the Savior condemned in this sixteenth of Luke, and he did not, and could not, indorse them; but among the things he condemns are

included what he had before commended, else he would be involved in a contradiction.

Hebrews ix, 26-28. He refers to this, but tries to avoid the fact that there was to be a literal death of the men. Did you ever hear of a literal fact occurring on one side, and a figurative something as antithesis? "It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment;" so Christ suffered once. "He suffered," is a literal fact. I inquire whether you can conceive such an anomaly as that the death of the men is figurative, and not literal? If you will furnish a well-marked case of this kind in any language, I would like to read it. It is simply a monstrosity and an absurdity, and only shows the subterfuges that drowning men will lay hold of. This is all I shall have to say of his last speech, except what will come up immediately in the prosecution of the argument that I desire to conclude in this speech.

I had read, as you will remember, the definition of the word *aion* and *aiontos*, as given by Aristotle, as noted by the author of the *Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge*, in the article "*Aion*," page 45. I had read this, and made some observations, a part of which, for the sake of connection, I will soon repeat. First, The primary or literal meaning of a word is the widest and most extensive signification the word, or any word, can have. Second, The figurative sense can not transcend the literal, and must always be kept within the limits of the literal. Third, *Aion* and its derivatives express duration. This word, and its kindred word, *aidios*, which is a word of the same origin, and belonging to the same family, with the word *akatalutos*, are the only ones whose primary and proper meaning is duration. Indeed, I may say the latter has reference to duration, and to duration only. Some other words include the idea of dura-

tion, but they do so only by implication, and not etymologically. I will name these presently. I will name the first now. *Akatalutos* is composed of *a*, which means not, and *katalutos*, dissoluble, meaning indissoluble; and only by implication does it relate to duration at all. We infer from it that if a thing be indissoluble it is endless. You observe that it is an inference; it is not etymologically in the word, but is implied from its real meaning. I read from the only place that it occurs in the New Testament Scriptures, Hebrews vii, 16: "Who is made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." Here you have *akatalutos* translated endless. In the word indissoluble you have the same idea; it is indissoluble, and therefore immortal. Another reason which justifies this definition is in Hebrews vii, 17. It is said: "Thou art a priest forever (*aionios*), after the order of Melchisedec." In the preceding verse the word *akatalutos* is applied to this priest, and hence *akatalutos* and *aionos* include the same ideas, both meaning endless. We have thus good authority for saying *aionios* means endless.

In connection with this I read the word *aphtharsia*. It occurs eight times in the New Testament, and means incorrupt, hence endless. Its duration depends upon the peculiar qualities it possesses, and hence by implication, and not by etymology, it includes the idea of duration. Third, *Aphtharton* occurs seven times. It means, literally, incorruptible; hence, only includes the idea of duration by implication. Fourth, *Aperantois* once only, in 1 Timothy i, 4, translated endless—endless genealogies. Fifth, *Amaranton*, which occurs in 1 Peter i, 4. It means unfading, in the first place, and is translated, "that fadeth not away," and is applied to the inheritance reserved in heaven, a passage that we have examined

before. Duration without end is granted in all these words, but they do not include the idea etymologically. *Aion* and *aionios*, and the kindred word *aidios*, are the only words that signify, etymologically, duration, either definite or indefinite, limited or unlimited. The words signifying immortal and incorruptible are no more expressive of duration than those other words that mean, literally, eternity and eternal. If the former imply it, the others express it. True, *aion*, the noun, and *aionios*, the adjective, are sometimes used to express a portion of duration, a limited period, but this fact by no means affects the literal and primary meaning of the words. On the contrary, the fact that they are used in law and poetry in a limited sense, proves that the literal meaning is very strong. Poetry is the language of passion; such, for instance, in the passions hope, fear, desire, joy, as well as all the other passions woven by the poet, are presented in the strongest words, and hence the hyperbole abounds in poetic descriptions; that is, words having a much stronger meaning than would be literally true, are used by the poet, and used in such a way that there is no limitation made in meaning. So in a particular place it heightens every circumstance connected with the object, and gives the highest idea of it. For example, David said: "I am a worm, and no man." The word is used figuratively, and applied to the man for the sake of reaching the lowest possible point. David did not intend to use that literally. No one is deceived by it. Again, Jeremiah said that "All nations before God are nothing; yea, less than nothing, and vanity." This, we know, is used only in the bold language of poetry. I might give more examples in illustration, but these may suffice.

In connection with one or two passages that are frequently brought forward in support of the idea

that the words are used only in the limited sense. I have now admitted all my brother claimed in the passages referred to, that they were used in the limited sense. But it does not follow that they were used in the literal sense. They were used in the figurative sense, in the language of law, poetry, type; and when used by the writer for the sake of heightening the circumstances, exalting the literal idea, he uses the strongest words. One of the prophets speaks of the everlasting hills, everlasting mountains, etc. In Habakkuk iii, 3-6: "God came from Teman, and the Holy One from mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. And his brightness was as the light; he had horns coming out of his hand: and there was the hiding of his power. Before him went the pestilence, and burning coals went forth at his feet. He stood, and measured the earth: he beheld, and drove asunder the nations: and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow: his ways are everlasting." Canaan was given to Israel for an everlasting possession. So you, in your deeds of conveyance, warrant and defend the real estate "forever" against all other claims. It is so used because it expresses the greatest extent of duration that you can give your right to another. So Canaan was given to Abraham for an "everlasting possession." God warranted and defended it to Israel, and their descendants, on the conditions on which it was bestowed; and he used the word everlasting to give strength to the document that gives them the right to the earthly Palestine. Who would, however, insist that because the word here, in the language of poetry, or the hyperbola of law, communicates the idea of limited duration, it must therefore be limited in its literal signification? Jonah ii, 6: "I went down to the bottoms of the mountains:

the earth with her bars was about me forever." This, Bro. Carlton has referred to two or three times, to show that everlasting means but a short time. What is the meaning here? Jonah thought himself confined in hell or hades. In this belief he said, in the strong language of the poet: "I am cast out of thy sight: I went down to the bottoms of the mountains; the earth with her bars was about me forever." Suppose a person should be cast from a ship into the sea, with no prospect of deliverance, could be brought to express his feelings, would it not be natural for him to give utterance to his feelings in strong language, in a manner like this: "I am undone! I am cut off from the earth forever! I sink down! I sink down forever and forever!" Suppose, now, that in three days some strange vessel should pick the man up, and save him, would it show the wisdom of any one to insist that the English word forever, used as in this case, meant, literally but three days, because the man was saved within that time? that this was its literal import, when it was only the language of a drowning man, when his passions were aroused to the highest degree? What would you call such a critic? We do not determine the literal and primary meaning of a word by an appeal to the language of passion, type, or law. The fact that *elohim*, the Hebrew corresponding to the Greek *aiónios* and the English everlasting, was sometimes used in a limited sense, by no means establishes the fact that this limited sense is the natural and literal signification of the word. The mere tyro would know better, and would see, in these expressions, a figurative use of the word. Its being so used, shows that it is a word of great strength; its literal meaning spreading out far beyond the hyperbola. See its literal use in Genesis xxi, 33: "And Abraham planted a grove in Beer-sheba, and called there on the name of the Lord, the

everlasting God." Deuteronomy xxiii, 27: "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." Psalms xxiv, 7: "Be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors." Proverbs x, 25: "The righteous is an everlasting foundation." Daniel iv, 3: "His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom." In all of these you will perceive that it is impossible for the word to mean less than everlasting, or endless duration. The "everlasting doors" means the endless doors; the everlasting arms, the powerful arms of God; the everlasting God needs not a definition.

