

A decorative border of open books surrounds the central text. The books are arranged in a rectangular frame, with each book icon consisting of two pages and a spine, all rendered in a simple, stylized line-art style.

HERSHEL OTTWELL
MEMORIAL LIBRARY

CHURCH OF CHRIST
HARTFORD, ILLINOIS

by
Corine Ottwell

Vol. 259

75

Herchel Ottwell
Hartford, G.C.

~~W. S. Ottwell~~

copy 4 shells 2

THEOLOGICAL

DISCUSSION

HELD AT

DES MOINES, JUNE 22, 1868,

BETWEEN

W. W. KING,

PASTOR OF THE UNIVERSALIST SOCIETY OF DES MOINES, IOWA,

AND

ALVIN I. HOBBS,

PASTOR OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, ON CHERRY STREET, DES MOINES, IOWA.

REPORTED BY

J. L. MCCREERY, OF DUBUQUE, IOWA.

285

DES MOINES:

MILLS & CO., STEAM PRINTING AND PUBLISHING HOUSE,
1868.

230.

MODERATORS:
HON. J. B. MILLER, *President*,
J. D. THOMPSON, C. E. FULLER.

MILLS & COMPANY,
PRINTERS AND BINDERS,
DES MOINES, IOWA.

STATEMENT OF QUESTIONS.

I. Do the Scriptures teach that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ will enjoy endless happiness?

Mr. KING affirms, Mr. HOBBS denies.

II. Do the Scriptures teach that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ will suffer endless punishment?

Mr. HOBBS affirms, Mr. KING denies.

A. I. HOBBS agrees to affirm the second question, on condition that W. W. KING shall affirm the first, and attempt to prove it in its terms, subject to the following

RULES OF DISCUSSION:

RULE I. The discussion shall be held in the Court House, in the city of Des Moines, Iowa, commencing on the evening of the 22d day of June, 1868, at 8 o'clock P. M., to continue six evenings. Each question to be debated three evenings, commencing with the first question.

RULE II. The disputants shall speak alternately, occupying one-half hour each, and making two speeches each, every evening, except in the opening argument on each question, the affirmant shall be entitled to forty-five minutes; and in closing the debate on each question, the affirmant shall be entitled to an additional speech of one-half hour.

RULE III. No new matter shall be introduced by either party in his final speech at the close of the question being debated.

RULE IV. Each disputant shall choose a moderator and these shall choose a third, to preside over the discussion.

RULE V. The discussion shall be reported by one or more reporters, as may be agreed upon by the disputants. Each disputant shall have the right to revise and correct the report in such particulars as do not affect the sense.

[Signed.]

W. W. KING.

A. I. HOBBS.

DISCUSSION.

FIRST QUESTION.

Do the Scriptures teach that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ will enjoy endless happiness?

MR. KING'S FIRST SPEECH.

BRETHREN, MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—In opening this discussion, I desire to have you duly impressed with the solemn, the momentous issues that here claim our attention. If the majority of the people of this city believed that there had been a revelation from God, unfolding the terrific fact that two-thirds of those citizens would be swept from time into eternity on the last day of the coming month, with what tearful, prayerful, anxious solicitude would you come here, and listen to a discussion upon the probabilities of its truth. We deal with questions infinitely more important; interests, compared with which all the great issues of time fade away and disappear as altogether insignificant and unworthy of a momentary thought; interests that will only have begun to unfold their measureless proportions when the affairs of time are ended, and all material things have perished. In some far-off cycle of duration, lying beyond the utmost reach of human thought, suns and stars may grow old, and die; then this immortal spirit will be standing only upon the threshold of its destiny, with eternity still stretching on and on before it.

I am here to affirm, and to attempt to prove, the doctrine of universal salvation—that all souls will at last become reconciled to God, holy, and therefore happy. My brother is here, not only to deny this grandest of all conceivable doctrines, but to affirm, and to attempt to prove, the doctrine of endless punishment. With all due respect for his ability, sincerity and zeal, I feel a real pity for him, in the performance of the terrible, the thankless task he has assumed; for he can not invoke a single Christian sympathy or prayer in his behalf. There is not one humane thought or feeling, one holy wish or aspiration, that does not utter its vehement protest against the merciless conclusions of his logic and his creed. All, all is against him—from the love and tenderness throbbing in the mother's heart, up to the love and tenderness throbbing in the heart of him who is the Infinite Father of us all. In due time I propose to speak of the abundant, the unanswerable prophecy budding and blossoming from this infinite love and tenderness; and show how, from this merciless conclusion of the head, bound in the icy fetters of human creeds, the heart of the universe takes its final and triumphant appeal.

I am glad this opportunity is afforded me for defending the faith I cherish; for this defense will be a vindication of the divine character and purpose. Sure am I that the blessed results of creation and providence I am here to announce and defend—results anchored in the unchanging will and purpose of God, in the mission of Christ, in the desire of angels, in the earnest wish and prayer of all Christian souls—are plainly revealed in the scriptures, as the grand consummation of all divine endeavor. I am brought hither by no personal ambition; by no desire to achieve a personal victory; but only to serve my Master, and win a victory for his cause. I could have no possible wish or motive to deceive you, or to be myself deceived in this matter. I could reap no possible benefit from the defense of error; for to you, and to me, there is but one possible salvation offered, and that is through the truth. Said Jesus, "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make

you free." With this single aim, with an earnest desire to serve him, God help me to speak worthy of my cause and my vocation, and let him have the glory of the triumph.

My brother and I are responsible to God, to the cause we serve, and to you, as those interested to know the truth, for the manner in which we conduct this discussion. Our profession, our calling, demand of us candor and fairness, and the exercise of a spirit becoming those who are followers of Christ, and religious teachers and guides for the people. Each has a right to claim that respect to which all are entitled who cherish a sincere opinion; and the least manifestation of an unkind or ungentlemanly spirit or manner on our part, would merit, and should receive at your hands, an indignant rebuke. We come not here to advocate a system or a creed, but to defend what we conscientiously believe to be the truth. As honest, christian inquirers, we must indulge in no concealment or evasion; but must state our convictions frankly, and fully, and abide the result. I scorn equivocation or evasion. Here, as elsewhere, I state my views in the plainest possible manner, so that no hearer can be in doubt as to my position or belief. It has always been my custom, in the discussion of doubtful or controverted points, to invite criticism of and objection to my views. This I have done Sunday after Sunday, upon this platform; for I will not take advantage of time and place to utter that which I am unwilling to advocate and defend at all times and in all places. It is with this spirit that I meet my brother here; and whatever be the result—whether I succeed or fail in defending the views I entertain, I mean to leave no occasion for any honest hearer to say that he has any doubt respecting my opinions.

At this point let me direct your attention to the fact that, by the very position we occupy, the presumption is against my brother, and for me; and the burden of proof, therefore, of necessity rests with him. Let me explain: I am here merely to affirm God's perfect character and providence; to claim that God will triumph; to take his nature and his attributes, as

revealed in the scriptures, as the only perfect proof of his intention, and build my argument upon the integrity of these grand truths. If any man is bold enough to venture a denial, he is bound to justify that denial. We are to make the Bible the ultimate appeal, the source of authority; and the *meaning* of the Bible is the Bible. If the scriptures have a meaning, it is because there are certain great central truths, irradiating the whole, and flashing a light upon every part. The central lights are the attributes of God; or, rather, the great central sun is God himself, as revealed in the scriptures. Upon these revelations of his character alone, I build my philosophy and anchor my argument. I take God's express will and purpose, as plainly revealed in the scriptures, and rest my case on his grand but simple declaration: "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." Is not that the kind of a God—a powerful, changeless, just and perfect God—which human intuition demands? "I will do," he says—not half, nor part, but—"all my pleasure." And if my brother shall deny the truth of this assertion from the mouth of the Most High, he is called upon to furnish the evidence to justify him in his attack upon God's veracity.

I build my faith, again, upon the immutable oath of God; who says: "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, surely shall say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength." And if my brother has the temerity to deny the truth of that oath, I have to suggest again that, as the manager of this attempted impeachment, the burden of proof rests with him.

I want you all to notice one significant fact, which will be developed throughout this entire discussion: that in every denial of my doctrine, and in every attempt to defend his own, my brother will make a direct attack upon the character of God. I announce this here and now; and hereafter in the progress of the discussion shall call your attention to the fact, and hold it up to public view. I repeat: every attempt of my

brother to sustain his position, will be an attack upon some attribute of God—upon his character, his providence, or the mission of Christ.

I have already incidentally referred to the strange, the unnatural position occupied by my brother in the discussion of this question. He is here, not to indulge in any pleasant or congenial labor, or led by any desire for pastime, but to perform an exceedingly painful duty; for—if he has a christian heart in his bosom, and I think he has—all through the discussion that heart will pray that the logic of his head may be confounded. He is here to oppose a doctrine that he hopes to be true, and that he prays may be true; to defend one that he hopes to be false, prays may be false, and that no christian ever dared pray might be true.

I propose to examine this unfortunate attitude of my brother in the light of revelation, and develop therefrom the logical and inevitable conclusion—for I take it for granted he will concede it. Upon this I propose to build my first affirmative argument.

Observe here one broad and vital difference between our two systems of belief: I pray for the salvation of all men, and I pray in faith, believing my prayer will be answered; my brother prays for the salvation of all men, but *does not believe* his prayer will be answered, consequently he can not pray in faith. If I should ask him: "Brother Hobbs, do you desire and pray for the salvation of all men?" his answer would be, "Certainly I do." "Brother Hobbs, do you believe God will answer your prayer?" "No, sir, *I know he will not!*" Is not this a strange attitude of prayer—prayer without faith, prayer for that which he *knows will not be granted?*

Notice further: this prayer, this fervent desire, this earnest anxiety, is not merely the fruit of human sympathy and compassion, but a duty plainly enjoined by the word of God. Jesus has commanded us to pray, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven." Now, this will of God is, that all men should be saved; my brother will not

deny here that it is the will of God that all men should be saved. Paul says, (I Timothy, ii: 1), "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men;" and (passing to v. 3-4), he adds, "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, *who will have all men to be saved*, and to come to a knowledge of the truth." There is God's will set forth. And it is not only for the triumph of God's will that every christian heart is to pray, but the apostle tells all men everywhere (v. 8), to pray, "lifting up holy hands, without wrath and *doubting*." My brother, can you do that? Can you pray for the salvation of all men "without doubting?" Yet precisely this is what men everywhere are commanded to do; and the reason has already been given, (v. 6), where the apostle speaks of Christ Jesus, "who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." Here is revealed the will of God, that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth; here is the divine command for men everywhere to pray for this result, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting; and the reason why we are not to doubt the answering of our prayers for the salvation of all men is set forth—because Jesus has given himself as a ransom for all, to be testified (or proved) in due time. Paul speaks somewhere else about the will of God being accomplished in the dispensation of the fullness of time; I do not know when that will be; I only know that it will be "in due time." To-day, here is a man who is a sinner; to-morrow that sinful man is brought to bow meekly and humbly at the foot of the Cross, repents and is converted; so far as *that man* is concerned, Christ is testified or proved as his savior. The next day *another* sinner is converted, and becomes a follower of the Cross; and so on—until *in due time* Christ shall be testified or proved as a ransom for *all*. And yet, because all are not saved *now*, men full of doubt declare that they *never will* be saved. This is the thought of the churches to-day—this semi-atheistic unbelief, denying God's rule throughout his empire,

assuming that because the promised and prophesied result is not reached immediately, it never will be reached. There is no proof that any will finally fail of salvation but this: Because all souls are not saved immediately, therefore they never will be saved. Does not every attentive, thoughtful man and woman see that this argument proves entirely too much? What right has any one to place such narrow limits upon the "due time" within which Jesus Christ "shall be testified (or proved) as a ransom for all," or denounce the word of God as false—the prophecy a failure? You might just as logically assume that all who are not saved by midnight to-night will never be saved. Such a thought ignores the grand law of Providence and progress by which God uses processes to bring all things from small, imperfect beginnings to grand and perfect results.

The same thought to which we have adverted is elsewhere expressed by Paul, (Phillipians, ii: 9, 10, 11), "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him and given him, a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Can language by any possibility be framed so as to be plainer than that? It is in perfect harmony with the passage previously quoted; so also the reason why we should pray with faith that God's will may be done, "who will have all men to be saved, and to come to a knowledge of the truth."

Again: Paul, (Hebrews, ii: 8), after declaring that Jesus shall rule throughout the universe, and that all things shall be put into subjection under his feet, adds, "But now we see not yet all things put under him." Yet on account of this very fact that the apostle connects with the promise—because we do *not yet* see all things put under him—men deny the perfection of God, and the steady flow and purpose of his grand providence. Strange unbelief!

My second affirmative argument I build upon the proposition that God will be glorified in all the results of his creation and providence. Paul declares, in the passage I have heretofore quoted, (Phillippians, ii: 11,) that "every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, *to the glory of God the Father.*" David says, (Psalm lxxxvi: 9,) "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name." Observe that the glorifying of the name of God is declared to be the result of worship—not of sin, alienation, rebellion. God is glorified by obedience and worship; (see Matthew v: 16,) "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven." The glorifying of the Father consists in, or comes as the fruit of christian life and influence. Here, then, is the plain and unequivocal declaration that all shall at last glorify God. Now, of what does this essential glory of God consist? I answer, it flows from his nature; His nature is his glory. Any thing that is godlike is glorious; any thing that is opposed to God is inglorious and shameful; not a mathematical axiom could be plainer than this. It will be a strange logic by which my brother shall prove that God is to be glorified at last by a condition of alienation, opposition, rebellion and blasphemy against him, yet this must be proved, or my brother will signally fail in his argument.

My third affirmative argument is based upon the nature of evil. My proposition is that evil and the suffering it produces are finite in nature, and finite in duration—because opposed to the final result which God declares he will achieve. God alone hath immortality, (I Timothy, vi: 16), and nothing can be immortal, or eternal, which has not derived that quality directly from God. It will be a curious logic which affirms that God confers upon evil, which is opposed to his nature and providence, and which he is trying to root out of the universe, that quality which inheres alone in himself—for "He alone hath immortality." There is no theory, illustration or explanation of evil, in harmony with any God or any providence

worth being called a God or a providence, which is not based upon the assumption that evil and the suffering which results from it are finite and temporary. The moment you assume that ground, all is harmonious and consistent. The moment you assume evil to be endless, no man can reconcile it with the existence and providence of a perfect God. If my brother can do it, he will do what mortal man has never done before. And this proposition, that evil is finite and transient, is proved by the plainest teachings of the Bible. They affirm that it lies within the purpose and providence of God, having a place in the divine economy for a season, but finally to be destroyed. It is here by a divine economy, by that same economy used for a temporary purpose, and under it at last to pass away. Denying this position, what kind of an account will you give of evil? How explain its existence in a universe created and ruled by a perfect God? Let me repeat my position, so as to be certain of being understood: I affirm evil to be in existence by virtue of a divine plan, in accordance with the divine intention, having a place, but necessarily a temporary place, in the divine scheme. If my brother denies this, I ask him to tell this audience how evil comes to be in the universe of a perfect God? Does it lie within God's providence, or outside of it? Does it come by virtue of the divine intention, or in spite of the divine intention? Is it under the control of God, or beyond his control? Is it here because God *could* not, or because he *would* not prevent its being here? If he denies this plain philosophy of evil, as based upon the attributes of God, and unfolded in the Bible, as I shall show you anon, he is bound to account for it.

Now, I affirm that God's providence is perfect and all-embracing. If my brother denies this, he affirms atheism; he affirms that there are things that exist and occur *a theos*—without God. The idea that evil is not a part of the providence of God, that it comes "without God," is plainly atheistic. The word "evil," in its primary signification, simply means that which tends to diminish enjoyment, or produce

pain. Such evil, God the Father, like an earthly parent, may introduce to effect a beneficent end. Let us see: In Exodus, xxxii: 14, we read, "And the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people." Here is a plain unequivocal statement, showing that evil was a thing God intended to use for a certain purpose. Jeremiah, xxvi: 3: "If so be they will hearken, and turn every man from his evil way, that I may repent me of the evil which I purpose to do unto them because of the evil of their doings." There is the same philosophy again, plain as a sunbeam. Amos, iii: 6: "Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?" Isaiah, xlv: 7: "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace and create evil; I, the Lord, do all these things." There is plain talk for you; it is not mine—it is that of the Bible, upon whose authority we have agreed to rely. I have quoted these scriptures to prove that evil is included in the divine scheme; that it lies inside of the control, purpose and providence of a perfect God; it can lie nowhere else; serving a temporary purpose, but finally to pass away. We find the same teachings in the New Testament. Paul gives us this plain philosophy in his epistle to the Romans, eighth chapter, commencing at the twentieth verse. This is one of my strong points in the Bible; if Brother Hobbs can uproot my argument based upon that, I am a defeated man. I ask the theologians of to-day how evil came to be here, and they do not know; I inquire how man came to be evil, and they can not tell. They claim that God made man perfect, not liable to pain and misery, but promulgate an absurd, irrational and self-contradictory theory that man was tempted and fell. But let us hear what Paul says, (Romans, viii: 20), "For the creature was made subject to vanity;" you see *God made the creature subject to vanity*. Now what is the meaning of the word "vanity?" Look in the dictionary, and you will find the definition—"emptiness, or lack of substance to satisfy desire." Why this is a magnificent philosophy! God created man intending he should *not* be satisfied; implanted within

him a perpetual and insatiate longing for more light and happiness. The whole philosophy of human activity and growth lies right there in that word "vanity." Mark the language: God made the creature subject to vanity—did not make him and he then became subject to vanity. But let us read on: "not willingly"; not with the will of the creature—for it can not mean that God was compelled to do that which he was unwilling to do. "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." Why, now, with the philosophy of evil I have propounded, we can see a light running through and illuminating the whole scheme. Take away this philosophy, and no mortal man can give any rational explanation of it. The creature "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." I wish my brother would invent some language to express a higher state of holiness and joy than we have here in that expression—"glorious liberty of the children of God." Will he say that this "glorious liberty of the children of God" is to be secured by binding them in an eternal prison-house of evil, to suffer the indescribable pains of Hell forever? But Paul says the *whole creation* shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God; all that were "made subject to vanity" are included in the deliverance. I know there is often an attempt made to evade the force of this argument, by affixing to the Greek word *klisis* a meaning in this passage which does not properly belong to it, and by which it is not translated elsewhere. It is claimed that this word does not apply to the human race, but refers to inferior and inanimate nature. What a statement is that for a christian minister to make, engaged in the salvation of human souls! What will men not do, in order to defend a favorite creed! We have abundant proof that this word, *klisis*, is applied to the human race. Colossians, i: 23: "The gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to

every creature" (*ktisis*). Galatians, vi: 15: "For in Christ Jesus, neither the circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but a new creature" (*ktisis*). II Corinthians, v: 17: "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature" (*ktisis*). Mark, xvi: 15: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature" (*ktisis*). With these passages before him, my brother will not deny that the word *ktisis* refers to the human race. And mark, the same *ktisis*, (creature,) that is made subject to vanity, that same *ktisis*, (creature,) is to be delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

There are four distinct points in this passage to which I wish to call your attention. First, the creature was made subject to vanity; secondly, it was made so for a reason; thirdly, vanity was subjected in hope; fourthly, the creature was to be delivered, not only *from* that vanity, but "*into* the glorious liberty of the children of God." This beautiful philosophy of evil is plainly manifest, running through the whole.

That evil is here for a purpose, but that it is temporary, and will have an end, is manifest from numerous passages. In Genesis, iii: 15, God is represented as saying to the Devil, or spirit of evil: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise (or crush) thy head, and thou shalt bruise (or crush) his heel." In John, iii: 8, we read: "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil." In Hebrews, ii: 14, 15, we read: "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." Here is the Devil with his head crushed at last; here is evil forever ended.—[Time expired.]

MR. HOBBS' FIRST SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—It is with a great deal of pleasure that I appear before you on this occasion, upon the negative of such a proposition as that which my opponent, in his opening speech of three-quarters of an hour, has never quoted, and never will—mark me—till the end of this discussion, if he can avoid it. My friends, there is a significance in this fact. I was always taught, that when I should lead in a discussion, the *onus probandi* being with me, in the first outset to plainly define the proposition, in its terms, setting forth the thing which was to be proved. Strange, unaccountable, it may be to you, that he should pursue the course he has. But I shall try to show you that it is not so unaccountable, after all. During the three-quarters of an hour that he stood here talking to you, he never so much as introduced his proposition to the audience at all—much less making any argument bearing upon the proposition itself. I hope he will try to do better in his future efforts. I will acknowledge that much of his speech was very beautiful: I will give him credit for considerable oratory, and somewhat of rhetorical flourish; but so far as argument, bearing upon the point at issue, is concerned, I might take my seat the next moment.

In the first place, I shall notice a few things that have been said in his address; not that they had any bearing whatever upon the proposition, but because they have loaned me some splendid material, which I shall have use for.

My opponent says, (speaking of himself), "I am here to prove the doctrine of universal salvation." You are not here to prove that, sir; your proposition asks you to prove that "those *who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ* will enjoy *endless* happiness." Well did I know the tricks of the trade, when these propositions were framed. I did not submit them with my eyes shut. I ask, has the gentleman framed

one single argument, and brought it to bear upon the proposition that "*those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ will enjoy endless happiness?*" If he has, I know not where it is. But, stranger than all, he tells you that the burden of proof rests upon *me*. This is something new, different from any thing I ever heard before—that the *onus probandi* rests in the hands of the negative. It may be that there are some rules of debate that require this, but if so, I have yet to learn of them. The laboring oar is in *his* hands; and before he is through, it will weary his arms not a little.

He tells us his faith is built upon the grand truth: "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." Well, *my* theory rests upon the same scripture. I think so, have always thought so, and if this controversy shall prove the contrary, I shall be pleased to be undeceived. But he says, any denial of his position will be an assault upon the character of God; in other words, it will be an assault upon the character of God, to deny Mr. KING's proposition!

An argument he made, upon the will of God; and with his remarks upon this subject I have been particularly diverted; for it seemed to me that his logic was as loose as his declamation was florid; and here I do not mean any disrespect to him; but it does seem to me that it would better comport with the laws of discussion, if he would take more care in framing his argument and putting it into logical form; but since he has not, I must do it for him.

I am glad that I am to have the opportunity of replying to this and similar arguments offered from the lips of Mr. KING; because, he stands before this community, and before the great Northwest, as the champion of that system of theology which he is here to defend; and if he, with all his power of declamation, power of oratory, power of reasoning, and depth of research, all of which, it is evident and well understood by you, are by no means inconsiderable;—if he, with the character he has before his brethren and before the world, shall be answered in the argument presented by him here, and that by

myself, appearing for the first time in formal debate, while he is the hero of many bloodless contests—if I shall succeed in answering his arguments, you must take it for granted that the cause he pleads must be defective. I shall try to be fair, candid, plain, and address myself to the understanding of all.

The argument based upon the will of God, as expressed by Paul, in the second chapter of his first letter to Timothy, is to the effect that whatever God wills *must* be accomplished; but God wills the salvation of the whole human family; therefore the whole human family must be saved. But we are not debating the question of the salvation of the whole human family. The proposition under discussion says not a word about that. The proposition affirms the salvation or *endless* happiness of "*those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ.*" But, he says, God wills the salvation of the whole human family; therefore—mark the "therefore"—the whole human family will be saved. Now, it is a well-known rule in logic that every conclusion must be drawn from two admitted or proved premises. Am I not right? [Mr. KING—"Yes, sir."] Every conclusion must be drawn from two admitted or proved premises, or the argument is valueless, or worse than valueless—nay, *sophistical*. And this is just the difficulty in which my opponent now finds himself; and I predict that he will not reduce one single argument, based upon the attributes of God, to the syllogistic form, or bring it within the purview of Aristotle's dictum. "Whatever God wills must be accomplished:" this is his major premise; and his minor premise is: "God wills the salvation of all men."

But the syllogism does not reach the proposition in debate; for the salvation of all men is not in debate to-night. I will put his argument into syllogistic form for him: "Whatever God wills must be accomplished; but God wills that all who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall enjoy endless happiness; therefore, all who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ will enjoy endless happiness."

This is the syllogism as it should be—if my opponent could only make it appear that the premises were true.

Now, let us look for a moment at the major premise. "Whatever God wills must be accomplished." What does Mr. KING mean by that? He evidently means to assert that God's will is absolute in reference to human destiny. That must be the meaning of his argument, if it has any meaning at all. But let us look at some other things that God wills in the same way, and see if God's will is accomplished there. God wills that all men should be saved *now*, does he not? [Mr. KING—"No, Sir]. Then, if God does not will that all men should be saved now, those who *are* saved now are saved *contrary* to the will of God!

Let me give you another illustration of my opponent's style of logic. "Whatsoever God wills to be accomplished must be accomplished." Now God wills that no man shall steal; consequently, no man can steal. We know that men *do* steal; but if God's will is always accomplished, when men steal they are only fulfilling God's will; and men certainly ought not to be punished for fulfilling the will of God! This is the result of *your* logic, Sir. You had better go down and turn those inmates of the cells below out of prison—including one sentenced to be hung for murder, on the tenth of next month. They have only been fulfilling the will of God! Let them go hence without day! "Whatever God wills should be accomplished, *must* be accomplished," says my opponent. Now, God wills that men shall not steal, lie, swear, etc., yet we know that men *do* steal, lie, swear, and break all the other commandments of the decalogue, every day. Now, these commands are given either without reference to the will of God, or, they are contrary to the will of God; or, they are the expression of the will of God. If these commands of God are given without reference to the will of God, then we have God acting without a will; if they are contrary to the will of God, then we have God acting against himself; but if they are the expression of the will of God, then God's will is *not* always

accomplished; for, we know that God has commanded men not to lie, steal, and murder, and yet men *do* lie, steal, and murder. If Mr. KING declares that it is not contrary to God's will for men to lie, steal and murder, then he has voted to build jails and penitentiaries to punish men for fulfilling God's will—for doing that, moreover, which they could not help doing! Oh, this system advocated by my friend has some beauties which I shall bring out before I am through! I give him credit for a great deal of ability, and eloquence, and zeal; but I should give him more credit if he would give more candid attention to the word of God!

Now, I will repeat the syllogism in the shape it should be: "Whatever God wills must be accomplished; but God wills that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall enjoy endless happiness; therefore, those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall enjoy endless happiness." That is the syllogism as it should be, in order to have any bearing on the proposition in debate. But has he proved the major premise? I do not grant it. I claim he has not proved it. Neither is the minor premise proved upon his part nor admitted upon mine. In both cases there has been a complete *petitio principii*: he begs the whole question. Yet he has drawn his conclusions with a flourish of trumpets, as if there were no difficulty in the way. This may be success, but I think you will not see it in that light. I shall leave the matter now, for him to patch up if he can; and when he does, I shall give him some more of the same kind of work to do.

My opponent has presented some peculiar arguments—remarkably peculiar. He based an argument upon Romans, viii: 20, and three or four succeeding verses, in reference to the creature's being "made subject to vanity." But what is vanity? He tells you it is sin and misery—only he calls it by another name, "evil." Did you not observe his remark about God's repenting of the evil he had intended? God repented of *sin*, did he? This may accord with the beauties

of accuracy, but I apprehend not. I have always supposed that scarlet fever, small-pox or famine were great evils; but are they *sins*, my dear friend? Romans, viii: 20, says God did not consult the will of the creature when he subjected him to vanity, or sin; therefore, sin is in the universe by God's will: this is my friend's logic. According to that, God is the author of sin; and if God is the author of sin, he is the greatest sinner—nay, the only sinner in the universe. If God, in his eternal counsel, intended to subject man to sin, without reference to man's will, I want to know how in reason's name *man* is accountable for sin? But I know the dodge he will take upon this point: he will say God knew that man would sin. But, according to Universalism, what God knew, he foreordained. Mr. KING tells you that the human race was made subject to vanity, by the will of God, without consulting the will of the creature. But in the very next verse we have the following—I will read the two verses in their connection: "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." Mr. KING, in reading this, placed great emphasis on the final clause; but did you notice how lightly he passed over the clause immediately preceding? From what is the creature to be delivered? From sin and misery? Paul says nothing about that. Paul says the creature is to be delivered "from the bondage of corruption." What is it that is subject to the "bondage of corruption"? Is it *the soul*? Do you mean to become a materialist, in support of the affirmative of this proposition? The same that was made subject to vanity, was also to be delivered from the bondage of corruption. I shall leave this passage for the present, and see what his ingenuity will do with it.

Having thus effectually disposed of my opponent's arguments, I will proceed to adduce arguments to establish the negative of the proposition in debate. I profess to accept the

scriptures as a divine revelation for the enlightenment of the masses; if my opponent does not, he had better become a Catholic at once.

Now, so important are the bearings of the doctrine that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall enjoy endless happiness, that we would naturally expect it to be set forth in unequivocal terms. Mr. Royce, a writer against Universalism, uses the following language:

"Universalism has a different God, a different Christ, a different Spirit, a different sinner, a different sin," [certainly a different sin, if evil is sin,] "a different atonement, a different pardon, a different salvation, a different resurrection, a different judgment, a different punishment, a different heaven, a different hell—in fine, a difference with respect to all the essential doctrines of Christianity."

Mr. Whittemore, referring to this representation of his system, remarks:

"To this we give our assent; Mr. Royce is right; we confirm his words."—*Trumpet and Magazine*, August 18, 1838.

Now, we conclude that the scriptures do not teach the doctrine of universal salvation plainly, for some Universalists have conceded it. In a debate between E. Ray and I. Kidwell, Mr. Kidwell says:

"I then discovered, for the first time, that by far the greatest part of the Bible is a perfect neutrality on the subject [of salvation], the body of the book being simply historical, while a considerable portion was written either enigmatically, poetically, preceptively, or epistolary—the book itself not being a system of any doctrine; hence, I discovered that to collect a system of salvation out of the Bible was like collecting jewels from a heap of rubbish."

Mr. Ballou, on Analogy, says:

"Even they who disclaim analogical deductions concerning a future state, do nevertheless use them. Do not they contend that man will be happy hereafter? *Not from any express assertion in the scriptures*, that I recollect. We may be told, it is the necessary inference from what they do assert, that man will be equal to the angels, be the children of God; incorruptible, in a spiritual body; that all will be subdued to God, etc. But, how do we know that these conditions will hereafter produce happiness? How confidently it is said that if men be sinners hereafter they must be miserable, if righteous,

happy. Such is indeed the case here; but we infer it of the future only by analogy, and *not from any direct testimony of the scriptures.*"—*Universalist Quarterly.*

Here, then, we have a concession of the fact that the scriptures do not teach the doctrine of universal salvation—much less the salvation or *endless* happiness of those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ.

My second argument against the proposition that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ will enjoy endless happiness, is based upon the fact that all christians, in every age, have believed the contrary. This argument refers not to speculatists in theology, but to the masses, for whose enlightenment the revelation was made.

My third argument is, that the masses of mankind, who have had access to the scriptures, and yet have not been converted, have always understood the Bible to teach endless punishment as the destiny of the incorrigibly wicked. This is the more remarkable, because the "sinister bias of ungodly men" wishes it otherwise. Moreover, Universalists tell us that the great masses of convicts are believers in an endless hell. What a triumph of consciousness of desert over a weakly sentimentality!—[Time expired.]

MR. KING'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I have been somewhat amused at the effort of my brother; and with that amusement was blended a pity for a man who could make *such* an attempt to answer my argument. I do not believe there is a man or woman in this audience, not saturated with bigotry, who believes he has made any reply. My main arguments he has never touched. My leading argument, that he is commanded to pray for the salvation of all men, lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting, he has not even

referred to. And thus, without replying to my arguments, he proceeds to introduce arguments of his own, on the negative side of the question. I had a right to call him to order for violating the plainest rules of debate. But, brother Hobbs, you may play that game as much as you please; you may go where you please; I understand your purpose, and shall not follow you; I shall attend to my own business, without being drawn or driven off in any such style. You say you understand the "tricks of the trade." Brother Hobbs, as a christian minister, you ought to be ashamed of such an expression! Tricks! thank God, the tricks are not in my hand to play; nor in my heart! God being my helper, I stand here to utter and defend what I believe to be his truth—not to play tricks!

Yes, my friends, I had heard some time since of brother Hobbs' boast that he had taken advantage of me in the manner in which he has worded the question. He had purposely shaped it, as you see he publicly acknowledges, so as to evade the real issue and present a false one. He tells you that I dare not state the question; that during the three-quarters of an hour that I was before you in my first speech, I did not repeat the proposition. Well, where was the necessity of my doing it? Did not Judge Miller state the question, and call me to it? Brother Hobbs says the question is not universal salvation. I know what the question is; but I do not know wherein lies the advantage of which he boasts. I plant myself upon the broad ground that *all men* will be saved; and if I prove that *all men* will be saved, it will need no additional argument to prove that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel will be saved—for they are included among "all men."

And I ask you, my friends, has brother Hobbs answered any arguments to prove the salvation of all men? I told you at the commencement, that every attempt to overthrow my arguments would be an attack upon God. His first attempt at refuting my argument was an attack upon God's power to accomplish the purposes of his will. Did he not ridicule the idea of God's being able to carry out his will in reference to

the salvation of all men? He asks, "Does not God will, with an irresistible will, that all men shall be saved to-day?" [Mr. Hobbs—"I did not say, 'irresistible.'] Well, he asked, "Does not God will that all men should be saved to-day?" I answered: "No." God says he will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth, but there is no limitation as to time. The word here translated "will" is the Greek word "*thelo*;" the same word used by Christ when he said to the man with the leprosy: "*I will, be thou clean!*" Brother Hobbs' whole argument was based upon the conception of a God unable to accomplish his purposes; clever, well-intentioned, but weak and infirm—who would like to do a good thing for his children, but can not! Every one of his arguments was of the same character.

Look at another point in my brother's logic: "God wills that all men should be saved." My brother and I both agree in that; but my brother says, "All men are not saved *now*—therefore they *never will be saved!* Wondrous logic! Did he get that from Aristotle? I think that without much reference to "Aristotle," and "syllogisms," and "major and minor premises," and "*onus probandi*," and "*petitio principii*," etc., this audience will be able to understand my talk.

My brother has advanced one remarkable idea, from which he draws an equally remarkable conclusion. I am attempting to prove it is God's will that all men will *finally* be saved. Upon this, my brother assumes it is God's will that all should be saved *now*; and because all men are not saved *now*, contends that God's will is thwarted. Brothers and sisters, look at this strange position for a moment. God wills that there shall be ripened corn next fall; therefore, God wills it should be ripe *to-day*; and since it is not ripe to-day, God's will will be thwarted, and corn will never ripen at all! In this argument my brother ignores the law of progress, and the onward flow of God's providence. I say, it is not God's will that all men should be perfect to-day, any more than it is his will that all corn should be ripe to-day. In answer to all this shallow

logic, I simply ask you to look at the method God uses in providence to accomplish his ends. Everywhere we observe a gradual growth, from immaturity and imperfection to ripeness and perfection. Had God desired to create the ear of corn fully ripe without growth, he could have done it; had he desired to create on earth a race that at the moment of their creation should be sinless and perfect, as the angels are, he could have done it. But for man's own final good, God saw fit to create him imperfect, "subject to vanity." It is necessary for the corn to progress, from the smallest germ, through all the manifold phases of imperfection, till it shall become at last the ripened ear; and in like manner he made man, weak, ignorant and imperfect, to pass through all the conditions of change and growth, to ultimate holiness and joy. God could have created and kept the whole race on angelic heights of purity and power; but he chose rather to create man finite, weak, and ignorant, and place him in a world where he must struggle against evil on the one hand, and for good on the other, and in the struggle develop faculty and strength. This is the whole philosophy of life, and a beautiful philosophy it is; but my brother appears not to have caught a glimpse of it. Because corn is not ripe to-day, he argues that it never will be; because all men are not saved to-day, he concludes there is no salvation for them anywhere in the eternal future. I contend that my brother has no right to fix any time beyond which salvation is an impossibility. He assumes that what is not accomplished in this short earthly life, never will be accomplished. He has no warrant, in reason or in scripture, for any such assumption. If he proposes to build an argument upon the present apparent defeat of God's final will and purpose, he has as much authority to apply it to the coming morrow as to the coming world, and assert that those who are not saved by midnight to-night never will be saved.

I call your special attention to the fact—since my brother has dwelt so strongly upon this branch of the subject—that in assuming that God's will is defeated because what he wills

shall *ultimately* be accomplished is not accomplished *immediately*, he deliberately ignores the philosophy of providence and progress throughout the universe. His only chance for successfully maintaining his position is to prove that this world is the only state of probation. This doctrine I deny: it is the most monstrous doctrine that ever obtained currency among men. I will not allow him to assume such a doctrine as a basis for his arguments: he must prove it. If it be true that all the human race who die unreconciled to God are doomed to suffer endless misery—and the whole of the advantage he claims, lies there—then, I say, he is bound to prove by the most explicit statement of the divine word that this is the only world of probation. A doctrine fraught with such infinite and eternal consequences should be written in characters of fire on every page of revelation. But do we find it there? Not at all. The word “probation” is not to be found in the Bible, nor any word signifying it; nor is there any language in the Bible to prove it, without being tortured into a false use. Is such a doctrine to be gathered by implication from a few doubtful passages—from the use of ambiguous words and phrases? It is an insult to the goodness and honor and justice of God to claim it. Let him bring his proof that this life is the only probationary stage of existence, and see what he will make out.

It is a doctrine of my Bible that God rules, and his infinite will and power and goodness extend throughout all worlds, and all times. When my body dies, I am the same afterward as before—God’s subject. Death reduces my mortal frame—the transient habitation of my deathless soul—to its kindred dust; but death can not conquer God, nor place an obstacle in the way of his redeeming grace.