I noticed before that it is sometimes duplicated, and it was asked whether there were a plurality of eternities. If *aion* means one eternity, the plural means more than one. In the ordinary use of words for the purpose of intensifying the idea, we sometimes double words. For instance, "forever and ever." Ever is duplicated. The word ever embraces all the period of eternity itself, while forever and ever intensifies the first, and is equivalent to "forever, even forever." The duplicate form of the word is used to intensify. This form is never found in the Scriptures in a limited sense. Let me repeat this, my brother: This form is never found in the Scriptures in a limited sense. Isaiah xxxv, 10: "The ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads," "*cis tous aionios Toon aconon,*" literally, unto the ages of the ages. The endless ages is used in Gal. i, 5: "To whom be glory forever and ever." I Peter iv, 11: "To whom be praise and dominion forever and ever." Also, I Peter v, 11: "To whom be glory and dominion forever and ever." Romans: "Swear by him that liveth forever and ever." Philip: "Now unto God our Father be glory forever and ever." I Tim. i, 17: "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever." Rev. iv, 9: "To him that

sat on the throne, who liveth forever and ever." 2 Tim. iv, 18: "And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom, to whom be glory forever and ever." Heb. xii, 21: "To whom be glory forever and ever." Rev. i, 6, and 18: "To him be glory and dominion forever and ever." "I am alive for evermore." Rev. v, 13, and 14: "Blessing, and honor, and glory, be unto him that sitteth on the throne and unto the Lamb forever and ever." Rev. xxii, 5: "And they shall reign forever and ever," referring to the reign of the saints as the final condition. This phrase occurs fourteen times in the New Testament, twelve times it means endless duration, as must be admitted. Now, by what rule can the other two places be admitted to mean less than endless duration? Suppose in a correspondence you find a word twelve times meaning the same thing, how would you conclude that in the remaining two instances where it occurred, it means something entirely different, and that, too, without any intimation by the author that he had changed the signification of the word? Would you not hold him responsible for the uniform meaning? You certainly would, unless he should communicate a change of meaning. In neither of these passages is there a new definition, and nothing in the association to suggest the meaning, and hence we are left with the uniform meaning of endless. This must be conceded unless it is claimed that adjectives have no fixed meaning. Does the noun give meaning to the adjective? Has it no meaning till associated with the noun? He should know that all words whether adjectives, nouns, verbs, adverbs, or any other parts of speech, must have their own separable and abstract meaning; hence, when we use a given word it is because it contains the idea that we wish to communicate; and this being true, the adjective, when applied to the noun, contains in itself a meaning that

expresses the quality we desire to express. To illustrate. I say here lies an apple. You have the idea of the thing, the name of which is apple. That name you call a noun. There is no quality expressed; but evidently it has a quality. If you can get it without the adjective I hope you will do it. Because if adjectives have no meaning except what they borrow from the noun, then you have the meaning in the noun itself without the adjective. But this you see is not the case. How shall I express the quality? I must do it by some other word, for in the thing, apple, there are many qualities. I might say, large, small, sweet, sour. Take the word sweet as an illustration. Does that word not have an abstract meaning of its own, whether applied to a noun or not? And just as much when not applied as when it is? Hence, when you find a quality in a noun, you select that adjective which in its own nature, meaning the idea of the quality in the noun, is contained, and apply that adjective for the purpose of expressing the quality not expressed by the noun. I am sure there is no possibility of avoiding these facts. They being true, allow me now to insist that when everlasting is applied to God, since it does not borrow its meaning from the noun, God, but has its own abstract meaning, and that meaning has reference to duration; and since in God there is found to be this quality of endless duration; that word is placed upon that noun to express that quality, because it is the adjective which does etymologically express it. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. CARLTON'S NINTH SPEECH.]

*Brother Moderators, and Friendly Hearers:*

Bro. Moore says he is surprised that I came forward here and stated that Jesus condemned the doctrine of the Pharisees. He concedes that the Pharisees taught the doctrine of endless punishment, and that Jesus in the sixteenth chapter of Matthew warned his disciples to beware of their doctrine; and then it is necessary for him to make it appear that Jesus indorsed the doctrine of the Pharisees on the subject of the resurrection. Let him produce the proof. I deny it. When Jesus taught his doctrine of the resurrection, the Pharisees were astonished at his doctrine.

Hebrews ix, 27. Did you ever hear of a literal death being brought in contrast with a figurative one on the other side? I scarcely ever heard it used any other way; did you? Well, now, the apostle, in presenting the case in Hebrews ix and x, presents the offerings under the law, and compares them with the offering by Jesus Christ. Well, we all know that. One offering was the offering of the blood of the beast, and the other, of the blood of Jesus Christ. All know that one offering was made by the high priest, and the other by Jesus Christ; and that the apostle says that they entered in with the blood of others, but Jesus Christ entered in with his own blood. Now what was it that literally died? The animal slain. Who represented the death, and the life after death? The priests. Who made the atonement? "But as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment, so Christ died." So, that is, they were alike. Can not every one see that they were both sacrificial? Call them what you please.

The death that preceded was sacrificial or the death of Jesus was not so. As the one, so the other.

He will answer all my arguments in the course of his speech, and then proceeds with a list of these words to make us understand that God possesses an endless existence, and that life is absolutely indestructible, and imperishable, and deathless; and then proceeds with these terms *aion*, *aionios*, and claims they are endless because they are applied to those things that we know are endless. Well, then, these words are limited, because they are applied to things that we know are limited. I propose to spend a little time upon the use of these terms. I have given you the best authorities in the world in regard to the use of these terms, together with an examination of the Scripture use of the terms. With that I am satisfied to rest the case with you and the world.

Now we come to Jonah. He says he went down to the depths of the earth. "It is not to be wondered at that Jonah said, I am dead," when he was thrown into the sea; but he did not say so then, unfortunately for my brother. This is the report he made after he came out, Jonah ii, 5: "The waters compassed me about, even to the soul: the depth closed me round about, the weeds were wrapped about my head. I went down to the bottoms of the mountains; the earth with her bars was about me forever." So he reported after he came out. That puts a different face on the whole matter. That spoils the whole story. So much for that about Jonah being scared, and thinking it was endless when he went in there.

After the labor of half an hour we come to this, that the quality in no sense inheres in the noun, but is conveyed by the adjective that is used to express it; and here we find *eis tous aionos*, *ton aionon* used fourteen times in the Scriptures. Twelve times, we

are told, it is applied to things that are endless; why not the other two times, when the same language is used the other two times? That is a point we are glad the brother made, and thank him for it. Now, suppose I travel about the world some, and when I come back, tell the people about the great ocean, the Pacific, the great continent of America that I have crossed on an iron rail from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I speak of this great continent; you get the idea of the great ocean and the great continent. And I get to telling the children about the great orange I found in the tropics; a great orange. Now why does not the word great have the same extent when applied to the orange as to the continent; and who would not understand that the orange is not so great as the world? Well, then, the boys have seen these little ants, and I get to telling them about the great ants I saw somewhere. Then they have to understand that the ant is as large as the Pacific Ocean, because the whole power of description is in the adjective and not in the noun. I tell you this is nothing but gammon.

He does not believe God is endless in existence because this adjective is applied to him. We learn first of the endless and imperishable, or deathless nature of God's existence, and then we may apply any word, no matter how limited, to express the quality which exists in God. I design to spend but little time on this subject, in consequence of the fact that we have disposed of it.

The other point on which the issue rests has not come up, and the brother has no time to introduce any new matter. So the time for construing *gehenna*, on his part, has passed, only so far as I choose to introduce it. On this subject the rule of all discussions forbids the introduction of new matter in the last two speeches, and he has let it pass without an argument

on *gehenna*. If he will not take hold of that, I want you to understand that I will. I will take hold of it now, because I can not notice it in the last, only in reply to what he may say in his next in reply to mine.

Now the question comes up, What does *gehenna* mean—the word on which he depends to prove endless punishment—the word that is taken to denote the place where the wicked are to be endlessly punished? It is, as all scholars know, from two Hebrew words, *gee*, valley, and *hinnom*, the name of a man. It was a valley, as we may find described in Joshua xv, 8; 2 Kings xxiii, 10; 2 Chronicles xxviii, 3. We might refer to a multitude of other passages to show the literal signification of this language, *gee hinnom*, or *Gee Ben Hinnom*, which signifies the valley of the son of Hinnom. In the first place, sacrifices were offered to an idol god, and the Jews were corrupted by heathen practices, and offered their children there in sacrifice. To drown the cries of the burning infants, and of the mothers while those children were burning to death in the arms of this great idol, while the fire was kept up below, they kept up a perpetual beating of drums, and the place was called the valley of Tophet, and the prophet said: "It shall be called the valley of slaughter, for they should slay in that valley till there should be no more place to bury." See appendix to the *Emphatic Diaglott*: "In this place were cast all kinds of filth, with the carcasses of beasts, and the unburied bodies of criminals who had been executed. Continual fires were kept to consume these. Sennacherib's army of one hundred and eighty-five thousand men were slain here in one night. Here children were also burnt to death in sacrifice to Moloch."

This was the literal fact in regard to the original meaning of *Gee Hinnom*. The Greek word *gehenna*

Schleusner on gehenna

is simply Greekifying the words *Gee Hinnom*, for it is no translation of any thing; it is only the Greek form of these two words, and stands for the translation of *Gee Hinnom*. Now it is claimed that *gehenna* became used in a different, or figurative, sense, in addition to this literal signification. The valley was near Jerusalem, on the south-east side. Concerning this place, Schleusner, the learned German lexicographer, says: "Hence it came that any severe punishment, and particularly an ignominious and disgraceful death, was called by the name of *gehenna*." Hence the question comes—for it is the only one that is relevant in seeking the signification of the word, and in order to enable us to understand how we are justified in receiving the word to-day as it occurs in the New Testament Scriptures—Was *gehenna* used in the time of Christ's personal ministry to represent endless punishment? Was it used as the name of the place of endless punishment? I propose to examine some points in regard to this matter. I do it for this reason—that it is claimed that Jesus Christ used the word *gehenna*; that it was used before, and that Jesus, using the word without explanation, they would naturally be deceived in understanding him to use it in the sense in which they employed it, unless he gave them a reason to understand that he used it in a different sense. Now, every one will admit that this is fair and candid. Now, can it be proved that any person used it in that age of the world to mean endless punishment? We propose to examine some authors, and see what the fathers say. The Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, which was made between two hundred and fifty and one hundred and fifty years before Christ, uses the word only in its literal sense, as the name of the valley south of Jerusalem. This is proof that up to one hundred and fifty years before Christ, it had not lost



its literal, etymological meaning. The Apocrypha, the spurious books written by the Egyptian Jews between the time of the last canonical writings and the advent of the world's Redeemer, the apocryphal books, appeared one hundred and fifty years before Christ. The Wisdom of Solomon, the second book of Maccabees, neither of them contain the word *gehenna*. They never used this word to designate the place of torments, or describe the character of them.

Philo Judeus lived and wrote at the very time of the Savior. He was an Egyptian Jew of the sect of the Pharisees, a believer in punishment after death. He frequently introduces the subject, but never calls it *gehenna*.

Now we come to Josephus, from seventy to one hundred years after Christ. Josephus wrote immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem. He never uses this word to express the miseries of the damned. We will remark that from one to two hundred years from the time of Josephus we have no Jewish writings whatever. This was the period which followed the destruction of their city and nation. Then where do we find the first author that uses the term to denote endless punishment? I refer you to the *Targum* of Jonathan Ben Uzzeel, and it was not written till two hundred years after Christ, and therefore is no proof at all, and can not come within the province of testimony to cover the time when Jesus Christ spake. Now, where have we got the proof that we are authorized to receive the word *gehenna* to denote a place of endless punishment? I stand here where I stood in the commencement of the discussion, and where I have stood a long time, knowing there is no evidence that the term comes to us with any authority as the name of a place of endless punishment, or was so in use at the time of Jesus Christ's ministry, employed by any person, Jew or Gentile, to denote a place of endless

punishment. Jesus never hinted that he used it to denote a place of endless punishment. Why should any body thus understand it to express a place of endless punishment? Is there any authority? If there is, pray let us have it. I have been utterly unable, in all my life, to find a particle of evidence that this word is used by divine authority to express a place of endless punishment. I do not, hence, believe it is.

Having noticed the facts, then, in regard to the meaning of the terms used to denote the duration of punishment, that they are ambiguous and limited, and to be understood by the nature of the thing to which they are applied, and that they do not of themselves denote endless duration, and that *gehenna* did not denote a place of endless punishment in the time of Christ, and not till two hundred years afterward, I now make another inquiry, that is, as the term *aionios* is ambiguous, and is to be understood by the nature of the things to which it is applied, and the circumstances under which it is used, is there any thing in the term punishment, the thing itself, that makes that necessarily interminable? If there is, an indefinite adjective may be used to express the idea. I will concede that. Then what does the word punishment mean? It means the infliction of the penalty upon violated law upon the transgressor, by the power to which he is amenable. Well, what idea would we get from the nature of punishment endless in its duration? Let us look at the object of punishment, that it is to promote the benefit of the punished; and the Scriptures teach that God punishes for our profit. It is clearly taught that the punishment is limited, and not unlimited. What is the word that is chosen to prove the endlessness of punishment? "These shall go into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." Everlasting, *aionion*, *kolasin*. The latter is from the Greek