What has my brother done in reference to the philosophy of evil as given in the Bible? He said I used the term “sin” and “evil” as synonymous. He probably did not intend to falsify, but I did no such thing. I gave a definition of “evil,” did I not? I said, “Evil is that which tends to diminish

enjoyment or increase pain.” All sin is evil, but all evil is not sin. All violation of law is evil; but only a *willful* violation of law is sin. If I thrust my finger into the fire, in ignorance of the laws of heat, it is an evil, but not a sin.

But to return: What has my brother done with the passage in the eighth of Romans, explanatory of the origin of evil? He evidently thinks his attempt to do away with the force of that passage was a grand success; but I wonder if the audience thinks so? Let us look for a moment at his explanation of this passage—if that can be called an explanation which made no attempt to explain it, but only to prove that my explanation was incorrect. He did, indeed, assert that the promise that the creature should be “delivered from the bondage of corruption” referred to our spirits being freed from our bodies at death. Dilemmas! Didn’t I hear you saying something about “dilemmas,” Brother Hobbs? Let me show you one, so you can take a good look at its horns. Since you insist upon it, we will suppose the “bondage of corruption” means our mortal bodies. But Christ came to deliver us from this “bondage of corruption”—that is, according to your argument, to sever our spirits from our bodies! Another point—another horn of this dilemma, if you please: will you tell us how God releases us from this mortality “into the *glorious liberty of the children of God*,” when at the resurrection all souls shall be reunited to their kindred bodies, and both, in the vast majority of cases, be plunged into hell, chained in sin, writhing in torment—for I take it my brother believes in the resurrection of the body? [Mr. HOBBS—“Don’t you?”] That is not the question in debate, here. Brother Hobbs, as you appear never to have read the Bible, at least with any correct understanding and discrimination, I will take a little trouble—not for the audience, but for you—and endeavor to enlighten you upon this matter. The apostle James says, “Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed; then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.” Now, lusts are placed in

and belong to this animal nature. The apostle Paul beautifully and strongly expresses the same when he says: "I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." So, that my brother thinks that being "delivered from the bondage of corruption" means being released from these mortal bodies, and I believe it means being delivered from the bondage of sin, which inheres in these mortal bodies, bringing you, and me, and the apostle Paul, and every christian on earth, into captivity to sin and death. We are not so far apart after all. But while I believe that being delivered from this bondage "into the glorious liberty of the children of God," means, into the sinless condition of the angels, he believes that, to the vast majority of the human race, "the glorious liberty of the children of God" means, being bound eternally in chains of sin, and suffering the unremitting tortures of an endless hell. The audience can of course take their choice of our definitions as to the meaning of the expression, "the glorious liberty of the children of God."

My fourth affirmative argument is based upon the proposition that God's providence is perfect, and will result in bringing all things into harmony with himself.

Will is everywhere the product of character. God's will is the product of his essential character. But God's character is changeless; therefore his will and providence are changeless in government and nature. I presume my brother will not venture to deny this plain statement and postulate. James says (i: 17), with the Father of Lights, "there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Is not this precisely what our souls demand of an infinitely wise and perfect God? Because perfect, his character needs no change, and knows none. Job says (xxiii: 13), speaking of the Almighty: "He is in one mind, and who can turn him? To this Brother Hobbs replies: "Any man can turn him." But Job adds something more: "What his soul desireth, even that he doeth." To this

Brother Hobbs makes another addendum: "Provided, man will let him!" To all such statements regarding the unchanging will and immutable purpose of God, my brother utters an indignant denial. In my former speech I quoted the divine declaration: "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." My brother insists upon thrusting an "if" into the mouth of the Almighty, and adds: "if it be consistent with man's pleasure?" Very well, here is Brother Hobbs *versus* the Bible. My brother's logic is based upon the idea of a God changeable, spasmodic, impotent, as the most fickle and feeble of human beings. While God says: "I will do all my pleasure," Brother Hobbs says, it is God's pleasure for "all men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth," but that God's pleasure is not done, and never will be. While God says that "what his soul desireth, even that he doeth," Brother Hobbs says that God in his soul desires to save all men, but in the vast majority of cases is prevented from doing it! His argument is based upon the idea of a finite, imperfect, incompetent, inconstant being, whose plans are changed and whose purposes are thwarted by the feeblest of his creatures. My argument is based upon the idea of a perfect, infinite, immutable God, as set forth in the Bible—and whatever may be your prejudices against me or my cause, I want you to observe that I base my arguments upon the Bible; upon the plain and positive declaration of the scripture: "The Lord God omnipotent reigneth!" —[Time expired.]

MR. HOBBS' SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—I must say that I am more than pleased with the result of my first appearance in a formal public discussion. I did not even dream that I could have so disconcerted my opponent by the remarks made in

my former speech. His plan seems to be to contradict every thing—himself, as well as me. He tells you I have denied that God could do, or would do, his will and pleasure. Did I not positively assert that my theory was based upon those very passages which he quoted to prove his own?

He says it is not true that he used the terms "sin" and "evil" synonymously, or as interchangeable. I know that he did, and so do you. [Mr. KING—"Brother Hobbs, I did not."] I have the proof here in my hands that he did. But let him deny it—that report will show. His third argument was based upon "the nature of evil." He says God can not confer immortality upon evil. Did he not mean to assert that God could not give immortality to sin? [Mr. KING—"Did I say any such thing?"] Did you not use the terms "evil" and "sin" interchangeably? [Mr. KING—"No, Sir."] What bearing had your argument upon the proposition, then? When you claimed that "evil" was in existence in accordance with the divine purpose, did you mean simply small pox, scarlet fever, catarrh, consumption, etc.? Were you not actually talking about "sin," whatever might be the exact terms you used?

Mr. King said that I must answer how "evil" comes. Did he not mean, I must answer how "sin" comes? He says, "evil is any thing that diminishes pleasure or increases pain;" and adds that I must tell how "evil" came into the world; then turns around and in the same breath says that "sin" lies inside the providence of God. All this while he was talking of the same thing, only sometimes he called it "evil," and sometimes "sin." That is what I call using the terms "sin" and "evil" interchangeably. The report will justify my assertion.

It was most amusing to watch his efforts to patch up that "will" argument. I must confess I had no thought I had so completely annihilated his argument at the first attempt. His utter failure must have been apparent to every candid person present. He says I can not believe that God's will can

be accomplished next fall—that the corn will ripen next fall—because it is not ripened *now*. Certainly I can and do believe it. But I asked him, "are any persons saved now?" and he answered: "Yes." Then, I said, those who are saved now, are saved either in accordance with God's will, or contrary to God's will; and of course he dare not say they were saved contrary to God's will, but quoted scripture to prove that it was the will of God that all men should be saved. Then, I asked him if it was not God's will that all men should be saved *now*, *i.e.* in this life? To that he answered: "No." Then I told him, if it is not God's will that all men should be saved now, those who are saved now are saved *contrary* to God's will. Then he saw the trap I had set for him, but it was too late to retreat.

You heard me say something about the horns of a dilemma, did you? Yes and you felt them, too. [Mr. KING—"Terribly!"]

My opponent said man was not created perfect. I said nothing about being created *perfect*. He said, quoting from I Timothy, ii: 4, that God wills that all men should be saved, and come to a knowledge of the truth. But if he will turn over to II Timothy, iii: 7, he will see that some men are "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." My opponent says, since God wills the salvation of all men, all men will be saved, or else God's will will be thwarted. My objection to his position is, he makes the will of God *absolute* in reference to human affairs, leaving no room for moral agency in man. He has told us, truly, that the scriptures are to decide this matter. Well, Paul says (II Timothy, i: 8-9), "Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner: but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel, according to the power of God; who *hath saved us*, and called us with an holy calling, *not according to our works*,"—note that—"but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ

Jesus before the world began." Here, then, we find that at the time when the apostles wrote, there were some who had been saved, and that according to the purpose of God. But my opponent says, God wills that some men should be saved *now, i. e.* in this life. According to this you are a *partialist*; and your pulpit has been ringing with partialism ever since you have been in it. If, some men were saved eighteen hundred years ago, "according to God's own purpose," and yet, others who lived at the same time, are not saved till millions of years after death, perhaps, then, these if saved in accordance with God's will and purpose, must be the objects of divine partiality.

My opponent accuses me of ridiculing the will of God. I hardly know how to account for this absurd charge. I can only explain it by the confusion into which the man was thrown, being utterly unprepared for my unanswerable reply to his argument. You all saw how utterly confused he was. He really seemed to have no idea what he was saying, or what to say next. Did he take any position on the trilemma I gave him in reference to the commandments? I asked him whether it was not the will of God that men should not steal, lie, murder, etc., now; this he dare not deny. Then, if it be God's will that men should not steal, lie, murder, etc., his will must be thwarted, for we know that men do, steal, lie, murder, and disobey every other of the ten commandments; there is a man now in prison in the lower part of this building, for murder, to be hung on the tenth of next month. Now, if it was God's will that that man should *not* murder, God's will was thwarted, for he *did* murder a fellow creature; but if it was God's will that he *should* murder, and if, as my opponent claims, God's will is absolute, and man's will can not interfere with it or thwart it, then that murderer is to be hung for fulfilling the will of God—and that, too, when it was utterly impossible for him to do anything else than precisely what he did.

Now, since Mr. King has been so kind as to give a dissertation on the eighth of Romans, I will return the favor and enlighten him upon the will of God. [Mr. KING—"Do so, if you please."] By the way, I wonder he has not quoted the passage uniformly quoted in debates of this kind: "He doeth according to his will in the army of Heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth." But, I will tell him what is the trouble with his argument: God's will is absolute as a rule of *his own* action; hence the scriptures say: "He doeth"—not man, but "he"—God—"doeth according to his will in the army of Heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth." Here the will of God, as a rule of divine action, is not made to depend for results upon man's moral agency; it is absolute. But God's will, as a rule of human action, is not absolute. God makes his will known, but makes the result, in the case of man, to depend upon man's moral agency. Hence we find the Savior using such language as this: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;" and again: "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." God wills that *all* should come and receive life now—or else he is a partial God, for some do now receive that life. The same idea of God's will contingent upon man's willingness, is found in the Savior's apostrophe to Jerusalem: "O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and *ye would not!*" Again: "The spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let the water of life freely." So, you see, notwithstanding my opponent's endeavors to make it appear so absurd, man's will has something to do with the matter. And there is no contradiction nor inconsistency in this; it is not a thwarting of God's will, since it is his will that certain results should depend upon man's will. When you become able to understand this, Mr. King, you will see and regret the fallacies and

absurdities with which your arguments have hitherto abounded.

Mr. King is in a condition of hopeless confusion in regard to the eighth of Romans. I am well aware that this is usually regarded as the stronghold of Universalism. He says the Greek word *ktisis*, occurring in the twenty-second verse, and translated "the whole creation," means "the whole human family." Now, it is a rule of interpretation that if a word be properly defined, the definition may be substituted in the context, and not injure or alter the sense. Is not that correct? [Mr. KING—"Yes."] Well, let us read this passage again, in its connection: "The creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." *All men* are the "children of God," you Universalists hold, don't you? [Mr. KING—"Don't you?"] I will attend to that, presently. [Mr. KING—"I would simply say here, that "the children of God," or "sons of God," I understand to mean angels, or a higher race of beings; as it is stated, (Job, xxxviii: 7), that when the foundations of the earth were laid, "the morning stars sang together, and all the *sons of God* shouted for joy;" and into the glorious liberty of this happy and sinless race, man is to be delivered from this bondage of a corrupt, carnal nature."] Well, he says "the children of God" means "angels;" I expected him to commit just that blunder, and then I expected to turn it upon him, just as I shall when I have finished up the subject under more immediate consideration. But to proceed with the passage we were reading: "For we know that the whole creation"—*ktisis*, which Mr. King declares to mean the entire human family—"groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now; and not only they"—the whole human family—"but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." Mark—not only *ktisis*, which my opponent declares to mean "the whole human family," but "ourselves also" wait for this redemption;

that is, as General Taylor once said, "The *whole world and the rest of mankind!*" Oh, this is a beautiful interpretation of God's word! It is strange my opponent can not see into what follies such doctrines as he is advocating logically lead him, and evade the snare! When he has attended to this I shall probably have occasion to refer again to *ktisis*.

Perhaps I ought not to dwell any longer upon the eighth of Romans; but I want you to keep one point at the very foundation of my opponent's argument, constantly before you, viz: that when the creature was subjected to vanity, God did it; God subjected the creature to vanity, not consulting the creature's will. He may say that man was created, not subject to the *necessity* of sinning, but only to the *liability* of sinning. But these fine-spun distinctions make no difference in the argument. There is not a Universalist standard author who does not take the position that whatever God foreknows he foreordains. Mr. King takes the same position. He asserts that God looked through this whole plan and its results, and that whatever is in that plan, or results from the forces set in operation by him, are in accordance with his will and purpose. This is his own language here to-night, as near as I can quote from memory. He accomplishes all his plans, and all results are in harmony with his purposes. Why not plainly say in accordance with Rogers, that God is the author of all sin, and that "all events take place agreeably to the unalterable decrees of Jehovah?" This is precisely what Mr. King means—he can mean nothing else; and yet before this discussion is through with, he will tell you that for every sin a man commits he must suffer its full desert; that there is no pardon that can release the sinner from the full penalty of his sin. His doctrine is: God created us subject to sin and misery, without our desire or consent; then, knowing that we *would* sin—foreordaining that we *should* sin: by his unalterable decrees making it an impossibility that we should *not* sin; and yet he wills to wring out of us, in sorrows, pains and penalties, the last iota of punishment our sins deserve—or, rather, *would* deserve

were we, and not he, the author of them;—and there is no remission of the penalty! This is the character Mr. King ascribes to God; and yet he accuses *me* of assaulting the character of God! There is an old and homely adage, by which my friend might profit: "Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones."

Mr. King, in order to get rid of the subject under debate and drive me off upon side issues, affirms that I must prove another state of probation. That is a bright idea, isn't it—for me to abandon the discussion of the question before us, and enter upon the task of proving another state of probation? No other life of probation than this is revealed to us; if we are not saved here, neither you nor I know of any place or time when we can be saved.

My opponent assumes to ridicule my "tricks of the trade." But he is beginning to see and feel their effect, as I knew he would. My only trick consisted in shaping the proposition so as to force him to come up publicly to a fair and square affirmation of the doctrine he preaches. I did not intend to allow him to come up here and appeal to your sympathies by portraying the heathens, and infants, and idiots, roasting in hell-fire.

By referring to Hedges' Logic, page 159, my friend will find that the first canon of logic requires that the proposition must contain the point, and only the point, to be debated. I framed the proposition in accordance with that rule. Then do not accuse me with perpetrating a "trick." I have simply brought him up to a direct affirmation of the doctrine he really preaches, but under the cover of "glittering generalities." The favorite mode of argument with this class of men, is by appealing to the sympathies and prejudices of their hearers—as did one of his brethren, riding on the cars, not long since. Addressing a lady, he inquired of her: "How would you like to know that your son, your darling and beautiful boy, in whom all your hopes are centered—how would you like to know that you had been the means of bringing that boy into

the world, to sin, and die, and go down to an endless hell?" Of course the mother did not wish it, from which the Universalist argued that it could not be true. What sort of logic is that? Because a mother does not wish her boy to suffer endless punishment, therefore there can be no such thing as endless punishment. Apply the same logic to the gallows, and see whether it holds true. Mother, would not your heart be wrung with agony to know that your only child was destined to become a robber or a murderer, and to expiate his crimes upon the gallows? Of course you would. Therefore, according to my friend's mode of reasoning, there can be no gallows! But you know that argument to be utterly inconclusive; it is no argument at all. That kind of maudlin sentimentalism is precisely what I intended to cut out of this discussion, and narrow it down to the one question in debate, when I framed the question as it stands.—[Time expired.]

MR. KING'S THIRD SPEECH.

BROTHER MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I propose at the outset, this evening, to notice a point attempted to be made by my brother on Monday evening, when he quoted to you the language of the apostle Paul, in II Timothy, i: 9: "According to the power of God, who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." The strangest and most significant thing in connection with this matter is, that this verse, of all others, should have been quoted by my friend in opposition to my argument that God governs in human affairs in accordance with his own will. There is not in the whole Bible a verse more directly to the point in my favor, and against his position. You all remember what he was

attempting to prove by this passage; namely, that some persons were already saved in the days of the apostles. I claim that all will be finally saved. My brother argues that those who were saved then, were saved either in harmony with the will of God, or contrary to the will of God; if contrary to the will of God, then God's will was not carried out; if in harmony with the will of God, then God was partial, in saving some then, and not saving others till afterward! Can you see the relevancy of this? If this argument, in the hands of my brother, be a sword against me, it is a two-edged sword, with the sharpest edge against him. If my brother brings a charge of partiality against God for saving some before he saves others, what will he say when, according to his own doctrine, God saves some and never saves others at all; when God takes up a man, for no good works of his own, a sinner, the chief of sinners, makes him a bright and shining light in the christian world, and at last bears him to mansions of eternal glory, while his neighbors, no worse, nor so bad, as he, are turned over to eternal damnation? Not only this, but remember how Paul was converted. God performed a miracle to convert him. God could convert every sinner on the face of the earth, by performing such a miracle as he did to convert Paul; but he does not choose to do it. According to my friend's theology, God performs a miracle to convert the chief of sinners, but plunges his fellow-sinners into an endless hell! Now whose theory accuses God of partiality? God has the right to select men out of an age, a race, a generation, a nation, for a special purpose, and endow them with power and confer upon them authority to carry out that purpose. But my brother arraigns God for this. Nay, more: he arraigns God for injustice and partiality, because he does not convert all men on the same day! What sort of logic is that? Let me make another application of the very same principle, to exhibit its absurdity. God created Paul eighteen hundred years ago; but did not create Brother Hobbs until eighteen hundred years after Paul was created. Supposing both of them to be saved

and sent to Heaven, of which I have not a doubt; then here is Paul, happy in Heaven eighteen hundred years before Brother Hobbs—having eighteen hundred years the advantage of him in Heaven! There is a parallel to my brother's application of the logic of partiality.

My brother has endeavored to invalidate my argument based upon the will of God, by trying to show you that God can not and does not accomplish his will. You remember I told you at the beginning, that every time he attempted to make a point against my doctrine and in favor of his own, he would attack some attribute of God. Evil and sin and suffering are in the world to-day; *ergo*, they will continue for ever: the whole force of my brother's reasoning upon this point turns upon this postulate, either openly asserted, or implied. God is as just, and good, and wise, and powerful, to-day, as he ever will be; consequently, whatever is allowed to exist to-day under the just and good and wise and powerful rule of God, must always continue to exist: that is his assumption. I have before shown you that this assumption ignores the whole lesson of God in providence; that man, like every other created being, commences physically, mentally, morally, spiritually, at the bottom of the scale, a babe, an infant; that he passes through processes, changes, developments, to a ripened end; that immaturity and imperfection must exist anterior to maturity and perfection; that in the economy of growth and progress, evil is an incident, serving a temporary purpose, and when that purpose is accomplished, finally to pass away. But, says my brother, evil is here now, and because it is here now, he denies that it will ever pass away. The inability of God to prevent evil, or to do away with it when thrust into the universe (as my brother claims) contrary to his will, lies at the foundation of all his logic. This low, narrow, one-sided view—so uncomplimentary, irreverent, I might say blasphemous, toward God—and explanatory of nothing, after all—ignores the whole philosophy of growth and progress, as manifest in nature and humanity. Character is the fruit of growth;

growth is the product of action; action springs from motive; motive is rooted in necessity. The simple fact that man is created not a man, but an infant, is a complete denial and overthrow of all my brother's logic. Under the providence of an infinitely wise, good and powerful God, an infant is born into the world to-day, and according to my brother's logic, it must remain an infant throughout eternity. My body is sensitive to cold, and when subjected to it, suffers pain; the necessity of preserving my body from the effects of an undue degree of cold is reported to my brain and urged upon my consciousness by the pain I suffer—and pain and suffering are "evils;" but by them I am stimulated to action, and I clothe my body; in the toil which is necessary to procure that clothing I unfold and discipline my faculties. But the logic of my brother, who argues that the evils to which man is subjected to-day must hold him in subjection forever, would assert that because I suffer from cold to-day, it would be proper for an infinitely wise, and just and benevolent God to thrust me into a snow-bank to freeze for ever! I am hungry, and hunger is a painful feeling—insufficiency of food is a great "evil," but hunger impels me to action, in order to procure that which shall satisfy this necessity of my nature; and in action I unfold my physical and mental powers, and develop manly strength. But because God has made the pangs of hunger incidental to existence and a stimulant to action here, therefore—according to my brother's logic—a man may legitimately expect to starve to all eternity! But this logic proves something more; it proves something not only against sinners, but against saints—using the term "saints" in its ordinary and legitimate sense. For it so happens that that God, the infinitely wise and good and powerful God, whose special child my brother is, if he is converted—ordains, or orders, or permits, or suffers, (you may choose whatever term best suits yourself), that Brother Hobbs should be subjected to-day to the undeniable and excruciating "evil" of a severe tooth-ache; therefore—according to Brother Hobbs' logic—he must suffer that terrible tooth-ache throughout eternity!

In support of my proposition that evil is included in the domain of God, having a temporary place and purpose in the divine economy, I have quoted the plainest declarations of the word of God. You can not but have noticed that he has never even referred to the scripture proofs that I presented; he has sedulously avoided all the leading arguments I adduced; his whole effort has been to ridicule my position; but in doing this, he has only ridiculed God, censured God's providence, denied God's word. If he denies that evil has its place within the domain of God, serving a temporary purpose in his providence, it is my brother's place to show you whence it comes, and how it comes; who it is that has sent here, and insists upon and succeeds in keeping here, something that God does not want here? I think it will not satisfy this audience for my brother to simply stand here, and ridicule me, and the Bible, and deny both, without offering a single explanatory suggestion of his own. Tell this audience, Brother Hobbs, if evil have not its proper place and beneficent purpose in the divine economy, how came it here? If it be not here by divine intention, but in spite of that intention, by whose intention is it here? He stands here and asserts that evil is in the universe, without telling us why or whence; but that it is contrary to the will of God, who does not and can not prevent it; and in the same breath he insists that he is not attacking the will and power of God! I want him now to do either the one thing or the other, with the scripture proofs I presented here. I have quoted any number of such passages as these: "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure;" "He is in one mind, and who can turn him? and what his soul desireth, even that he doeth." In the name of Heaven, what is my brother going to do with these scriptures? If he accepts them, let him say so, and yield his position at once; if he denies them, let him say so, and no longer pretend to base his position upon the Bible. He dare not accept them, he dare not deny them; so he makes no reference whatever to them; yet his denial of my position is a logical denial of these scriptures upon which I base my position.

But he does not forget the Bible entirely. He has volunteered, at last, to help me to a text, and wonders why I have not quoted it before, as it is a favorite one with our people. Well, it is true I have not yet brought up all the texts that might have been adduced in support of my position—for I have not had time to quote the whole Bible. Here is the text he was so anxious for to me quote: "He doeth according to his will in the army of Heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What dost thou?" Very well: there is a text of his own furnishing, in support of my position; I accept it. But what will *he* do with it? Does he deny it? I want to know whether he thinks that statement is true or not? Poor man! It was a pitiful sight to see him break his little, puny lance against that granite wall! My brother, there that text stands, an impregnable bulwark for christian faith, defying every skeptical assault that can be made upon it. But does the audience remember my brother's comments upon this passage? They were most profound, and well worth remembering: He said that when the text says, "He doeth according to his will," it means that *he*—*GOD*—doeth according to his will, and not man! Sublime conception! Profound insight! What new meaning is thrown upon the text, under the light of his brilliant christian genius! But in the next breath he boldly declares that God's will is contingent upon human will, when dealing with human affairs; that "he doeth according to his will in the army of Heaven," his will there being absolute; and also "among the inhabitants of the earth"—when the inhabitants choose to let him! I appeal to the audience if this is not a fair statement of his argument upon the will of God being contingent upon man's will. But the text goes further; it says: "None can stay his hand." "False," cries my brother; "any one can stay his hand, and thwart his plans and defeat his will, now, and to all eternity."

My brother has drawn into the discussion—unnecessarily, it seems to me—the difficult problem of divine foreknowledge

and decrees, which has perplexed the ablest minds in all ages. He thrusts it upon me, as if it were a terrible thing for me to grapple with, but a very simple thing for him and his brethren. I do not see why it should be my special business to settle this vexed question of foreknowledge and decrees; it strikes me it is no more my place to explain it in such a manner as to make it harmonize with *my* position, than it is his place to explain it so it will harmonize with *his* position. He thrusts it upon me—I thrust it back upon him. I challenge him and his friends to solve it in harmony with their theology; when they have done so, it will be time enough for them to call upon me to solve it in accordance with my theology. I wish the audience to observe that all such difficulties are just as formidable in his path as they are in mine.

Precisely the same course he attempted in reference to the origin of evil; he endeavored to compel me to furnish a full and consistent explanation of the matter, without furnishing a word of explanation of his own. He endeavored to ensnare me into a difficulty by begging me to say that God was the author of sin. I was half tempted to say so for his benefit, so lost and forlorn was he for lack of something to say. Now, I am not going to say that God is the author of sin; but I will construct an argument that I think you will confess looks logical, and which would be as difficult for him to answer as for me.

My brother says, man sins by the use of his free will, or moral agency. But who gave to man this moral agency? Why, God, of course. Is God infinitely wise? did he know the end from the beginning? So the Bible declares. Well, when God gave man free agency, did he not know how man would use it? Certainly. And he conferred it upon man of his own free will and pleasure; he was under no compulsion to give that dangerous power to man, or even to create man at all. Now, if God is not the potential author of sin, who is? Do you not see that my brother finds just as much difficulty in solving that problem as I? Take foreordination as a basis of

argument, and we land at last at the same point, so far as the origin of sin is concerned. But I claim that the problem is far more perplexing in his hands than in mine; for he claims that God's will is limited, fettered, thwarted, by man's will—he is fearful that if God's will is left free, sovereign, triumphant, man will be robbed of moral agency, and become a slave; forgetting that on the opposite supposition, God's will is fettered, his power is limited, his plans are thwarted, by man's moral agency, and God becomes the slave. Any system that defends endless sin and misery is based upon the miserable postulate that God's plan of creation and redemption is a gigantic failure, being left completely under the control of human caprice. How different a conception of God is this from that set forth in the passages of scripture I have quoted! If you had never been taught a creed in your life, and some one should stand here and say, in the simple but sublime language of scripture: "The Lord God omnipotent reigneth"—infinitely wise, infinitely kind, infinitely powerful—having created a race of men for his glory and their own good, and purposing to lead them at last to peace and purity, and happiness and Heaven: if this were the statement made to you, and you believed it, would you ever imagine or dream of such a doctrine as my brother stands here to defend? As I have already remarked, if God's will be conditional upon man's will, and contingent upon human caprice, in accordance with my brother's theory, the difficulties in his way are no less than in mine, upon the theory that God's will alone is the sovereign will; that all other wills are inferior and finite, and that these finite wills, without being subjected into slavery and without crushing out their free agency, can be swayed by motives presented, and gradually molded into harmony with the will of God; and this the scriptures declare will be done: this is the meaning of the mission of Christ, the purpose of the whole grand scheme of redemption. I affirm that God's will is sovereign, and man's will subordinate. My brother dare not deny this in words, but bases his logic upon the

hypothesis that man's will is sovereign, and God's will subordinate; that God wills all men should be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth, but that man does, and will to all eternity, thwart and defeat God's will. My brother argues for man's free agency. I am not here to contradict him, so far as that is concerned. But, taking him upon his own ground, he will not deny that when God conferred free agency upon man, he knew how man would use that power. God had a definite purpose in view for the benefit of man, but gave man a power to defeat that purpose. In other words, God deliberately willed to defeat his own will, and ingeniously planned and purposed to thwart his own plans and purposes! My brother, until you pull this beam out of your own eye, don't be so anxious about the little motes in your neighbor's eyes!

Unable to answer my arguments—at least, I have good reason for supposing so, for he has as yet paid no attention to them—he has quoted for your edification the language of Ballou, Whittemore, Rogers, and others. You all see through that game. That is one of the "tricks of the trade," too. If I were base enough I could play it upon him. I am not here to defend everything that may have been said by other men who have believed the doctrine of universal salvation; if *they* uttered absurdities, I am not responsible for them. This is another effort on his part to draw me away from the subject under discussion, and waste my time and that of the audience upon irrelevant issues. I, too, might bring some choice extracts from the literature of those who have held to his side of this question. [Mr. Hobbs—"Bring them on!"] But he would deem it a violation of the rules of christian fairness and the proprieties of discussion, were I to attempt to hold him responsible for all the absurdities his brethren have ever uttered. I say that his course in this matter is an appeal to a base prejudice, and is utterly unworthy of a christian debater and gentleman.

With a dread, a trembling dread, he could not repress, I heard him the other night warn you against listening to any

appeal to your sympathies. For my part, I thank God for human sympathy. But my brother may well tremble, for he knows that every human sympathy utters its eternal protest against the merciless theology he defends. I was ashamed of him, and for him, and shocked, and so were you, when he ventured to speak with a sneer—actually with a *sneer*—of a mother's love, and the feeling she manifested, when asked whether she could be happy if she knew that her child was going to hell. In the name of Heaven, is this holiest affection beneath the sky to be answered by a brutal sneer, that a miserable dogma may be defended?—[Time expired.]

MR. HOBBS' THIRD SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I might, if I were so disposed, cull a beautiful boquet of epithets, distributed so profusely through the speech to which you have just listened. But I forbear; for I have something better, which I shall endeavor to present. But I must say that this debate has been conducted so far, very much out of the propriety which I had hoped would attend its prosecution; and, in proof that I am not mistaken in my idea as to how a debate of this kind should be conducted, I wish to read a short extract from one of the most able, talented, learned ministers in the Universalist ranks—Mr. Austin:

"In a well-regulated discussion, its tone and character depends materially upon the course pursued by the affirmative. If the individual who occupies that position adopts a manly, dignified plan of procedure—if he adheres closely to the question, and forms his arguments so that they bear legitimately and directly upon it—then the negative will be enabled to pursue a similar course, and the way is open for an interesting and profitable investigation. But when the affirmative chooses to lead into another track—recorts to sophistry, trickery, deception—indulges in a strain of fault-finding, vituperation, misrepresentation—into harsh censures, hard names, low epithets—the negative, though unwarranted in pursuing a similar course, even by

such an example, must necessarily modify the nature of his replies to meet so unpleasant an exigency, and the debate can not but lose much of its attraction and value."

I propose, the first thing I do to-night, to hastily review the arguments presented by the affirmative on Monday evening. He complains that I have not paid any attention to them; have pushed them aside; have purposely evaded the real issues in debate. He had better waited. I told him that every argument he advanced should receive due attention.

Mr. King has told you, and that truly, the Bible is to be the ultimate arbiter in this discussion. O, that he could fully realize the force of the declaration he has made! But what has he done toward bringing his proposition to a scriptural test? I assert that not one single argument which he has advanced during this discussion, whether claiming to be scriptural or otherwise, has within it the terms of his proposition. I might, so far as arguments are concerned, take my seat this moment, and say not a word further. I know he has told you that if *all men* are saved, then those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ will be saved, because the less is contained in the greater. But is there not a palpable evasion of the proposition in that statement? I will show you there is. He says he comes here to prove that all men will be "saved." If he were to prove the "*endless* happiness" of all men, then the greater would contain the less, and he might claim that he had gained his point. But what does the gentlemen mean by the term "saved?" Does he mean "endless happiness?" If so, why not say so, and go on with his proof? The agreement signed by both of us before entering upon this discussion was that we should discuss each of the two propositions set forth "in its terms." What are the terms of this proposition? One of them is the word "endless." Have you had any argument from Mr. King to prove "endless" happiness, yet? Suppose he should prove that all men are to be "saved"—to be brought into a condition of happiness—in a future state; his

task is not yet done—he must prove that happiness to be *endless*. I assert, then, that there has not been one single argument, from the beginning of this discussion to the present, having any bearing upon the proposition in its terms.

When Mr. King asserted that the Bible was to be the final arbiter in this discussion, he added another statement, to the effect that “the meaning of the Bible is the Bible.” To that I say: Amen. But he adds another statement, to which I can not agree, viz: that the meaning of the Bible must be ascertained by the attributes of God as revealed in the Bible. This I deny. Let us see to what this would lead us. First, we both acknowledge the Bible to be a revelation from God. If we could have known God, and his attributes, and purposes, and counsels, and will, as they have been revealed, by nature or reason without such a revelation, then a revelation would have been a redundancy. “The world by wisdom knew not God,” said the apostle, long since. And again: “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” Ah, my friends, this book, of all books *the Book*—this is the lantern to our path and the lamp to our feet. Here we must ever draw fresh supplies of knowledge concerning the unseen and eternal One, and his plans and purposes in reference to our present and future being and well-being.

But to return: Mr. King said, we must interpret the Bible by the attributes of God. According to this, we can not interpret the Bible until we know what the attributes of God are. But we can not know what the attributes of God are until we interpret the Bible. Therefore, according to the position taken by the gentleman, the Bible is a sealed book, and must remain so to all eternity. So much for his idea of interpreting the Bible by the attributes of God.

Mr. King says my belief is contrary to the prayer of my heart; that is, my reasoning leads to results from which my feelings shrink. And this he produces as an argument to prove

that all men will enjoy endless happiness. Pray tell me, where does that touch the question? But to accommodate him, since I have nothing else to do, I will analyze this argument. My logic is against the prayer of my heart, therefore my logic must be wrong; in other words, whatever conclusions my reason may reach, if such conclusions are unpalatable, unpleasant, disagreeable, such conclusions must be false. If that be not the argument as stated by him, I know not what is. Let us try this style of argumentation in reference to some other matters. I reason that if the grasshoppers* visit this section in large numbers they will destroy our crops. This is a very unpalatable, unpleasant, disagreeable reflection. It affects not only our feelings but our pockets. Therefore, according to Mr. King's logic—if the grasshoppers visit this section in large numbers they will *not* destroy the crops!

Mr. King referred to the Lord's Prayer: “Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven.” Does Mr. King pray that prayer? Did he not wish to bind it upon me that the sessions of this debate should be opened only with the Lord's Prayer? But is the Lord's will done in earth as it is in Heaven? No. Will it be to-morrow? If so, then we shall have Heaven on earth; for I apprehend that where the Lord's will is done perfectly, there is Heaven. But the Lord's will is not done on earth to-day, nor will it be to-morrow. The gentleman told you that whatever the Lord wills, must be accomplished; but I showed him that it was the Lord's will that men should not lie, steal, swear, murder, etc., and yet all these things were done, consequently the Lord's will was not accomplished; thus placing the gentleman in a dilemma from which he has not yet extricated himself, and never will, for he never can. He quoted for my benefit the passage in Paul's Epistle to Timothy, commanding us to pray for the salvation of all men, lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting, and

*The grasshopper plague was just commencing its ravages at Des Moines at the time this discussion was held.

claimed I could not thus pray without doubting, because I did not believe in the salvation of all men. But when he prays the Lord's Prayer, he must pray without faith, for he does not believe the Lord's will is done in earth as it is in Heaven to-day, nor will be to-morrow. So the argument based upon prayer hits himself precisely as hard as it does me.

The gentleman quoted from Paul's Epistle to the Phillipians, ii: 9, 10, 11: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." I have read a little more than he did, but my quotation includes the passage that he quoted. Then he turned back to Isaiah, (xlv: 23), and read: "I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." These passages, the gentleman refers to a future state. He talked much about the corn, that is not ripe now, but will be next fall, forgetting that man had any agency in making the corn grow. But let us see what conclusion Paul draws from this passage. Romans, xiv: 10, 11, 12: "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." But, says my friend, and all Universalist writers, the judgment is not in the future, but here, constantly going on. But Paul quotes from Isaiah xlv, to prove that we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and Mr. King says Isaiah xlv, refers to the future state—to a period beyond the resurrection. So, according to Mr. King's own showing, there is to be a judgment beyond the resurrection. But in any case, the argument did not touch the proposition; for even if Mr. King had

proved that at that period beyond the resurrection, everybody should be made happy, he has not yet given us a word or syllable of proof that their happiness must necessarily be "endless," according to the terms of the proposition. I simply drop these remarks by the way, promising that I shall use this argument when I come upon the affirmative.

Mr. King quoted Hebrews, ii: 8, and I was really astonished to hear this quotation and exegesis: "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." This passage Mr. King refers to a future state, and interprets "him" to mean Christ, or God, I forget which. Now, I have always supposed that Paul was here talking about *man*. Let us look at the context. In verses 6 and 7 we read: "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; (verse 8,) thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet." Whose feet? Why, the same person that was set over the works of his hands, etc. But who was David talking about? (See Psalm viii: 4.) Why, *man*. "But now we see not yet all things put under him," (man); (verse 9): "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." Now, what is the meaning of all this? I have always understood it to mean that man, in the original creation, was put into a state of superiority, and endowed with regal power; not, as Mr. King says, "subjected to vanity,"—sin and misery—but "crowned with glory and honor." It is hardly worth while to spend any time in exposing so egregious a blunder as this; but I refer to it as a fine specimen of Mr. King's hermaneutics.

Mr. King's second argument was based upon the proposition

that God will be glorified in the results of his creation and providence. He quoted Psalm lxxxvi: 9: "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name." Also, Matthew, v: 16: "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." He must take the phrase "all nations" to mean every individual of the race, or else his argument can mean nothing. Surely those who have ceased to exist as nations can not come *as nations* and worship and glorify God. Have nations an immortality? If so, "with what body do they come?" I do not think the gentleman can retort "thou fool," as Paul once did to a similar question, but upon a different subject. [Mr. KING—"I used that passage, and the one in Matthew, simply to prove that the glorifying of the Father was to come through worship; I did not attempt to prove that 'all nations' meant every individual of the race."] I know you did not *prove* it, but simply *asserted* it; what I want is your *proof* of the fact.

I wish to refer again to the controversy between us in regard to "sin" and "evil", in order to make an *amende honorable*. I find I was mistaken when I asserted that the gentleman in his argument upon that subject used the terms "sin" and "evil" interchangeably. I was so impressed by the nature of the argument—which could have no bearing whatever upon the subject unless he was using the word "evil" in the sense of "sin"—that I was thus led into error. I find by the report that I was mistaken. I recall the statement. But, Mr. King, do you believe that all the evil in the world is here by virtue of divine plan and intention, or only a part of the evil? [Mr. KING—"Don't leave your argument, Brother Hobbs!"] I ask you, sir, do you mean *all* evil, or only *a part* of the evil, is here by virtue of divine plan and intention? What kind of evil do you mean? [Mr. KING—"Well, grasshoppers, for one thing!"] So, then, grasshoppers have a *moral character*, have they? It would be absurd to say that anything was contrary to the nature of God which has not a moral character. If his

argument has any relevancy at all, he must use the word *evil* in the sense of *sin*, for no class of evils except *sin* has any moral character. To say that that is contrary to the character of God, which has no moral character, would be as absurd as to say that a horse or a stone is contrary to the moral character of God. You perceive, if his argument has any relevancy at all, he must have used the term "evil" in the sense of "sin." Perhaps he means *pain*; (for he thinks *pain* is an evil; and the other evening he gave as a definition of "evil," "that which diminishes pleasure or produces pain.") Then evil is, according to his speech this evening, both cause and effect—*pain*, and the cause of *pain*. Such is the absurd position in which he places himself by his argument upon the origin of evil. In introducing this argument, based upon Romans, viii: 20, Mr. KING said: "This is my strong proof; if I am uprooted from this, I am a defeated man." He has been completely driven from that stronghold. Now let him come up in a manly way and acknowledge himself defeated.

Mr. KING's fourth argument is based upon the proposition that God's providence is perfect, and will result in bringing all things into harmony with himself. This is simply his second argument revamped. But what did he mean by "all things"? Why didn't he say "all the human race"? I saw him looking around beseechingly, to see whether I would let him. He was planning to entrap the audience with a sophism; there was another "all things" for which he was paving the way. His first proof was James, i: 17: "With the Father of Lights there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." And then he followed with a long argument to prove that God is unchangeable—a long and utterly needless argument, for I never knew anybody to deny it; certainly I do not. He also quoted Job, xxiii: 13: "He is in one mind, and who can turn him? and what his soul desireth, that he doeth." Well, I have no fault to find with that; I believe it as firmly as my opponent can. But how does this militate against my position? Is not punishment for sin in harmony with God's providence now?

Then, according to my opponent's own argument, it must be in harmony with God's providence hereafter. Certainly, if God has revealed it, it may be in harmony with his providence. He admits that in this state of probation, God's providence will not bring all things into harmony with himself. But he asserts that this is not the only state of probation; and in the next sentence makes the assertion—which renders his argument suicidal—that the word *probation* is not to be found in the Bible, nor any word of similar signification. Then, how does he know there is another state of probation? He admits that men die in sin. Then, if the scriptures tell us of no state of probation hereafter, they must remain endlessly in sin—hence endlessly in punishment, because punishment must follow sin, so long as sin shall last. Hence punishment is endless. There is no possibility of avoiding this conclusion.—[Time expired.]

MR. KING'S FOURTH SPEECH.

MESSEURS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—My brother opened his last speech by complaining of my manner of conducting this discussion. I will not spend my time in discussing that point. The audience will recollect the manner in which he commenced his first speech, and the style in which this discussion has been conducted on his part, since that time. I have striven, amid great and frequent provocations to the contrary, to treat him courteously. I have called him "my brother," even until now; but he has not seen fit to return the compliment once. But let this pass—it is not worth spending time upon.

My brother has again brought upon the carpet the Eighth of Romans, claiming that he has uprooted me from the position I took relative to the origin of evil as set forth in the

quotations I read from that chapter. I appeal to this audience to say whether he has done anything toward invalidating the argument I built upon that magnificent passage. I ask you whether the positions which he has taken in reference to it have not been of a character to comparatively fritter away its meaning? I ask you whether, if I had stood here and treated the Bible as my brother has, captiously criticised and ridiculed that plain and beautiful lesson, if his friends would not have charged me with handling the word of God deceitfully, and trifling with sacred things? He has tried to make the passage sound ridiculous by substitution. He said I had claimed that the word translated "creature" meant the whole human race. Certainly. For whom was the Bible given? for whom did Christ suffer death on Calvary? for whom was Paul writing his epistles—but for the human race? Can my brother mention any other "creature" but *man*, that "was made subject to vanity," and that is destined to be "delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God?" He may cast as much ridicule upon the idea as he chooses, it is the correct one, and he knows it; only, it will not do to grant the argument. But while he was creating amusement for himself and his brethren by substituting "the whole human race" for "the creature," he was doing precisely that—only he did not know it—which would make the meaning of the passage perfectly plain and clear. It was "the whole human race" that was "made subject to vanity"; it is "the whole human race" that shall yet "be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." But here my brother discovered a wonderful and exceedingly amusing thing; "not only they," says the apostle, "but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves." How can "the creature" mean "the whole human race," when reference is afterward made to "ourselves?" And at this he raised a laugh among his audience by quoting a ludicrous blunder of General Taylor. I fail to see the difficulty here

which seems so palpable to my brother. He says, "the whole creation, groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now;" and not only creation at large, the human race in general, but even we apostles and converted men, "which have the first-fruits of the spirit," we ourselves are subject to the same law, we groan with the same groaning.

He complains of my mode of interpreting this passage; but when driven to furnish another interpretation, see what work he makes of it! He told you that being "delivered from the bondage of corruption" meant being set free from these mortal bodies. But I referred you to the fact that the creature was to be delivered not only *from* "the bondage of corruption," but delivered *into* "the glorious liberty of the children of God;" and inquired of him how this was to be accomplished by chaining men in sin and torment forever? To this he has not vouchsafed any explanation as yet. But he has proceeded a little further in his explanation of the passage: he tells us that that for which not only the whole creation but we ourselves groan within ourselves, is, "the redemption of the body!" these actual physical bodies! So all that Paul preached and wrote and suffered for, all that Christ died for, all that God labored for, was the redemption of our human bodies! But suppose I grant so strange and unnatural an assumption as that; will my brother tell us how our *bodies* are to be delivered into "the glorious liberty of the children of God" under his theology which binds them in eternal chains in hell forever? Brother, you may as well let that scripture alone. There is no such thing as a consistent or reasonable interpretation of it in accordance with your doctrine. The whole grand theme is redemption, the redemption of the race, of the whole race, from the vanity—the evil and suffering—to which it was temporarily subjected in hope, into "the glorious liberty of the children of God!"

A word by the way, in reference to the translation of this passage. It may seem presumptuous in me to say anything

about this, when I see my brother surrounded by and saturated with the combined wisdom and scholarship of his denomination. You will remember the declaration of Paul elsewhere that he himself is under the dominion of his carnal nature; that he finds a law in his body, dragging down his soul into captivity to sin and death; so desperate is the conflict between the spiritual and carnal in his nature, that he cries out in an agony, "Oh, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" or this body of death!" This is near the close of the seventh chapter of Romans. And here, in the eighth we have, in the original, the same idea again, though somewhat obscured in the English version on account of erroneous translation. Every school-boy, who ever read in a Greek primer, knows that the Greek word, "*apolutro*," here translated "redemption," means "a setting free from," "cutting loose from"; the verb derived from it of course meaning "to set free from," "to cut loose from," etc. The fundamental idea is that of separation; severing the bonds by which one is bound, and setting him free. *Apolutro* is the verb; [Mr. HOBBS—*Apolutrosis*.] Well, *apolutroo*, then; and *apolutrosis* is the noun, with similar signification. Now, mark you, the primary idea here is separation; a separating of bonds, or separating a man from his bonds. Well, what next? Why, every boy who has ever studied an ordinary Greek grammar, (say that of Dr. Bullion—he is one of the best of Greek scholars, and thoroughly orthodox at that), knows that in defining the Greek cases, the genitive conveys the idea: First, of *separation*; Second, of *origin*; Third, of *possession*. Now, what are the signs of the genitive case? Bullion says the sign of the genitive is "of" or "from." What next? Why, it is a plain rule of syntax and common sense, that where we have a genitive case connected with a verb or substantive denoting separation, it should be translated with the word "from." Here we have just such a case—the word *apolutroo*, meaning "a cutting loose from," "a setting free from." And the correct rules of Greek construction are strong as an iron

chain in favor of the principle for which I am contending, that the phrase in our common version translated "the redemption of the body," should be, "the redemption *from* the body." The same word is here found that is used in the eighth chapter: "Who shall *deliver* me *from* the body of this death?" where it is translated "from" instead of "of." The cases are parallel, and demand the application of the same rules, and a similar translation. With this thought in mind, you will perceive a beautiful harmony between Paul's expression here and his reasoning upon the same subject elsewhere.

I closed my former speech in the middle of an argument in regard to my brother's sneer at the idea of appealing to a mother's sympathies. I asked, and I ask again, if this holiest affection beneath the sky is to be met by a brutal sneer, that a miserable dogma may be defended? I ask my brother here, who claims to be a christian, and is a father—I ask him, as a christian father, in the presence of God and his own conscience—could you, sir, be happy in heaven, knowing that your child was wailing in an endless hell? Answer me truly, and then sneer, if you can, at that question directed to a mother! Thank heaven for a mother's love! the love that guarded and protected my infancy, that shielded my childhood years from evil, that followed me with counsels and prayers all the way up to manhood, and then went to heaven, pouring benedictions on my head; the love that never is alienated, never grows weary, but follows its object through all the devious windings of willfulness and sin, ever yearning, ever laboring to win the wanderer back, ever pleading with God to bring the poor prodigal home! But how did my brother answer this sacred appeal to a mother's affection? Why, he said: "Mother, would not your heart be wrung with agony to know that your only child was destined to become a robber or a murderer, and expiate his crimes upon the gallows?" Ah, my brother, if this evasive answer is an argument for or against anything, it is fatal to *your* system, not mine. If the temporary suffering and temporal ruin of her child would cause such grief to the

mother, how can the knowledge of his *endless* sin and suffering but fasten in her heart the barbs of an immortal anguish? But perhaps the point of my brother's argument lies in his query whether the mother's grief is a proof that there is no gallows, or will avert her boy's impending doom? No: for the mother's love is not matched by her power. In this question, my brother again, as he inevitably must in every argument in behalf of his theory, makes a direct attack upon the character of God, assuming that he is either as powerless as a human mother, or as heartless as a fiend. Because the mother can not prevent the sad calamity my brother has pictured, therefore God can not prevent one infinitely greater. Give the mother power commensurate with her love, and she will reform her boy, and save him from such a shameful end. Give the omnipotent God a mother's love, and he will correct and restore, and save the erring child from endless sin and suffering. But my brother's argument is based upon the miserable assumption that as the mother is impotent in the one case, so God is impotent in the other. By such logic alone, by such attacks upon the divine perfection, does my brother attempt to prove the endless damnation of a majority of his fellow-creatures, and invalidate my arguments in behalf of the glorious doctrine of the final reconciliation of the world to God.

The audience must have marked in his last speech another illustration of Brother Hobbs's tendency to misrepresent my arguments, and to apply to my language a meaning that could not legitimately be attached to it. He says I quoted Psalm lxxxvi: 9: "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O, Lord; and shall glorify thy name," and that I argued or asserted that "all nations" meant every individual of the race. It may mean so, but I never argued or asserted any such thing. I quoted that text simply to show that the glorifying of God's name was to come through worship. I quoted Matthew, v: 16: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven," to prove

that the Father was glorified by a christian life. The same thought is to be found in Phillippians, ii: 11, where Paul says that every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, "to the glory of God the Father." And we need not even go to revelation to learn that my Father is glorified by the obedience and love of his children: a hardened, disobedient child is a disgrace, and not an honor, to its father.

I had not finished my fourth affirmative argument, based upon the proposition that God's providence is perfect, and will result in bringing all things into harmony with himself, when my time expired. I argued that God's providence was perfect, because the outgrowth of one coherent and changeless purpose, based upon God's immutable will, which will was sure to be accomplished. I assumed that God was not a finite, imperfect, incompetent, inconstant being, the feeblest of whose creatures could successfully interfere with his purposes and compel him to change his plans. I anchored my argument upon the scriptural declaration that over this universe "The Lord God omnipotent reigneth!"

But my brother objects to my basing any arguments upon the attributes of God. He says I stultify myself when I say that the Bible must be interpreted in the light of the attributes of God as revealed in the Bible. I can not see this. My Bible tells me God is love; that he is infinite, omnipotent, great, wise, holy, just, and perfect; that he is "our Father." These plain statements all can comprehend. These I call the great central lights of revelation, giving meaning to every part. Any interpretation of scripture ascribing to God conduct utterly inconsistent with his omnipotence, wisdom, justice, love, perfection, must be incorrect. That is what I meant when I said the attributes of God as proclaimed in the Bible are the great central lights by which to interpret the Bible. If my brother has any other light by which to interpret it, let him tell us what it is, and whence it comes. It is not a heavenly one, most assuredly. So I shall proceed with my argument, based upon God's own declarations concerning his

own character and power. I shall place the word of God against that of Brother Hobbs, and the audience can believe whichever they choose.

The Almighty declares, Isaiah, xlvi: 9, 10: "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." Brother Hobbs quotes that magnificent passage with a semi-sneer, and says it is a falsehood; God can not, and does not, and never will do all his pleasure. And then he tells you I have not proved anything! See also Isaiah, lv: 10, 11: "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.*" That is not my language, Brother Hobbs, but the language of God; now quote that with a sneer, and tell the audience that it amounts to nothing. I quoted Collossians, i: 19, 20: to show what it was that it pleased God should be accomplished: "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.*" In opposition to my doctrine that God wills, and will accomplish the final reconciliation of all things unto himself, which horn of the dilemma will my brother take: that the quotation from Collossians is false, and that it has *not* pleased the Father "to reconcile all things to himself"—or that the quotation from Isaiah is false, that God shall *not* accomplish that which he pleases? I quote to similar effect, I Corinthians, xv: 28: "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.*"

As God's whole character and will are thus actively employed in the work of salvation, it must follow logically and inevitably

that every attribute of his nature is employed in that work, for the whole must include the parts. I challenge my brother to point out any attribute of God which is not in harmony with this work: nay, more; which is not committed to it, and pledged to its success.

My fifth affirmative argument is based upon the mission of Christ. I hold these propositions to be true: 1. Christ came into the world to save all men. 2. He has power to perform work. 3. He will use that power to that complete that work.

In proof of the first proposition, that Christ came into the world to save all men, I quote I John, iv: 14: "And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the son to be *the saviour of the world*," I Timothy, ii: 6, "Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom *for all*, to be testified in due time;" I John, ii: 2: "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins *of the whole world*;" Hebrews, ii: 9: "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*."

In proof of the second proposition, that Christ had power to perform the work he came to do, I quote, 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 thing to himself;" John, xvi: 15: "All things that the Father hath are mine;" John, xvii: 2: "Thou has given him [Christ] power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him;" Hebrews, i: 2: "God * * * hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir all of things;" Matthew, xxviii: 18: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."

In proof of the third proposition, that Christ will use the power conferred upon him to complete the work for which he was sent into the world, I quote Isaiah, liii: 11: "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied." In connection with Hebrews, i: 2, which asserts that God hath appointed his

Son the "*heir of all things*," I quote John, vi: 37: "*All that the Father giveth me shall come to me*;" also, the thirty-ninth verse of the same chapter: "This is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing;" John, x: 16, "And other sheep have I, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be *one fold and one shepherd*;" I Corinthians, xv: 21, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall *all be made alive*;" also, same chapter, verses 24, 25, 26: "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;" also, same chapter, verses 55, 56: "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." Now, my brother, how could Paul sing the song of victory over the grave, and death, and the sting of death, if sin, which is the sting of death, is to continue forever? And yet my brother denies that sin is to be ended, but stands here defending the doctrine of eternal sin and endless suffering. Romans, v: 20, 21, is to the same import, and furthermore brings us again face to face with the same philosophy of evil, concerning which so much has been said already. God, in giving us his law, well enough knew that it would not be obeyed by all—no, nor by any; but it was given as an ideal, toward which man might labor, and by which he might measure his own deficiencies and failures; as the apostle says: "Moreover, the law entered *that the offense might abound*." Does that look as if there were any divine intention and purpose in this matter? But if this had been all, it would have been indeed a wretched providence; but this is not all: "Where sin abounded, *grace did much more abound*." Now, sin has abounded everywhere; every human soul has been subjected to it; but how can grace abound *much more* than sin if many souls are to be left forever in bondage to sin? But

we have the word of God for witness, that where sin abounds, grace shall *much more* abound; "that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness *unto eternal life* by Jesus Christ our Lord."

Still more plainly, if possible—as plain as it is possible for language to express anything—is this fact set forth in Paul's epistle to the Ephesians, i: 9, 10: "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*." Again, Philippians, iii: 20, 21: "For our citizenship is in Heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, 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*."

Now, Brother Hobbs, with these scriptures plainly before you, bearing directly upon the proposition in debate, will you, dare you, stand before this audience and repeat that I have proved nothing? On these passages, and such as these—for I have quoted not a tithe of those which might be presented, bearing upon this subject, did time permit—on these and similar scriptural declarations I build my philosophy and my religion; tear these from my sky, and I abandon faith and hope, for myself and for mankind, and leave the world to drift on in darkness, without a purpose or a plan, in weakness, and helplessness, and eternal orphanage.—[Time expired.]

MR. HOBBS' FOURTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I am certainly surprised at the exceeding sensitiveness manifested by my friend. He complains that I am lacking in courtesy

and appears to feel very much grieved because I do not call him "Brother." Were you discourteous, Mr. King, when, on your door-steps, some three weeks since, you called me "Mr. Hobbs?" And since then, at different times? Did you on those occasions intend any disrespect to me? If not, then do not accuse me of discourtesy in addressing you as "Mr. King."

You all saw what a hurry he was in during his last speech, rattling over those passages of Scripture so rapidly that nobody could follow him, or get any idea of what he was attempting to prove by them. I should be in a hurry, too, if I had been speaking for a whole evening, and not put in one single argument, when I had the *onus probandi*. If he expects to keep going back to the Eighth of Romans, and patching up his argument on that, he will not get to any other argument upon the question for the next six weeks.

A word about his Greek: I do not profess any special proficiency in Greek; but I think I know enough about the language to upset any such criticism as he has made in reference to the phrase translated "redemption of the body," in the Eighth of Romans. Did you not think it a remarkable thing that the gentleman refused to take the Greek text and read it? I am frank to tell you, I think he could not do it; not alone because he refused to attempt it, but from the ignorance he manifested in his criticism upon the text. The Greek text has here "*apolutrosin tou somatos heemon*;" but when he went to criticising the translation he did not even so much as give the word for redemption that occurs in the text, till he heard me mention the right word to my moderator, and then corrected himself. I acknowledge it is not a pleasant task to expose such pedantry; but it is sometimes necessary, when a man presents himself before the public as a great scholar, proficient in the languages, etc., and endeavors to carry a weight of influence with the public to which he is not entitled. The word in the text is not *apoluo*—it is *apolutrosis*, from *apolutroo*, meaning "to redeem." To prove this I refer you to Pickering, or Robinson, or any other Greek dictionary. The word he referred

to, *apolo*, does mean "to loose," "to separate by loosing;" but the trouble is, that is not the word in the text. If the word were *apolo*, then there might be some pertinency in his criticism; but as it is another word entirely, his criticism is utterly inapplicable. The word here used, *apolutrosis*, occurs in the New Testament twelve times; and is rendered "redemption" in every instance but one. It is the same word used in Colossians, i: 14: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Also, Luke, xxi: 28: "Your redemption draweth nigh;" Romans, iii: 24: "Through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." So in the other several places where the same word is used. In one instance only is the word rendered "deliverance." So much for his criticism on the translation of Romans, viii: 23—a criticism which has no relevancy, whatever, to the text, it being upon a word which is not even contained in the text. You remember he voluntarily told you that if I uprooted him from this passage he was a defeated man. Now, let him come up and acknowledge himself defeated, and give up his case.

This is his second attempt at Greek criticism, and from the result in both cases I presume it will suffice him for this discussion. Has he answered my criticism on *klisis*, in the Eighth of Romans? He made it mean "the whole human family;" but I exhibited to him the ludicrousness of the text with such an interpretation, for that would make it read, "not only the whole human family, but ourselves also," wait for the redemption of the body. Has he ever disposed of that? But enough of *klisis*.

He says the phrase "children of God," in Romans, viii: 21, means "angels;" and quotes from Job, xxxviii: 7, where it is said the sons of God shouted for joy. But in Job, xxxviii: 7, the Greek word used happens to be *aggeloi*. In Matthew, xxv: 31, the same word *aggeloi* is found, and is there translated "angels." I expect him to use the twenty-fifth of Matthew, yet—and if he does not, I will—and then I intend to hold him to his translation of the word *aggeloi*—"sons of

God." But I call Mr. King's attention to the fact that the term "children (or sons) of God" occurs four times in this immediate context; but only in this one case, the twenty-first verse, does he explain it to mean the angels of light; and I ask him to tell me by what authority he interprets it to mean angels in this one place, but not in the rest?

Mr. King uses language toward me, which I might retort upon him, but I will not. After the *amende honorable* which I made, without constraint, except as my own conscience dictated, I did hope there would be no more misrepresentation on his part. But it seems my hopes were groundless. He quotes from Isaiah: "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure," and various other portions of scriptures; and then charges me with giving God the lie. I believe those passages; I have told him again and again that I believed them; what I do not believe is the gentleman's interpretation of them. But with him, it seems, to deny his interpretation of the Bible is to deny the Bible. His own interpretation of the Bible is the only one he will admit; he insists upon his own infallibility; he would make a splendid pope, and Pope Pius IX ought to vacate the chair at once and let him take possession!

No matter what arguments I advance, Mr. King pays no attention to them, nor makes any attempt to reply. If he pretends to state them, he perverts them, and replies to something wholly outside of the arguments I really made. He has done this in regard to my answer to his argument on the will. I said, the commands of God are given, either, first, without reference to the will of God; or, second, contrary to the will of God; or, third, they are the expression of the will of God. If they are given without reference to the will of God, then we have God acting without a will; if they were given contrary to the will of God, then we have God acting against his own will; if they are the expression of the will of God, then God's will is not always accomplished, for the commandments are not always obeyed. One of the three horns of this trilemma

he must take; but he has never noticed my argument at all. He has advanced the position that whatever God wills must be accomplished; but God wills the salvation of all men; therefore all men will be saved. The trouble with him is, the salvation of all men is not the question we are debating here. I demanded of him that he should put his arguments into the shape demanded by the terms of the proposition; but he will not do it; he persists in violating the solemn agreement he made with me before the debate commenced, to discuss each proposition mentioned "in its terms." I ask this audience whether the gentleman has advanced a single argument to prove that the happiness of *anybody* will be "endless." I hope he will not allow this discussion to pass without making the attempt, or else confessing his utter failure. He says: "God wills the salvation of all men." But what he means by "salvation" I do not know; nor anybody else, as I can discover. If he means "endless happiness," why not say so? I will put his argument into syllogistic shape for him. "God wills the endless happiness of all men; but those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ are a part of all men; therefore God wills the endless happiness of those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ." But another syllogism is needed in order to reach the terms of the proposition, as follows: "Whatever God wills must be accomplished; but God wills that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall enjoy endless happiness; therefore those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ will enjoy endless happiness." Now, it is the law of the syllogism, and he has admitted it, that no conclusion can be drawn in an argument, except from two propositions, either admitted by the opponent or proved by the affirmant. But in the syllogism before you, there is a *petitio principii* in both the major and the minor premise. Has he proved to you that whatever God wills must be accomplished? Where is his argument? Have I not shown that God's will is *not* always accomplished? For it is God's will that men

should not lie, steal, swear, murder, etc., yet men do all these things daily. So you see the fallacy in his argument there. And in the minor premise he begs the question in the same way. Has he proved that it is God's will that those who die disobedient to the gospel of Christ shall enjoy endless happiness? What arguments has he adduced in proof of this? None—none whatever. His arguments—such as they were—have had no bearing upon the proposition; and if they had, there is a *petitio principii* in both branches of his syllogism.

I have explained to him where the fallacy in his argument was, but he has paid no heed to it. But though he has failed to understand me, the audience will not. God's will is absolute as a rule of the Deity's action, but not absolute as a rule of human action. That is, God has been pleased to make certain results concerning human interests, depend upon man's will; as, "Ye *would not* come unto me that ye might have life;" "*Whosoever will*, let him take the water of life freely." He tries to ridicule this argument by saying that "whatever God does will, he does will." I am surprised—not indignant, for I have nothing to be indignant over. If he goes on in this way, showing that he can not meet my argument, I have nothing to be indignant over—though his friends may have.

My opponent's argument based upon God's pleasure I reduce to the same trilemma: God's commands must be given either contrary to God's pleasure, or without reference to his pleasure; or they must express what is his pleasure. The gentlemen will not venture to assert that the commandments are given contrary to God's pleasure, or without reference to his pleasure. They must express what is his pleasure. Then it is God's pleasure that men should not lie, swear, steal, etc.; but men do lie, swear, steal, etc.,—consequently God's pleasure is not always accomplished—and for the same reason as above given—because God has seen fit to make some things depend upon man's pleasure. This trilemma will sweep away every argument you can bring; and I put it into the hands of the people as a key to unlock the entire arcana of Universalist sophistry.

The argument upon the will and pleasure of God, when properly used, instead of supporting Mr. King's position, overthrows it. For, if it be God's will and pleasure that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ should suffer endless punishment, and God's will and pleasure must be accomplished, the result is inevitable, from Mr. King's own logic, that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ must suffer endless punishment.

Mr. King, on Monday evening, was going to compel me to prove that there was no future world of probation—to prove a negative! But I soon showed him that the *onus probandi* was with him, and since then he has not had a word to say upon the subject. A fine time he would have, endeavoring to prove a future world of probation! Why, the idea would sap all the foundations of christianity. Suppose Mr. King comes to a gentleman among his acquaintances, and says to him, "My dear sir, you ought to be converted, and become a christian." To this the other might reply, "O, Mr. King, I don't see any necessity for that; I am very busy just now, and have a great many other matters to occupy my attention; beside, it don't make any difference—there is no need of being in a hurry—you teach that a man can repent and be converted at any time, after he is dead as well as before; and if I should happen to die in my sins, you will doubtless be a missionary in hell, and I will attend to the matter when we get there!" This procrastination is the legitimate, logical result of your doctrine of another state of probation.

The gentleman says I sneer at a mother's sympathies. I, who have enjoyed the affection of as loving a mother as ever lived; over whom she has watched through many a sleepless night; I, who have shared her tender care through the many dangers of childhood—I, sneer at a mother's love? No, sir: I could not; nor have I done so. But I *do* sneer at his attempt to found a theology on the sympathies of a mother's heart, that he could not establish by manly logic. When I spoke of the gallows in the illustration the other night, I did it only for

the purpose of showing the fallacy of his argument, in appealing to the mother's sympathies. The logic of his argument was that the unfortunate end of any child could not but be contrary to the wishes and feelings of any mother's heart, therefore no such unfortunate end could occur. The absurdity of this position is manifest, and he has as yet been unable to extricate himself from it. You understand now why I worded this proposition so as to prevent his indulging in these "glittering generalities," and appeals to a weakly sentimentalism. The result, as you see, justified my foresight in cutting down the proposition to the simple, the only question at issue between us. Now, it seems to me that there has been enough of this kind of talk, and that it were about time your attention was called to something solid in the way of argument.

He says it is not partiality in God to save some to-day, and others to-morrow. Here, you see, he uses the word "saved" as interchangeable or synonymous with "conversion." If God, for the accomplishment of his own wise purposes, converts some men in this world, and leaves others to be converted in the other world, after millions of years of sin and suffering—that is not partiality! His nonsense about Paul being created and converted and sent to Heaven eighteen hundred years ago, thus having eighteen hundred years the advantage of the present generation, I shall not attempt to reply to; I need not. Your own common sense will answer all such arguments as that.

I believe I have answered all that he has said hitherto, except his argument based on the mission of Christ; and to that I have not time to reply in this speech. In conclusion, I have only to say that I have unquestionably uprooted him—to use his own expression—from the Eighth of Romans, and we will see whether he has the temerity to bring it up again. I have proved the judgment to be in the future; in the eternal state. The coming of Christ is therefore in the future. But the judgment being, by his own proof-texts, in the future state,

there must be in that judgment, as in all judgments, a discrimination of character. And we know that, at that time, it will be said: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still." And beyond that, as Mr. King says, there is no change; the states of probation (no matter how many he may contend for), have all terminated then; the unjust will remain unjust forever, the holy will remain holy to all eternity; and thus I have proved my proposition, before I have come to it. And in proving my own, I have defeated his, and defeated it forever; and I ask the gentleman to come up manfully to-morrow evening and acknowledge his defeat.

One thing I do not know but I ought to refer to by way of explanation. Mr. King and I are, both of us, by natural constitution, of an ardent and excitable temperament. I can answer for myself that whatever I do, I do with all my might. In some of my speeches I know I have exhibited considerable warmth and energy, from which some might infer the passion of anger; but I can assure you that nothing has been further from my heart than any feeling of personal hostility or bitterness toward my friend.

In conclusion, I humbly trust that you will take home with you the thoughts you have heard from this stand; that you will reflect upon the fact that God has placed us here to work out our salvation with fear and trembling; to enjoy the abounding riches of his grace, if we will accept them in the manner pointed out by him; and finally, through the merit of the blood of Christ, be received with all the blood-washed throng into the abodes of celestial bliss. But I urge you to presume not upon the mercy of God. The only salvation for man, is in returning from the paths of sin and iniquity, and finding pardon in the atoning sacrifice of Christ. May the Lord bless and keep you all, and prepare you for a blissful eternity in his presence.—[Time expired.]

MR. KING'S FIFTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—My brother claimed last night to have detected me in a slight inaccuracy, in respect to the Greek word used in Romans, viii: 23: and translated "redemption," and refuses to accept my rendering of the passage—"deliverance from the body." Now, although by a slip of the tongue, I chanced to say *apoluo*, instead of *apolutroo*, so that my brother was technically correct, yet the two words have the same base or root, and the same meaning is included in both; both imply "cutting loose from," "delivering from." If any of you will simply open your common English lexicon, Webster's unabridged, you will find that one of the leading definitions of the word "redemption" is, "*deliverance from bondage*;" these are the exact words. Now, we do not say, in ordinary speech, "deliverance in;" we say "deliverance from." Here, then, is the idea of separation, which, according to the Greek idiom, requires, or at least, allows, the genitive to be rendered by "from." The same word, *apolutrosin*, is found in Hebrews, xi: 35: and is there rendered "deliverance"—"and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance." And in the other eight passages where the word occurs, it might with equal propriety be rendered "deliverance." See Luke, xxi: 28: where the common version reads, "your redemption draweth nigh," but where the meaning is perhaps more accurately expressed by the other term, "your *deliverance* draweth nigh." And so wherever the word is found. Taking, then, this undeniable fact, that the word *apolutrosin* readily bears this construction, we claim it as being the correct one for the passage under consideration, because it then harmonizes completely with the oft-repeated declarations of the apostle Paul, elsewhere. He often speaks of his mortal or carnal nature as being the occasion of sin, and expresses a longing to be delivered from it; crying out in his anguish: "O, who shall deliver me from this body of death." And in the passage before us, he makes his approaching

deliverance from the body the basis of his apostolic joy. But suppose that in regard to this matter of translation I am entirely in error; it does not effect the argument at all, nor aid my brother a particle. There stands the promise of a glorious result—deliverance from, or redemption from, a lower condition into a higher one. Throwing aside all verbal criticism, and looking at the matter from a common sense point of view, does my brother assert, as the position he assumes would logically indicate, that “the redemption of the body”—of these mortal frames—is all that is taught or promised here? There is not a christain in this audience who believes it. It would make mere nonsense of all this grand lesson of inspiration. But suppose you say, as he seems to wish you to take for granted, that the human body is the precise and only thing that is to be delivered, or redeemed, then I ask him again, in what sense can human bodies be said to be delivered “into the glorious liberty of the children of God,” when according to his theology they are to be chained in hell, to suffer endless punishment?

My brother again tells you I have “proved nothing.” Have I not? Why, just look at the plainest, grandest utterances of the word of God that I have presented here. I thought the Bible was to be our arbiter in this discussion; but the Bible seems to have no weight with him. No matter how many texts I bring, nor how plain and definite, and directly to the point they may be, he deliberately ignores them, and tells you they have “proved nothing!” Brethren and sisters, it is for you to say. His eye may be blind to the light which they shed upon the subject before us; but glad am I that his blindness or denial can not strike them from the sacred record—that no human power can pluck those stars from the sky, or veil their glory from the eye of faith.

He says he does not know what idea I intend to convey by the term “salvation;” that I have not defined my meaning. My brother forgets, but the audience will remember, that at the very commencement of this discussion I used the following

language: “I stand here to attempt to prove the doctrine of universal salvation; that all souls will at last become reconciled to God, holy, and therefore happy.” I call that a definition of salvation.

My brother last evening made a very gentlemanly and christian acknowledgment of a misstatement he had made here. I appreciated the manner and spirit of his acknowledgment, and am ready at any time to reciprocate it. In the heat of extemporaneous discussion, every man is liable to make mistakes. It is manly to correct them, but unmanly to take advantage of them. In the excitement of debate, in the excess of zeal for a cause or for a principle, a man may be led unwittingly into the use of language marked by too great severity, or perhaps tinged with contempt. And it may be true that both my brother and myself have been led into a violation of the strictest rules of gentlemanly and christian courtesy. If so, it would be better for both to acknowledge the fact, and both do works meet for repentance from this moment onward. [Mr. HOBBS—“Confess for yourself, my dear sir!”]

My brother made an ungenerous, unjustifiable, and contemptuous thrust at my faith, which I was sorry to hear, and am sorry to be compelled to notice. He made an attack on the moral character and influence of my belief, when he said: “Mr. King meets a sinner in the streets, approaches him, and tells him he ought to repent, be converted, and become a Christian. But the sinner says: ‘There is no hurry; I have other matters claiming my attention now; if I should die in my sins, I have no doubt you will be a missionary in hell, and I will attend to the matter there!’” Brothers and sisters, some of you, I saw, smiled at that; but do you think that is exactly right and proper and christian language for a disputant to use toward his opponent in debate? And this, too, when I believe, and continually affirm, that the divine retribution follows the sinner everywhere, and into every world—that there is no escaping the punishment inseparably connected with violated law, and which will sooner or later be meted out

to every man; while *he* teaches that the divine retribution is not visited upon the sinner in this world; that if it ever fall upon the sinner at all, the most of it is deferred to another world; that it makes little difference how you *live*, only so you *die* right, and in that case you can escape *all* punishment, both here and hereafter! A man with *such* a theology claiming that *my* belief tends to encourage men to continue in sin!

He talks flippantly about my being a missionary in hell. My brother, I do not know the spirit which prompted you to utter those words; but I say to you, if you had fallen into a pit on earth, and lay there bruised, mangled, helpless, God knows I would come to you, and try to help you, and lift you up from your sad condition. I hope that I shall not be more unfeeling—that I shall not have less sympathy—in the world to come. And if I were to know that you were lying even in the depths of hell, wretched, and blind, and far away from God, I would pray our Father above to let me come to you, and instruct you in the way of truth and life, and lead you home to him and Heaven—to light, and peace, and happiness.

My brother again denies that evil is included in the divine economy; that it has a place in the purpose and plan of God; and that God can and does perform his sovereign will. In denying this he is not denying a theory of mine, but the plain statement of the will of God, enforced by numerous facts in the history of the past as recorded in the scriptures. Take, for instance, the story of Joseph and his brethren. Here, God has a purpose to accomplish. The ultimate results he reveals in a prophetic vision to Joseph, who dreams that his brothers' sheaves bow down and worship his own. But the means by which this result shall be accomplished he does not reveal. Joseph tells his dream to his brethren, who are angry with him, and propose to murder him. Finally they change their minds, and sell him into slavery to some Egyptians passing through the land. Then they thought they had defeated the purpose of God—had made that prophecy a falsehood. But after many years, behold, a famine falls upon the land, and

these very brothers are down there in Egypt, bowing before Joseph, and praying him for corn to save them and their families alive—thus literally fulfilling the prophecy. Do you remember Joseph's explanation to them of the ways of God in providence—an explanation that holds just as good to-day as it did four thousand years ago? He told them that though *they* meant it for evil, *God* meant it for good. Brothers and sisters, is there no pertinence in that? It is in perfect harmony with many other illustrations of the same doctrine to be found in the Bible; and with the statement of Peter, in the second chapter of Acts, to the Jews who have crucified Christ: "Him, being delivered *by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God*, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Thus does the Bible teach—what any sound, rational theism demands—that God is sovereign even over evil, and can make even the wrath of man to praise him.

In his last speech, my brother is on hand again with his "trilemma"—which, he seems to think is a very terrible thing—in reference to the commandments of God. He says, "God's commandments are the expressions of God's will. And he goes on to ask: "Are the commandments obeyed *now*?" If not, he contends that God's will is defeated, and consequently my argument based upon God's will must fall to the ground. This, as I think I shall be able to show you, is the loosest possible logic; for it is confounding two things which are entirely separate and dissimilar. It is confounding a law, with the conditions which that law is intended to regulate, correct, and improve. God's commands express absolutely the condition of spiritual life which we are intended to attain by and by, and which God places constantly before us as the ideal toward which we should continually strive. I think you will apprehend my meaning when I say, sin is a different thing to God from what it is to man. Sin does not injure God. Sin is a violation of a law governing human nature and human action, affecting human happiness and producing human misery; sin injures man, but it does not injure God.