*kolazo*, to prune, to restrain, to chastise. The word *kolasin* literally means a cutting off. Then, if we take it in its literal signification: these shall go away into *aionion*, an age-lasting cutting off; or, still more literally, cutting off to the age. What was the cutting off of the age? And who were the persons here that were exposed to this cutting off? If we take pains to examine the Scriptures in regard to the teaching of the Scriptures on the subject of the people being cut off and banished, and all this, we will find who they are. Turn to Romans xi. The apostle here inquires: "Hath God cast away his people?" He was talking about the Jews. "God forbid." "I also am an Israelite;" feeling a personal interest in regard to his relatives in the flesh. Have they been cut off? Is that the last of them? God forbid. What then? Blindness in part hath happened unto Israel. What, an endless partial blindness? No! It hath happened until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in. Then they are cut off for a time. Here are branches growing on the good olive-tree. The branches were cut off because they were unproductive. Here is the cutting off. Because of unbelief, they were cut off, or broken off. What next? They were broken off, that the wild olive branches might be grafted in. Here the wild olive branches were being grafted in, and were bearing tame olives. You know if you take a scion, and graft it, it will bear according to the scion. But here was something unnatural: the wild branch bearing tame olives. The Jews were thus cut off. How long were they to remain cut off? Until all the Gentiles were grafted into the tree to bear sweet olives. Remember, it was an everlasting cutting off. Were they to remain cut off always? Do not boast, you wild olive branches, because you do not bear the trunk; the trunk bears you. Do not boast because of this. Re-

member they were cut off because of unbelief. These branches were broken off; they are not burned up. They shall be grafted in, because God is able to graft them in again. Will he do it? That is the question. Here is a contingency, the brother says. Let us see. It is written: "And so all Israel shall be saved: for it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, who shall turn our ungodliness from Jacob." - Then all the Israelites shall have been brought in, and all the Israelites shall be restored; and no wonder the apostle, when he beheld the universality of divine grace, and its infallibility to the end secured, and the purpose of God fulfilled, and the mission of Christ accomplished, that he had gone out into the ocean of God's grace, boundless mercy and grace, and could not see shore or touch bottom, he broke forth: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! Who has had any thing to do with this? Has any person instructed God? or performed this work for him, of bringing mankind, Jews and Gentiles, back to God? Not any one. How is it, then? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen!" That is the way Paul winds up the matter about the restoration of these persons from this everlasting cutting off. That comes as far from proving endless punishment as any thing we have had since he began.

I propose to notice some of the beauty of this pagan doctrine of endless punishment. Tertullian, a presbyter of Carthage, in Africa, in the third century of the Christian church, first proclaimed the doctrine of endless punishment. [*Time expired.*]

## [MR. MOORE'S TENTH SPEECH.]

*Messrs. Moderators, and Christian Friends:*

I believe that every thing that has been presented in the last speech has been considered before. My brother is mistaken in regard to the subject of *gehenna* not being noticed. It was noticed yesterday. He had not replied to it, and I suppose that is the reason he had forgotten it. The special point made in my argument has not been noticed yet; the point was that the punishment of the wicked in *gehenna* was after death. That was the argument, and the evidences were submitted, and stand unconsidered and untouched; and I prophesy that they will so stand until the end of time.

The word *Kolasin* occurs twice in the New Testament: once in Matthew xxv, 46, and once in I John iv, 18, in the last place translated "torment," one of the strongest words in the English language to express punishment. He concedes here that the word *kolasis* literally means cutting off; and he concedes another fact, that without good reason, we should not receive it in any other than the natural and ordinary meaning of the word. There is no reason why we should receive any other meaning of *kolasis* than cutting off. You go into your orchard; you cut those branches off which are useless. They are dead, and never bear fruit; they molder into dust again. It is endless cutting off. They are never united again. That is precisely the meaning of the word. I referred him to it yesterday, but he did not then come to it. He now tells you precisely what I told you, that it means cutting off; and it is a cutting off endlessly, because whenever you cut off a branch, there is no uniting it again. Is there any getting it united to the parent stem? is there any fruit to be gathered

from the branch cut off? Why did you cut it off? Because it was an incumbrance; it was worthless; it was an injury to the tree; and for the sake of your orchard, and for the sake of the fruit you hope to gather from the tree hereafter, you cut off the branch that is an incumbrance and an injury. Hence the wicked shall be "cut off," because they are useless in the divine government. To remove them to heaven would be a wrong and an injury. Heaven would be as bad a place, or worse than earth. It could not better the condition of men in the world here to transfer the bloated sot, with his reddened eyes and cheeks, and trembling limbs, from these mundane shores to the palace royal of the King eternal, immortal, and invisible, without reformation and without repentance. My brother does that; he makes death take them away from this world to the other, and transfers them from the temporal to the immortal state at the very time when the spirit leaves the earth body and enters the spirit body. That would be a cutting off with a vengeance! But is it not perfectly clear, that the wicked grow worse and worse? and, instead of having greater compunction of conscience, the apostle says they reach a point where they are past feeling, given over to hardness of heart and reprobacy of mind. When the man dies he is free from it all; because he immediately rises to immortal glory! This is a strange system. It offers a premium on sin and vice! It would be a mercy to take them out of the world, and transfer them to heaven; to put them out of this sorrowful world, Bro. Carlton, and transfer them as fast as possible to the immortal state, and great will be the reward of those who do it! [Laughter.]

The entire lecture we have had on the subject of *gehenna* is met in what we have hitherto said on that subject. I shall pass over it with a very few brief

observations. It is true the word was originally applied as he has stated. He has given a correct history of that word in regard to its origin. But we want the meaning in the days of Jesus. Two hundred years before the coming of the Savior, gehenna ceased to be a fact on earth; subsequently it became a symbol of every thing that was loathsome. He told you that, last night or this morning, it was not a literal reality, because it did not exist in the world. But the individual, after the body is killed, is to be destroyed in *gehenna*; that is, after he has gone into the unchanging state, then God destroys him, if he is a wicked man. So the apostle testifies in Matthew xvi, and the other apostles, as we have before cited.

He still insists, that the Savior condemned the doctrine of the Pharisees; but you observe how careful he was in not committing himself in regard to the subject of the resurrection. He does not say that the Savior denied or indorsed that doctrine; but merely that the Pharisees were astonished at his doctrine. That is true, because they saw how he had put the Sadducees to silence, and the Pharisees rejoiced in it. It does not say that the Pharisees were astonished, but that the multitude were astonished. Paul, however, claims that he was a Pharisee, and worshiped the God of his fathers according to the doctrine of the Pharisees touching that subject. He believed in the doctrine of the "resurrection—both of the just and the unjust." Precisely what my brother does not believe in, Paul did. He has given you, he says, the best authorities there are extant in regard to the meaning of the words *aion* and *aiouion*, and because he has given those authorities which do not militate against the argument I submitted, he refuses to follow the evidences which I have presented, and, with his peculiar capability, attempts to make the impression on this audience that the thing is demolished.

But I am satisfied that the intelligence of this audience will place a different estimate upon these mere assertions. He had much better take up the evidences and show that they are incorrect and false in their nature. The only thing he did call attention to was the use of the adjective. He referred to "the large orange and the large continent" to show that the meaning was in the noun. Did not the word large have the abstract meaning before it was used? If the meaning was in the noun why have an adjective? If the meaning is in the noun there is no use of the adjective to express it. We say "orange," we have expressed no quality at all; when we have said "continent" we have expressed no quality at all; we have given the simple name of the thing in each case. But if we want to express the quality, we look into the noun to see what the quality is, so as to describe it. For instance, if we find that it is large, we find in the list of adjectives a qualifying word which expresses the quality we find in the noun. We use it, not that the noun may give it its meaning, because it had the meaning before we place it on the noun. We find the noun has the quality we want to express by the adjective; and, so far as the word large is concerned, there is not an iota of difference in the meaning in the word in either case. So we set "sour," "black," "white," or any other adjective before the noun, either in the English, Greek, or any other language, because it contains the idea we want to express. I say that that man's hair is gray; "gray" is the quality in the noun, and can not be expressed without that word. The word "gray" does not receive its meaning from the noun, but it had that meaning before. And when I use the word everlasting, I apply it to God, because the word expresses a quality which God possesses. We have here the most extended sense of the word possible according to the rule, that the figurative

meaning must be within the limits of the circle of the literal; and, since the greatest possible meaning is endless, it is the literal. There is no evading it.

The fourteen times that the duplicate form of the phrase already read—in twelve of them there is no doubt as to the meaning, nor can there be any possibility of doubt. In one of the others it is applied to the reign of the righteous, and in such an association as to submit the idea of endlessness beyond a doubt. Read the entire twenty-first and twenty-second chapters of Revelation, and note the import of the fifth verse of the twenty-second chapter, that the "Saints shall reign with Christ forever and ever." That is to say, when Christ shall have triumphed over all his enemies—when he shall have decided the destinies of the universe, and consigned the wicked to their place, and his saints to the new heaven and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness; then they shall remain endlessly happy. We are left with the other only instance, but that refers to the torment of the wicked in the same association. I want to know what the principle of criticism shall be that will make it mean "endless" thirteen times beyond doubt, and something else the other time, unless it be to support the theory of some one without any evidence. My brother had better be anxious, and labor to succeed, or he will be like an old man in Lebanon, when some one was preaching the endless happiness of all men; he was about "two sheets in the wind;" the speaker was puzzled over it considerably, when the old fellow exclaimed: "Make it out if you can, if you can't I am a gone sucker!" [Laughter.]

I have scarcely time now to turn your attention back, and even to name, in their order, the arguments that I have adduced in support of the proposition under consideration: that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Jesus Christ shall suffer

endless punishment. These are the persons of whom I affirm. I adduced, as the first proof, John iii, 18, Mark iii, 29, Hebrews xi, 6, which express these facts: first, that the wicked are now condemned; that they shall be condemned; that they shall not see life; that they abide under the wrath of God; that they can not please God. This being true, the classes spoken of in these passages are condemned now, and prophetically, and absolutely; for you will remember that my brother placed great stress on "shall be blessed," when it was the promise made to Abraham. He insisted that it was absolute in that case. Well, if it is absolute in the one case, we have as much reason to affirm that it is absolute in the other. Then, with himself as witness, they shall be damned is a clear proposition that the individual who dies without belief in Jesus Christ, is unalterably doomed beyond the possibility of escape. They shall not enjoy life. Another positive form of expression, without any expressed condition or contingency. They shall not be able to please God; and in such condition as this, they must, from the necessity of the case, be endlessly punished, unless they are made happy, and taken to heaven, when they neither please God, nor can enjoy God, are under his wrath, are damned, and shall be damned positively and absolutely. A damned man, a condemned man, one that is under the wrath of God, one that can not please God, in heaven and happiness! If his position is correct, that must be.

The second argument is based on the statement made in 1 Peter iv, 7: What shall the end be of those that obey not the gospel of God? the word "end" being *telos*, meaning final. 2 Thessalonians vi, 10; also Romans vi, 20-22, in which he says: "The end of those things is death." Death means cutting off, as the word *kolasis*, in Hebrews vi, 7-8.

As the earth that received all the dressing that man could give it, and all the showers that God could pour upon it, and is not fruitful, is cast out; so likewise, the individual that has apostatized shall be cast out; and his end is to be burned. The end (*telos*) of the person or thing is final; but the end of the persons above mentioned is "death;" hence endless punishment, endless cutting off, as the branch from the tree.

The third argument was based on 2 Peter ii, 4-18, in which the apostle tells us of this class of persons, that they were cursed children, that can not cease from sin, and that they should utterly perish in their own corruption; that they were wells without water, and clouds driven by a tempest. Matthew xii, 31, 32. The individual guilty of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come. "This world" and "that world," as defined by Bro. Carlton, in regard to the resurrection of the dead, means this state of existence and that state of existence, or time and eternity; and there is no reason why it should mean any thing else, unless to accommodate him, and for the sake of his special theory. Mark says, they "have never forgiveness." If such are saved, they are saved without being forgiven; they are saved when they are cursed children; they are saved when they utterly perish; they are saved in impenitence! These things are impossible, as must be conceded by every right-minded man; and we are forced to the conclusion that they are punished endlessly.

We introduced, as a fourth argument, the law of antithesis, that they were equal in extent, but different in quality, as defined by Crabbe, in his book of synonyms; and that being true, we may expect to find in an antithesis that which is opposite in its nature, but equal in its extent. But I turn to the passages without repeating the evidences further than

I have done. Daniel xii, 2, 3: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." "The many," it is said by many of the best commentators, Dr. Adam Clarke among them, means the whole, or is equal to the entire family. Those that sleep in the dust of the earth shall rise, some to everlasting life, some to shame and everlasting contempt. All are raised, some to one condition, and some to the other. This has been answered by insisting that this was accomplished at the time when Jerusalem was destroyed, when the abomination of desolation stood in the holy place. But I ask, whether, in that instance, there was a resurrection of any body. He tells you it meant a resurrection from spiritual death to spiritual life. I would like to know how it is that, all of them being raised from spiritual death, some of them are raised to everlasting contempt? All are raised out of the graves of sin, and some of them are raised into everlasting contempt! Fie on such exegesis as this.

The next passage is in antithesis, for the everlasting life must be taken as the antithesis for everlasting shame and contempt. Shame and contempt are the opposite of life; everlasting is the equal of everlasting, and from the former reasoning these mean endless; *aionios*, from *aci*, always, and *on*, being, always being, that beyond which there is nothing—endless life, and endless shame and contempt. Also, John iii, 16: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Here perish and life are the opposite of each other, and the everlasting life is placed in contrast, or antithesis, with the perishing. The perishing must, consequently, while opposite in its nature, be equal in its extent. The logic I will not try to analyze further.

Revelation xiv, 10-13. Here we have a description of the wicked, the smoke of whose torment shall ascend forever and ever, and that of the patience of the saints; who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus; who rest from their labors, and their works do follow them. The condition of one is happiness, that of the other, misery. One is everlasting; the other must be taken in the same extent, therefore endless, because this is the meaning of the word.