God commands that no man shall steal. Now, I ask my brother, is it the will and determination of God that no man shall steal *to-day*? I say, not at all. That command is but the utterance of a law, the setting up of an ideal, of perfect justice, toward which I am to aim, and to which I am to attain, as a final result. It is only by conflict, toil, and discipline, that I am to attain to that ideal. God holds up that perfect rule of right before me, and I am to strive to reach it. He uses suffering, punishment, discipline, anything that will tend to bring me there. I gradually learn what justice is, I learn to love it; through pain and suffering am disciplined; I am brought into obedience unto the law of right, until at last I become a law unto myself, having no disposition to do otherwise than right. It is just as he holds up manhood as a condition to which the child will grow. It is his desire that the infant shall attain to perfect manhood. But I claim it is not his desire that the new-born infant shall become a perfect, full-grown man *in a day*. The same rule applies physically, mentally, morally; the same rule of growth, discipline, progress. Physically, mentally, morally, God expects and intends that each of us shall *start* into life as a child. Physically, mentally, morally, he places me, an infant, at the foot of the mount of ascension; up this mount I am to climb. He knows that I must walk with faltering footsteps, must stumble and fall many a time, must get many bruises, before I learn to tread that upward path with firm and assured feet, or stand triumphant upon the victorious heights of achievement, my manhood complete. This is the law that runs through every department of human life, through all God's providence in the government of the world and man. It is God's will, God's command, if you please, that man, a grown man, shall walk the earth the crowned ruler of the lower world. It is equally God's will and command, that man should start as an infant, should become a youth, should pass through all processes of discipline and stages of development to final perfection. Mark this one thing, for it is the nexus of the

whole argument. Ultimate perfection necessarily implies an imperfect beginning. Look at this law of growth, stamped upon all things in nature, upon man, physically mentally and morally; and see if it does not necessitate not only a complete and perfect end, but a feeble and imperfect beginning, and all the conditions of weakness and imperfection lying between the two. It is strange to me that any man can be so blind as to ignore, or so bold as to deny, so plain a fact as this.

I will now return to my affirmative work.

My sixth affirmative argument is based upon the only true philosophy of human freedom and redemption, as taught by Jesus in the beautiful parable of the prodigal son, recorded by Luke, in the fifteenth chapter of his gospel. I have not time to read this parable to you now; nor need I, for we are all familiar with it. The universally accepted opinion, and the meaning plain upon the face of the parable, is, that the prodigal son represents the sinner, while the Father is God. I did hear of one man who said one son represented the Jews, and the other the Gentiles; but it is not worth while to combat so senseless an idea as that. But what is the lesson taught in the parable?

The first lesson is, the prodigal son *did come back*. Two parables, spoken by our Saviour, are found in this same chapter, before that of the prodigal son. The first is of the man having a hundred sheep, one of which was lost, and he went forth seeking it. You will find no record of his saying that if he did not find it that day, or by some other set time, he would leave it for the wolves to devour; but he sought it *until he found it*. The next parable is the woman having ten pieces of silver, who lost one piece. You recollect she is represented as lighting a candle, and sweeping the house, and seeking diligently—how long? Why, *till she found it*. Then comes the story of the prodigal son; and you will observe, the prodigal son *does come back*. My brother contends for human freedom; so do I; but I deny a freedom mightier than God's freedom; and the mutual relationship and final result of

human freedom and divine will is beautifully set forth in this parable. Man has the largest possible freedom; yet his freedom can not hinder the final result, nor interfere with the operation of God's perfect providence. This parable contains a solution, clear as a sunbeam, of the whole vexed problem of free agency; it exhibits the operation of God's power in the correcting and molding of the perverse human will, and that without destroying or forcibly interfering with it. The son was free to go away from home and become a prodigal. When away he was free to stay away just as long as he chose. But he could never get so far away from home but God's eternal law of retribution followed him; after a while he began to reflect—there was no compulsion upon his will, but he very naturally began to reflect—that while he was feeding on the husks that the swine did eat, in his father's house there was bread enough, and to spare. And what was the result? Why, after a while, (we are not told how long), after experiencing to his full satisfaction the operations of God's perfect law of retribution—after having had impressed upon his mind beyond all possibility of obliteration the important lesson, "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap"—after starvation and suffering, and other "evils" which my brother declares have no place nor purpose in the providence of God, had "brought him to himself"—he came to the sensible conclusion, "I will arise and go to my father!" And now mark you, there was no compulsion about this; he was still free to stay away as much longer as he chose; and he was as free to return to his father's house as to stay away. But want, hunger, pain, had "brought him to himself," and created in him a new will. Meanwhile, the absence and sinfulness of the son has not affected the father; he has not been angry at the son; has not disowned him. Unchanging, tireless, patient as his own infinite nature, the father has been waiting for the wandering son to come back, knowing all the while that some time he would come back, by virtue of the perfect providence whose unerring retrobation he could never escape, of the want, ("for he began

to be in want,") the "evil," which should at last inevitably "bring him to himself." This parable teaches another lesson: that punishment in the hands of God, is inflicted, not to gratify the vengeance of God, but to teach, discipline and redeem the one receiving it. To assert that God ever inflicts suffering for any other purpose than to benefit the sufferer would be a charge against God too blasphemous to be uttered. Yet I have heard it said that man had no claim upon God; that God owed his children nothing except damnation. There is no language strong enough to properly characterize so monstrous, so infernal a theology. In the name of my God, the infinite and ever loving Father of us all, I indignantly repel the charge. No claim upon him? If it be true that an earthly father and mother are bound in honor to take care of the babe they have brought into the world—if that babe, by virtue of its very weakness and helplessness has a claim upon its parents for protection, love, and care—ininitely more true is it that we, ushered into this world by God's pleasure, not our own, have a *claim* upon *Him*. I say it reverently, but full of trust; I say it, because I know it to be true.—[Time Expired.

MR. HOBBS' FIFTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I congratulate you heartily upon the very much improved temper and disposition of my opponent to-night. I felt last night like saying, in the language of Mr. Skinner: "Friend King, 'keep cool,' and you will not only *feel* better but *do* better." He has done a great deal better to-night, and I am very glad of it.

And first, a few words right here in regard to Greek criticism. It is surprising that Mr. King can not come squarely up and acknowledge he was wrong, and let it go. Why not? You know you *were* wrong, my dear sir! And I again call

the attention of the audience to the fact that my opponent said, at the commencement of this discussion, that if he was uprooted from the Eighth of Romans, he was a defeated man. When "uprooted" on every other position he took in connection with that chapter, he tried his hand at changing the translation so as to make it support his theory, and see what work he made of it! First, he got hold of a word that was not in the text; secondly, he applied a rule of Bullion's grammar that can not apply at all—the rule referring to the construction of the genitive after *verbs*, while the word translated "redemption" (like the English word "redemption") is a *noun*; and thirdly, to illustrate his theory of translation, that the genitive after *apolutrosis* should be translated by "from," he referred you to what he calls a parallel case, in Hebrews, xi: 35, where there is no word in the genitive case, or any other case, after it in the same sentence—simply and only the accusative of *apolutrosis*! In Ephesians, i: 14, you will find a case precisely parallel to the one before us in Romans, viii: 23. There the apostle speaks about an inheritance for which we are to wait "until (*apolutrosin tees peripoi-eseas*) the redemption of the purchased possession." Here we have the genitive after *apolutrosis*,—a construction exactly similar to that with which Mr. King has made such work in Romans, viii: 23. But how would this read, according to his rule of translation? Why, that we are waiting to be redeemed—"delivered"—"separated"—*from* the purchased possession! It strikes me that this is the farthest possible remove from the Universalist teachings upon that subject. So here, as in every other attempt he has made to force the Eighth of Romans into the support of his theory, I have met him, and according to his own showing, he is a defeated man. Why not rise and say, "I am defeated," acknowledging it nobly before the audience?

I understand my opponent as meaning, by the term "salvation," that all men will finally become holy and happy. [Mr. KING—"I said, 'all men will finally become reconciled to God,

holy, and *therefore*, happy.'"] Well, now let us suppose—which is by no means true—that my friend has succeeded in proving that this universal reconciliation to God would take place. He is still very far from having proved the affirmative of this proposition. That calls upon him to prove the *endless* happiness of all men. The simple fact that a man is reconciled to God is no proof that he will always remain so. I predicted that my friend would not bring a single passage of scripture to prove the *endless* happiness of all men. Has he done so? I now make him this proposition—that he may take his strongest passage, or half a dozen, or a dozen of his strongest passages of scripture, and we will confine our attention entirely to them, to the clear, plain, satisfactory interpretation of them, and risk the issue upon the result. My friend will not accept this proposition; he dare not; he knows he would be as effectually routed everywhere as he has been on the Eighth of Romans.

The gentleman complains that I make an attack upon the moral character of his faith. I showed, and I had a right to show, that the logic of his system instilled into the minds of the people, would exert a deleterious influence, causing men to procrastinate their return to God, and to continue to indulge in sinful pleasures in this world, thinking to secure salvation in the world to come. You can all see that it would have precisely that result.

He waxed quite eloquent in response to my suggestion about his being a missionary in hell. He said, if I had fallen into a pit on earth he would help me out; and that if he should see me lying in hell, in suffering and agony, he would pray the Father to let him come to me, and teach me the way of life, and lead me home to heaven. I certainly am grateful to the gentleman for his benevolent intentions. But does not my friend remember a similar case related in the Scriptures—where the rich man prayed that Lazarus might be sent to him in hell, on an errand of mercy? But Abraham said it could not be, for betwixt the two there was "a great gulf fixed,"

which none could pass. Then the rich man prayed that Lazarus might be sent to earth, where his five brethren then dwelt, "that he might testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment." But Abraham replied: "They have Moses and the prophets; and if they hear not them, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." And if Mr. King were in heaven, and should see me in hell; suffering the punishment due to disobedience and rebellion in this life, and should pray the Father to let him come to me and lead me up to heaven, would not God say, "No, he had not only Moses and the prophets, but Christ and the apostles; it is too late; the day of salvation with him is passed."

Mr. King continues to take it for granted that there is a state of probation beyond death. I have called upon him again and again to prove the fact before founding any argument upon it; but he has not done it, and he can not do it. He himself affirms that the word "probation" is not in the Bible, nor any word of similar meaning. This fact alone is fatal to his assumption of a future state of probation. He says men die in their sins. Then, if there be no other state of probation, it follows as a matter of necessity that they must remain endlessly in their sins.

Mr. King takes up Joseph's case. But does this teach the final salvation of all men? I can not see that it teaches the endless holiness and happiness of anybody or anything. I can not see its bearing upon the proposition in any shape. Suppose Joseph did have a dream; and that his brethren did sell him into Egypt; and that they afterward went down to Egypt to buy corn; and that Joseph did tell them that, while they meant it for evil, God meant it for good,—what has all that long story to do with the endless happiness of Joseph, or his brethren, or anybody else? He says that the crucifying of Christ by the Jews was in accordance with God's intentions. I suppose he means by this that God compelled the Jews to crucify Christ. Then it was not the Jews' act, but God's act. The argument must mean that, or it means nothing. He may

as well give up entirely this "will" argument. The more he attempts to patch it up, the more inconsistent and nonsensical he makes it appear. The best thing he can do with it, is to let it alone.

I have at length forced him to take some position in reference to the trilemma in which I placed him concerning the commandments and the will of God; that they were given either contrary to God's will, or without regard to his will, or were the expression of his will. He was at length forced to take some position on this matter—but what a position it was! He says that my argument confounds a law with the conditions that law is intended to regulate. I will acknowledge I do not know what he meant—some of you may—but that is his language, as near as I can recollect. If I am wrong he can correct me. I do not see that it makes any difference what is the intention of the law—there is the law, and it is, I contend, the expression of God's will; and the gentleman dare not assert the contrary. And if the commandments of the decalogue are the expressions of God's will, we see that God's will is not done, for those commandments are violated every day. But he begins to see his way out of this difficulty. He draws—or rather, hints at—a distinction between two kinds of will: the will of *desire*, and the will of *determination*. And these commandments, he tells us, are not the expression of God's will of *determination*. Then, of course, they must be the expression of God's will of *desire*. This theological distinction Mr. King probably did not suppose I would notice; but I was on the lookout for him, expecting exactly that dodge. Now, I would ask him whether he is certain that the will of God, as expressed in I Timothy, ii: 4, where it is said that God "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth," is the will of *determination*, or only the will of *desire*? I assert that the Greek word *thelo*, used in this passage, does not mean "to determine," but simply "to wish," "to desire." God's *determination* is always accomplished; but God's *desire* is not. The commandments of

the decalogue are the expressions of God's desire, but they are disobeyed every day. Consequently, Mr. King's argument based upon I Timothy, ii: 4, falls to the ground. Though it be indeed God's desire that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth, yet it is by no means certain that this desire will be accomplished: nay, as in the case of God's desire as expressed in the commandments of the decalogue, it is beyond all controversy certain that it is not accomplished. In drawing this line of distinction between God's will of *determination* and his will of *desire*, Mr. King virtually acknowledges the truth of the position I assumed some time since, that God has been pleased to make certain results relative to human interests, here and hereafter, dependent upon human agency.

Mr. King tells us that man starts into life as a babe; that God knows he will stumble and fall, and get many bruises before he finally stands triumphant on the victorious heights of achievement, in completeness of manhood. See into what strange contradictions and inconsistencies a false theology will lead a man! On the one hand Mr. King argues that man is created subject to vanity—sin and misery—in the very constitution of things, with the intention that he shall grow better and better as he grows older. And yet there is nothing for which he contends so vehemently, as that the new-born infant is innocent and pure and holy—perfectly fitted for Heaven! He contends that suffering is sent as a means of discipline and development, to lead man on to final perfection. But how is it with those who, under the beneficent dispensation of punishment, that is to lead them up the mountain height, keep growing *down hill* all the time—"waxing worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived?" (II Timothy, iii: 13.) How is it if God for their sins "send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie, and be damned?" (II Thessalonians, ii: 11.) That is a sort of progress—that is a kind of punishment, whose beneficent influences I do not understand.

Mr. King brings upon the carpet the parable of the prodigal

son, and seems to think that any interpretation of it that does not coincide with his own must be very foolish. I want to ask the gentleman just one question: if the prodigal son is the sinful man, who was the elder son that complained so bitterly when the younger son came back? Let him answer that.

According to Universalism, evil, sin, punishment, suffering, is the Saviour, leading us back to God. According to my Bible, Jesus Christ is my Saviour, and God's goodness is that which leads us back to him. But it may be that sin and suffering is goodness!

I resume now my line of negative argument: My fifth negative argument is based upon the fact that the Jews, materialists excepted, believed that the scriptures taught endless punishment. (See Prideaux, Vol. I, page 352). This fact is admitted by Universalists themselves. I have only time to quote in proof that the Jews believed in endless punishment hereafter, an extract from one of the most learned Jews that ever lived, Josephus, in his "Discourse concerning Hades." He says: "For all men, the just as well as the unjust, shall be brought before God the Word; for to him hath the Father committed all judgment; and he, in order to fulfill the will of his Father shall come as judge, whom we call Christ. For Minos and Rhadamanthus are not the Judges, as you Greeks do suppose, but he whom God and the Father hath glorified; concerning whom we have elsewhere given a more particular account, for the sake of those who seek after truth. This person, exercising the righteous judgment of the Father toward all men, hath prepared a just sentence for every one, according to his works; at whose judgment-seat, where all men, and angels, and demons, shall stand, they will send forth one voice, and say, "Just is thy judgment:" the rejoinder to which will bring a just sentence upon both parties, by giving justly to those that have done well an *everlasting fruition*; but allotting to the lovers of wicked works *eternal punishment!*"

ARGUMENT SIXTH. First: God's government over man is

moral. Second: as a subject of that government, man must be a moral agent, free to obey or disobey law. Third: moral law relates to right and wrong, and is intended to regulate and control us as social beings. Fourth: in the nature of the case, the present manifestation of God's moral government in the way of command must be peculiar to our present state of being, and as to any future state, we can not define its duties, relations and regulations, except as they are revealed beforehand, unless it could be demonstrated that we shall be in every respect then as now; hence, to argue what shall be God's method of government *then*, from what takes place here *now*, would be as illogical as the argument very common in some places, and formerly with many of our own ancestors, that railroads would be a positive injury to the country; "or that education would be a baleful thing, because some who have been educated have disdained to labor with their hands, and have looked contemptuously upon the uneducated. Those persons forgot that if *all* were educated, the very difference in the two classes from which the complained of evils flow, would be done away, and all would be equal."—[Whately's Logic.] Fifth: moral government necessarily implies moral subjection; for we *ought* to do that which is right, and *ought not* to do that which is wrong. Sixth: moral obligation implies freedom of choice and action; else there can be no sanctions of law, in the way of reward and punishment; but without such sanctions it is not properly moral law. The above undeniable propositions are preliminary to the following argument:

The reasoning necessary to establish Universalism denies man's moral agency, thus putting his power of volition and action under the inexorable grasp of an unalterable and eternal decree. In proof of this I will quote from a few of the standard Universalist works:

"If," When you say man is a free agent, you mean that he possesses a self-determining power which enables him to act contrary to his choice; or, if you mean that a man may have one motive to do a thing, and ten thousand motives, each of which are equally as strong as the other, to do the opposite

of that thing, and that he can follow the impulse of that one motive directly contrary to the impulse of the other ten thousand; we frankly confess, we believe no such thing. But if, when you say man is a free agent, you mean that he is free to act according to his choice, we agree with you. We believe that man is a moral agent in the sense that he is, and will be, rewarded for his virtues and punished for his vices.—[*Universalist Book of Reference*, page 379.]

"Equally unphilosophical as unscriptural is the denial that all things, in the broadest acceptation of the phrase, have their origin in the unchangeable designs of heaven.—[*Rogers, pro and con*, p 289.]

Rogers, in combatting the doctrines of Arminianism, says:

"But this reasoning proves," you will say, "that we are destitute of moral freedom; whereas, this is contradicted by our experience; for we can all do what we please, within the compass of our ability," Granted; [says Mr. Rogers]; but, can you please as you please? You are pleased with beauty; can you, if you try, be equally pleased with deformity? You are pleased with musical harmonies; can you be equally pleased with discords? * * *

* You can not prefer pain before pleasure; nor sickness before health; by an error in judgment you may indeed mistake the weaker for the stronger motive. * * * You must see, reader, that the notion of free will is a chimera."—[*Rogers, pro and con*.]

All this is diametrically opposed to the scriptures: See Joshua, xxiv: 15: "And if it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom ye will serve;" Isaiah, lxxv: 12: "When I called ye did not answer; when I spake ye did not hear; but did evil before mine eyes, and did choose that wherein I delighted not." Also Isaiah, lxxvi: 4, where nearly the same language occurs. Rogers says, we can not prefer pain before pleasure; but Paul says, Hebrews, xi: 25, that Moses chose rather "to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin." So Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego chose the fiery furnace rather than idolatry with its consequent temporal benefits; so Daniel chose the lions' den, rather than the highest honors of Babylon's kingdom; so of the long list of apostles and martyrs, who, if they had hope in this life only would have been of all men the most miserable; so of the mighty host of ancient worthies, who "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 sheep-skins and goat-skins, 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" (Hebrews, xi: 35-38). But Universalism says:

"Man is compelled to act in some way; man can act only according to his choice."—[*Universalist Book of Reference*, p. 379.]

"Believe me, reader, it is not possible to avoid the conclusion that all events take place agreeably to the unalterable decrees of Jehovah."—[*Rogers, pro and con*, p. 300.]

This is directly contrary to the scriptures. God commands some things, and inhibits others. See Jeremiah, xliv: 4: "O, do not this abominable thing that I hate!" *i. e.*, commit idolatry. But notwithstanding God's hatred of it, they did it. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" (Matthew, xxiii: 37.) "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." (John, v: 40.)

According to Universalism, if we disobey God's commands, God punishes us to the full desert of our crimes; *i. e.*, punishes us for what we can not avoid. For Rogers says: "The notion of free will is a chimera."

ARGUMENT SEVENTH. Universalism thus destroys the distinction between vice and virtue. Vice is the unconstrained choice of wrong, and the practice according. Virtue is the unconstrained choice of right, and the firm adherence to it, despite suffering and trial.

ARGUMENT EIGHTH. As Universalism destroys man's moral agency, it must make his actions neither blameworthy nor praiseworthy; neither rewardable nor punishable. This is contrary to the Bible, and to Universalism itself.

ARGUMENT NINTH. Universalism makes God the author of all sin, and the only sinner in the universe.

"So, then," exclaims the Arminian objector, "the author really seems bent on proving that as Jehovah *foreknew* of the existence of sin, he must also have *designed* it." Yes, such is really my purpose.—[*Rogers, pro and con*, p. 286.]

No wonder Universalists do not think that man deserves an endless hell! No wonder they make sin a finite evil, a mere peccadillo! No wonder they say God would be a merciless tyrant if he were to punish us eternally for the acts of this life. But, is he not equally a merciless tyrant if he punish at all?

My opponent built an argument—and he no doubt thought it was a very strong one—on the mission of Christ. His first proposition was "Christ came into the world to save all men." Granted, if you will add one clause—"according to the gospel." His second proposition was, "He had power to perform that work." I grant that, if you will add one phrase—"according to the gospel." His third proposition was, "He will use that power to complete that work." This I deny, unless all men shall accept salvation upon the terms of the gospel. In reference to his flood of proof-texts, you know I have no time within the limits of this discussion to answer each of them separately. He might as well lay down the Bible, saying, "There is the proof of my proposition—reply to it!" I will review a few of the strongest of them, and show that Universalism is suicidal, as well as sophistical. In reply to Hebrews, ii: 9, "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*," I ask you to turn to the fifth chapter and ninth verse of the same epistle to the Hebrews, and read: "Being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto *all them that obey him*." In reply 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 to himself*," I ask you to read on three verses further as

following: "And you that were sometime alienated, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled, in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblamable and unreprouvable in his sight, *y*"—my dear sir, I call your attention to that "if;" I do not thrust it into the mouth of the Almighty, I find it there—"if ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel." In reply to John, vi: 37, "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out," I ask you to read on to the fortieth verse of the same chapter—"And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." In reply to John, x: 16, "And other sheep have I, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd," I read the ninth verse of the same chapter: "I am the door; by me if any man enter in he shall be saved." Why is it that my friend can not see these "ifs"? why does he omit all reference to these conditions that are everywhere annexed? Read the twenty-sixth, twenty-seventh, and twenty-eighth verses of this same tenth chapter of John, last mentioned: "Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you; 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." He places this passage after the eternal state. Now, here are some who are *not* of his sheep. But those who are not of his sheep shall perish; when? Why, when the others are gathered into the fold. So the very passages he cited, when taken in connection with the contexts, are directly against him. Thus is his argument based on the mission of Christ fully answered.

In further reply to Mr. King's argument based on the mission of Christ, I introduce my tenth negative argument: Universalism robs the Lord of his character as a Saviour; it makes his sufferings and death simply a splendid pageant—a merciless infliction of the divine Father, that might have been

dispensed with as well as not, so far as our salvation, present or eternal, is concerned. Did you notice how adroitly Mr. King worded his argument—on the "mission of Christ?" He does not, Universalism dare not, construct an argument on the death of Christ. Here we have an explanation. Let the gentleman tell us, according to his system, *from what* the death of Christ saves us? The scriptures affirm that Christ taketh away the sin of the world; that the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin; will Universalism tell us *how*? Did Christ die merely as a martyr? or to express the divine love? or, as one of their once great theologians, whose praise was in all their churches, (Abner Kneeland) said: "For aught I can see, God could just as consistently forgive sin before, [the death of Christ], as since; neither does he now forgive sin on account of, or with the least reference to, the sufferings of Christ, any more than he does on account of the sufferings of the apostles, or any one else who has suffered in the same cause." Ballou says: "Christians have for a long time believed that the temporal death of Christ made an atonement for sin, and that the literal blood of the man who was crucified has efficacy to cleanse from guilt; but surely, this is carnality and carnal-mindedness." (*Atonement*, page 133). And further on, he says: "To believe in any other atonement than the putting off the 'old man,' and putting on the new, * * * is carnal-mindedness and death." Mr. Lafever, in the "*Gospel Anchor*," vol. ii, No. 5, holds that the sufferings of Christ for the world were of the same kind with the sufferings of our revolutionary heroes, who "shed their blood in the cause of freedom; so that it may be said, almost without a metaphor, 'by their stripes we are healed.'" Mr. Williamson, in the "Exposition of Universalism," makes "the only difference between the death of Christ and that of the martyr, consist in the fact that he died *voluntarily, without constraint.*" How many martyrs have died in the same way and with less trepidation?

Again: the scriptures tell us, "Jesus shall save his people

from their sins." But how can this be, if every sin must be punished to its full desert, as Universalism tells us? The scriptures say, Jesus will vouchsafe eternal salvation; but how can that be, if there is nothing in eternity to be saved from; for salvation must mean, a saving *from* something? If we are saved as to eternity, God must have a law with an infinite penalty. To save from, or to pardon sin, is to free from punishment due the sinner. Universalism says, "To save from sin is to save from sinning; that is, to save me from my friends is to save me from being friendly; to save me from my debts, is to save me from going into debt. That would be a glorious system of finance, would it not? Why not pay off the national debt in this way? But, first, there is not a lexicon in the world that will so define the term "pardon;" second, there is not a statute known to human legislation that uses the term in this sense; third, this sense is contrary to the scriptural usage of the term; see Ezra, ix: 18: "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." Also, Ezekiel, xviii: 20: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." But in one of the following verses, the twenty-first, we have a remission of this penalty, conditioned upon the obedience of the individual: "But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, *he shall surely live, he shall not die.*" Also, Psalms, lxxviii: 38: "But he, being full of compassion, forgave their iniquity, and destroyed them not." Also, Psalms, ciii: 8-12: "The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide; neither will he keep his anger forever. He hath not dealt with us after our sins; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. 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."

What God means by "pardon" may be illustrated by his

dealings with the Ninevites. He threatened them with destruction within forty days, for their enormities; but when they repented of their sins and obeyed his commands, he pardoned them, and the threatened punishment was not inflicted. Now, God either threatened them with an unjust and undeserved punishment, or in pardoning them remitted deserved punishment. Which horn of that dilemma will the gentleman take?

That the blood of Christ does cleanse from sin and secure the remission of deserved punishment, is abundantly manifest from the following passages: I John, i: 7: "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." Ephesians, i: 7: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Hebrews, ix: 14: "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" I Peter, i: 18, 19: "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." Matthew, xxvi: 28: "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Hebrews, x: 28, 29: "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses; of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite to the Spirit of Grace?" Romans, iii: 24, 25: "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." Romans,

v: 9: "Much more, then, being now justified by his blood; we shall be saved from wrath through him." Revelation, vii: 14: "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

Such is the Bible doctrine of pardon for sin; and to this the Universalist idea, which demands a full expiation by the sinner, for every transgression, is diametrically opposed. Hence, my conclusion, that Universalism destroys the character of Jesus as the Saviour of the world.—[Time Expired.

MR. KING'S SIXTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.—My brother has been treating you to a rambling discourse upon every conceivable subject; and without replying in any shape or manner, without attempting to reply, without even alluding, to the arguments I presented on the affirmative, has led off with a number of negative arguments. I know his purpose, but I know my business better than to be led away from my affirmative work by any such maneuvering. I advertise you, Brother Hobbs, you will have need for all your material, affirmatively, after to-night.

He has touched again upon the subject of probation. He says I can not prove another world of probation. He assumes a position for which there is no warrant, not a shadow of support, either in reason or scripture—he boldly affirms a change in the condition and opportunities of the soul in the future state—and then calls upon me to prove the negative! If I can not prove there is another world of probation, he can not prove that *this* is a world of probation, in the sense in which he uses the term—a state in which repentance and reformation are possible, but beyond which they are impossible.

Let *him* prove that the next world differs from this in that respect, or cease building arguments upon his unsupported assumption. Until he presents such proof, I have the right to hold that in every other world as in this—in every other stage of existence, as in this—every man is a constant probationer in this world for another; and every day, in this world or any other, a probationer for the day which shall follow. The grand issues of eternity are to be irrevocably settled here in the very infancy of our endless existence—the whole purpose of God must be made triumphant within this narrow space of earth and span of life—or all is hopeless. This he coolly assumes, without a gleam of common sense to favor it—without a text, a word, a syllable, in the whole Bible to support it.

He wants to know what Joseph's dream does toward proving endless happiness? Who quoted it to prove endless happiness? You know, and he knows, that I quoted it to overthrow his sophistry that evil is outside of the divine purpose. He made a general onslaught on divine sovereignty and power. I quoted the story of Joseph to show that evil is a temporary thing—in the providence of God, not outside of it—under his control, not beyond his control—serving his purposes, not thwarting his purposes.

He has spent much of his time to-night—having nothing better to offer—in quoting everything he could find in the works of authors who have not believed in eternal punishment, that he supposed you would disagree with, in order to arouse your prejudices against me and my cause. I could have quoted choice extracts from the literature of my orthodox brethren against him for the same purpose, had I deemed it legitimate argument. I might have quoted from Jonathan Edwards, who pictures his hearers as roasting in the flames of hell, and wishing they might be changed into a toad, or any other reptile, to escape their undying torment. But I forbear for the present.

By the way: one thing I have noticed, as being rather a curious fact. The orthodox of all denominations are out in full

force in this audience, trying to fellowship Brother Hobbs; I see before me a plentiful sprinkling of Presbyterians, and other upholders of the doctrine of divine foreknowledge and decrees; yet these are the points which Brother Hobbs has most bitterly assailed during this debate. I speak in all seriousness to Brother Hobbs—I am afraid he will get into trouble in that direction unless he is a little more cautious in his expressions than he has been. I must say it is amusing to see them cuddling together, studying how they may best meet and defeat the doctrine I am defending! The fact is, all this talk about foreknowledge and decrees has nothing to do with the subject under discussion; a man may believe them, or disbelieve them, and be an Universalist; a man may believe them, or disbelieve them, and not be an Universalist. This sort of talk is all for the sake of filling up time, and if possible drawing me off from the track.

He boasts again, that he has driven me from the Eighth of Romans. He has ridiculed my interpretation; but what better interpretation—what interpretation at all has he given? He has told you that the term translated “creature” does *not* mean “the human race” has he told you what it *does* mean? He says it is not “the human race” that is to be “delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God;” has he told you for what “creature” this transcendent destiny is reserved? He has endeavored to tear down, but has made no attempt to build up. He has exhibited inconsistencies, but not an explanation has he ventured. I appeal to thoughtful men outside of churches, whether the course my brother is pursuing is not directly calculated to make skeptics by the score?

I will now return to my affirmative line of argument.

My seventh argument is based upon the fulfillment of the great law of love. God is love, and love is the highest rule and principle of his government. Jesus says, (Matthew, xxii: 37-40:) “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first

and great commandment. And the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.” That this law of love will be fulfilled is plainly declared by Christ, (Matthew, v: 17, 18.) This law of love is the sum of all the law; and Christ declares that “one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.” And yet my brother tells you that this law of love never will be fulfilled.

My eighth argument is based upon the divine justice. If there is one attribute of God that more than another *demand*s the ultimate happiness of all his children, it is the attribute of justice. And what is the perfect rule of justice? It is, doing right; and to do right is always to do good. I affirm that justice, in its pure sense, never demands punishment at all, primarily and alone; but only as a means for securing the great end of perfect justice, which is, obedience to law. And what is God's first great law? As already shown, it is the law of love. This the prime law of the universe. And the highest demand of the law of justice is, that this prime law of the universe, the law of love, be obeyed. The only punishment it demands, is sufficient punishment to secure obedience to the law of love. But my brother declares that the great principle of divine justice, in securing obedience to and the triumph of this great law of love, demands that God shall place man in a condition of eternal disobedience, from which there is no escape. In all worlds and forever, God's irreversible and eternal law, flowing from his own perfect nature, will thunder into the ears of his immortal child, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.” All other laws, all providence, all redemption, are based upon the love of God to sinful man, expressed in the gift of Christ to the world; all converge in that law of love. Yet, my brother tells us, God will eternally chain half his children in a condition where they can never yield obedience to that law of love, and thus will forever defeat the ends of justice.

My ninth argument is based upon the proposition that the

happiness of God, angels and men, demand the salvation of all the race. There must be a heaven for all, or a heaven for none. Never was there such a mockery beneath the sky as the idea that the sacred ties of earthly affection can be ruthlessly severed, the human family rent in twain, one-half or one-fourth of it be placed in some secluded corner of the universe, to be called heaven, while the rest are crushed down in eternal torture. The happiness of God himself demands the salvation of all his children. God is not an abstract idea, an insensate law, but my own loving Father, sympathising with my sorrow and grieving over my pain. Take away that cheering, blessed thought, and what is left of the idea of a God? A mechanical force, or worse, a fiend. Not so have I learned to know my God, my infinite and ever-loving Father, who yearned over me with an infinite yearning while I was yet dead in trespasses and sins, and sent his Son to save me, and lead me into the way of life. But the greater his love, the greater his pain when I am in pain. If the Bible be true in its representations of God's measureless and undying love, and there be children of his whom he can not save, but who must dwell in endless misery, God himself is the prime object of pity in the universe—his heart must be the prey of an infinite and immortal grief. And what becomes of the joy and songs of the angelic throng? They are watching your career and mine; they wait with keen anxiety and unutterable yearning for our return from the ways of sin and sorrow to the paths of purity and peace; and there is joy in heaven over every sinner that repenteth. That is not a picture of fancy, it is the language of Christ. Do you believe the angels will be happy, will chant their hosannas with unalloyed bliss, when half the human race are crushed down into never-ending torment? Brother Hobbs made a sneering reference to a woman's love, and the feeling she manifested when asked if she could be happy knowing that her child was in hell. But last night I asked him, and to-night I ask him again, and insist upon an answer—whether *he* could be happy in heaven with his child

wailing in endless torment? I have a right to put to him that direct and practical home question, for he stands here preaching that mothers and fathers are to go to heaven, there to sing hosannas to their God who is torturing half their family in hell. There can be no happiness for any, unless there is happiness for all. Cast out one poor soul, to wander in eternal orphanage and pain, and its piteous wail echoing throughout God's universe will hush every song of rejoicing in heaven. Talk about a mother being happy with her children in hell? No, no; it can not be! To accomplish this you must destroy memory and personal identity, and virtually annihilate the human soul—or rob the universe of love and sympathy, and transform hearts of tenderness into hearts of stone. Which will you do? Will you stand here and say we shall not know each other in heaven—or that we shall cease to love each other there? There is no answer to that, you men with your cast-iron theology, who stand here talking about a God of love, who hates half his children with an insensate and insatiate hate—there is no answer to that, which does not make a hell of heaven, where a God that is worse than a fiend reigns over a world where justice is dethroned, humanity annihilated, and love and tenderness destroyed. Were an infinite God to offer me a heaven where wife and children and others loved on earth can never come, and tell me to be happy there, knowing that they were in torment, I would answer: 'No, never! Let me go and suffer with them—I do not want your heaven!' And no man with a human heart in his bosom would ask or accept of a heaven on such terms as that. I try to respect the sincere opinions, of my fellow men, however evidently incorrect or absurd, but what language is appropriate and fitted to describe this kind of logic, which, in order to prove that half the human race is destined to suffer infinite and endless misery, dethrones the God of the universe, denies his justice, his love, his power, and obliterates the last vestige of tenderness and sympathy and compassion from the heart of angels and of men? Neither the Scriptures, nor nature, nor providence, nor the human

heart—not one christian nor humane wish or aspiration or prayer—brings aught to favor this dogma of eternal agony, which makes existence a curse, earthly life a cruelty, and immortality and infinite calamity to the vast majority of the race. Such a doctrine has no germ in its bosom that can blossom into beauty, or bring forth fruitage to benefit and bless humanity; it has nothing in it to satisfy the highest longings and aspirations of the human soul—nothing of peace, or joy or hope—of trust in a loving Father and a righteous God—of faith that looks beyond the grave, victorious over death, and triumphant in the blissful prospect of a glorious immortality.

As an extra half-hour's speech is on the programme for to-night, by the close of which the audience will be very weary, I will not occupy my full half-hour at present.

MR. HOBBS' SIXTH SPEECH.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I should think, after such a speech as that, the gentleman would want to sit down. He pretends to be very generous toward his audience, in not wishing to weary them. That is the way he manages to make a virtue out of a necessity. He would not exhibit such a regard for the weariness of his hearers if he could think of anything more to say. And now, I hope, his friends will not deem me uncivil, but I feel like asking every candid man and woman here, whether they consider that incoherent rhapsody with which he closed his last speech to have in it any argument bearing upon the proposition we came here to debate? I looked around to his moderator, who vouched for Mr. King to me as an honorable opponent, but I could not see in his eye any indorsement of that course. But it becomes necessary for me, being upon the negative, to follow the gentleman, to some extent, in his tortuous windings.

He complains that I do not tell you the meaning of the scriptures that he quotes here. You know and he knows that it is not a part of my business to explain *his* scriptures to you; it is enough to show you that they do *not* mean what he says they mean; that his doctrine is *not* in the scriptures he brings forward as proof. If he wants to know what the doctrine of the Eighth of Romans is, let him come over where I preach, sometime, and I will tell him. I have done *more* than my duty as a negative. I have not only answered all his arguments, but, having the time to spare, have introduced *ten* negative arguments—just one more than he has introduced on the affirmative—and he has never replied to a single one of them. Where now does the weight of argument stand?