John v, 28, 29. We have here a description of the fact of the resurrection of the dead. All that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. Here is the resurrection of two classes—one to one end, the other to another—different in their character and nature, and equal in their extent; and hence, if there is endless life for one, there is endless death for the other. Romans ii, 6-11—in which we have the contrast between those who seek for glory, honor, and immortality, who receive eternal life, and those who obey unrighteousness, who suffer indignation and wrath. The nature of the things is opposite, but the extent of them is equal. Revelations xx, 10—in which we have a description of the beast and the false prophet being tormented forever and ever. Revelations xxi, 8: "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." The end is opposite, and the extent equal. Revelations xxii, 14, 15. Those that keep his commandments might enter the gates of the city, and those that do not were without the city. The end was opposite, but the extent equal. The

time when these things are to occur (Revelations xxi, 1-5), when the Lord would come and bring the holy city from God out of heaven. The premises of Bro. Carlton accepted thankfully, I will hasten with the mere naming of what seems to be necessary in order to gather up the entire argument. Matt. xxv, 46: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." The punishment and life are taken as opposites, while the everlasting and eternal are in the same extent. Hence, if everlasting life means endless life, everlasting death must mean endless death. I have shown that the word everlasting, etymologically and primarily, means endless; therefore the wicked shall go away into endless punishment, but the righteous into endless life.

Argument fifth. The punishment of the wicked in *gehenna* is after death. I considered this argument at the beginning of my speech, and shall not repeat it now.

The next was that based on 2 Peter 3-7, and 9-14. The destruction of the earth at the coming of the Lord with his saints, and the destruction of the wicked, associated also with the resurrection of the dead, as presented by the Apostle Paul, 1 Corinthians xv, 57: "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ;" which enables us to exclaim: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" Also, Isaiah xxv, 6-12—a description of the same event, and wiping away all tears, applied to the resurrection by Bro. Carlton, in the former part of this discussion. Also, a description of the same in Revelations xxi, at the time when the Lord shall have come and executed the wicked, and cast them into the lake of fire and brimstone, making it certain, Bro. Carlton being the witness, that the twenty-fifth of Isaiah has reference to the immortal state, the endless condition of men.

Argument seventh was built on Luke xvi, 19-31, the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. I submitted that I was not anxious to claim it as a parable, or as a history. In either case it presented the fact that there was an impassable gulf between the good and the bad after death. He claimed it meant the Jew and the Gentile. I asked him who the five brethren were; I asked him about that impassable gulf between the Jew and the Gentile; but he has not answered, and I fancy he never will. Also, Matthew xiii, 47—the casting of the net into the sea. When full, the net was drawn to shore, and the good put into vessels, and the bad cast away—"so shall it be at the end of the world." We showed you that it had reference to the present period of human existence in this world, and at its conclusion the angels would be sent to sever the wicked, and cast them into the furnace of fire.

The eighth argument was founded on these facts: That there is to be a day of future general judgment—not only that it is future, but general—and every man and every woman be personally interested in it at the same time. The Scriptures I will not name in connection with this, for the purpose of forcing it further on your consideration, with the circumstances connected with the judgment, and simultaneous: First, The personal advent of Jesus Christ: "As you see him go into heaven, so shall you see him come again." "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all his holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory." "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works." First, That he was to come literally and personally—not in a figure—is settled as a fact, without mistake. Second, That at the time of his coming to raise the dead, for it is said that when he comes in the clouds

of heaven, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air. And again: "All that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

We have associated with this the fact, in the next place, that God will separate between the good and the bad. He accepts the good by saying, "Come;" and to the wicked he will say, "Depart." One goes into everlasting punishment; the other into life eternal. In connection with this, that he executes his judgments finally, delivering one class to hell, and taking the other to heaven.

We noted next the argument on the word *aion*, which I shall not repeat, having noticed it so recently. Hoping that it is not forgotten, I am prepared now to conclude this discussion with the very best of feeling toward all, and especially desire to tender my most hearty thanks to the people, and to the moderators, for the impartial manner in which they have presided from day to day, and session to session, over our deliberations and investigations, to the present hour; and my sincere and earnest, anxious and sincere desire is, that they themselves may have been benefited, and that the Lord God Almighty, who gave us being, may lead us all into the knowledge of the truth, and the enjoyment of the blessings of everlasting life! To this audience, for their patient hearing and candor, as manifested through the entire assemblings and associations we have had, we pray God's blessings to rest upon you, and guide you into the truth, and the benefits of it, that we may know it, do it, and enjoy it forever. [*Time expired.*]



[MR. CARLTON'S TENTH SPEECH.]

*Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:*

We have come, in the good providence of our kind Father in heaven, in the midst of the multiplied blessings he has showered down upon us—and who has signally smiled upon us for the last four days—we have come to the close of our present investigations, so far as your speakers are permitted to do so before you. The further work that shall be done in this direction remains to be done by yourselves in examining, in all candor and honesty, the evidences and arguments that you have heard, and we trust you will treasure up the truths you may have received in good and honest hearts, and carry forward this work of investigation.

A school is not so much to impart instruction, as to prepare the mind to acquire it. A discussion of this kind is not expected to convey all religious instruction or information on such topics, but to aid the mind—to furnish helps to the mind in its future investigations in the acquisition of useful religious knowledge.

I propose to notice some things that were said in the last speech, which is called a recapitulation by my brother, but which is so nearly a condensed repetition of what we have had so many times before, that you will pardon me for not repeating what I have said before, or replying to things I have answered before.

The first argument presented in the last speech that will claim our attention is “that the abstract idea exists in the adjective before it is borne to the noun.” The scientific and learned auditors of this congregation in particular will feel greatly edified to-night, to learn “that the abstract idea of the quality exists in the adjective and is borne by it to the noun.” And

after he had labored upon that for a long time he began to speak about somebody's gray hair, and after talking awhile about that, proposed to show that the quality was in the adjective, but admitted in the conclusion that the quality was in the noun. If so all the adjective did was to express the quality that was in the noun. That, to my mind, was something pretty rich. I want to ask the brother and this congregation one question, Can an adjective describe a quality of a noun which is not inherent in that noun?

[Mr. Moore.—Bro. Carlton, will you permit a correction? I did not say, or at least did not intend to say, that the adjective conveyed the quality to the noun, but that the idea of the quality was abstractly in the adjective, and was used when we found a quality in the noun which was abstractly in the adjective.]

Mr. Carlton.—Now he gets it, that the quality is not in the adjective, but only describes the quality that is in the noun, that was in it without the adjective. That is all I claim. Then, when an ambiguous adjective is applied to God it may express a quality that is in God, but when applied to a limited object the quality is in the limited thing. It expresses the idea of endlessness in God, but of limited duration in punishment. That is the point, and by his aid we have got it so clear in your minds that you can never forget it if you try.

Now, after the recapitulation there are several points to be noticed, before we conclude, which I shall not stop to present fully, but in a condensed form as I proceed. First, the quotation: “He that believeth not is condemned already.” Second, “He that believeth not shall be condemned.” Suppose I illustrate this idea. The fire burns. The child that puts his finger into the fire is burned already. The child that shall put his finger into the fire shall be burned. Does that mean that the child that puts his finger in

the fire is burned now, and because he is burned now he shall be burned in the future? There is just as much sense in the one case as in the other. "He that believeth not is condemned already"—that is, the unbeliever is condemned now. That is equally true. But does that prove that the unbeliever is condemned a thousand years hence? No, but that the unbeliever shall be condemned. That is all there is of it. He, in condensing his argument, says that this condemnation is endless punishment. He assumes it. Now, let Jesus tell what condemnation is. He says: "He that believeth not is condemned already;" and "*This* is your condemnation, that light is come into the world." Where is it? In the world—"and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." From this he assumes endless punishment. This is an unwarranted inference, and one for which there is no authority in God's word.

The next argument is based on the word everlasting. He introduced the term everlasting destruction. I do not propose to notice the exact order in which it was used, as he used this term perhaps a dozen times in his last speech, and it has been used in the discussion perhaps a thousand times. But he has failed to show that everlasting, or the corresponding words in Greek, mean endless, when applied to punishment anywhere. That is all I need say in regard to his use of that word.

Then he calls attention to the fact he had found a place where the Scriptures said of certain persons that they were "accursed children." We grant that it is said they were "accursed children," but does it say they were accursed endlessly? Not at all. Then, to make you believe it, he says it is final, absolute. Why? Because it is necessary to his case. Why it is final is not in the premises or proof. Not a particle of it.

Then he brings up the unpardonable sin, and un-

dertakes to make you believe that persons guilty of it would suffer endless punishment. Well, if any of you will just point your finger to the particular instance, or call my attention to any place where an instance is given, or any proof shown, that there is any sin at all beyond the present life, I will be much obliged to you if you will speak out. Tell me where he has at any time shown that the Scriptures teach that there is any sin beyond the present life. So far is he from getting endless punishment in the future world, that he has not got a particle of sin, not a semblance of it in the resurrection state. Then he assumes that the punishment will continue endlessly, because, he says, the sin will be endless—he assumes that too.

Now, let us notice another rich point. He said something to the effect, that in this world the more people sin the less they will suffer. That is the rule, and so he goes on, and on, until he is past feeling, and does not suffer at all. Then he tells us that he enters the next state of existence as he left this—past feeling, so that he can not suffer at all. I want to know how a person will suffer endless punishment for sin, when that person is utterly incapable of suffering at all. You can all perceive the contradiction in that argument.

Next, he tells us, in summing up, something with regard to a certain course of conduct, of which the end was death, or whose end is to be burned. He labored hard to bring all the authority he could to show, that when farmers labored long and hard upon their farms, and they would not produce, that they abandoned them, and the end was to be burned. We asked him to show where this had been the case, but he was unable to find any place where this has been done. That would be a miserable kind of farming, a little worse than any person ever heard of, even in districts inhabited by the most lazy men. We all

know that the burning is but the preparing of the ground for future usefulness and productiveness.

But the end, he says, is the finality. Let us refer to Ecclesiastes, where it says: "It is better to go to the house of mourning than to go to the house of feasting; for that is the end of all men." Is that the finality of all men? That is all that is necessary to say about this.

Next is the antithesis—differing in nature, but equal in extent. Now what is the nature of the blessing that the individual receives by faith in God? It is spiritual life and peace. This he receives by faith. When? When he believes in this world and enjoys it as a reward? Yes. What is the opposite of the antithesis? It is a state of death—that is, a state of condemnation. "He that believeth not is condemned already." The one is equal to the other—neither endless, because there is no endless reward. A finite being can not merit endless reward. The life the Christian lives is a life of faith in God. Punishment is the opposite of such a life. There is an antithetic argument proven equally strong.

Now, we come to notice how the matter stands in the present case. I shall not attempt to go over all the ground in reference to future judgment, and future punishment or reward. We notice that there are two points, and only two. One was, that we are not warranted in applying the word punishment, in the word of God, to signify endless duration. We have found that it is not done even by the best orthodox authors, who have best understood the natural signification of the terms used; and that Dr. Watts says the terms, when applied to punishment, do not signify endless duration. Then the fact that these words are used in the plural, that the Scriptures speak of them in the natural sense, in the fullest and strongest sense of these terms, showing their begin-

ning and ending in the plural, and the beginning of both these terms in the singular, as well as plural, show that no dependence can be placed upon any, or all of them, to prove endless punishment.

I would ask one further question: How many limited durations, strung together, will prove one unlimited duration. Suppose I use *aion*, *aionios*, and string together as many of these indefinite and ambiguous terms as the brother could name, and it would fall infinitely short of endless duration. Consequently, he gains nothing more than by the use of one term, and it is coming no nearer the endless duration. Having failed utterly, then, to produce a word which of itself signifies duration, or signifies endless, when applied to punishment, his total and complete rout, his utter failure to prove it, is apparent to every person capable of reasoning.

One thing yet remains; that is, the place of endless punishment. He has taken the word *gehenna*. If it is the place of endless punishment, then four thousand years elapsed before God gave to mankind the word to denote even the name of the place—that place to which they were exposed, and into which thousands of individuals were every day falling, to endure endless punishment. Is it not strange, he should not have told them that there even was such a place? Not only that; but to the Gentiles the name of the place was never uttered in the Old Testament. If we even concede that the word *gehenna* was used, it was never spoken to the Gentiles. It was spoken only to the Jews. But, then, does it signify a place of endless punishment, when used in speaking to the Jews? The sense in which this term must be understood, and the only sense in which there is any authority to understand it, is the sense in which it was used in the days when Jesus spake on earth. Now, in what sense did the people use it then? I

challenge the brother to show that, for two hundred years after the advent of Christ, any body used it to denote endless punishment. He has never attempted, nor ever intimated that he would make the attempt, and has never asked for time to prepare to make it; nor can he show it. There is no book on the footstool of God, there is no history or instance recorded where any person at all, before the third century, employed the word *gehenna* to mean that. Now, how are we to understand that Jesus employed this term? In one of two senses only. First, as the name of the valley Hinnom, south-east of Jerusalem; secondly, as a symbol of death and destruction in the present life; for in these two senses alone does history show us *gehenna* was ever used for two hundred years after the Christian era. Now, I ask this audience, where is the proof, aside from that which he presented in the tortuous use he made of the passages he quoted, and from which he drew his inferences—except these, where is there any kind of a shadow of such meaning looking to the future? If any one has seen it, I would be glad to know where the evidence is. I want to show, once for all, the most perfect, utter, and complete rout ever experienced by mortal man in trying to accomplish any thing he had ever undertaken to establish from the Bible. Here it is: I can not help it, if I would; and I would not, if I could. I have not done any thing to establish such a doctrine as that; and never expect to. I would feel sad on account of it, if I did. There may be some persons here who feel sorry at this result; but in reality, inside, I guess they do not.