I suppose that in the gentleman's concluding speech to-night we shall have some more specimens of high-wrought rhetoric, attempts to play upon the public sympathy, appeals to popular prejudice. His only hope of success lies in arousing a furor in his own behalf by addressing, not the judgment, not the intellect, but the passions of the multitude. I presume you will be treated to vivid representations of eternal damnation, high-wrought pictures of your fellow creatures "frying" (to use his own classic language,) "in the flames of hell," with occasional references to your "bigotry" and my "brutal sneers," and "baseness beneath the character of a Christian gentleman" because I will not spend all my time in telling you the meaning of the scriptures he brings forward. He calls me "brutal," and then complains because I do not call him "brother." My brother in Adam, King, this will never do. [MR. KING—"My brother in Christ, I can not help it."] I know I have not called him "brother." I acknowledge not that sacred relationship to a man who tramples under foot the blood of Jesus Christ, the seal of the new covenant. I never can, I never will, strike hands with that doctrine which attempts to degrade the worth of the blood of Jesus Christ to the level of that of a mere man.

The gentleman says he quoted the story of Joseph to overthrow my sophistry upon the will of God. Upon my word I never should have known it if he had not told me. I built my argument on the will of God, and he never attempted to controvert it, but built up a man of straw for himself to tear down.

He says he might quote Jonathan Edwards and other orthodox authors to exhibit the repulsive features of my doctrine. My dear sir, I tell you beforehand, I disavow any such morbid exaggerations, all such overwrought and hideous descriptions in reference to hell; so you can not quote them against me. And now I ask you, do you disavow the doctrines of Rogers' "Pro and Con," in reference to God being the author of sin? [MR. KING—"I do."] Have you not yourself stated that God is the potential author of sin? [MR. KING—"I have not."] Mr. King, I know, and all this audience know, that you have, during this discussion, declared that God is the potential author of sin. [MR. KING—"Messrs. Moderators, I demand the privilege of making a correction of a deliberate misstatement. I have not given it as my own theory that God is the author of sin. When he was thrusting difficulties before me that were just as much in his way as in mine, I told him I thought *I might construct* an argument that he would confess *looked* logical, and which would be just as difficult for him to answer as for me. I did not give it as *my* theory, but simply as *a* theory, which it might trouble both of us to controvert."] The gentleman has said that evil is here by divine purpose and plan. Webster defines "evil" to be "sin." Have I not a right to interpret Mr. King's words by the standard lexicons of the language?

The gentleman says such use as I make of the Bible would make skeptics by the score. I am not here to defend the Bible; we have both agreed to admit the Bible as authority, and deduce our arguments therefrom.

He says I am here to prove that Christ will save men, *if men will let him*. That is just exactly what I do teach. You

teach a forcible salvation, whether men desire it or not. You teach that God takes a super-control over every man's will, and by compulsion brings him into heaven at last.

He says I thrust "ifs" into the mouth of God. Are the "ifs" not there already? In the case of every text he has quoted in support of his position, if he had quoted the context, his argument would have slain itself. When he quoted Colossians, i:19, 20, to prove it was the Father's good pleasure "to reconcile all things to himself," had he read but three verses further he would have found that it was the Father's good pleasure to do this "*if* men would continue in the faith." Is that "*if*" mine, or is it God's? The trouble with my friend is not that I thrust "ifs" into the mouth of God—what he wants is, a new version of the Bible with the "ifs" left out; then he could get along very well. Then Hebrews, v:9, instead of saying: "Being made perfect he became the author of eternal salvation *unto all them that obey him*," should read: "He became the author of eternal salvation unto all who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ." Oh, taking out the "ifs" would not be sufficient; you see the Bible would have to be altered all through before it could be made to give a shadow of support to my friend's theology!

The gentleman says, God sent Christ to fulfill the law. He quotes Matthew, v:17, 18: Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Very well; here Christ says he came to fulfill the law: and did not Christ fulfill it? The gentleman quoted that to prove the salvation of all men; but what bearing does the text have upon that subject? Does it say that all men shall fulfill the law?

The gentleman says justice demands the salvation of all men. He asserts that divine justice never demands punishment at all. This is a new idea to me. The first definition Webster gives of the word "justice" is: "The quality of being

just; the rendering to every one his due, right, or desert." Now, the sinner deserves something: what is it? Why, punishment. And Mr. King says God will render to the sinner the last iota of deserved punishment. On the other hand, he tells us that God's justice requires that all men shall be saved. Has he explained how it is that God's justice requires this? How justice demands the salvation of those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ? Till he does this—and he can not now do it in this discussion, for he has made his last speech in which new argument is allowable—the argument based upon the justice of God can have no weight on the affirmative side of this proposition. But I hold, on the contrary, that God's justice requires that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall *not* be saved, for God's justice must be in harmony with his revealed Word. And since God's Word declares that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ must suffer endless punishment, such a result must be in accordance with God's justice.

Mr. King tells us that in all worlds, and forever, the moral law is in force. Talk about the moral law being in force in another state of existence! What is the moral law, pray? Why, it is a rule of action given to regulate the conduct of men *in this world*, as social beings. It applies to time, not to eternity. Can we steal in eternity?

He says I teach that God chains half his children in hell. I teach no such thing. I teach that God will consign to endless suffering those who die in willful disobedience. Have you proved the contrary? Where have you brought the term "endless" into your argument, in the course of this whole discussion? When and where, during this debate, have you even attempted to prove your proposition "in its terms," according to your written agreement? Either you would and could not, or you could and would not. If you would and could not, your failure is manifest. If you could and would not, why have you not? Ah, Mr. King very well knows that he can not frame a

single argument to prove that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall enjoy *endless* happiness, but I will turn around and use the selfsame argument against *him* on the next proposition, and defeat him *there*. Now he knows why I framed these propositions just as I did.

Mr. King says the happiness of God, angels and men, demand the happiness of all. I would ask Mr. King if God was not happy before man was created? If he was happy before man was created, he must have become unhappy when man fell; and if he can not be happy until all men are saved, he can not be happy now, because all men are not now saved. But I thought Mr. King told us, in his exposition of the parable of the prodigal son, that man's sin *could not affect God!* There goes one or the other of those two arguments!

The gentleman asks: "Could you be happy in heaven, with your children in hell?" In answer to this I will refer him to Matthew, xxii: 29, 30, where the Sadducees came and tempted Christ, asking him in reference to the woman who had seven husbands—which would be her husband in the resurrection? But Jesus answered: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God; for in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven." Now, to argue from this state, where certain conditions and relations exist, to another state, where such conditions and relations no longer exist—to say we could not be happy *there* under certain circumstances because we could not be happy *here* under similar circumstances—is utterly illogical and absurd, and Mr. King knows it. It is making human feelings the standard of God's actions; it is attempting to measure the infinite by the finite, which Mr. King himself disallowed in the earlier part of this discussion.

I shall now make a very brief and hurried review of my opponent's arguments, and my own.

Mr. King's first argument was based upon the alleged fact that my reason leads to a result, endless damnation, which is against my heart; that I can not pray for salvation in faith;

that it is God's will that all men be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth; (I Timothy, ii: 4). Also, Matthew, vi: 9, 10: "After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." To this I answer:

1. *Salvation is conditional.* Hebrews, v:9: "He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him;" Revelation, xxii:14, 15: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, any 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." I pray for the salvation of all, but only in accordance with the conditions of the gospel. 2. *The logic of his argument is false.* Whatever reasoning leads to a result contrary to our heart's desires is false; but my reasoning leads me to the result that if men have evil communications their good manners will be corrupted; that "he that believeth not shall be damned;" or, that if my child have consumption it will die; or that, if your child, mother, commit murder, it shall be hung, or go to the penitentiary for life; all which results are contrary to the desires of our hearts; therefore, all such reasoning is false. 3. *Whatever God wills must be accomplished.* God wills that all men shall enjoy endless happiness; therefore all men, those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ included, will enjoy endless happiness. Here we have *petitio principii* in the minor premise; the question in debate taken for granted. As to the major premise, there is a fallacy, because he has admitted the distinction between the will of desire and the determination. God wills that no man shall lie, steal, swear, etc., therefore none do lie, steal, swear, etc. This is his logic, brought to the *reductio ad absurdum*. This argument is faulty, because it loses sight of the fact that God's will is only absolute as a rule of divine action—"He doeth according to his will in the armies of heaven and among the

inhabitants of the earth." But God has willed to make his will as respects present and eternal salvation depend on the free exercise of man's will. His will is that if men do not accept salvation on gospel terms they must suffer the penalty. In this sense, God's will, counsel, purpose, pleasure, desire, intention, providence, shall stand—be vindicated forever.

Combining his proof-texts—Philippians, ii: 9, 10, 11: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow * * * and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father;" and Isaiah, xlv: 23, 24: "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, surely shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength;" with Romans, xiv: 10, 11, 12: "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;" it is established, beyond peradventure, that the judgment is *yet future*, and in the resurrection state—beyond which, Mr. King argues, there is no change in moral character; therefore, the penalty then visited upon those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall be endless punishment.

ARGUMENT SECOND: God shall be glorified in the results of his creation and providence. Psalms, lxxxvi: 9: "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name." He did not attempt to *prove* that "all nations" means every individual of the race, but asserted it; I deny it. Still, if he insists upon it, the judgment by this logic is yet future; see Matthew, xxv: 31, 46: "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 these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." This shows *aionios* to be "endless."

ARGUMENT THIRD was based on the nature of evil. He would not admit "sin" under "evil" in this argument; but gave "grasshoppers" as a type of evil. Answer: grasshoppers, then, must have a moral character; for to say that anything is opposed to the nature of God which has no moral character, is as absurd as to say that a block of wood or a piece of chalk is contrary to God's moral law. But he must have meant by "evil," "sin;" hence, by his own showing, God is the author of sin.

ARGUMENT FOURTH: God's providence is perfect, and will result in bringing all things into harmony with himself. He admits that providence does not result thus in this world; he has not attempted to prove that there is another state of probation; yet admits that some die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ. If they die in sin, and no redemption is proved after death, they must remain eternally in sin, and hence eternally in punishment. Again: God's providence works either—first, without reference to his commands; or, second, contrary to his commands; or, third, in harmony with his commands. If without reference to his commands, we can not know results; if contrary to his commands, God works against himself; if in harmony with his commands, we see that both commands and providence do not bring obedience in this life; yet, it is God's will that it should be; so that this argument, instead of proving what is made out, annihilates the potency of God's will, commands, and providence, counsel, purpose and pleasure. Who is it, my auditors, attacks God's character?

His other arguments have been placed before you and answered so recently, I will not weary you by going over them again.

I have thus recapitulated my opponent's arguments, and my

replies, briefly and hastily, but I think fully enough. I have answered completely every one of his arguments; I only hope he will do as well when he comes to the other proposition. But I tell you, when I come upon the affirmative I shall prove the proposition in its terms, or give up the case. I ask you whether a single argument has been brought up that contained any reference to the proposition in its terms, in itself or by synonyms? I ask you as intelligent men and women, living in an awfully grand epoch, to open your Bibles, and behold what is God's will, what are the conditions of salvation, in what way to avail yourselves of the blood of Christ, of the benefit of that atonement, and at last rise, with all the pure and good, to join the Lord, and be forever with him, where sorrow and sickness, pain and death, shall never come; but all be peace and joy, forever and forever.

I really hope that my opponent may yet be brought to see and acknowledge the truth; may yet be so candid as to fulfill the promise he made in his first speech, that if he was uprooted from the Eighth of Romans he would acknowledge himself a defeated man. I have put difficulties in his way that he never has answered, and never can answer. There are four places in that immediate context where the "children of God" or "sons of God" occurs, and he says it has reference to the angels in one instance, and only one. By what law of hermeneutics does he make the term apply to angels in one place, and to men upon this earth in all the other places? I have not told what I think the Eighth of Romans means; I will tell you at some other time, if you will come and hear me in my pulpit. But one thing I wish to remark: this passage is acknowledged by commentators to be one of the most difficult in the whole Scriptures; yet he plants himself upon it, but is unable to make it plain as teaching his doctrine. There is something very strange about his choosing that passage. Why not take passages that are plain and unequivocal, having an evident bearing upon the question? One thing I have abundantly

shown, and that is, that the Eighth of Romans does not teach Universalism. That is all that it was my duty to show. I have answered every argument he has presented, and advanced ten arguments on the negative side of the question, which he has never noticed at all. And now I ask you to give an intelligent verdict, in your own minds, at the bar of your own consciences, and before God, as to the result of the debate on this proposition, which he agreed to prove, not in a general way, but to prove "in its terms." My prediction is, he will never debate this proposition again. It is shaped so as to deprive him of the advantages of which he and his brethren usually make so much. There is nothing in it about half the human family "frying in hell." I only say, those who die in *willful* disobedience to the gospel of Christ, with their last breath uttering imprecations against God and his government, having sinned away their opportunities here, will be consigned by infinite justice into banishment from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power forever. If the Scriptures teach not this, they teach nothing.—[Time expired.]

MR. KING'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Brother Hobbs hopes that you and I, and everybody here, will get to heaven, where there is no sorrow and sickness, pain and death, but only peace and joy forever. I hope the same; but I advise you—if his theory be true—when you get safely into that blessed abode, if you want to be happy, to *close the blinds*, to shut out the sights and sounds of misery outside!

My brother accuses me of appealing to the popular prejudices of my audience. "Popular prejudice!" Look at him! Here he sits with fifteen or twenty ministers of his own denomination around him, and ministers of other denominations, who

have no special love for me, scattered through the congregation, while the house is crowded with the members of the orthodox churches in town, whose sympathies are with him so far as this question is concerned—every orthodox church, the Young Mens' Christian Association, every religious organization, not excepting even the Catholic churches, (though they are rather more liberal than any of the rest,) banded against me—and yet *he* accuses *me* of appealing to the "popular prejudice" of my congregation! My brother, it is *you* that have the popular string to play upon; I am sorry to say it, for it is no very great credit to the popular string! [Mr. HOBBS—"Mr. King, you are misrepresenting my meaning; I did not mean denominational prejudice—I meant you appealed to the sinister bias of ungodly men."] O! he says he did not mean denominational prejudice; he referred to the sinister bias of ungodly men. You understand him now—he means the majority of this congregation are ungodly men! [Mr. HOBBS—"I did not mean that?"] You didn't mean that? Well, Brother Hobbs, will you tell this audience what on earth you *did* mean? [Mr. HOBBS—"You can interpret it as you please."] I am trying to interpret it to *please you*, Brother Hobbs.

My friend is endeavoring to make out that I have said there is to be no change after the judgment. He can not find a scrap of evidence to show that I ever advocated the nonsense that there is to be any time in all God's eternity when men will not change from glory to glory. The doctrine that there is no change in man after death is rung in all the pulpits of this city. If that doctrine be true, there is no possible chance for Brother Hobbs or any one else to get to heaven. Brother Hobbs I presume to be an average man in goodness among his Christian brethren; but it is a fact that he has many infirmities—sins of thought, word, and deed. If he undertakes to deny this, he places himself a great way ahead of the apostle John, who declared, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." And the best of Christians would not make a very perfect heaven,

take them as they are on earth, subject to passion, to infirmities of feeling and temper, to the various imperfections and weaknesses incident to humanity. They must change, and that mightily, too, before they can constitute fit material to make a heaven out of. This doctrine of no change after death would consign everybody to hell. I have stood by the bedside of Christians, dying believers in the different theologies, (and good men and women who have lived for years sincerely believing any theology will be likely to die in peace), I have stood by the bedside of many dying Christians, but I never, in all my life, saw or heard of one who did not feel that he was in character altogether unfit for heaven, and did not depend upon God's grace to essentially change him. If there is no moral change after death, hell must be the doom of every one of you.

My brother says my doctrine is that Jesus will save us in spite of ourselves. Has he forgotten so soon the parable of the prodigal son, and the philosophy of free will therein set forth? The prodigal son came back just as free an agent as he went away.

He ridicules the idea of the moral law existing in the other world. Will not God live and reign in the other world? Do not the immutable laws of right and justice exist and apply everywhere and forever? If not, I can understand how there came to be a rebellion in heaven: it was because there was no moral law to control things there!

He says I have not proved the proposition "in its terms"; that I have not proved the happiness of redeemed souls to be "endless," and can not. Brother Hobbs, that is a very presumptuous assertion, with the work you have before you; for you have the same term in the proposition upon which you are to assume the affirmative. You are to prove "endless punishment." You are playing on a verbal quibble; you know the term "endless" is not applied to punishment anywhere in the Scriptures. The only time the word is used in the Bible to express a spiritual condition is in Hebrews, vii:

16, where the apostle speaks of "the power of an endless life." If I have failed to prove my proposition because I can not find the word "endless" applied to happiness, what will be your position on your proposition when you fail to find the word "endless" applied to misery? Brother Hobbs, I would not have insisted upon that point so strongly, if I had been you—it puts a difficulty in your own way!

He expressed a hope that I may yet come up from my faith to his. Up? Up? Up, from my little narrow platform, embracing an omnipotent God, a perfect providence, a triumphant Saviour—*up*, to his broad platform, of a defeated God, a baffled providence, a divided empire, a triumphant devil? Brother Hobbs, I believe I would prefer to be excused!

He says, our relationships will be different in heaven from what they are here. Now, Brother Hobbs, I am going to appeal to the members of your own church. Mothers, I want to know of you, in your own hearts and before your God, if you believe your earthly relationships will be severed in heaven, so that you will not know your own children? [MR. HOBBS—"Messrs. Moderators, I ask the privilege of correcting Mr. King in his statements; he knows that I am to have no opportunity to reply after he is through, and is taking advantage of his position to misrepresent me. I said it was illogical to argue from this state, where certain conditions and relations exist, to another state, where such conditions and relations do not exist. I said nothing about fathers and mothers. I did not refer to ties of blood and consanguinity."] [MR. KING.—"Brothers and sisters, his explanation is worse than his first statement. It must have been "ties of blood and consanguinity" to which he had reference. It was in answer to my argument upon the relation of a mother to her child that his response was made. He repeated my question, and said, "*In answer to this* I refer him" to the passage in Matthew in reference to the woman with her seven husbands. Brother Hobbs, *why did you bring up that case*, if not to prove that human relationships were not to exist in heaven?]

[MR. HOBBS—"I brought it up to show that it was illogical to argue from conditions and relations existing on earth, to a state where the conditions and relations of things were so entirely different."] [MR. KING—"Brother Hobbs, did you, or did you not, bring up that scripture and your comments upon it, as an answer to my question in my last speech, whether a mother *would not know* her children in heaven, or would *cease to love them* there?] [MR. HOBBS—"I have said nothing about it."] Very well—if you have not yet answered that question, will you *now* answer it? Brother Hobbs, you know you dare not tell the mothers in this audience that they will cease to have a mother's memory and a mother's love in heaven. Ah, I know how you talk on a funeral occasion to the bereaved mother, who has laid her child away in the grave, in a spirit of unflinching trust. You tell her that her child has gone before her to the fair banks of Immortality, where Jesus, the Good Shepherd, keeps that tender lamb, to await her coming. Tell her that when she, too, reaches heaven, she will not know her child? You dare not do it. Still less dare you tell her that she is to become so heartless, so dehumanized, so demonized, that she can enjoy unalloyed happiness, in heaven, with her child wailing amid the unspeakable agonies of an endless hell!

I have heretofore stated several plain propositions, and endeavored to prove them by the direct, explicit language of Scripture. It is not for me to say that I have "whipped out" Brother Hobbs, or "vanquished" him, or "completely silenced" him; he has indulged in considerable of this kind of language, but I do not think it adds to the strength of his cause, in the minds of thoughtful men.

My first proposition was based upon the fact that my brother, with all Christians, prays for the salvation of all men. I added that this rested not merely on human desire, sympathy, and compassion, but was done in obedience to an express command of the Word of God, I Timothy, ii: 1: "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions,

and giving of thanks, be made for all men;" and the reason why this should be done is given in verses three and four: "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth." And this is not all: in the eighth verse of the same chapter the apostle commands "that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting." Now we are told not only to pray, but to pray *without doubting*; and the reason why is given in the sixth verse: because Christ is a full and perfect saviour, "who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." Do you call that sophistry? Do you call that weak? I know what Brother Hobbs says about it; but I wish to know of the audience if *they* say I have offered no proof of my proposition here? I am to pray for the salvation of all men; I am to pray for it because it is God's will that all men shall be saved; I am to pray without doubting, and my faith in the salvation of all men is to be based on the fact that Christ gave himself as a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. And the New Testament is full of this kind of scripture, to all which my brother replies by asking: "Are all men saved *to-day*?" to which I answer: "No." Whereupon he assumes that they never will be saved.

My second affirmative argument was based upon the proposition that God will be glorified in all the results of his creation and providence. I asked in what the essential glory of God consists. I quoted David (Psalms, lxxxvi:9), not, as my brother says, in order to prove that all men shall be saved, but to prove that the glorifying of God comes from the worship of him. I claimed that the obedience and not the disobedience of a child glorifies his father. Shall we be told that if he can not be glorified by the obedience of his children, he will be glorified by putting them into an eternal prison-house of torment? I expected my brother to make that assertion, but he has not ventured upon that ground in this discussion. Then I quoted Colossians, i:20, showing

that it pleased the Father, through Christ, to "reconcile all things to himself;" also Philippians, ii:9, 10, 11, which declares that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, "to the glory of God the Father;" and inquired what kind of glory is that which is to be given to the Father but the glory of obedience and worship? Then I quoted the language of Paul, I Corinthians, xv:28, that Christ should reign till he had put all enemies under his feet, and then deliver up the kingdom to the Father, "that God may be all in all;" and then the song of victory be sung over death vanquished, the grave robbed of its trophies—the song, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"—and I asked my brother what kind of a condition is this? one of pain, or of joy, thus heralded by that triumphant song? Has he answered? I expected he would say—Brother Hobbs, I will give you credit for not doing one thing: I don't know whether you did not think of it, or knew better than to try it; but it is usual with men holding your doctrine to say—"Oh, of course God will subdue all things; he will convert and save all who will accept of salvation; and those whom he can not convert he will trample beneath his feet, and chain in eternal sin and torment." But when any man undertakes to say that, I have only to remind him that the very same word which is used to express the fact that everything is to be subdued to Christ, is also applied to Christ in saying that he shall be subject to the Father. That blocks every attempt to show that that subjection is to be one of chains and agony.

My third argument was based upon the nature of evil, my proposition being that evil belonged inside the providence of God, and not outside of it, being finite in nature, finite in duration, and at last, having served its temporary purpose in God's providence, to pass away. Since "God alone hath immortality," I argued that he would not confer a quality that inhered in himself, upon that which was opposed to his nature and providence, and that he was trying to eradicate

from the universe. In support of this theory of evil, I introduced as proof the much-contested passage from the Eighth of Romans, where Paul declares that the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly; but that the creature waits to be redeemed and delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God. My brother denied this plain exposition of the nature of evil, and objected to my interpretation of Paul's plain language, because to have accepted it would have left him without a shadow of a defense; yet he gave no better interpretation, nay, no interpretation at all; declared that man was not the "creature," spoken of by Paul, who was "created subject to vanity," but without naming any other "creature" in the universe that waits to be delivered "into the glorious liberty of the children of God;" offered no explanation as to how evil came here if not in accordance with the purpose and plan of God, but in spite of his intention and in opposition to his will.

My fourth argument was based upon the proposition that God's providence was perfect, and would result in bringing everything into harmony with himself. Having shown that God desired the salvation of all men, I brought scriptures to prove that "what his soul desireth, even that he doeth." To which my brother answered that though God did what his soul desired in the armies of Heaven, yet among the inhabitants of the earth God's will was contingent upon man's will, and whatever God desired was accomplished, only providing man did not object!

My fifth argument was based upon the mission of Christ. I argued—first, Christ came into the world to save all men; second, he had power to perform that work; third, he will use that power to complete that work. I have not the time in this concluding speech to repeat the texts I brought to the support of these several propositions. You will remember what a reply my brother made to this argument. When I quoted the assertion of Paul that God had appointed his Son Jesus Christ the "heir of all things," and Christ's own statement,

"All that the Father giveth me shall come to me," my brother asks me to prove what "all things" means—whether to trees and things of that kind. Is that meeting manly argument in a manly way? "All things?" What "things" was it Jesus died to redeem? My brother knows the term includes all human beings. But it will not do to acknowledge it, for he stands here as the representative of a theology which says that though Christ was appointed by the Father to be "heir of all things," he has been robbed of three-quarters of his inheritance by the Devil.

My sixth argument was based on the parable of the prodigal son, showing how beautifully the providence of God operates in molding man's will to the will of God, without interfering with man's free will, without compulsion; and yet the prodigal son *does* at last come home. To which my brother replied by inquiring who the elder son was, that felt so indignant when the prodigal returned!

My seventh and eighth arguments were based respectively on the love and the justice of God; that neither were manifest in creating human being by unnumbered millions, and then sending them to eternally suffer unimaginable torments amid the flames of hell, to which his answer was, in substance, that since it is revealed in God's word, it must be consistent with God's love and justice—thus taking for granted the very thing in debate.

My concluding argument was based upon the proposition that the happiness of God, the angels, and men, demanded the salvation of all mankind; that the highest and holiest instincts of the human heart demanded that there be a heaven for all or a heaven for none. In response to this he at first asserted that earthly ties of affection and consanguinity—the love of husband and wife for each other, of the mother for her child, of man for his fellow man—would be unknown in heaven; but afterward, when his doctrine was exhibited to him in all its naked hideousness, he repudiated it, and refused to take either one

position or the other—to answer whether the mother would not know her child in heaven, or would cease to love him.

In conclusion, I reciprocate any kind sentiment my brother may have expressed for me; any kind wish. Brother Hobbs, one thing gives me joy. You may in all honesty stand here and say that God's purpose will not be accomplished, that his will will never be triumphant, that he will not reign over a united empire; but thank God, that does not make it true. No bold unbelief or bold denial of yours can prevent the great consummation. You may stand here amid this moral night, and tell me *you* do not see the promise of that dawn; that you can prove it will not come. But I tell you it is the will, the irreversible will of Almighty God that the morning *shall* come. No cunning logic, no plausible sophistry, can prevent the sun of Infinite Love from climbing the sky, and flooding the universe with the glory of a God-like and accomplished purpose. You can not give me your hand in Christian fellowship; you can not call me "brother;" but *my brother you are*; my brother, because one God above is the Father of you and me, and loves us both with an immortal love; my brother, because our elder brother, Jesus Christ, came to earth and died for you and me; my brother, because we yet shall stand, with all earth's myriads, the universal brotherhood of man, redeemed and glorified, before our Father's throne, in the beatific mansions of our heavenly home. And I thank God for the assurance that, however much you may distrust the justice of God, or the perfection of his providence, you will be with me in my glory and hope and rejoicing, when the mists of superstition shall have been cleared away, and the veil taken from your eyes, till you can look upon God as he is—the Lord God omnipotent reigning; upon Christ as he is, after he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied; upon the universe as it is, with no place for sorrow or tears, but basking forever in the light of infinite love and perfect peace.

SECOND QUESTION.

Do the Scriptures teach that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall suffer endless punishment?

MR. HOBBS' FIRST SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—It is with pleasure that I appear before you to-night, on the affirmative of the proposition which has just been read in your hearing. I say, it is with *pleasure* that I do so. I suppose the gentleman may yet undertake to torture this remark out of my meaning; I can not tell what he may do. Judging the future by the past, he may say, it is with pleasure I tell you that any portion of the human race, in his classic phrase, will “fry in hell.” The reason of my pleasure is, because I believe the proposition to be God’s truth; because I believe the Scriptures teach it; because I believe that whatever God wills in reference to the destiny of the race, or a part of the race, is the best; because I have no disposition to set up my views, my circumscribed notions of things, my short-sightedness in reference to the doctrines of revelation, against the declarations of Jehovah, who, at one glance, takes in not only the present, but the past, and the future as well; not only this world, but all worlds that are speeding their way through immeasurable space, and for aught we know, peopled with intelligences greater and better than ours. God, who has spoken to us from the heavens, may not have unfolded to us all the reasons for what he has done, or may do; but, it is enough for me to know that the Bible is God’s book, and I bow the knee at the shrine of the religion of Jesus Christ. If I find in that book a doctrine that may not agree with my peculiar inclinations or idiosyncracies, or the perverted sympathies of ungodly men, it is no reason why I should cry, “Away with it! crucify it!”

The laboring oar now falls into my hands as affirmative. Gladly, I welcome it; and shall try to row this discussion in a straighter course than it has hitherto gone.

When upon the other proposition, it was simply my business to follow the gentleman; and he will testify to you that I followed him closely. The audience will bear witness that I stuck to him like a brother; in six troubles I did not leave him, and in the seventh, yea, even in the Eighth of Romans, I did not forsake him. Now let him do the same by me; let him come up close to me, and test the temper of my theologic blade, and measure the strength of truth and error.

The proposition has already been read; I shall repeat it: “Do the Scriptures teach that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall suffer endless punishment?”

FIRST. *Do the Scriptures teach it? Not does nature teach it? nor, does reason teach it? nor, do false analogies teach it? nor, does perverted human sympathy teach it? but—do the Scriptures teach the doctrine here unfolded? And here, I wish to say, that in the discussion of this proposition, as of the other, both my friend and myself professedly bow the knee before the Word of God; both professedly acknowledge the Scriptures as being of divine inspiration; to be all from God, without alloy—all true, without admixture of error. To such testimony must we appeal in the discussion of such a question as this. If the proposition read in this way: “Does human reason teach that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall suffer endless punishment?” then, indeed, in the discussion of the question might I deal with arguments based upon human reason. Or, if it read: “Do our human sympathies teach that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall suffer endless punishment?” then might we build an argument upon human sympathy, as the gentleman has already endeavored to do, upon the other proposition. But as the proposition says nothing about “reason,” or “human sympathy,” but appeals*

at once to the Scriptures as the source of testimony, to the law and to the testimony I go; and if I speak not in accordance with these, it is because there is no light in me.

But, first, I wish to say a few words as to the province of reason. • I know the course our Universalist friends take, when we propose to throw reason out of such a discussion; and it may be my opponent will tell you that I discard reason from the universe of religion. Let him not be too fast. Reason has its use, its province, in regard to religion. Reason has a right to sit in judgment upon the question whether the Bible is of God, whether it was given by divine inspiration. But when reason has decided that, upon the evidence adduced to decide the fact, then she must bow to the dictates of divine truth, even though perverted sympathy may revolt against heaven's high decree. Again: reason has her province in the interpretation of the Bible. Not as a test of truth, nor as a test of any doctrine in it; but reason may take up any passage of Scripture, and ask, "What does this mean?" It is not her place to say, "this particular verse or chapter teaches this, that, or the other, because it harmonizes with my feelings, my idiosyncracies, my desires;" the province of reason is, to open that book, and apply to it the same laws of interpretation which she applies to any other document given to man for his enlightenment; the same laws of interpretation applied to the statute books of our land, or of the State in which we live; or to the newspapers which we daily read. God having made a revelation to us in human language, has placed himself under obligation to use language we can understand. How are we to understand it, if it has a secret sense; if it has to be followed into some secret closet to discover what he has intended to tell us? It must be subjected to the same tests we apply to any other book; and reason must do that work; but when reason, by the laws of hermeneutics, a well established science, has performed that work, she must not then lift up her voice and say, such and such doctrines contained in that book are false, because they

do not agree with human feelings, sympathies, or idiosyncracies. Those who do this are in the way to Infidelity, and well nigh their destination; but we are to accept them, with reverence, as being from God.

Willful disobedience presupposes the opportunity and ability to obey the gospel. This I wish to have distinctly understood; for in the proposition just discussed, my opponent has never seemed to realize that fact, but has gone on to talk about one-half or two-thirds of the human family "frying in hell." Will he assume that one-half or two-thirds of the human family have had the opportunity offered them to obey the gospel of Christ, and have refused to obey?

Again: willful or wicked, rebellious, rejection of Christ as Saviour, and despising of his blood as a meritorious cause of our salvation, is involved in the willful disobedience of the gospel of Christ.

"Endless" I use in the sense of everlasting.

"Punishment" I use in the sense of penalty of law inflicted. Distorted and exaggerated views of punishment, such as have been used so classically by the gentleman, and such as he may hereafter quote from other-day authors who have believed in the doctrine, I do not take the ownership of, nor propose to defend. I understand the nature of this punishment to be, compulsory restraint; hopeless exclusion from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power forever; an eternal consciousness of God's disapprobation, and of the immeasurable crime of willfully and wickedly rejecting Christ.

I shall here give a summation of results already reached, before I shall pass to my arguments:

1. There are those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ.

2. The day will come, says Mr. King, when all will be saved; and so say all Universalists; all will be in a condition of endless happiness, because they will be made holy. Universalists differ as to how this holiness will be accomplished; some say by death, some by future repentance, some by this thing, and some by that.

3. This time, they say, will be at the resurrection, when Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father.

4. Beyond this, Mr. King tells us, there will be no change of character, for all will be holy; and Mr. King denies that they can ever fall. This is the position of all his brethren, so far as I have been able to hear or read. Then shall be sung the triumphant song, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

With these results before us, alleged by Mr. King, and all his friends, so far as I know, we are prepared to pass to the argument.

I shall now offer a series of arguments based upon scriptural antithesis which, for their correct understanding must be interpreted according to the law governing the antithesis. I have not heretofore said much in reference to interpretation, because it was *his* business to interpret, and mine to show that his doctrine was not in the scriptures he adduced to prove it. Now the case is changed; it is now my business to interpret, and his to show that my doctrine is not in the scriptures I bring to prove it.

"Antithesis" is from *antithemēi*, "to set over against." It is synonymous with "contrast," from *contra* and *sto*, "to stand against." "Comparison," from "compare," and the Latin *comparo*, or *com*, and *par*, "equal;" signifying the putting together of things that are equal. "Contrast," in French, *contraster*, Latin *contrastō*, or *contra*, and *sto*, "to stand," or *sisto*, "to place against;" signifying the placing of one thing opposite to another. Likeness in quality and difference in degree, are requisite for a comparison. Likeness in degree, but opposition in quality, are requisite for a contrast. See *Crabb's Synonyms*.

The law of the antithesis is, that one member is to be taken in the same extent as the other, whether that antithesized be weight, number, duration, or anything else. Lest the gentlemen should dispute my statement of this law, I quote from A. Campbell, in Campbell and Skinner's Debate, page 186:

"The words on both sides of the antithesis are taken in the same extent of meaning." Mr. Skinner admitted it, in these words: "I have never denied nor opposed the doctrine of antithesis."—*Campbell and Skinner*, page 194.

Now, the term "perish" is antithesized with the phrase "eternal life." You will remember that my opponent, in his argument in the mission of Christ, introduced the following passage: (John, x: 16:) "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice: and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd." This passage he applied to the state beyond the period when the song of victory is sung, quoting that song in the same argument. Then the language found in the same chapter, twenty-fourth to twenty-ninth verses, by the same speaker, the Saviour himself, upon the same subject, must refer to the same period: "Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him, how long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not; the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me. But ye believe not, because ye are *not of my sheep*, as I said unto you: My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them to me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." In this passage, which my friend places beyond the resurrection, beyond the singing of the song of victory, we have the Saviour saying there are some which are *not* his sheep. These sheep, that belong to his fold, he will give eternal life, and they shall never perish—thus antithesizing "perish" with "eternal life." Now, as the gentleman applies this beyond the resurrection, beyond the song of victory, after which period moral character is *changeless*, (I wish you to remark that word, and emphasize it—I know his dodge, he intimated it to me the other night, but I will attend

to it when it comes up again), "eternal life" must be endless, and by the law of the antithesis, "perish" must be endless also. And if Mr. King should deny that this word is ever used in reference to the endless condition of the future, the Saviour, greater authority, so uses it in Matthew, xviii: 14: "Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish." Moreover, Mr. King, for once, unwittingly agrees with the Lord, where he uses the immediately preceding context, the parable of the lost sheep, and applied it to the state beyond the song of victory.

John, iii: 15, 16: "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting 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." Here, you see the words, "eternal," or "everlasting"—for these are different translations of the same word in the original—are antithesized with "perish." Read also the thirty-sixth verse, same chapter: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life;" *hath* everlasting life; yes, my friends, there is a sense in which we have everlasting life now, those of us who have had our sins washed away by the blood of Christ; we have the earnest of the eternal inheritance; we have it by foretaste; the spirit hath already been brought into that liberty into which the body shall come by and by. But let me read the rest of the verse—though this is as far as it usually suits Universalism to read: "And he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God *abideth* on him." We have already seen what "perish" means, by the gentleman's use of the contexts where it occurs; so we are forced to the conclusion that those who do not believe must suffer endless punishment.

ARGUMENT SECOND. "Saved" is antithesized with "perish." II Thessalonians, ii: 10, 11, 12: "With all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of truth, that they might be saved; and for this cause, God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe

a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." Here "perish" is equivalent to "damned," and both, the opposite of "saved." The gentleman defines "salvation" to be, ultimate holiness, and consequent happiness to be consummated when the song of victory is sung. This is the only definition of "salvation" I have been able to get out of the gentleman's lips; and I was glad to get even that much. In the text before us, "perish" being in antithesis with "saved," if the salvation is endless, perish must express the same duration. II Corinthians, ii: 15, 16: "For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish: To the one we are the savour of death unto death; and to the other the savour of life unto life. And who is sufficient for these things?" The same is true of this passage as of the other. Therefore, that which is opposed to life, that is, death, must be endless.

ARGUMENT THIRD. "Eternal life" is antithesized with "indignation and wrath." Romans, ii: 3-11: "And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honor and immortality, *eternal life*; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, *indignation and wrath*, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile: but glory, honor and peace to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile: for there is no respect of persons with God."

In regard to this passage I remark: *First*: Eternal life is here the reward of a class. *Second*: Indignation and wrath and

retribution are for a class, and are antithesized with eternal life. *Third:* Glory, honor and peace are equivalent to eternal life. *Fourth:* Tribulation and anguish are equivalent to indignation and wrath, and are antithesized in the same way. *Fifth:* These rewards and punishments are to be awarded at the revelation of the righteous judgment of God, then, future.

Now, inasmuch as I have before shown that "eternal life" is "endless life," so the tribulation and anguish and indignation and wrath must likewise be endless.

ARGUMENT FOURTH.—"Eternal life" and "death" are antithesized, Romans, vi:21-23: "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. For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

In regard to this, I remark: *First:* This passage looks to final results of human action. *Second:* The results of sin on the one hand, and of holiness on the other, are antithesized. *Third:* As extensive, therefore, in duration as is the life, so extensive in duration is the death.

ARGUMENT FIFTH.—Everlasting punishment and life eternal antithesized, Matthew, xxv:31-46: "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 these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."

In regard to this passage, I remark: *First:* The word *aggelos*, which Mr. King used to mean the sons of light, the heavenly messengers, occurs in the thirty-first verse. *Second:* The phrase "all nations" occurs in the thirty-second verse, which, he insisted, comprehends the whole race of man. *Third:* Christ will come with the angels, and the race will

stand before him, and he will judge them; but this can not refer to any judgment past, because no such events have ever happened. *Fourth:* At this judgment, some (verse 41) are to go away into the fire prepared for the Devil and his angels, or to everlasting punishment, some to life eternal. *Sixth:* "Everlasting punishment" and "life eternal" are in antithesis; if the life is endless, so must be the punishment, according to the law of interpretation governing the antithesis. But, as there is no judgment mentioned in the Scriptures, yet future, except that which is connected with the resurrection of the dead, therefore, the entering into life must be in the eternal state; consequently the everlasting punishment must be in the same state—hence endless, because in that state there is no change of moral character.

The word *aiônios* is here used to express the duration of the life, and also of the punishment; but I do not propose now to build an argument upon *aiônios*, but upon this law of the antithesis, which requires one branch to be taken in the same extent of meaning as the other.

I shall now take leave of this series of arguments based upon the antithesis, hoping my opponent will come up manfully, pay proper attention to them, and if he denies their validity, show wherein the fallacy lies.

I pass now to my sixth argument, based upon the sin against the Holy Spirit, Matthew 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."

Mark, iii:28, 29: "Verily I say unto you, all sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they blaspheme; but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation."

I John, v:16: "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it."

Universalists endeavor to evade the force of this argument by saying that *aion*, here translated "world," refers to the Jewish and Christian dispensations. Very well, if this be so, that those who commit this sin can not be forgiven in either the Jewish or Christian dispensations, if forgiven at all, it must be beyond death. But it is for him to prove this, before he can rid himself of the "never forgiveness" in Mark, iii:29. Now let us see if he will come up with his proof of a future state of probation. I think if he ever had a fair opportunity, he has it at this moment. Here is a passage of Scripture which he can never rid himself of, so as to save Universalism, unless he does show a future state of probation—even on the Universalist assumption that *aion* refers to the Jewish and Christian dispensations.

Then look at the passage in John's Epistle. Here the apostle found there was one sin men might commit that he could not command prayer for. Whoever shall fall under the awful condemnation of this sin—the sin unto death—can never be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the world to come. And this is the apostle who was proverbially known as the Apostle of Love. "God is love," said John. I never attended, nor read, nor heard of a Universalist discussion before this, where an argument was not built upon the passage, "God is love." But, there was one sin in the dark catalogue which even the Apostle of Love could not ask his brethren to pray for. I might or might not know what that sin was; it has nothing to do with the argument; here is the simple biblical statement that there is such a sin. This is declared by this apostle of love, whose heart was overflowing with love for his brethren; when so old that nothing else could be done upon his part, when he could no longer go to the assemblies of the saints, no longer perform any active part in evangelizing the world, he used to be carried

by his brethren in a chair, and when seated with the congregation, would simply say: "Little children, love one another!" This was the love that was burning in his heart and upon his lips all his life; yet this apostle of love could not command prayer for a brother—not for a man outside of the church, a guilty, ungodly man, who had never made any profession of religion, but had persistently trodden under foot the blood of the Son of God, and counted it an unholy thing—but for a *brother* in the church, for whom his heart yearned with undying affection, who had committed such a sin. What can that be but the sin against the Holy Spirit for which the Saviour has declared there shall be no forgiveness, in this world nor in the world to come; it shall remain upon the conscience that commits it while the universe shall stand, while ages upon ages roll away; while God shall retain his seat in supernal glory; while the blood-washed throng shall stand in spotless robes around the great white throne; it hath *never forgiveness*. Awful sentence! It makes my heart fairly tremble to think of it! I only ask you if it is not true, if it must not be true, according to all the laws of correct exegesis, that here is a passage which leaps beyond the grave, beyond the judgment, that spans eternity, and takes within its inexorable grasp the wicked soul, and holds him forever and forever? It would seem to me after what has been said already, that I might stop here; that I might ask my friend to come up and meet these positions; to meet them, not with quibbles and cavils, but in a fair, candid, open way. If my exegesis is wrong—if my application of his logic is wrong—let him show it; if they are correct, let him admit it. Admitting it, he must go with me to my conclusion. I ask the audience to give him close heed, and see whether he meets the arguments I have presented. [Time expired.]

MR. KING'S FIRST SPEECH.

BROTHER MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—My brother has this evening appeared before you, with the laboring oar in his own hands. He is to attempt to prove and defend the doctrine of endless punishment. And at the outset I wish to call your attention to the repeated statement of my brother, when I was upon the affirmative, that I was bound to prove the exact terms of my proposition—"endless happiness." You will observe that his proposition is just as explicit; that he is bound by its terms to prove "endless punishment." But my brother knows that there is no passage in the Bible where the word "endless" is applied to punishment. He was extremely anxious to confine me to the exact verbal statement of the proposition; now let us see how closely he will adhere to the "exact terms" of the proposition which calls upon him to prove "endless punishment."

I now propose to exhibit to your view something of the character of the doctrine my brother is here to prove and defend. "Endless punishment!" You remember how he resisted every attempt on my part to convey to your minds any adequate idea of it, and repudiated the "other-day descriptions" of it to which I referred. I do not wonder at this; I know that the less said about the doctrine the better, both for itself and its defenders. Neither you nor I, nor the most gigantic and comprehensive human intellect, can form even a faint and distant conception of "eternal punishment." You may exhaust your ability to think; Imagination may wing her almost limitless flight until compelled to fold her pinions in weariness; but darker and more lurid than all the pictures that fancy or frenzy can paint to chill the heart with horror, "eternal punishment" still stretches on beyond, in infinite perspective. Suppose that all the misery and suffering that has been endured by every individual that has ever lived upon this earth, from the dawn of time until now, and that will be endured till the end of time—agony immeasurable,

incalculable, unimaginable—were to be made the terrible experience of one poor human soul! Yet, when that soul shall have endured that agony, it will not in the least have diminished the unutterable aggregate of its *endless* suffering. This, my brother tells you, is to be the destiny of a majority of the human race, under the rule of the infinitely wise, just and merciful God and Father of us all.

Let me give you another illustration: Suppose a line of figures, closely printed in the smallest type, were to extend from here to the sun; and suppose *each figure* to represent so many hundreds of thousands of millions of ages; and that during all these innumerable ages, one unbroken experience of suffering were to be visited upon one soul; and then suppose that even this enormous aggregate of agony were to be repeated as often as there are seconds in the life of a man who reaches the ordinary age of three score and ten years; even this measureless period must end at last; but the poor lost soul will be no nearer the end of its torment than when it first plunged into the burning billows of hell. And all this, my brother tells you, is to be the doom of a large proportion of the human race, under the rule of the infinite Father, whose mercy endureth forever.

I tell you, my brother, when you stand here and affirm such a doctrine as this, it is difficult for me to conceive or imagine how you can do it with absolute sincerity, and at the same time preach to the world what an infinitely loving being God is, what a kind, a merciful Father he is, how his goodness ought to lead us to repentance. It is inconceivable to me that my brother can believe such a doctrine as this, and yet remain perfectly unmoved at the thought; but here he stands, careless and unconcerned, with no expression or sign of sympathy; and when he has made some good point, or brought up something that looks like proof that unnumbered millions of the race will be damned forever, he puts on an air of triumph and rejoicing, and his brethren smile at the pleasing thought! And they all assume an air of *nonchalance* and satisfaction, as if it were a capital good thing to have this doctrine proved.

My brother, if you really believe what you are trying to prove, and have a human heart in your bosom, I ask you to show some sort of feeling consistent with that terrible belief. I wish here to read for the benefit of my brother an extract from the writings of President Dwight, one of the giants of American Orthodoxy. He says:

"This subject of endless punishment is immeasurably awful, and beyond all others affecting. Few persons can behold it in near vision with a steady eye. The very preacher who teaches the doctrine to others, can not know, unless certainly assured of his own salvation, (a case undoubtedly very rare) that he may not, at the very time, be alleging arguments that are to affect himself, and to evince his own final destruction, as well as that of others." [This includes my brother, for he rejects the Baptist doctrine, "once in grace always in grace."] "If his heart be not made of stone, he can not contemplate the subject as it respects his fellow men, without overwhelming horror. There are, I know, those who speak concerning it with an air of cool, self-complacency, as being, in their opinion, easy of investigation, and free from embarrassment. I am inclined, perhaps uncharitably, to give them credit for little candor, clearness of intellect, or soundness of character; and greatly doubt whether the doctrine has been investigated by them, either to such an extent or with such a spirit, as might furnish them with just views of its character."

I next quote an extract giving expression to the feeling that must constantly dwell in the heart of any man who has a heart, and sincerely believes the doctrine of eternal damnation. I quote the language of the venerable Saurin, the eminent French divine, in his sermon upon endless punishment. He says:

"I sink! I sink under the awful weight of my subject! And I declare, when I see my friends and my relations, the people of my charge, this whole congregation—when I think that I, that you, that we all, are threatened with these torments—when I see in the lukewarmness of my devotions, in the languor of my love, in the levity of my resolutions, the least evidence, though it be only presumptive, of my future misery—yet I find in the thought a mortal poison, which diffuses itself into every period of my life, rendering society tiresome, nourishment insipid, pleasure disgusting, and life itself a cruel bitter. I cease to wonder that the fear of Hell hath made some mad, and others melancholy."

I might quote volumes in a similar strain; such feelings are only what should be in the heart of every man who holds to such a horrible doctrine.

Listen to the statement of Albert Barnes, one of the most eminent and able divines of the American Orthodox Church:

"That the immortal mind should be allowed to jeopardize its infinite welfare, and that trifles should be allowed to draw it away from God, and virtue, and Heaven; that any should suffer forever—linger on in hopeless despair, and roll amid infinite torments, without the possibility of alleviation, and without end; that since God *can* save all men, and *will* save a *part*, he has not purposed to save all; that, on the supposition that the atonement is ample and that the blood of Christ *can* cleanse from all and every sin, it is not in fact applied to all; that, in short, a God who claims to be worthy of the confidence of the universe, and to be a being of infinite benevolence, should make such a world as this, full of sinners and sufferers; that when an atonement had been made, it did not save *all* the race, and put an end to sin and woe forever. I have read, to some extent, what wise and good men have written, I have looked at their theories and explanations, I have endeavored to weigh their arguments, for my soul pants for light and relief on these questions; but I can get neither: and in the distress and anguish of my own spirit, I confess that I see no light whatever. I see not one ray to disclose to me the reason why sin came into the world; why the earth is strewed with the dying and the dead, and why men must suffer to all eternity. I have never seen a particle of light thrown on this subject that has given a moment's ease to my tortured mind, nor have I an explanation to offer, or a thought to suggest. I trust other men (as they profess to do) understand this better than I do; but I confess, when I look on a world of sinners and sufferers; upon death-beds and graveyards; upon a world of woe, filled with hosts to suffer forever; when I see my friends, my parents, my family, my people, my fellow-citizens—when I look upon a whole race, all involved in this sin and danger, and when I see the great mass of them wholly unconcerned, and when I feel that God only can save them, and yet he does not do it, I am struck dumb! It is all dark—DARK—DARK to my soul, and I can not disguise it!"

This is the language of one of the most giant intellects of modern Orthodoxy; to him the subject is "all dark—*dark*—*dark*!" Yet my brother here sees no difficulty—all is perfectly clear and plain to him!

But I propose to read to you one or two further extracts. I wish to unfold the doctrine in the light in which it has been taught by its advocates and defenders. I do this, not that I claim to hold Brother Hobbs responsible for their teachings. This audience will bear me witness that in the former discussion Brother Hobbs dragged in the statements and notions of half-a-dozen Universalists, and endeavored to hold me

responsible for them. I told him that such a course was not manly nor correct. But after I had made the request that he should not do this improper and unmanly thing, Brother Hobbs, instead of answering *my* arguments, read more, and still more from other men claiming to be Universalists, and proceeded to combat *their* arguments instead of *mine*. Now, in quoting from Orthodox divines a fair statements of Orthodox doctrines concerning eternal punishment, I do it, not to hold my brother responsible for them, but to show the audience what this doctrine is that he appears here to sustain and advocate. While I might quote volumes, I shall at present read but a single extract. The great champion and apostle of modern Orthodoxy, Jonathan Edwards says:

"If you continue God's enemy unto death, you will always be his enemy. And after death, your enmity will have no restraint, but will break out and rage without control. When you come to be a fire-brand of hell, you will be a fire-brand in all respects; viz: you will be all on fire; filled with the fire of God's wrath, and also you will be all in a blaze with spite and malice toward God. You will be as full of the fire of malice as you will of the fire of divine vengeance; and both will make you full of torment. Then you will appear as you are, a viper indeed. You are now a viper, but under disguise—a wolf in sheep's clothing. But then your mask will be pulled off; you shall lose your garments, and walk naked. Then will you, as a serpent, spit poison at God, and vent your rage and malice in fearful blasphemies. Out of that mouth, out of which, when you open it, will proceed flames, will also proceed blasphemies against God. That same tongue, to cool which you will wish for a drop of water, will be eternally employed in cursing God and Christ."

Hear him again:

"We can conceive but little of the matter; but to help your conception, imagine yourself cast into a fiery oven, all of a glowing heat; or into the midst of a glowing brick-kiln; or of a great furnace, where your pain would be as much greater than that occasioned by accidentally touching a coal of fire as the heat is greater. Imagine also that you were to lie there for a quarter of an hour, full of fire—as full within and without as a lighted coal of fire—all the while full of quick sense; what horror would you feel at the entrance of such a furnace! and how long would that quarter of an hour seem to you! If it were to be measured by a glass, how long would that glass seem to be running! And after you had endured for one minute, how overpowering to you would it be to think that you had it to endure for the next fourteen! But what would be the effect on your soul if you knew you

must lie there, enduring that torment to the full of twenty-four hours! how much greater would be the effect if you knew you must endure it for a whole year! and how vastly greater still if you knew you must endure it for a *thousand years*! Oh, then, how would your heart sink if you thought, if you knew, that you must bear it *forever*—FOREVER! that there would be *no end*! that after millions of millions of ages, your torment would be no nearer to an end than ever it was! that you never, never should be delivered! But your torments in hell will be *immensely greater* than the illustration represents."

Once more:

"How dismal will it be, when you are under the racking torments, to know assuredly that you never, never shall be delivered from them, to have *no hope*! when you shall wish that you might be turned into anything, but shall have no hope of it; when you shall wish that you might be turned into a toad, or a serpent, but shall have no hope of it; when you shall rejoice if you might have any relief after you had endured these torments millions of ages, but shall have no hope of it; when, after you had worn out the ages of the sun, moon and stars in your dolorous groans and lamentations, without rest, day nor night, nor one minute's ease, yet you shall have no hope of being delivered; when, after you have worn out a thousand more such ages, yet you shall have no hope; but shall know that you are not a whit nearer the end of your torments; but that still there are the same groans, the same shrieks, the same doleful cries, incessantly to be made by you, and that the smoke of your torment shall still ascend forever and ever; and that your souls which have been agitated by the wrath of God all this while, will yet exist to bear more wrath; your bodies which have been burning and roasting all this while in those glowing flames, yet shall not have been consumed, but will remain to roast through an eternity yet, which shall not have been at all shortened by what shall have been passed."

O, my friends, this seems impious to me; it sounds like blasphemy against God; yet this is but a single fragment from Orthodox literature. But my brother says he does not believe in *that kind* of a hell; he tries to parry in advance the force of all this; he claims that such descriptions are overdrawn and exaggerated. But he knows it is impossible to exaggerate upon this subject. The very fact that he tries to soften down this idea of hell is a virtual abandonment of it. The fact that all the pulpits in this city do not hold up before the people such pictures of eternal torment in every sermon is proof that the preachers do not really believe in eternal torment. There is no explanation for this inconsistency, except upon the ground

that in my brother's heart, in the heart of every man who preaches this horrible doctrine, there is a reserved denial of it. He may try to modify and soften it down as much as he pleases; but if pain continue *forever*, it is an *infinite* infliction, and my brother knows it. There can be no description or conception of endless punishment that can exceed, or even approach, the reality, and it still remains, in the language of my brother's proposition, "endless punishment."

In attempting to meet and overthrow this doctrine of endless punishment I shall take certain broad and general grounds of interpretation. I shall not follow my brother in an interminable chase of texts. You will understand my method before I am done. I have before said that the Bible must be interpreted in accordance with its central and general spirit and purpose; that the character and attributes of God are the great central lights of revelation, illuminating the whole. If you cease to be guided by these central lights of revelation, and take isolated passages, scattered here and there throughout the Bible, and interpret them according to your own conceit, you can prove anything and everything by the Scriptures. My brother and I could stand here and throw apparently inconsistent and contradictory texts without end into each other's faces, and make skeptics by the score; and at the end of two weeks, or two years, be no nearer any definite conclusion than at the beginning. But there is a better way, thank God.

In regard to the arguments already adduced, I will say, first, that according to his assertion when I was upon the affirmative, he has proved nothing, said nothing having any bearing whatever upon the proposition he is defending, for the word "endless" is not in any of the texts he has quoted as proof.

My brother's argument of antithesis, in connection with which he has made such a display of his classical lore, is simply and utterly fallacious. He says: "perish" is the antithesis of "eternal life." What does the prodigal son mean when he says: "I *perish* with hunger"? Does not my brother see that his antithesis, if it proves anything, proves annihilation, not

an endless existence in torment? There is not a common school boy who does not know that *perish* refers to the extinction or termination of existence. Suppose my brother should read in a newspaper that a man had "perished" in a snow-bank; would he understand, or would any of you understand that he had been placed in a snow-bank to live eternally?

My brother says he does not rely on the word *aionios* to prove endless punishment. And yet he immediately does use it, assuming *aionios* to mean endless. He introduces the Twenty-fifth of Matthew, concluding with the verse (46): "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous unto life eternal." Here the word *aionios* is used in connection with punishment, and he coolly *assumes* it to mean endless, and then at once faces about and uses this text to prove endless punishment. But, bringing in his argument on the antithesis, he says the same word is applied to *punishment* that is applied to *happiness*. Certainly; but having said that does he not build an argument on *aionios*, where does he get his right to *assume* that *aionios* means "endless" in *either case*?

I affirm that the expression "*aionios*" in connection with "life" does not refer to duration. See John, vi: 47: "He that believeth on me *hath* everlasting life;" verse 51: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood *hath* eternal life;" I John, v: 11: "And this is the record, that God *hath given* to us eternal life;" verse 13: "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that ye *have* eternal life."

Now, Brother Hobbs does not believe in the doctrine, "once in grace always in grace." He does not deny that a man who has been a Christian, a sincere believer, of whom the Scripture saith, "he *hath* eternal life," may backslide and go to hell at last. So a man who at one time possesses "eternal life" may cease to possess it. This shows, (and there is abundance of other proof to the same effect), that the expression "eternal life," as employed in the New Testament, has no reference to

duration, but to spiritual condition; in other words, that it is employed to denote the kind of life, and not the length of time that the possessor is to enjoy it. A Christian may enjoy this "eternal life" to-day, but next year, or next week, if he backslide and become a sinner, he will no longer enjoy "eternal life."

I pass now to the consideration that if the doctrine of eternal punishment be true, it must be taught in the Scriptures in plain and unequivocal language. Such an all-important and terrible doctrine as this must not be left to be inferred from a few scattered ambiguous words and phrases. But that this doctrine is not plainly and unequivocally taught, but is inferred from a few ambiguous words and phrases, is shown by the fact that its ablest defenders are not able to agree as to the testimony by which it shall be sustained, and among them have abandoned the whole Bible ground of defense. One passage has been abandoned by one commentator, and another passage by another, till there is not a passage left which all agree upon accepting as undeniable proof of eternal torment. And this is the best kind of evidence for the negative of this proposition. It is going into court, and using my opponent's witnesses to defeat him.

Take first, the passages which Brother Hobbs has quoted concerning the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. He claims that these passages plainly teach that future punishment is to be endless. But leading commentators who believe in the doctrine of eternal punishment, repudiate the idea of its being taught in the passages which refer to the sin against the Holy Ghost. I quote first from Pearce:

"Neither in this world, etc. Rather, neither in this age nor in the age to come; i. e., neither in this age, when the law of Moses subsisted, nor in that also when the Kingdom of Heaven, which is at hand, shall succeed it. And this is a strong way of expressing how difficult a thing it was for such a sinner to obtain pardon. From all of which it may be concluded that to speak against the Holy Ghost, (as these Pharisees did), was therefore never to be forgiven, in that age or in the age to come, because no means of obtaining

forgiveness for it was to be found, in the Jewish law or under the Christian dispensation; but that, however, upon their repentance they might be forgiven and admitted to the divine favor."

Wakefield says:

"An attentive reader of the Scriptures will perceive that under this sort of phraseology a comparison is intended to be made; as if he had said, though the Christian religion is a dispensation of mercy, this sin shall no more be forgiven by the law of the gospel, than it was by the law of Moses, under which the punishment was death."

Dr. Clarke says:

"Neither in this world, etc. Though I follow the common translation, yet I am fully satisfied that the meaning of the phrase is, neither in this dispensation, viz: the Jewish, nor in that which is to come, namely, the Christian. *Olam Habo*, 'the world to come,' is a constant phrase for 'the days of the Messiah,' in the Jewish writers. The sin here spoken of by our Lord ranks high in the catalogue of presumptuous sins, for which there was no forgiveness under the Mosal dispensation; see Numbers, xv:30, 31; xxv:31; Leviticus, xx:10; I Samuel, ii:25. When our Lord saith that such a sin hath no forgiveness, is he not to be understood as meaning that the crime shall be punished under the Christian dispensation, as it was under the Jewish, viz: by the destruction of the body? And is not this the same mentioned in I John, i:7, called the sin unto death, that is, the sin that was to be punished by the death of the body, while mercy might be extended to the soul? The punishment for presumptuous sin, under the Jewish law, to which our Lord evidently alludes, certainly did not extend to the damnation of the soul, though the body was destroyed. Therefore I think that though there was no such forgiveness to be extended to this crime as to absolve the man from the punishment of temporal death, yet on repentance mercy might be extended to the soul; and every sin may be repented of under the gospel dispensation."

Now mark, this is the language of men who believe with my brother, in the eternal punishment of those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ. And yet, when these, the very ablest commentators in the Orthodox ranks, repudiate the idea that this passage concerning the sin against the Holy Ghost refers to any punishment extending beyond the death of the body, Brother Hobbs still asserts, with his customary egotism and impudence, that it plainly teaches the doctrine of eternal torment. And as these able commentators declare that the passage concerning the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost,

from Rogers. If he wishes to make of himself a "bogus Universalist," in the classic language of one of his friends, he can disavow those authorities, and that right soon.

He tells you I said I did not rely on *aion* for an argument. I said that in the argument I was then constructing upon the antithesis, I should not build upon *aion*. It does not follow that I have pledged myself never to build an argument upon *aion*, or have given up the argument based upon that word, because I did not use it when constructing an argument disconnected from *aion*.

Mr. King says the Greek word *apolumi*, translated "perish," means "utter extinction of being." The gentleman must beware, or, instead of being an expounder of Universalism, he will find himself an Annihilationist. Suppose we translate *apolumi* in various places where it occurs in accordance with the gentleman's rule: John, iii:15, 16: "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 be annihilated."

Does not the gentleman know that the word *apolumi* means to be deprived of, to lose, to die, to dismiss, to depart, to go away? He brings up here a passage to answer my argument on the antithesis. It is the language of the prodigal son in the far-off country. That parable of the prodigal son seems to be a favorite subject with our Universalist friends. He makes the suffering of the prodigal son, far away from home, while his father did not know where he was nor what he was doing, a representation of the righteous retribution God visits upon his wandering children to bring them home and make them better! At last the prodigal son exclaimed: "I perish with hunger." The gentleman asks: "Did the prodigal son mean he was in danger of living eternally in hunger, or in danger of dying of hunger?" And this he calls an argument to overthrow my argument on the antithesis! Does not the gentleman even know what the word "antithesis" means? What pertinency has his statement to my argument? - Is the

word "perish" in antithesis with anything in the passage in the parable of the prodigal son? He knows it has nothing in antithesis with it, yet he calls this a proof that "perish" does not mean endless punishment. Suppose the young man had found nothing to eat: would he not have "perished"? But would he have been annihilated, do you think?

The gentleman endeavors to frighten me from attempting a textual defense of my position, on the ground that it arrays the Bible against itself. But he went into a textual defense of universal salvation, therefore, according to his logic, he is responsible for arraying the Bible against itself. Because I take one scripture here, and another there, and prove a given thing, is this arraying the Bible against itself? Yes, it is, according to your handling of it; but not according to any correct interpretation and exegesis. Under a correct law of exegesis, the Eighth of Romans is consistent with every other portion of the Divine Word.

But Mr. King says the Bible must be interpreted consistently with the attributes of God. Right here crops out the infidelity of his whole system. What! interpret the Bible by the attributes of God? What system of hermeneutics ever attempted this, except one permeated with semi-infidelity? I have always been taught that there were certain well-understood laws, which, properly applied, according to their meaning and intent, will bring out of the Divine Word the meaning of God, and lay it open for our instruction. I have already fully answered his argument from the attributes of God, and what reply has he made to my answer? None—none whatever. True, he attempted to reply—but miserably failed. If we are to interpret the Bible by the attributes of God, I ask, whence are we to learn the attributes of God? You must first interpret the Bible before you can find what the attributes of God are. This is the beautiful position into which his logic leads him: you must interpret the Bible by the attributes of God, but you can know nothing of the attributes of God till you have interpreted the Bible; consequently

it is impossible for you ever to know anything about the attributes of God; or to interpret the Bible! Perhaps the gentleman expects to learn the attributes of God from some other source than the Bible. But he will remember what Paul says: "The world by philosophy, or worldly wisdom, knew not God." Does the gentleman wish to go back and try the experiment so long tried by the Greek and Roman philosophers? Such an experiment would result now as it did then: it would plunge the world into darkness and heathenism—into polytheism or pantheism—for he who goes to nature for his information will assuredly run into polytheism or pantheism. Such has been the result in all ages of the world, and the gentleman ought to know it. I know he has said he can learn the attributes of God from the Bible, because they are described there in simple words—"great," "good," "holy," "wise," "merciful," "eternal," etc. But because simple words are used, it by no means results that their meaning is evident and indisputable without the Bible to interpret them for us. For instance, concerning this word "eternal" we shall have more dispute than any other. The gentleman says from the word "great" being applied to God he deduces the infinity of God. But whenever he hears the word "great" applied elsewhere, does he at once suppose the thing referred to is infinite? That argument would at once overthrow his own position. Paul exclaims: "How shall we escape if we neglect so *great* salvation?" Here the word "great" is applied to salvation; but the gentleman, in determining the attributes of God, interprets the word "great" to mean "infinite." If a "great God" is an "infinite God," a "great salvation" must be an infinite salvation;" but it can not be an infinite salvation unless it be a salvation from an infinite penalty: therefore, according to the gentleman's own argument, there is an infinite penalty. So, according to the gentleman's own logic, either God is *not* infinite, or there *is* such a thing as infinite punishment.

The gentleman quotes from Jonathan Edwards, who speaks

about the smoke of their torment ascending forever and ever. Mr. King talks as if he didn't believe this. Yet this is precisely the language of the Bible. In quoting from these authors, his logic is—if there is any logic in it—that, whatever being made the subject of contemplation, harrows up the feelings, must necessarily be false. Now, Edwards and others, when they contemplated the subject of endless punishment, had their feelings stirred; and is it not so with all of us? Yes, and that is why we spend our time, our lives, in laboring to save the souls of men. But there is no truth in the assumption that, whatever being made the subject of contemplation, harrows up the feelings, must be false. Supposing that, before the creation of the world, one angel had said to another, "God, the Great, the Infinite One; God, the Wise, the Good, the Holy One, is about to create a world, to be filled with human beings, rational intelligences, with undying souls; and these human beings must suffer in pain and sickness and sorrow and sin, wars and famines and pestilences, for thousands upon thousands of years;" would not the contemplation of such a scene as that have harrowed up the feelings of that angel? And had the angel proceeded upon the assumption of my opponent, he might have said: "There will be no such creation; no world of human beings will be brought into an existence of sin and suffering: it is incompatible with any angelic interpretation of the character of a God of love." Yet we know that such reasoning would have been false; we know that there is just such a creation. If this is the logic with which the gentleman proposes to meet me, he is welcome to use it to his heart's content.

The gentleman complains because my brethren smile when I make a point on him. My brethren, I am happy to say, are in the habit of smiling when they see truth triumphing over error; of being pleased, and perhaps expressing their pleasure in their countenances, when they witness the truth of God being triumphantly vindicated.

The gentleman sneers at the idea of my believing an endless

punishment, and yet believing in a God of love. Why, my friends, is it not an evidence of God's love that he has revealed to us the fearful consequences of sin? Suppose a man were coming down Court Avenue some dark night; that you should see him ignorantly approaching the river's bank; a few steps more would bring him to the brink, where he would plunge into the rushing waters; and suppose you were to cry out, "See here! See here! Don't go there, you will fall into the river and be drowned!" Would you think it an evidence of your malignity that you had warned that man of his danger? But God has done more than that; he has not only warned man of his danger, but has sent his Son to die for man, that he may be rescued from that danger.

The gentleman says that I insisted he must find a passage where the term "endless happiness" occurred. I said no such thing. I said he must bring evidence to prove the proposition in its terms. I did not ask him to bring a verse containing the precise words of his proposition. I demanded of him an argument that would prove the proposition in its terms; but that to this hour he has not done, and never will, for he never can.

The gentleman insisted upon my presenting an argument from the Old Testament. I will now oblige him. I refer him to Ezekiel, xviii: 4: "The soul that sinneth it shall die." I care not what death he makes this; it does not matter to me: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." There it stands as legible as the Divine hand could write it. The former clause of this verse is a favorite Universalist text; but as the gentleman, to my surprise, has not yet quoted it, I will do so for him: "Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth, it shall die." As I have said, I care not what death this is; if you say it is temporal death, all right; if spiritual death, all right; it is all the same, so far as the argument is concerned. My argument is this: that death is of itself, by virtue of its own nature, endless. In death there is no life, nor life-begetting power.

And if "the soul that sinneth shall die," and if there is no life-generating power in death, then the soul that through sin incurs the penalty of death must remain under the penalty of death forever, unless that penalty be removed, and new life imparted to the soul through the life-giving power of a beneficent God. But divine beneficence has its own rights in this matter. While divine beneficence has the right to offer mercy and pardon to the sinner, it has also the right to stipulate the terms upon which mercy and pardon shall be extended. But how shall we know what those terms are? God's revelation is the only thing that can tell us. You may talk of nature and reason as much as you choose; you may scale the starry heights, seek the depths beneath, and traverse the immeasurable expanse of the physical universe; you may dissect your own body, your own brain; you may study nature and man, philosophy and metaphysics, till life shall come to a weary close, and yet find no answer to the question: "How shall the soul be saved alive that has incurred the penalty of death?" God alone has revealed it. He has told us how we may escape. He has sent his Son to die for us—has given him to be a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. And Jesus, the Son of God, has sent his apostles into the world, to proclaim the terms of salvation: "He that believeth on me"—you see there is a condition here—"shall never die." "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." There stands the gospel commission and he can not quibble it away.

The gentleman asks for an argument in proof of endless punishment from the Old Testament, and I have given him one. I hope he will not pass it by unnoticed, as he has all my other arguments, but will pay some attention to it.

The gentleman asked me to tell him the first place in the Old Testament that endless punishment is referred to: I will accommodate him. He will find it in the second chapter of Genesis, thirteenth verse. There God gave to Adam a command, that he should not eat of the tree of the knowledge of

good and evil, and stated what would be the penalty of disobedience: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The same penalty is affixed to disobedience in this case as in the other: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," and the same argument holds good; since death has no life in itself, nor life-begetting power, the soul once under penalty of death must remain under it, unless rescued by the mercy of God.—[Time expired.

MR. KING'S SECOND SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS: Brother Hobbs repudiates all such descriptions of hell as I have read, declaring them to be the creations of heated or morbid imaginations. At the same time, unless he has been very much maligned, he has portrayed the sufferings of the damned just as strongly, in colors just as vivid; and others in this city have done worse. I would not quote what has been said in pulpits of this city by parties hired and indorsed by churches here, during the past year. They ought to be ashamed of themselves; I hope they are.

Brother Hobbs claims that it is the way in which we, (the Universalists), interpret the Bible, that makes it appear to teach contradictory doctrines: as if he and his *Orthodox* friends were all *agreed* upon the meaning and teachings of the Bible! Why, the man very well knows that his church is constantly at loggerheads with every other church of Christendom in regard to the meaning of the Scriptures; and that each church is in the same way diametrically opposed to every other church upon points of theology; and yet each claims to draw its theology from the Bible! This does not look as if he had any right to cast the whole blame upon *us*. This only shows that the *meaning* of the Bible is the Bible, if we could only

find it. But with the frail erring human judgments we have, we read sincerely, examine candidly, and honestly differ, and can not help ourselves.

He made a thrust at me, charging me with infidelity. I will not call any harsh names. I will try and be perfectly candid in this matter. Infidelity! What does the word mean? Why, "without faith." Which of us believes most in God, and his omnipotence, wisdom and goodness? most in Christ, and the successful accomplishment of his work of redemption? We both believe that God desires the eternal happiness of all men. He believes God will be thwarted, I believe God will be triumphant. He believes in a partial Saviour, I believe in a universal Saviour. In short, the great difference between him and me, between our two systems of theology, lies in the fact that I cherish a faith infinitely broader and stronger and deeper than his. Yet he has the astonishing recklessness—to call it by no harsher name—to denounce me as lacking in faith, as being an Infidel! If either of us has any grounds for calling the other an Infidel, I leave it to the audience to determine as to whom it is. He has never answered my appeal to the utter mockery that appears in the lives of himself and his Orthodox brethren if they really believe what they preach—that the vast majority of their fellow creatures are destined to dwell eternally in torment. They smile, and laugh, and enjoy themselves excellently, while their friends and neighbors are daily and hourly plunging into endless woe. Rather than believe that my brother and his Orthodox friends can possess such hearts of stone as to really believe in this, and yet go on their way rejoicing, and light-hearted, cracking their jokes, I deem it more complimentary to them to believe that deep in their souls there is reserved, denial of and disbelief in the horrible doctrine they preach. Thank God that my brother can not be as cruel as his creed, or as the God of his creed. I rejoice to believe that he is vastly better than his creed; that his heart is better than his doctrine; that his sympathies are larger than is consistent with his theology. I have heard sermons an hour

long, composed of chains of terrible and apparently unanswerable logic, welded in defense of the doctrine of eternal damnation; and at the close I have seen the preacher fall upon his knees, lift up his heart to God, and the very first breath of his prayer melted every link of those chains.

My brother says, the contemplation of temporary suffering distresses mens' minds. I hardly understand what argument he is trying to found upon that fact. The temporary suffering of a child distresses its mother, but what is it that keeps the mother from absolute insanity? It is the thought that the suffering is temporary—that it will not last forever. Her child lies suffering intensely from some agonizing disease; but there is either a hope of its recovery, or a certainty of its death. But let that mother accept it as an inevitable fact that her child must lie on that bed of burning anguish world without end, and she would not keep her reason an hour. He says that if an angel had been told beforehand that such a world of pain and sin as this was to be created, he would have grieved over it. I do not see how that helps the matter. If it be true, how deep and immortal must be their grief at the sight of a world whose inhabitants not only suffer from war and famine and pestilence here, but the majority of whom were created with the certain knowledge on the part of their Creator, that when their sad career on earth was ended, they were to plunge into infinite and endless suffering hereafter? The fallacy in my friend's representation of the angel grieving over the sad scenes transpiring upon earth, lies in the fact that he states but a *part* of what the angel must have seen, if he understood "the whole counsel of God." The light and peace which was to follow this darkness and sorrow, the angel must have known, though my friend has not the faith to believe in its coming. The trouble in my brother's argument is, that he can see no difference between temporary suffering, serving a temporary purpose, resulting at last in discipline and development, and strength, and everlasting joy, and eternal suffering, leading only to suffering more and more intense forever and forever.