My dear friends: We come to the close of this discussion. How does the matter stand? Has it been proved that the Bible teaches the doctrine of endless punishment? With all these clear, plain views, revealed in the Scriptures, that teach us that

God executeth "judgment and justice in the earth;" that they have ever been in the earth, over our first parents, and on down through four thousand years, he has declared when and where justice and judgment should be executed by our Savior Jesus Christ: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise up unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and execute judgment and justice in the earth." Having presented all these things, and examined all the answers to them, where do we stand? We stand, at the close of this discussion, here, with the fact before us that God reigns as a father, and while he is a sovereign, he is the father of the spirits of all flesh, the guardian and protector of the children of men, who rewards us for our obedience, and punishes us for every act of disobedience, encouraging no sin, because just as certain as we sin we must suffer. There is nothing in the universe of God more nicely adjusted than the administration of justice. We can not have a good thought without being blessed. It brings peace into our hearts. We can not speak a kind word without being benefited, nor do a kind deed without being made happier by it, feeling that we are God-like, Christ-like, in the performance of these charitable deeds. We can not cherish one impure thought without being injured. We can not speak one wicked word without being damaged. We can do no one wrong act without being wronged. That is what there is in this Universalism; that is what there is in it that will injure society or any body. What is there that will encourage any body to do any thing wrong in this glorious doctrine of the blessed God that we have presented here? The brother says that I have laid hold of Isaiah xxv: "And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make a feast of fat things, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And he will

destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces." He says Bro. Carlton has applied this to the immortal resurrection. No, sir; he did not do that. The Apostle Paul did so apply it. Paul says, speaking not on the subject of the glories of partitive resurrection, but speaking on the subject of the resurrection of the dead, he says: "So also is the resurrection of the dead;" not the resurrection of a part, but of the resurrection of every body. "It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption. It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power. It is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory." There is a natural body—*psuchiken soma*. There is an animal body—that is, the one we live in—and there is a spiritual body—*pneumatikoa soma*, afterward that which is spiritual. After we are done with the animal, we shall have the spiritual body. This mortal must put on immortality; this corruptibility must put on incorruption. Why? Because we have been born of Christian parents, or in a Christian land, or in this age of the world, in America? No. Not on account of any contingency in the purpose of God; but because it is the fiat of the Almighty, the will, and the purpose, and the pleasure of God. Just as certain we shall enter the spiritual and immortal life as we have entered into the earthly life; and possess the spiritual body, as we possess the earthly; and rise to life in Christ, as here we live in Adam. The Apostle Paul applied this to the resurrection, and says: "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written." What? That tears shall be wiped from

some faces? No. What, then? "That God will swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces."

How many are left out, excluded in the final consummation, in the fulfillment of God's purpose in creation, when he made man for a little time lower than the angels, but made him, in the purpose of his own infinite wisdom and boundless beneficence, for a glorious destiny, who, when he brought the untold millions of men into existence a little lower than the angels, made the creature subject to vanity—not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature itself, also, shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption of the children of God. Where? Some into a happy, and some into a miserable state? No. All shall be delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God. And what children are these? We have insisted, and shall forever insist, that all mankind are the children of God. Not into the liberty that they now enjoy. There are some who are, fortunately, the children of God by Jesus Christ, and to this we all aspire, and this we all seek to live; but it is not into that liberty, because the apostle says that those which have the first fruits of the spirit are also under bondage. What class does he speak of? Turn to the book of Job, xxxviii, 7. Here, on the morning of creation, when mankind are first ushered into the creation, the myriad hosts of those spiritual intelligences above, that are not thus placed in this low condition, "The morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." Into the glorious liberty of these bright angels above shall universal humanity, redeemed, renovated, and washed through the blood of the Lamb, and their robes made white, sing praise to the Lamb forever. That is the consummation. No disappointment in the govern-

ment of God; no stupendous failures; no endless mournings; no hopeless separations; no weeping and wailing; no mourning of parents because their children are absent from them world without end; no separation in the blessed world above. No, no. Why? The tears are wiped from off all faces; death swallowed up in victory; all mourners shall be comforted; the sundered ties, the earthly affections, shall be reunited; the glimmering sparks of affection and love, that shone amid the darkness of this world, and rendered life cheerful and desirable, that have been extinguished here by death, shall be rekindled, and glow with immortal fervor in the paradise of God. There is cause for rejoicing; there is cause for glorifying the great Father who made all things as he would have them, in the beginning, and rested, and enjoyed satisfaction in having it all finished as he would have it, when he gave the work into the hand of his Son, to restore moral order, and beauty, and felicity, in the moral universe, and sent him to gather in the Gentiles, and save all Israel. He shall work out this undertaking of the moral renovation and purification of the world, until his moral creation, the new creation, is complete; and when that work is complete, it shall all be as God designed, and Christ anticipated, "who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." "And his rest shall be glorious." Yes; when Jesus enters into his rest, when Jesus' work is completed, as he contemplated and designed, as the Father's literal creation was complete, then shall he survey the vast procession over which Jesus reigns, and for whom he tasted death, as God did in the beginning, and pronounced it all very good.

We rejoice, dear friends, in the opportunity that has been afforded to us of thus laboring in defense of

the character of our heavenly Father; of laboring in defense of the Savior, a perfectly efficient and successful Redeemer; laboring to show that God's purpose shall be accomplished, that Christ's mission shall be finished, that sin shall be banished, transgression ended; that everlasting righteousness shall be brought in, "and the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

Gentlemen Moderators, let me say, I do most heartily thank you for the able and impartial, and patient manner in which you have presided over our deliberations for the last four days. May your service not be in vain, but may God bless this occasion to your benefit, and to your improvement. To the congregation let me say, we have labored in much weakness—having been sick all the while—have labored in much weakness to defend what we are convinced and fully persuaded is the truth of heaven; to defend it, to explain and present it before you, and to expose error, which we have done in the clearest testimony that can be demanded in any case, having shown that the doctrine of endless punishment is of purely heathen origin. We are satisfied with the result. Let your views be what they may, may God bless this occasion and this meeting to your good! I thank God for the blessed faith which enables me to anticipate another meeting for all of us. We have taken sweet counsel together, and have walked to the house of God in company. We shall separate, and go to our homes. We may never meet again on earth, but there is a light that rays down from the throne of God; by the aid of that light I look forward and anticipate the arrival of that period when the tears and woes of this world shall be submerged in the healing tide flowing from the boundless beneficence and peace of God;

when we shall all meet in a happier assembly above, to be separated no more forever, with a ransomed world, where all the vast family of man, the family of God, shall be gathered home without the loss of a member; where the last broken family circle shall be made whole, and the last mourner shall be comforted. I thank God for this glorious faith and this blessed hope, which we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and that reaches to that within the veil where Jesus hath for us entered.

To my brother, at the close of this fourth discussion, in which we have labored earnestly and diligently together, we part as friends, I trust, as we have done in all our labors, earnestly and honestly seeking the truth. May God, in his infinite love, smile on you, and guide you into all truth; enlarge your faith, and bring you into a wider knowledge of the truth.

The speakers then shook hands cordially, Mr. Moore replying:

"I reciprocate, and ask the same blessing on you," when the meeting adjourned, and the benediction was pronounced.

Calton's Admissions

Salvation conditional P. 43

Man is immortal P. 83

That baptism is immersion  
P. 104, 105

That there is a devil P. 132

That there will be a resurrection  
P. 139

Hughes denies it. See Hughes' debate  
PP. 97, 413, 414

That there is no reward P. 224

work & labor in heaven PP. 241,  
242

no suffering or punishment  
after death, P. 243

Doctrine of 'endless punishment  
in the world at the time  
of Christ P. 299