At last my brother brings an argument from the Old Testament. He has found a proof of endless punishment in the Old Testament: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." I do not want to believe that my brother was so dishonest and insincere as to endeavor to mystify and mislead this audience. I do not want to believe that he was so ignorant as not to know that this passage has no sort of allusion to endless punishment. But he is certainly either himself deceived, or is endeavoring to deceive you. What is the statement in the text? "The soul that sinneth, it shall suffer endless punishment in hell?" Not at all. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die, unless it repents?" So says my brother, but the text says no such thing. If it did say this, or if my brother could show that it meant this, it would not have a particle of weight in the argument, as I should claim that all would at last, repent. There is no interpretation that can with any show of sense be put upon the passage that in the least helps out my friend in his argument.

Finally, my brother goes back to the first transgression. Here, as before, he translates and tortures God's word to suit his own case and creed. God says, "*In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.*" My brother does not believe that, nor does an Orthodox clergyman here. They insist upon reading it: "*In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt suffer endless punishment!*" They all interpret it in that way, yet they all know there is no sense in it, interpreted in that way; they know that eternal punishment could not be suffered in that one day. My brother deliberately adds to the plain statement of God, a different penalty, and that to be suffered at a different time, from that announced by God himself.

Mr. HOBBS—"Messrs. Moderators, I rise to a point of order."

Mr. KING—"What is your point of order?"

Mr. HOBBS—"I call upon the Moderators to call Mr. King back to the question."

Mr. KING—"Am I not talking upon the question?"

Mr. HOBBS—"I demand that Mr. King be called to order,

because he is misrepresenting my statements when I have no opportunity to reply; the audience will soon be dismissed, and go away with false impressions."

Mr. KING—"In what way false? In what respect am I out of order? At the close of my last speech I asked him to give me the time when, the place where, and the chapter and verse in which, eternal suffering was first threatened as a punishment for sin? He promised to do so, and referred me to the second chapter and seventeenth verse of Genesis: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," in answer to that request. And now I am taking that identical verse that he gave me as being the one in which he says endless punishment was first threatened, and showing that the passage has no reference whatever to endless punishment. Now I appeal to the Moderators, am I in order, or am I not?"

Mr. HOBBS—"Mr. King still persists in misrepresenting me. I did not bring up the passage to prove endless punishment, but built my argument upon the nature of the penalty—death, thus arriving at the doctrine of endless punishment."

Mr. KING—"In heaven's name then, why did you bring it up, saying that you brought it up in response to my request for the first passage in the Old Testament proving endless punishment? If you did not bring it up for that purpose, for what purpose *did* you bring it up?"

Mr. HOBBS—"I said that in the Old Testament we have a law with an endless penalty, death; for in death there is no life, nor life-begetting power; hence of its own nature it is endless, unless the individual by the mercy of God is taken out of it."

Mr. KING—"Then, am I to understand that you give up this passage, and acknowledge that it is not a proof-text in favor of endless punishment?"

Mr. HOBBS—"You can understand what you please."

Mr. KING—"Bro. Hobbs, you would stand a great deal better with your audience if you did not get so nervous, when your arguments are met."

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE—"You haven't met them, yet."

Mr. KING TO THE AUDITOR—"See here, my friend, who is running this funeral?"

My friends, I will be candid with you. I do not deny a future retribution, beyond this world; but I *do* deny that it is a doctrine of the Old Testament in any shape or manner. I could read a volume from the ablest Orthodox commentators admitting that fact. If you want to know what punishment God promised to inflict, and really did inflict, and when it was inflicted, go back to the original record of the transaction, where Adam was tried, and convicted, and sentenced, by his Maker. There you will find that upon Adam, and upon Eve, certain pains and penalties are promised, during "*all the days of their life*;" that in the sweat of their face should they eat bread, "*till thou return unto the ground*; for out of it thou wast taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." There God leaves him, and is utterly silent in regard to any punishment beyond that period. What right has my brother to assume that God meant more, infinitely more, than he said? Not only that, but that when God revealed simply a temporary infliction, which, in his own words, was to continue "*till thou return unto the ground*," to whose duration God himself assigned a definite limit, he keeps concealed an infinitely greater infliction thereafter? When the doctrine of eternal punishment is based upon such passages as this, wherein no man not utterly blinded by prejudice could discover the faintest allusion to it, no wonder that men sneeringly say, "Anything can be proved out of the Bible!" I appeal to the sense of justice and common sense of my audience, whether a just and merciful God was not in honor bound to reveal to his ignorant children the *full* consequences of their conduct if they should violate his law? Whether, if God had a place of eternal torment prepared for his children in case they should disobey his command, it was consistent with his character to reveal to them nothing of the awful doom awaiting them, and even after they had sinned, to say nothing of any further.

punishment than that which should follow them till they returned to the dust from which they were taken, and unto which they must return?

So much for my brother's Old Testament proofs of endless misery, so far as he has already gone. Now let him continue his investigation; I will warrant him the same result in every instance. In order to leave him no loop-hole of escape, I will make this broad assertion, and let him overthrow it if he can. The doctrine of endless punishment is nowhere to be found in the Old Testament. Now let him search the record, from Genesis to Malachi, for proof-texts of his position; he will find on investigation that they have as little reference to eternal torment as those he has already produced.

Mark what a significant fact has been developed. Go back to the creation of the first man; place yourself in imagination with the parent of the race, at that moment, infinitely more momentous than any or all other moments in the history of humanity; reflect upon the incalculable consequences destined to follow that first act of disobedience; believe, as you must believe or deny intelligence to God, that God knew what was to be the result to man in case of his disobedience; acknowledge as you must acknowledge or deny to God his crowning attributes of love and justice, that God was in honor bound to reveal to his ignorant children the consequences of such disobedience. Now, my brother tells you the consequence of disobedience to God is eternal torment in hell—and yet, at this one grand nexus of all history and providence, a merciful God, anxious to save his children from sin and suffering, and able to communicate to them the fact that physical death will follow their disobedience, together with certain other pains and penalties which they must endure till their bodies return to dust, reveals to them before their sin no token of this infinitely greater and endless punishment which my brother says this merciful God had prepared for his children from the foundation of the earth, nor gives them the least intimation of

it afterward! Ah, brothers and sisters, there must be something radically wrong in an assumption of this sort. Why does my brother preach the doctrine of endless punishment? Because he loves it, and rejoices in the contemplation of it? I hope not. But as he claims and doubtless believes, because he looks upon the terrors of hell as a restraint upon the ungodly; because he regards the doctrine of endless punishment as one of the grand and redeeming forces in the world. He assures us that men to-day, under the blessings of liberty, civilization and progress, when ancient forms of tyranny and cruelty are fast passing away, when old and condemned systems of treatment of the offending are giving place to new and better ones, when we have disciplinary prisons and reform schools for criminals, asylums for the fallen and destitute, hospitals for the insane, and similar philanthropic institutions blossoming all over Christendom as a proof of the growing humanity and Christianity of the age—even now, my brother assures us, we need the doctrine of endless damnation to save souls with! And yet in that early day, before man had sinned, when for his own sake and the sake of unborn humanity, he needed all the warning, restraining influences of this magnificent doctrine, God gave him no hint of it! And when Cain, the first murderer, had shed his brother's blood, God gave him no intimation, before or after the commission of his foul crime, of a world of eternal torment, but sent him forth to be a fugitive and a vagabond *upon the earth*. To this ignominious sentence my brother adds the infinitely greater penalty of being a fugitive and a vagabond in a world of torment throughout eternity. And when the world became so corrupt that God was compelled, in order to accomplish its renovation and purification, to send a flood and destroy all but eight persons, in all Noah's preaching for one hundred and twenty years, we find no intimation that they were to be tormented forever after they were drowned. So I might pass step by step, and chapter by chapter, through the entire Old Testament, and not the least

trace of punishment beyond the grave could be found any where. If there be any passage there which proclaims or hints it, you need not fear but that my brother will bring it up. I again repeat, in the whole Old Testament there is not an affirmation nor hint of this doctrine. In making this statement I will be sustained by many of the ablest and best Christian scholars and commentators, such as Paley, Jahn, George Campbell, and others. And if such a terrible penalty as this is not mentioned nor hinted under the rigorous dispensation of the law, you need not expect to find a revelation of it under the better covenant of grace and mercy. I know that my brother will shower upon your heads proof-texts from the New Testament; but the words which believers in the doctrine have translated "eternal" in conformity with their own notions and prejudices, are words that in the original do not primarily mean eternal. They are words of doubtful and contested signification, of a dozen different meanings, in many instances certainly not meaning "endless." And I repeat, such a doctrine as this, flatly contradicting the whole tenor of the Gospel and character of God as set forth in the Scriptures, can not be proved by inference, from a few scattered ambiguous words and phrases.

When I was up before, I read Dr. Clarke's opinion upon the passage brought up by my brother in reference to the sin against the Holy Ghost. My brother says he does not care what Dr. Clarke says upon the subject. I have learned to have just that opinion of my brother's egotism to believe, that he does not. I also read the opinions of those eminent scholars, Pearce and Wakefield. I did this to show that even this passage, brought up by my brother as an unanswerable one in proof of eternal punishment, was not so plain and unambiguous, but that many of the ablest Orthodox scholars had declared that it had no reference to punishment in a future state. I now wish to read, for the same purpose, Whitby's remarks in reference to I John, v: 16:

"If any man see his sick brother sin a sin which is not unto death, that is,

for which God hath not primarily threatened and required that he should die for it, as he did to them that were guilty of murder, (Gen. ix: 56; Numbers xxxv: 30, 31), and for idolatry, (Deut. xvii: 2, 5), he shall ask of God restoration of his life and health, 'and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death.' 'There is a sin unto death,' of which God hath denounced that he that doeth it shall die for it; 'I do not say that he shall pray for it;' that is, for deliverance for the person guilty of it from death."

Macknight says:

"If any one endowed with spiritual gifts is sensible that his brother has committed a sin which is not to be punished with bodily death, because he hath repented, or is in a disposition to repent, let him pray to God and he will grant, at his request, recovery to those that have not sinned unto death. There is a sin which will be punished with death, because the sinner is impenitent. I do not say concerning it that the spiritual man should ask God to recover such a person by miracle."

Gilpin says:

"If any of your society is visited with sickness for his sins, let public prayers be made; and if his sins be not of such a nature as God maketh fit to punish with death, the devout prayers of the Church will be heard."

Benson says:

"If a Christian by the impulse of the spirit perceives that any Christian brother has sinned such a sin as to draw upon himself a disease which is not to end in death, but to be miraculously cured by him, then let him pray to God, and God in answer to his prayer will grant life and perfect health to such Christians as have sinned a sin which is not to end in death. There is a sin which draws down upon Christians a disease that is to end in death; I do not say or mean that any Christian shall pray for that, because in such case God would not hear his prayer, nor miraculously cure his Christian brother at his request."

I might read from half-a-dozen other eminent commentators to show that this passage concerning the sin against the Holy Ghost, means no such thing as my brother claims it does. This is not "Universalist logic;" it is the testimony of his own witnesses. Among them, they have given up *every passage in the Bible* claimed by defenders of the doctrine of endless punishment. Yet my brother tells me this is *plainly revealed* as a doctrine of revelation.—[Time expired.]

MR. HOBBS' THIRD SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS:—In regard to controversy in general, I am not unaware that there are those who think it unprofitable, especially when the subject is of a scriptural character. But so far as I am concerned, this has never been my opinion. It is true, circumstances might exist under which I might deem myself justifiable in declining a controversy. But when the truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ is to be vindicated, or any of the great essential doctrines of the Christian system defended, I deem it, when a proper opponent is presented, and when those truths are so involved in the minds of the people as to be somewhat in doubt, something of cowardice to refuse to come before the public and defend the doctrines we believe. I have assumed the position I now occupy because I love the truth; controversy for its own sake I do not love; I rather cultivate the arts of peace. When we reflect that the Saviour, and his apostles, were ever and anon engaged in disputation with their cotemporaries, surely we can not conceive it to be *beneath* our dignity to meet and manfully oppose what we deem to be error. In the present discussion, I do not contemplate the conversion of Mr. King, perhaps, not that of any of his friends; I do not imagine that much apparent and immediate good will be the result. At a time when the passions and prejudices of men are heated to the highest pitch, they are not in a favorable mental attitude to examine candidly and weigh impartially the arguments that may be presented on either side. But I do trust that when the sober second thought shall have come, and men's passions and prejudices shall have become cooler by the lapse of time, that good may result, as God ever holds conservatorship over his own truth.

Before proceeding with my own argument, I will notice a few things advanced by my friend in the course of this discussion. Mr. King on Friday evening stated that I had preached worse things during the last six months than the quotations he read from Jonathan Edwards. If he means that

I have drawn more exaggerated pictures of eternal torment than Edwards, he is simply mistaken. My pulpit has never been made the theater for the exhibition of such morbid hyperbolisms. From my pulpit has been proclaimed the great truth, based upon the sure word of God, that those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel shall be punished with banishment from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power forever.

The gentleman says, each church differs from all others in regard to this matter of future punishment—therefore they must all be wrong. That is the logic of his argument, if there is any logic in it. But by the same logic, Universalism must be utterly false. When I look back over the history of Universalism in this country, it has worn more colors than the chameleon ever displayed. Go back to Murray, and you will find Universalism as taught by him a very different thing from the Universalism defended upon this floor. He believed in the vicarious atonement of Jesus Christ; he based his hope of salvation on the fact that Jesus shed his blood for the sins of man. In those early days, some of my own family were of this faith; so I know of what I am speaking. Again, in those days, it was commonly taught that as soon as men died, whether saints or sinners, they went immediately to the same heaven. Now it is necessary to have, as one of the preachers of that faith not a thousand miles from here, was once heard to say, "For aught he knew a million years of suffering and purgatorial torment." And now the blood of Christ is cast aside as being of no more account than the "blood of a revolutionary hero." Not only is Universalism a different thing at different times; but, it is a different thing in different places. Universalism in Iowa is essentially different from Universalism in New England. Last Fall, the very party to which Mr. King belongs, was excluded from representation at the Massachusetts Universalist State Convention, as not being orthodox among the Universalists themselves.

The gentleman made an eloquent little speech in reply to

my remarks upon the infidel tendencies of Universalism, trying to create the impression upon your minds that I had charged him personally with being an Infidel. He claims that, so far from being an Infidel, he believes more than I do. Ah! yes, my dear sir, that is the trouble; you believe more than the Bible teaches; and he that believes more than the Bible teaches, when that belief is in direct contradiction to the teachings of the Bible is equally an Infidel with him that does not believe any of it. I do regard the system which Mr. King is here to defend, as utterly and diametrically in opposition to the plain teachings of the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. According to this system, in the language of one of the strongest friends and supporters of the gentleman since this debate began: "The blood of Jesus Christ is of no more merit, in securing the sinner's salvation, than the blood of a goat." You may call this strong language, blasphemous if you will; but just such is the language that naturally wells up from the advocates and believers of the doctrine of universal salvation.

On page 169 and 170 of Austin and Holmes' debate are to be found some choice extracts, which Mr. Austin does not deny being correct. I find there quoted the language of Mr. O. A. Brownson, who was for some years the editor of a Universalist newspaper. Mr. Brownson says, (I quote Mr. Austin's report of his language:)

"Of the 2,500 subscribers of the paper he edited, [in defense of Universalism], it was presumed that more than one-half were skeptics or skeptical. He has conversed with hundreds of professed Universalists, who would own to him that they supported Universalism only because it was the most liberal sentiment they could find, and because it was better than Deism to put down Orthodoxy."

An Infidel agent at the West, writing for the Investigator, (Boston), July 19th, 1840, says:

"Indeed, the Universalist clergymen are not to be sneezed at. Mr. I. Kidwell [one of the oldest and most popular clergymen of Ohio], preached last Sabbath. I went to hear him; and of a truth, he preached as good sense, reason, philosophy, and liberty, as I want to hear, or expect to. He is a very good Kneeland man."

Such men are the worst and most dangerous kind of Infidels, my friends. When Infidelity comes with open and bold front, we know how to meet it; but when it comes in the sacred name of religion, it is necessary to tear away the guise, in order that people may see it in its own native deformity.

In all this I intend no personal application; I do not accuse Mr. King personally of being an Infidel. I have made no remarks which he could by any just construction, deem personal or disrespectful, unless it were my remark in reference to the "tricks of the trade." I could not for the life of me imagine why the gentleman should be so indignant at that chance expression, till an evening or two afterward, when a gentleman informed me that this was a slang expression, used by gamblers. But at the time I happened to use the expression, I had no knowledge whatever of that fact.

But I have a few more proofs of the infidel tendencies of Universalism, to present to you. Mr. Fishback, one of the most talented preachers of the Universalist denomination in Iowa, who preached in Oskaloosa for five years, in 1861 said to a preacher now upon this floor: "I wish you would go into my congregation, and preach a sermon upon the evidences of Christianity." And in his farewell sermon to that congregation, he said: "I have now preached to you for five years, and fail to perceive that you are better men or women than when I began." He is now in Illinois, in the Insane Asylum. We have heard a great deal from the Universalists in reference to the tendencies of Orthodoxy toward making men and women insane. It would be well for them to look at home. Insanity is a calamity that may happen anywhere, and under any circumstances. Excitement of any kind may disturb the mental balance, and produce insanity. Let the gentleman search the records, and see if there are not in the insane asylums as many of his faith as of any other, in proportion to the number of its adherents.

The gentleman charges that our conduct is inconsistent with our belief, in that we do not devote our lives more exclusively

and agonizingly to the saving of souls. It may be that we are lacking in this direction. But would the gentleman have us worry our souls to death on account of the wicked who take no care for the salvation of their own souls? Shall we go contrary to the advice of Solomon: "Fret not thyself because of evil-doers"? After we have faithfully warned our fellow creatures of the wrath to come unless they obey the Gospel, it would exhibit very little sense to be constantly putting ourselves upon the rack and into torture on their account. The whole argument is entirely sophistical; in fact, no argument at all. In a town in Indiana, near where I formerly lived, there was a great collection of drift-wood in the river below the city, a never-failing source of miasm, disease and death. The physicians of the city told the citizens that they must remove that drift, or be constantly exposed to dangerous and frequently fatal diseases; but the drift was allowed to remain, and remains there yet, for aught I know. And therefore, according to the gentleman's logic, there never was any drift there at all.

The gentleman complains that we persist in smiling, and sometimes even laugh. Well, I don't know that we smile and laugh any more than the law allows, or the Gospel permits. The apostle commands: "Rejoice evermore;" and I do not know but there is as much *merit* in obeying that command as any other. Those who have obeyed the gospel, and reposed their confidence in Jesus Christ, are not all the while racking their brains for fear of falling into hell.

The gentlemen say we claim that eternal punishment is a sort of redeeming ordinance. Well, *he* believes that *temporal* punishments are a sort of redeeming ordinance. His plan is, to make the sinner pay the last stripe of suffering due his transgression, and then let him go free. But an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. We hold that eternal punishment is calculated to *prevent* men from sinning. We do not preach eternal torment in order to make men love God; but to hold the moral nature in equipoise till the love of God can work its way through the stony heart.

He believes that the statement, "He that is dead is freed from sin," is to be taken literally. Now, we are commanded to "cleansc ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord." Now, if we can not be freed from sin till death, while "he that is dead is freed from sin," I want to know if every one of us is not in duty bound, in obedience of that command, to commit suicide?

The gentleman says that Orthodox commentators have given up every text upon which they used to ground the doctrine of endless punishment. This is evasive and untrue. But it is true as regards Universalism; Universalists have given up, one by one, the texts which used to be accounted the most unanswerable proofs of Universalism. Mr. Gurley, in the *Star of the West*, for 1843, even gives up Acts iii:21, one of the strongest proof-texts of Universalism—stronger than even the Eighth of Romans! I might show the same with regard to most of their other proof-texts. But what does this prove? Simply, as I have already shown, that Universalism changes its colors, chameleon-like.

Perish, the gentleman says, means "total extinction of being," "annihilation." Let the gentleman try that definition in Matthew x:28: "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." The word here rendered "destroy," is *apolumi*, which is elsewhere translated "perish." Has the gentleman turned Materialist and Annihilationist?

The gentleman makes another effort to overthrow my argument based upon the sin against the Holy Ghost. He endeavors to show that the punishment for that sin was temporal death; or, rather, that such has been the opinion of certain commentators. But supposing he should prove that the punishment for the sin against the Holy Ghost was temporal death, how does that effect my argument? I did not base my argument upon the penalty, at all; but upon the statement that this sin was never to be forgiven, "neither in this world nor in

the world to come." His interpretation, if established, would only prove that those who had committed this sin were to be held in the power of temporal death to all eternity. The gentleman may go on till doomsday; endeavoring to prove what the penalty was; I simply reply, whatever it was, it was endless, for the sin was never to be forgiven, "neither in this world nor in the world to come." He says I said the sin could not be repented of. I said nothing of the sort; I made no affirmation, *pro* or *con*, upon that point.

The gentleman has attempted to answer my argument based upon the death-penalty passed upon Adam for the first transgression. You could all see what work he made of it. Even after I arose to correct him, he went on in the same strain of perversion, building up a man of straw, and knocking it over, crying: "What a grand victory!" He charged me with saying that the penalty for that first disobedience was spiritual death. I said plainly, I did not care whether it was spiritual or temporal death; it was death, and "the soul that sinneth, it shall die." I care not whether that death be temporal, spiritual, moral, or what kind; the argument holds good in any case; for in death there is no life, nor life-begetting power.

Right here, I want to call your attention to the Second of Hebrews, in connection with this very same thought, and show you that one of the very passages quoted by the gentleman in this discussion, recoils upon himself with tremendous and crushing power. You will remember that he quoted the Second of Hebrews to prove that Christ should have all things put under him. Now, I will show him that the passage refers not to Christ, but to man. Let us see: Hebrews, ii:6-9: "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; *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 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."

"For every man?" Yes; it was necessary before man could escape from the death-penalty which had been imposed upon him. I care not, I say, whether this death be physical, spiritual, or moral, Jesus must taste death for every man before man could be released from the death-penalty.

I quoted Ezekiel, xviii: 21: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." The gentleman sneered at this quotation, and charged me with thrusting "ifs" into the mouth of God, making him say, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die—if it does not repent!" I put no "if" in connection with this quotation; but let the gentleman open his Bible, and read through this same eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel, and he will find that God himself has added an "if" to this declaration. Read the twenty-first verse: "But *if* the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, *he shall surely live, he shall not die.*" Now, who thrusts an "if" into the mouth of the Almighty? or, rather, who snatches an "if" out of the mouth of the Almighty?

I will now return to my own line of argument.

My eighth argument is based upon the mediation of Christ, in opposition to the doctrine of Universalism that Christ is now upon the throne of judgment, and judging the world daily, thus making this a perfect state of retribution.

I Timothy, ii: 1-5: This passage you have heard repeatedly read. First, the apostle enjoins the enlargement of Christian benevolence, to manifest itself for all, in harmony with the spirit of Christ's death and mediation. The death and mediation of Christ were for all who would avail themselves of it. God wills (*thelo*, "desires") that all be saved now, and to this end has removed all legal obstacles by the death and mediation of Christ. Romans, iii: 24, 25: "Being justified freely by his

grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God." Hebrews, viii: 7, 7: "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises; for if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." Hebrews, ix: 15: "And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Now, it is incompatible with the Scriptures and with common sense, that the same person could, at the same time, be a judge and a mediator. But God "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;" (Acts, xvii: 31) hence the judgment of all men must be in the future—the time when the wicked "shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

My ninth argument is based upon the fact that the wicked are to be punished after death. See Matthew, x: 28: "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;" Luke, xii: 4, 6: "And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them which 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." The word rendered "destroy" in the passage first read, is in the original Greek, *apolumi*. The same word is found in 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." In this passage, Mr. King defines "destroy" to mean annihilation, or total extinction of being. In John, x: 28, we find again the Greek word *apolumi*, here rendered "perish:" "And I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." Here, again, Mr. King says "perish," *apolumi*, means total extinction of being. Now, by his own definition to destroy both soul and body in hell is the infliction of an infinite penalty.

Again: In John, x: 28, and Luke, xii: 4, 5, the word *gehenna* occurs, and is translated "hell." This word was well understood among the Jews to refer to a state of after-death punishment.

"The Jews not only understood Christ to use the term in the sense contended for above, and used it in the same way themselves, in explaining the Old Testament Scriptures, but this same word, *gehenna*, is frequently found in their targums, or the paraphrases or expositions of the Jewish Scriptures. The Chaldee targums are, some of them, traced back to the days of Ezra. They are known to have existed in the days of the Maccabees, and to have been republished about a century before the advent of Christ, and generally read in the synagogues. Dr. Prideaux gives the most important of them an existence and great influence and authority with the Jews, in the century before Christ. (See Austin and Holme's Debate, page 687; Prideaux, vol. i, p. 352.)

Parkhurst says: "*Gehenna* was, in our Saviour's time used by the Jews for 'hell,' the place of the departed. This appears from the word being thus applied by the Chaldee targums, and by the Jerusalem targum, and by that of Jonathan Ben Uzziel." Clarke gives an example, in connection with Psalm, cx, where the Chaldee targum, speaking of the tale-bearer, says: "He shall be hunted by the angel of death, and thrust into *gehenna*."

Now, *gehenna* can not be in this world, or men could kill and cast into it; nor can it be in the intermediate state, between death and the "song of victory," because the soul and body

will be separated, as Mr. King admitted in his comment on the Eighth of Romans; so, beyond the "song of victory" *gehenna* must be; for death, that holds the body will be destroyed, and *hades* that holds the spirit, will yield up its victims, and in the resurrection-state, body and soul will be reunited; and then, and not till then, can the casting of both body and soul into hell be possible. But, all beyond is changeless, Mr. King says; therefore, soul and body will remain in *gehenna* endlessly, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched. (Mark, ix: 44). Justin Martyr, in his Apology, Section 8, has these words: "We see that the souls of the wicked, on being reunited to the same bodies, shall be consigned over to eternal torments, and not, as Plato will have it, to a period of a thousand years in hell. But if you will affirm this to be incredible or impossible, there is no help, but you must fall from error to error, till the day of judgment convinces you we are in the right."—[Time expired.

MR. KING'S THIRD SPEECH.

BROTHER MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I have before called your attention to the fact, that if the doctrine of eternal punishment be true; if it be a doctrine of divine revelation, it must stand revealed in plain and unambiguous language, concerning which there can be no dispute. I have called your attention to the further fact, which my brother has endeavored to parry and evade, that if the doctrine of eternal punishment be revealed at all in the Bible, it is in such doubtful and ambiguous language that the ablest scholars and commentators of his own school can not agree as to the testimony. I claim this significant fact to be a most signal overthrow of the doctrine.

My brother brought up the other evening, as a proof-text

from which there could be no escape, Mark, xvi:16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." But what does this mean? Does it mean, or does it say, he that believeth not shall be punished endlessly? Campbell, Kappe, Horne, and others, able commentators, translate this text: "He that believeth not shall be condemned," and that it has no sort of allusion to a future life. But even if we take the text as it stands, let us see how much countenance it gives to my brother's doctrine. He insists upon having these propositions proved in their express terms: Then I ask what authorizes him to say that the damnation spoken of is to extend throughout all eternity? If the text means, "he that believeth not shall suffer *endless* damnation," why does it not say so? So long as the individual is disobedient to God, he is dead in trespasses and sins, and is under condemnation or damnation already. But a man who has sinned and is under condemnation for it to-day, may repent to-morrow, and be no longer under condemnation. Are such texts as that to be accepted as proof of eternal damnation? My brother is a great stickler for the Bible just as it reads; he is also a stickler for baptism—and in his mouth *baptisma* means immersion in water; will my brother tell this audience whether every person who is not baptized by immersion in water shall be consigned to eternal woe? If so, then the vast majority of mankind, and of the most pious and devoted men and women the world ever knew, are to suffer endlessly in hell for a slight error into which they have ignorantly fallen in the translation of a Greek word of very doubtful signification!

I have before showed you that according to my brother's doctrine, the great majority of mankind are destined to suffer endless torment. But he attempted to evade this: he denied it, saying that only those to whom the Gospel had been offered, and who had willfully rejected it, were to be damned. If that be true, then all the heathen are to be saved anyhow, if they have no offer of the Gospel and no opportunity to reject it.

Therefore, when you send missionaries to them with the Bible, you give these heathens, who are otherwise sure of heaven, an opportunity to earn eternal damnation by rejecting the Bible; and the Gospel, instead of being a message of peace and good will to men, instead of being the means of salvation, is but a trap to catch souls for hell! If my brother's statement be true, then in heaven's name keep the Gospel away from the heathen?

My brother has quoted Matthew, xxv: 46, as a proof-text of endless punishment: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." Now, my friends, I want you when you go home to give an unprejudiced reading to this chapter and the one preceding, containing one unbroken discourse of Jesus. By what was this discourse called out? By a question of his disciples, provoked by a remark of Jesus concerning the temple, to which his disciples had called his attention. The twenty-fourth chapter commences: "And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to him, for to show him the buildings of the temple. And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. 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?" Now, mark, there is a Greek word signifying the world, the earth and all it contains, and that word is *kosmos*. But Jesus does not here use the word *kosmos*, but *aion*, which means age, or dispensation; that age, the Jewish dispensation, being about to end with the destruction of the Jewish temple. Jesus points out the signs that are to proceed that calamity, so plainly that there is no opportunity for any one to mistake. And this discourse continues, without break or interruption, throughout these two chapters, the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth. Read them for yourselves, and to test the matter, when you have read them, or as you read them, point out the verse

where Jesus ceases to talk about the temple, and commences to talk about the affairs of eternity. And notice, that according to the assumption of my brother, at some point in this discourse, Jesus must have suddenly stopped talking about the destruction of the temple, and without giving a word of notice, commenced talking about the affairs of eternity. Such is the assumption of commentators who teach that a portion of this chapter refers to the soul's eternal destiny; and I have been amused at their efforts to fix the point where Jesus ceased talking upon the one subject and began upon the other, some commentators fixing upon one verse, and some upon another. There is a sudden and violent transition, yet nobody can find where it is.

My brother attempts an exposition of the parable of the sheep and goats, found in the last portion of this discourse. He assumes this portion of the discourse refers, not to the destruction of the temple, or anything connected therewith, but to the future judgment. But his exposition is a complete stultification of the Bible, and a plain denial of the central idea of the Gospel in reference to salvation. He said eternal life was the reward of recompense for obedience, and endless punishment the reward or recompense for disobedience. According to his exposition, endless felicity is the pay that God gives man for being good here, and endless torment the penalty for the evil he has done here. This is contrary to common sense, to philosophy, to any idea of God which regards him as a being worthy of worship, or even of respect, as well as contrary to the plain teachings of the Bible. The best man that ever lived, when he came to die, felt himself infinitely indebted to God, and on the score of debt and credit could claim no right to heaven in payment for his good works. So Paul declares, (Ephesians, ii: 8): "By grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." And so Christ declared to his disciples, (Luke, xvii: 10): "So likewise ye, when ye have done all those things

which are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants." Furthermore, in assuming that this parable of the sheep and the goats has reference to a future judgment in the eternal world, my brother places upon the terms "eternal life," and "everlasting punishment," a meaning they will by no means bear. I have before stated that "eternal life" refers to a condition of the soul, but has no reference to duration. The ablest scholars of the age concede this. Christ speaks of the believer as having *already* eternal life abiding in him; of *having passed from death unto life*; and the apostle Paul says: "You hath he quickened, *who were dead* in trespasses and sins," (Ephesians, ii: 1); and, by the way, that puts an end to all my brother's talk about death being endless, and that consequently the punishment of death for sin is an endless punishment. And my brother preaches distinctly that a man may be converted to-day, and receive the gift of *eternal life*, but at some future time backslide, and go to an endless hell. But mark you, while that man was obedient to God he had eternal life. This shows that the term "eternal life" refers not to duration, but to a condition or state of soul in harmony and communion with God, the source of eternal life, and in that condition has a portion of the divine or eternal nature. The original word translated eternal and everlasting is *aionios*; but his argument built upon *aionios* is fallacious. Any word used to prove his doctrine must be taken in its ordinary, natural, primary signification. Now, my brother can not bring a single lexicon of any authority which says that the ordinary, natural, primary signification of *aionios* is "eternal." The primary idea is not "eternal." He can not find the word in any of the Greek classics, meaning "eternal." A schoolboy reading in the rudimentary Greek reader, would laugh at the idea of *aionios* meaning "eternal." The definition, "eternal," is put at the very last end of the list of synonymous English expressions, as being the most unusual, unnatural, and unfrequent meaning of the Greek word *aionios*. In Matthew, xxv: 46, the Greek word rendered punishment is

kolassin, the primary meaning of which is "pruning," as when a man lops off useless branches of a tree, in order that it may bear more or better fruit. And here you find the true, the scriptural philosophy of punishment. The idea of God punishing his children when it can be of no use—tormenting them not for *their* benefit, but because *he* loves to torment them—is more than unreasonable and unscriptural; it is essentially fiendish. Such was not Paul's idea of punishment. He tells us that God chasteneth us "for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness," (Hebrews, xii: 10). My brother laughs to scorn my idea of punishment being inflicted for the benefit of the sufferer, and says that suffering, and not Christ, is my Saviour. But when my brother laughs at that he laughs at an authority higher than I. You will recollect that David committed a murder, the murder of Uriah, under peculiarly black and damning circumstances; a treacherous murder, under the guise of pretended friendship. But afterward, when his crime was brought home to him, and its enormity pointed out, his moral sense was awakened, and he was plunged into the lowest hell of sorrow and remorse. But he says something that my brother would not believe; he says God delivered his soul from the lowest hell; and he says furthermore—and I hope my brother will not laugh at the idea—that his sufferings while in the lowest hell were very beneficial to him; for he declares, "Before I was afflicted I went astray, but now have I kept thy word." Brother Hobbs, is that Universalist sophistry?

My brother objects to the "other-day" style of defending his doctrine; he calls it exaggeration, and the result of a heated and morbid imagination. O, my friends, you can not make endless punishment a reality, and then indulge in figures of speech, or pictures of fancy that *can* be an exaggeration. The strongest figures, the most vivid pictures, are utterly powerless to give even a faint conception of its enormity. I now propose to give you an extract from a sermon by one of

the modern preachers of this doctrine, from one of the ablest living expounders of Orthodoxy. I quote from Sermons, Second Series, by Rev. C. H. Spurgeon, London :

"That same body which is now standing in the aisle or sitting in the pew, if thou diest without Christ, shall burn forever in the flames of hell. It is not a fancy of man, but a truth, that actual flesh and blood, and those very bones shall suffer : "Thy whole body shall be cast into hell." Hell will be a place for bodies as well as souls. Jesus speaks of the "fire that never shall be quenched." Now do not begin telling me that this is not a physical fire. Who cares for that? But they are real, sir; yes, as real as yourself. There is a real fire in hell, as truly as you have now a real body, a fire exactly like that which we have on earth in every thing except this—that it will not consume, though it will torture you. You have seen the ashes too, lying in the fire red hot, but when you take it out it is unconsumed. So your body will be prepared by God in such a way that it will burn forever without being consumed. When thou diest thy soul will be tormented alone—that will be a hell for it—but at the day of judgment thy body will join thy soul, and then thou wilt have twin hells; body and soul shall be together, each brimful of pain, thy soul sweating in its inmost gore drops of blood, and thy body, from head to foot, suffused with agony; conscience, judgment, memory, all tortured; but more, thy head tormented with racking pains, thine eyes starting from their sockets with sights of blood and woe; thy heart beating high with fever; thy pulse rattling at an enormous rate with agony; thy limbs cracking like martyrs in the fire, and yet unburnt; thyself, put in a vessel of hot oil, pained, yet coming out undestroyed; all thy veins becoming a road for the hot feet of pain to travel on; every nerve a string on which the devil shall ever play his diabolical tune of hell's unutterable lament. But hear me, while I again affirm God's truth; I tell thee, sinner, that those eyes that now look and lust shall look on miseries that shall vere and torment thee. Those ears which now, though loudest to hear the song of blasphemy, shall hear moans and groans, and horrid sounds, such as only the damned know. That very throat through which thou dost drink, shall be filled with fire. Those very lips and arms of thine will be tortured, all at once. Why, if thou hast a headache thou wilt run to thy physician; but what wilt thou do when thy head, and heart, and hands, and feet, ache all at once? If thou hast but a pain in thy veins, thou wilt search out medicines to heal thee; but what wilt thou do when gout and rheum, and vertigo, and all else that is vile, attack thy body at once? How wilt thou bear thyself when thou shalt be loathsome with every kind of disease, leprous, palsied, black, rotten, thy bones aching, thy marrow quivering, every limb thou hast, filled with pain; thy body a temple of demons, and a charnal of miseries?

"You listen to me now unmoved; it will be harder work when death gets hold of you, and you lie roasting in the fire."

What do you think of that, my brother? You complain of my exaggerating. Why, I have been modest and reserved, compared to the greatest living preacher of your favorite doctrine. He says he can not exaggerate hell; but I must say he comes as near to it as anybody I ever read.

I will say further, that every attempt of my brother and his co-laborers here, or elsewhere to explain away and soften down their doctrine is a plain confession of its falsity. Why attempt to soften it down? Why endeavor to explain it away? I tell you, my friends, that is the grandest sign of the growing intelligence of this age. Let Brother Hobbs and his fellow-laborers in the Orthodox field preach in Des Moines as Spurgeon does in London, Sunday after Sunday, and how many hearers do you suppose he would have? Why, you know your pews would be empty and your pulpits closed in a month. And what kind of a comment is that upon your doctrine? One severe thing I must say here, because I feel it to be true. The strongest proof I ever had of the infinite forbearance and long-suffering of Almighty God, is, that he will allow men to blaspheme his name in that way, and not strike them dumb or dead!

How has my brother answered my remarks regarding Old Testament-proof of his doctrine? What has he said? Do you think—do you suppose *he* really thinks—he has been very successful in looking for proofs of endless punishment there? Only a little while ago, Henry Ward Beecher declared he could not find the doctrine in the Old Testament; and the ablest men of all denominations generally acknowledge the same. And what answer has my brother to this? Why, he says I do not believe in Christ. What under the heavens has that to do with the argument? I thought we were discussing the question of endless punishment. Do we disbelieve in Christ because we believe that he can and will save all men? I flatter myself I am not often silenced, but I acknowledge I do not know how to meet such logic as that. We will let that stand as a triumphant vindication of his doctrine—if you regard it as such! He quotes from O. A. Brownson—a man who has been on

every side of every theological question, and is now a Catholic. He quotes from Mr. Fishback—who left Universalism for Spiritualism, and is now in the Illinois Insane Asylum. Does he wish me to portray the effects of his doctrine in causing insanity and suicide? He knows that our lunatic asylums are crowded with its wretched victims. Before me in this congregation sits an intimate friend, who had a sister, a young and inoffensive girl, beautiful and of brilliant intellect, who listened to these pictures of torment till she became convinced that she had sinned away the day of grace, had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, of which my brother here has been telling you, till there was no forgiveness for her, and is now hopelessly insane. Many of those present will remember the case of Brother Farnham's daughter, an amiable and harmless girl of fifteen or sixteen, who was brought to believe that she had committed the unpardonable sin, and was driven into insanity. Rising in the night, she went to the mill-race of her father's mill, and there drowned herself. I could give you three hundred similar cases. And the worst of it is, the victims of this doctrine are not the hardened, reprobate class of men, but gentle girls, tender-hearted mothers, who but for your dark doctrines of damnation, might be ornaments to society and blessings to the world. And others, noble-hearted men and women, with keen instincts of right and justice, clear perceptions of the truth, knowing your doctrines must be false, are driven, since you pretend to found them upon the Bible, into rejecting the Bible, and become Infidels. You accuse Universalism of leading to infidelity? My brother, you know—or if you do not, a little investigation would serve to prove to you—that nine-tenths of all the Infidels in the land are made such by the very doctrine you are advocating here.

I think I have sufficiently noticed all that my brother has advanced by way of argument, and will now proceed to adduce a few arguments upon the negative of this proposition.

My first negative argument is based upon the fact that the doctrine is nowhere to be found in the Old Testament. This

point has already been incidentally referred to. Will you claim that it was left to be revealed under the new and better covenant? The meaning of the word "gospel" of itself is enough to negative any such idea; it means "good news," "glad tidings." Do you call it a revelation of glad tidings that half the human race are destined to a world of endless wo? Is that a thing for angels and archangels, and all the host of heaven, to rejoice over? Ah, theirs was a strange song to sing over such tidings as that! And mark you, the language of the heavenly messenger who proclaimed the birth of the Saviour of the world: Luke, ii: 10: "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people." It was not the good tidings which were to be to all people, but the great joy was to be to all people. And the New Testament throughout claims to be a revelation of greater grace and mercy than was set forth in the Old. See Hebrews, viii: 6: "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises." Is the doctrine of eternal torment one of these "better promises?" No, no, my friends; Paul, in one of his letters to Timothy, tells us something better than that; (II Timothy, i: 10): "Our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." But my brother here, would claim that the main purpose of the Gospel was to bring endless damnation to light.

My second negative argument is based upon the consideration that the doctrine of endless punishment makes Christ's life a series of absurdities and contradictions, and turns some of his pointed rebukes against himself. You remember his parable of the man intending to build, who commenced without sitting down to count the cost, so that he was not able to complete his work, but his half-reared tower mocked his incompetent design, so that all who beheld it mocked him as they went by, saying: "This man began to build, and was not able to finish." Look at the rebuke that

Christ gave himself, claiming to have come to save the world; that the Father sent him for that purpose. He came to build up a spiritual temple in which every human soul was to be a stone fitly hewn. According to my brother's theology, Christ hardly begins his work before the devil steals three-fourths of his material, and the partially-reared walls are to stand forever incomplete, mocking Christ and God throughout eternity.

Not only this, but it makes Christ's life throughout a bundle of contradictions and absurdities. It is upon two occasions only that we have any record of his weeping. The first, was over the grave of Lazarus, a friend and a good man, who had died, but whom he was about to bring to life. The second was when he looked upon Jerusalem, and uttered that mournful apostrophe: "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 wings, and ye would not!" And even this mournful appeal closed with a grand prophecy, declaring that even these hard-hearted Jews should yet lift up their eyes to him as their Saviour and Deliverer, exclaiming: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!" We read much of Christ's tenderness of heart and deep sympathy with the suffering. Here we find him weeping over the temporal calamities that were about to fall upon a doomed people, who were yet to recognize him as their Saviour, and over a dead friend whom he was about to restore to life; yet he had no tear to shed over the innumerable millions of human souls then writhing in eternal torment, and the innumerable millions more destined to join them in their endless experience of pain. These are strange things in the life of Christ—things never yet explained, nor capable of being explained, in harmony with the terrible theory advocated by my brother. The special thing for him to talk about, to lament, to weep over, should have been the fate which had befallen and must yet befall one-half the race—the very race which he came on earth and died to save.

My friends, I have answered my brother's argument, I think, fully; now, I ask of you to see to it that he answers mine. Remember that such a doctrine as this which he advocates, if true, must be plainly set forth in the Scriptures; it can not be guessed at; it must not be inferred from ambiguous phrases, and words of doubtful meaning, or words distorted from their natural meaning. Remember this doctrine is against the spirit of the Gospel; that it renders the good tidings of the angelic messenger, and the song of the heavenly host, a bitter mocking; that it is contrary to the spirit of Jesus, to the philosophy he unfolded, to the tenor of his life, to his conduct and his tears. My brother's first duty in defense of his position must be to reconcile these astonishing and inexplicable inconsistencies.—[Time expired.

MR. HOBBS' FOURTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—When my time expired, I was prosecuting an affirmative argument. I will finish that before referring to anything brought forward by the gentleman in his last speech.

I was building an argument upon the fact that the Lord commanded his disciples to fear not them who can kill the body only, but to fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell. Mr. King had before defined "destroy" to mean "total extinction of being." This makes him, instead of a universal-Salvationist, an Annihilationist. Has the gentleman answered this? Not at all. Again, the gentleman said "perish" meant "annihilation," and quoted the language of the prodigal son—"I perish with hunger"—to prove it. Then I put that into his argument, and showed him to be an Annihilationist again. Does the gentleman attend to this? No. He passes on, as he always does, never noticing any point that is made against him.

I have referred to the word *gehenna*, showing that the Saviour and his apostles must have used the term as referring to a future state, according to the *usus loquendi* of that day. *Gehenna* can not refer to any place in this world, for then men could be killed and cast into it. It can not refer to the intermediate condition between death and the general judgment, for the soul and body are then separated. It must be, then, after the general judgment, and after the saints shall have sung the song of victory, that there is danger of soul and body being cast into hell. But beyond the general judgment and the "song of victory," as Mr. King admits, all is changeless.

Mr. KING.—"Messrs. Moderators, I am compelled to call the brother to order. This makes the third time he has said that I have said that after the judgment everything is changeless. I have never made such a statement, and the moderators know it, and the audience know it. The soul, during every stage of its endless existence, is subject to perpetual change."

Mr. HOBBS.—I re-assert that Mr. King has taken the position that beyond the judgment there is no change in moral character. I would like to know why he quoted I Corinthians, xv; Isaiah, xlv; Philippians, ii: 9, etc., if not to prove that all men will at last attain a condition of permanent blessedness? I must own that I am perfectly astonished; I thought I was ready for almost anything on his part; but I was not quite ready for such a sudden change of base. He evidently discovers that my arguments are telling with terrible force upon his system, hence this complete repudiation of an argument that but a little while ago he took so much pains to construct. But this new move does not help him a particle. I care not which horn of the dilemma he takes. If there be no change after the judgment and the "song of victory," as the gentleman has heretofore argued, then those who are cast, soul and body, into hell, must forever remain in hell. But if all are to be made holy, and consequently happy, when the "song of victory" is sung, and if there be a change of moral character

afterward, as the gentleman *now* argues, the only change of moral character possible is from holiness to unholiness, from happiness to unhappiness, from heaven to hell. But this is suicidal to his system. When I was leading him on to reassert his positions, over and over, before this audience, he did not foresee what use I was going to make of them. Now, I have brought him where he can not dodge the point, and I intend to hold him there.

My tenth argument is based upon the futurity of judgment, which is to take place after the resurrection, as mentioned in the fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians; 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, every tongue shall swear, surely shall 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;" Philippians, ii: 9, 11: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." These passages Mr. King quoted on his affirmative to prove that all men would be saved, and located their salvation at the "song of victory," by reference to I Corinthians, xv: 55: and note this: Mr. King says these passages apply beyond the resurrection. But the apostle Paul, not being initiated into the beauties of my friend's system, in the simplicity of his mind concludes from these very same scriptures that there would be a future judgment. See Romans, xiv: 10, 11, 13: "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. Let us not,

therefore, judge one another any more,'” etc. Now, since the system of Universalism demands that the condition into which every one shall enter at the resurrection must be endless, so those who are consigned to punishment at the judgment mentioned by Paul, must be consigned to endless punishment.

My eleventh argument is based upon those scriptures which represent our works as being brought under divine scrutiny in a future state. II Corinthians, v:9, 10, 11: “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. Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men; but we are made manifest unto God; and I trust also are made manifest in your consciences.”

In my tenth argument, I proved the judgment to be beyond the resurrection, by the gentleman's own proof-texts.

Galatians, vi:7, 8: “Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting;” Ecclesiastes, xi:9: “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 thy heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know thou that for all these things God shall bring thee into judgment;” 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;” Philippians, v:18, 21: “For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the Cross of Christ; whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things. For our citizenship is in heaven;

from whence also we look for the Saviour, 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.” Here is the “redemption of the body,” Mr. King, if you would only look at it rightly. Here, too, is the *end* of one class of men, and that *end* is destruction; while the end of the righteous is, that Christ shall change their vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto his own glorious body. That does not look as if there was the same destiny, the same *end* for all. Again, Revelation, xiv:13: “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.” In this passage is brought before us the great thought that men's actions are cumulative in their influences and effects; consequently that men, by the nature of the case, can not become the subjects of judgment until they have spent their force and influence, personally and posthumously, upon the destinies of men. Bolingbroke, the distinguished Infidel, wrote his famous works against Christianity, leaving a bequest of funds wherewith to publish them after he was dead; consequently they had no effect upon the world until after he was dead. How could he, as Universalists maintain, receive punishment while he lived for all his evil works, when his worst works did not begin to exert their pernicious influence until after he was dead? So with St. Paul. While he lived, he could preach only with his own voice, and effect the generation in which he lived; but now, though dead, he has been speaking through millions of tongues, through all generations since he lived. It is pure nonsense to talk about the judgment being in this world, when men's actions have as yet scarcely begun to produce their cumulative effects. The influence which a man exerts in this world has been aptly illustrated by the Missouri river, which, at its source, a man can stand astride of. But rivulet after

rivulet, tributary after tributary, flows into it, until at last it can bear the largest vessels upon its bosom, and rolls on, and on, through the Gulf of Mexico, till it reaches the great ocean, and mingles with the waters of all the earth. Such is the cumulative force of human life and influence. Hence, there can be no final judgment until this cumulative force of life and influence is forever ended.

My twelfth argument is based upon the fact that men will come forth after the resurrection in diverse moral conditions, and to diverse destinies: 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." Parallel to this is Daniel, xii:2: "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." In harmony with this, Paul says, Acts, xxiv:15: "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 do not know whether the gentleman believes in any resurrection of the body at all; he has not yet affirmed it, and his last spiritualistic dodge would seem to indicate very clearly that he does not. But it makes no difference to me; whatever position he takes, I am ready to meet and "uproot" him. John the Revelator closes up the grand triumph by saying, Revelation, xxii:11, 12: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still. And behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be."

I know that Universalists endeavor to evade the force of John, v:28, 29, above quoted, by making it a moral resurrection or conversion, occurring in this world; but with this interpretation, if Mr. King choose to take this dodge, let him

inform us how some can be converted to life, and some converted to damnation; and also tell us what are the "graves" spoken of in the text. But if it refer to the resurrection spoken of in I Corinthians, xv, as it certainly must, and the same must be true with Daniel, xii:2, then the damnation, the shame and contempt, must be endless; as the gentleman admits there is to be no change of moral character after the resurrection and the "song of victory." This is rendered more certain from what Paul says, connected with what John says: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still;" for God enforces no such language in the present state of existence; his language to the sinner now is: "Repent and live."

There are some things in the gentleman's last speech to which I will briefly refer. He asks what he seems to think will be a very puzzling question to me in reference to baptism and salvation. He seems to be entirely ignorant in regard to our doctrine. He gives an utter misrepresentation of our teachings, not only upon baptism but other points. He represents me as saying that none will be lost excepting those who have received an offer of salvation and refused it. Have I said so? I have made no affirmation of the sort. I know what he is trying to do. He is very anxious to wring into the discussion heathens, and infants, and idiots so that he can play upon your sympathies. But I took good care of that, when I shaped the propositions as I did. The discussion is in reference to nobody except those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Christ. We will leave the heathens, and infants, and idiots, out of this discussion, if you please, Mr. King.

The gentleman says I have represented heaven and hell as a recompense or reward for our good or evil conduct on earth. The apostle represents death as a recompense for sin, for he says, Romans, vi:23: "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." And Luke represents eternal life as a recompense for those who have done well in this life: Luke, xiv:13, 14: "But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame,

the blind; and thou shalt be blessed; for they can not recompense thee; but thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." And we are told that Moses had respect unto the recompense of reward. But it does not follow from this, as the gentleman seems to endeavor to show, that men can gain heaven by the merit of their works.

Mr. King brings in the Greek terms *aion*, and *aionios*. He says that in the Scriptures, *aion* refers to the Jewish and Christian dispensations. Let us see whether this be true or not. Look at Luke, xx: 34, 35; and let us read it, interpreting *aion* according to the gentleman's rule: "And Jesus, answering, said unto them, the children of the Jewish dispensation marry and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain the Christian dispensation neither marry nor are given in marriage!" According to this, there have been no marriages since the Christian dispensation was ushered into being!

The fact is, the gentleman's representations regarding *aion* are entirely incorrect. I hold in my hand Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament. Under *aion*, we have this language: "In conformity to the Jewish mode of speaking, *aion* means an age, period of the world, *seculum*; the Jews were accustomed to dispute concerning two ages of the world, one of which they called the present age or world, the other, the age or world to come. (*Buxtorf, Lex. Rab. Chald. Tal.* 1620.) The former, in their opinion, was to comprehend the time from the creation to the advent of the Messiah, and was marked by imbecility, imperfection, ignorance, vice, misery and crime. The latter they referred to the joyful time when the Messiah should come in majesty to establish his dominion; when he should subdue to himself all the kingdoms, recall the dead to life, sit in judgment on both Jews and Gentiles, advancing the good felicity in his kingdom, and inflicting punishment on the wicked—especially on the Gentiles, as being hostile to the Jews, and given to idolatry; when, in

short, he should introduce a new era, distinguished by knowledge, liberty, piety, and felicity of every kind." Here we have *aion* meaning eternal. The great mistake the Jews made was, they overlooked the temporal coming of Christ. They looked forward in expectation of his majestic coming, as they and we are now looking; hence, that last part of the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew is still in the future, and will be fulfilled at the second coming of Christ.

Mr. King wants me to prove eternal punishment by a word whose *primary* meaning is "endless." I refer him to the distinguished Greek writer and philosopher, Aristotle. The gentleman will accept him as authority, I presume. He lived about the time the Septuagint version of the Old Testament was made—some two hundred and seventy years before Christ. Here is what he says: "It therefore is evident that there is neither place, nor vacuum, nor time beyond; wherefore the things there are not by nature adapted to exist in place; nor does time make them grow old; neither under the highest [Heaven] is there any change of any one of these things, they being placed beyond it; but unchangeable and passionless, having the best, even self-sufficient life, they continue through [*aiona*] eternity. For indeed, the word itself, according to the ancients, divinely expressed this. For the period which comprehends the time of every one's life, *beyond which, according to nature, nothing exists*, is called [*aion*] eternity. And for the same reason also, the period of the whole heaven, even the *infinite time of all things*, and the period comprehending that infinity, is [*aion*] ETERNITY; deriving its name from [*aei einai*] 'always being,' immortal and divine. Whence also it is applied to other things; to some indeed [*akribesteron*] *accurately*, but to others [*amauroteron*] *in the lax signification* of [*to einai, te kai zen*] *being*, and even *life*." (*Arist. de Coelo*, Lib. I. Cap. 9.) Here Aristotle, the great Greek philosopher, tells us that *aion* means primarily and etymologically, eternity; that

its meanings, when it means less than that, are lax, and figurative. And Aristotle certainly knew the proper meaning of the term. What higher authority, what better evidence, can any one ask, to prove that the primary and etymological meaning of *aion* is "endless?" Therefore, when the Scriptures say: "These shall go away *eis kolasin aionion*," is not that departing into endless punishment?

The gentleman has a new definition, too, for *kolasis*. He says the word means "pruning." That I deny. There is no place in the Scriptures where the word is used in that sense. Whenever chastisement is spoken of in the New Testament, the word used is not *kolasis*, but *paideia*, which is from *paideuo*, from which we have *pais*, "a child." He refers to Hebrews, xii:10, as a text in which *kolasis* is used in the sense of pruning or chastising. But in Hebrews, xii:10, the word used is not *kolasis*, but *paideuo*. So let him make what he can from that passage.

He says I complain because he reads these exaggerated descriptions of eternal punishment. He is mistaken. I have not complained. Let him read away, as long as he chooses. But I do think he would be in better business attending to my arguments, or I will be so far ahead of him that he will never overtake me.

The gentleman charges me with saying that he rejects Christ. I have not said so. I have said that the leading authorities of his church regard the blood of Christ as having nothing to do with the remission of sin; he has not repudiated those authors till this hour; and he dare not; for if he does, he will be turned out of church. In answer to my quotation from Mr. Fishback, he replied that Mr. Fishback had been led astray by Spiritualism, and is now in an insane asylum in Illinois. Poor Fishback! I sympathize with him! But if Mr. King is not on the high road following him, I am very much mistaken!—
[Time expired.]

MR. KING'S FOURTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Brother Hobbs has taken occasion to make a thrust at me, insinuating that I am turning Spiritualist. I know so little about that people that I can hardly tell what they do believe. If to believe that, in the life hereafter, we are not all to sit down together on one plane of unchangeable flatness and everlasting monotony, with nothing to do but play on a harp, sing psalms, and eat sweet-cake—if to disbelieve in such a heaven as that makes me a Spiritualist, why, then I suppose I must be one. I certainly have no idea that the time will ever come when we shall have learned all there is to be learned; I believe and hope that in the Hereafter we shall to all eternity change from glory to glory: I supposed this was the scriptural doctrine of spiritual progress. If it be the doctrine of Spiritualism, why, so much the better for Spiritualism.

MR. HOBBS.—"I believe in spiritual progress, but not your kind."

MR. KING.—Brother Hobbs has at last found an authority to prove that *aion* means primarily, "eternity." Here is a Christian minister, agreeing to adhere to the Bible, acknowledging himself defeated and driven from that foundation, and going back several generations before Christ, to a heathen philosopher for his argument! If my brother is correct in his rendering of the word *aion* as used in the Scriptures, and in the time of Christ, let him bring an ordinary Greek dictionary, and show it. Let him call upon any clergyman in this audience, agreeing with him in regard to the proposition in debate, and let *him* say whether the first and natural meaning of *aion* is "eternity." Here is Donegan's lexicon: let us see what that will say. "*Aion*—time; a space of time; life-time; life; ordinary period of man's life; the age of man; man's estate; a long period of time; *eternity*; the spinal marrow!" There are the definitions in their order as they come in Donegan's

lexicon. In a list of ten definitions, "eternity" is the most unnatural and unusual of all but one! And were we to examine all the lexicons, we should arrive at a similar result. There is not a solitary dictionary in existence which gives "eternity" as the first, the primary, the natural and ordinary meaning of the Greek word *aion*.

What next? Why, "*gehenna*." My brother brings in a geographical proper name, to prove eternal torment. And here, again, he did not dare tell you the origin of this word, and its real meaning. He knows that the word simply means, the valley of Hinnom. He knows that in the Old Testament it is used in no other sense than as the name of a valley near Jerusalem. He knows that the Targum he brings in as proof is a thing whose age is a matter of dispute, some claiming it to have been in existence in the time of Christ, some placing it as late as the sixth century. The best critics suppose it to have originated in the third century. And this geographic name—as much a geographic name, the valley of Hinnom, as the valley of the Des Moines—by some cunning twist my brother claims to make a proof of eternal damnation. The word is used in no such sense anywhere in the Old Testament. Nor is it used in any such sense by any profane writer, before the time of Christ. Josephus, the distinguished Jewish historian, who flourished about the time of Christ, or a little later, who was a believer in future punishment, and wrote upon the subject, did not use the word *gehenna* in reference to it. It was not used by any or all the apostles and writers of the New Testament, except that James speaks of the tongue as being set on fire of hell. There is not a particle of proof, sacred or profane, back of the time of Christ, to show that *gehenna* has any reference to future punishment—much less *endless* punishment. I have a right to demand of Bro. Hobbs, to tell this audience when and how this word *gehenna*, that before and till the time of Christ was a proper name, referring to a deep valley near Jerusalem, came to cease to be a proper name, and to acquire the meaning of a place of endless

torment. He introduces the text (Matthew, x:28): "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 *gehenna*," as one from which he proves eternal torment. He boasts of having defeated me here, in much the same style as he boasts of having uprooted me from the Eighth of Romans. If he calls that a victory, he may well exclaim with the Roman general: "One more such victory will ruin me!" He has twice taken occasion to tell this congregation that he will preach on the Eighth of Romans, at some other time and place. If he had ordinary shrewdness, he would know that this is a confession of defeat. If he had any interpretation that would stand in the face of opposition, he would give it to you here, and not invite you to go somewhere else, where he could smooth the matter over among a quiet circle of friends, with nobody to ask any troublesome questions. But to return from the Eighth of Romans to the text before us. Does it say, "Fear him who will destroy both soul and body in *gehenna*," or who is *able* to do so? Furthermore, in order to prove his position by this text, he must prove that "destroy" does not mean to destroy, but to keep in existence forever. Will it not be a powerful logic that can accomplish that? With all his tricks of the trade, I do not think he can perform such a cunning trick as that. But my brother says, if God is not really going to destroy both soul and body in *gehenna*, it is an unworthy mockery on his part to use such language as this. When John the Baptist said: "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham," does it mean that God *will* do it? No: the meaning of the text before us is very plain: "Do not stand in fear of men, who can kill the body only, but fear God, who brought both soul and body into existence, and by a word could blot both out of existence, if he chose. When a man attempts to prove endless punishment from that passage, he has a tremendous task before him.

Brother Hobbs sneered at the idea of a judgment in this world. With the Bible before him, and pretending to be a

preacher of the truths contained in that Bible, he sneers at the idea of a judgment in this world. Has he not read, Psalm, lviii:11: "Verily, he is a God that judgeth *in the earth*;" Jeremiah, xxiii:5:, "I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute *judgment and justice in the earth*;" John, ix:39: "For judgment I am come *unto the world*;" John, xii:31: "And *now* is the *judgment of this world*." In the face of dozens of such texts as these, he sneers at the idea of a judgment in this world. Souls are being continually brought to judgment. The infinite perfection and love of God is the rule by which every soul is brought to judgment, to-day, to-morrow, forever. My brother has quoted texts to sustain his position, that had no more reference to a future judgment in the eternal world, than a judgment to-morrow on Capitol Hill. And if he had proved that future judgment, his work is not yet accomplished; he must prove that after that judgment those who have sinned up to that time will not have an opportunity to repent and turn to God. Suppose I grant a future judgment, that does not prove endless punishment, any more than a judgment at the bar of an earthly court proves that the offender will suffer endless punishment. Brother Hobbs must prove a judgment, beyond which, God says, no poor child shall have the privilege of coming home. I therefore refuse to follow him through his long string of texts, because they have no relevancy to the question.

But Brother Hobbs says there can be no judgment till the world and the lives of all men in it have come to an end, because the influence of sin is cumulative, and God must wait till he finds out how much the aggregate damages are before he can fix the proper penalty for the sinner. Now, that is all nonsense. It stultifies all common sense, as well as my brother's own theology. Here is a man who has lived fifteen or twenty years in sin, growing worse every day; exerting a broad and pernicious influence; but Brother Hobbs, or somebody else, preaches to that man, and he repents, is brought to

the foot of the Cross, is converted and saved. Now what about the influences of that life? Do those influences cease to operate because the man is converted? Not at all. And is he to be judged and punished according to his influences? Then every saint upon the face of the earth, when that future judgment arrives, will be dragged off to damnation! So far as regards the fact that all influences, good or evil, are cumulative; nobody denies that; but that a man is to be judged and punished in proportion to them, and above all that this fact can be made a valid argument in proof of endless torment, is an utterly silly idea. No one can tell what a single careless deed or word may do—what its fruitage shall be. It may influence not only the observer or hearer, but those whom *he* shall influence, and so on, and on, extending to innumerable human beings, and through all generations to come, affecting for weal or woe *each* individual brought within its range to all eternity. If the accumulated evil influences exerted is to be the standard by which men are to be judged, then there is nothing in reserve for any body but infinite and endless punishment.

Brother Hobbs quotes Revelation to prove his doctrine. He walks boldly where angels fear to tread. He knows that the canonical character of that book is in question to-day; many of the most pious and eminent men are in doubt as to the validity of its claim to inspiration. It might be suggestive, if not instructive, to compare, for a moment, Brother Hobbs with Dr. Adam Clarke, one of the ablest of the Orthodox commentators. To Brother Hobbs, the meaning of the book of Revelation is as clear as a sunbeam. But Dr. Clarke, in his commentary on the book of Revelation, says it is of doubtful meaning, and he will not venture an interpretation as authoritative, and warns his readers not to use it in defense of any doctrine.

You see Dr. Clarke is a very modest man. Brother Hobbs, here, is so much abler there is no occasion for him to be modest!

But what has my brother quoted from Revelation? Why, a

passage that has no bearing whatever upon the question. "Let him that is unjust, be unjust still." Well, what of it? Is that saying: "He that is unjust, let him be tormented in hell throughout eternity? That is what my brother is trying to prove to you. Brother Hobbs, if you don't do better for the affirmative than you are now doing, I shall have to come over to that side and help you to some scriptures. I believe I could defend endless punishment myself better than you are doing it.

Brother Hobbs has not yet met any of my negative arguments. I need not recapitulate them to you—I shall do that briefly to-morrow evening. If he intends to pay any attention to them—and I think you will agree they are deserving of some attention and consideration,—it is about time he had commenced.

Brother Hobbs, why don't you bring along your "Rich Man and Lazarus?" I expected you to fetch that upon the carpet the first thing, and have been waiting patiently for it ever since. You are not going to let this discussion close without making a strong argument founded on the parable of the "Rich Man and Lazarus," are you? Such a thing never was heard of before in a debate of this kind!

I call your attention to the fact that the apostles never preached the doctrine of eternal punishment; or if they preached it, they never used one of the terms to prove it which my opponent uses. The term "*hades*," the name of the place where the rich man of the parable was sent, is never used by any of the apostles, except once, where it is applied to Christ's lying in the grave, and once by the apostle Paul, in the fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians, where it is translated "grave"—"O grave, where is thy victory!" But neither *hades* nor *gehenna* are ever used by any of the apostles to indicate eternal punishment or any place of torment. The apostles were sent out to "teach all nations" those things which Christ had taught them; and they afterward announced that they had declared the whole counsel of God; their special work was to save men from an endless hell; yet never, from first to last,

did they tell anybody that there was an endless hell! never an allusion to anything of the sort—never a reference to anything their Lord and Master had said regarding it. It is very evident that John and Peter and Paul knew nothing about the true doctrines of Theology. It is very evident they did not comprehend what Christ meant to teach, in his parable concerning the rich man and Lazarus, the sheep and the goats, the wheat and the tares, etc. Those apostles, if they believed in endless misery, and were really in earnest in endeavoring to save men from it, certainly committed a great oversight in never referring to those parables in proof of it. The Orthodox pulpits of Des Moines are determined to commit no such oversight as the apostles were guilty of.

Not only did the apostles not teach the doctrine of eternal torment, nor refer to Christ's teachings in proof of it, but they failed to proclaim it under circumstances eminently demanding it, were it not either false or useless. Turn with me to the second and third chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, and read Peter's grand revival sermons; he beat our modern revivalists completely out of sight—converted five thousand persons, and dipped them all under water, too, according to Brother Hobbs. He preached to the very murderers of Jesus; the very men who ought above all others who ever lived to be threatened with this terrible doom, if they were in danger of it; and what was the tenor of his sermon? That Jesus, whom they had killed, God had raised up to triumph over them and condemn them for their unparalleled cruelty and treachery and murder, to suffer endless punishment for their dark crimes? Ah, no! but even to those murderers of Jesus he preached that God had raised up Jesus, and sent him, not to damn them, but to bless them, in turning away every one of them from his iniquities. Now, let these modern ministers of the meek and lowly, the gentle and loving Jesus, go ahead, and out-do Edwards, and out-splurge Spurgeon, in their pictures of eternal torment, and see if they can convert half as many as Peter did, and not half of those they do convert, backslide. And mark you, from

that first gospel sermon on the day of Pentecost, to the last recorded syllable of Scripture, nowhere does any of the apostles say one word in reference to the doctrine which my brother here deems so important and necessary to the salvation of mankind.—[Time expired.]

MR. HOBBS' FIFTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I am pleased that notwithstanding the stormy beginning of this discussion, there is promise of a calm closing. I apprehend you will be as well pleased with the change in my friend's manner and tactics as I am, and as he himself evidently is. The difference is so perceptible that nobody can have failed to notice it. Even my little prattler, only about three years of age, noticed it last night, and as we left the hall remarked: "Pa, Mr. King is gooder than he was, isn't he?" It is a good thing to look pleasant. It affects all, companions and opposers.

My friend in his last speech brought against me one serious charge: that I went back to a heathen philosopher for the definition of the term *aion*. When I heard that, I wondered to myself: "Mr. King, can it be you are in earnest in such a reply as that? Are you trying to throw dust in the eyes of the people? or do you presume upon their ignorance?" Mr. King knows there is not a Greek lexicon in existence which does not, in defining the meaning of the words of the language, cite the authors who use the words in accordance with the signification given; and those authors, the writers of the Greek classics, are what my friend calls "heathen authors." Christ and his apostles did not originate the Greek language; they used it as they found it, with the meaning given to the words which composed it as used by these same "heathen authors." Such a dodge as that may be creditable to my friend's evasive

art, but not to his honesty, his sense of propriety, or his estimate of the intelligence of his audience. Aristotle was one of the most famous among the Greek philosophers, who lived about the time the Septuagint version of the Old Testament was made. In his writings, he himself being a Greek, speaking and writing the Greek as his native language, it is reasonable to suppose he knew the meaning of the words he used, at least as well as my friend Mr. King can know them at this distance of time. And Aristotle says the primary or etymological meaning of *aion* is "eternity." Mr. King defied me to bring an author who would say that the primary meaning of *aion* was "eternity;" and I have brought such an authority, clear, unequivocal, explicit.

Mr. King says I had not the manliness to come out and tell you that *Gehenna* was the proper name of a valley near Jerusalem. Upon my word, I supposed everybody here had learned that in Sunday-school! But suppose it did mean that in the beginning; does it follow that it always continued to mean only that? that it never came to mean anything else? I should think the gentleman would have more discretion than to run against his own authorities all the time. Mr. Skinner, a Universalist preacher, and high in authority in his denomination, says: "In process of time, *Gehenna*, and *Tophet*, another name for the same thing, were used in the Old Testament, *figuratively*, to set forth the temporal but severe judgments coming upon the Jews." (Campbell and Skinner's Debate, page 120). I have quoted other authorities to show that it came in process of time to mean a place where the wicked should finally be endlessly punished. I have quoted Prideaux upon this subject. Parkhurst says it came to indicate a place of endless punishment. Mr. King charged me with saying that the Greek word *gehenna* meant endless punishment. I certainly said no such thing. *Gehenna* is a Hebrew word, Graecised, at first meaning the valley of Hinnom, near Jerusalem, where the offal of the city was cast, to be burned; where, amid the carrion, the worm died not,

and the fire never was quenched; a peculiarly repulsive and disgusting place. In process of time the word was made to refer, figuratively, to severe temporal judgments; and in process of further time it came to mean a place of endless punishment. But the term "endless" is not primarily in the word *gehenna*.

You remember the gentleman's explanation of the text: "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." The gentleman represents the Saviour as encouraging his disciples to endure persecutions from men, because men could kill only the body, while God *could* kill both body and soul—but then, he *wouldn't* do it! If they feared man rather than God, God *could* burn up their souls as well as their bodies in that valley of Hinnom; but there was not the least danger that he *would* do it! God is a God of power—but if you do disobey him, you have nothing to fear from him! I am sorry to see my friend stultify himself in this way. While we are at it, let us try the same method of interpretation upon some other passages. For instance, Philippians, iii: 21: "According to the working whereby he [God] is *able* to subdue all things unto himself." But according to the gentleman's style of interpreting Scripture God *can* subdue all things unto himself, but that is no indication that he *will*! Why, in every Universalist debate that ever was conducted, one of the strong points made is, that Christ is *able* to save all men; from which it is presumed that he *will* save all. Mr. King has used precisely the same argument in this debate.

Mr. King says none of the apostles, except James, uses the word *gehenna*; consequently they did not teach endless punishment. Whatever *gehenna* may mean, the doctrine of endless punishment is not true, because the apostles did not use that particular word, *gehenna*! There is logic for you! But does not this logic prove too much? If it have any

bearing at all, it proves that whatever the Saviour taught, that is not true, unless the apostles also taught it, and in the same words used by the Saviour!

He says if a man keeps on sinning till he is fifty or sixty years of age, and then repents, his repentance does not do away with the evil influence of his acts, consequently he will be sent to hell forever, notwithstanding his repentance. He forgets the passage of Ezekiel, which I have quoted once before (Ezekiel, xviii: 21): "If the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die." The trouble with Mr. King is right here: his system leaves entirely out of the Gospel the idea of pardon. After fifty years of sin, if a man turn away from his sins, reforms his life, and yields obedience to Christ, God will pardon him; God has promised to pardon him.

The gentleman objects to any future judgment, because God judges in the earth now. But he pays no regard whatever to the textual import of the word "judgment." He knows that there are several words in the original Greek, all translated by the one English word "judgment." He knows that we must determine the meaning of the word "judgment" by the context. How can he talk about the Lord Jesus Christ having come into the world to enter into judgment, when the apostle says God has appointed a day in the future when "we must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ?" The phrase "judgment-seat" occurs ten times in the New Testament, and always has reference to a *judicial process*. In some of these places it refers to earthly tribunals—in others to a tribunal of a similar character in the future world. Here it refers not to any earthly process or earthly potentate, but to Christ. I have already proved by Isaiah, xlv: 23, 44, and Philippians, ii: 9, 10, 11, combined with Romans, xiv: 10, 11, 12, (where the phrase "judgment-seat of Christ" occurs,) that the judgment-seat of Christ is beyond the resurrection, and beyond that Mr. King says, there is no change of moral character.

My friend found himself in so close a corner at last, that he had no alternative but to repudiate the book of Revelation as being inspired. But he can not make any such dodge as that. This debate was entered into with the distinct understanding that the book known as *the Bible* was to be our arbiter; and now he can not be allowed to cast away as uncanonical everything that happens to interfere with his argument. Beside, he himself based an argument upon that very book. He can not be allowed to impeach his own witnesses in this way. Austin uses Revelation, xxi:4, to prove Universalism: "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." I quote from the next chapter of the same book, and Mr. King says it is uncanonical! The Universalist creed, as published in the "Universalist Book of Reference," quotes Revelation as authority. But the gentleman says Dr. Clarke says this is a very difficult book to understand. Well, Dr. Clarke says the Eighth of Romans is a very difficult chapter to understand; but my friend finds no difficulty in it—"he boldly steps where angels fear to tread!"

I have thought that a choice bouquet of elegant expressions might be culled from my friend's speeches; such as, "you ought to be ashamed of yourself;" "too base for a Christian gentleman;" "roasting in hell;" etc., etc., but I forbear.

He proposes to furnish me some scriptures in proof of eternal punishment. Then he does acknowledge that there *are* some scriptures that support it.

He concludes that the doctrine of endless punishment is false, because Peter did not preach it on the day of Pentecost. That reminds me of the Irishman, who was found guilty of stealing on the testimony of one witness; on which he became very indignant, saying he could have brought forty witnesses who did *not* see him steal!

The fact is, the doctrine of eternal punishment is intended not so much to be constantly harranged from the pulpit,

as to put Christians on the alert for the salvation of their fellow men. And if I refrain from giving from the pulpit these vivid descriptions of torment, I only do what the gentleman asserts the apostles did; yet the apostle says: "Knowing the terror of the Lord, we persuade men."

He says there is nothing in the Twenty-fourth of Matthew referring to the end of *kosmos*. I should presume not, for the word *kosmos* does not occur there at all. The whole matter is explained in what I said last night, and what I read from Robinson's lexicon, showing that the Jews were accustomed to refer to two grand *aions*—or periods—one beginning at the creation of the world, and extending far beyond our own day, to the majestic coming of Christ; the second commencing at the majestic coming of Christ, and stretching on throughout eternity. With the end of the first period they associated the resurrection of the dead, and the general judgment, just as we do now.

Now I want to show you that the gentleman's plan of making *aion* refer to the Jewish and Christian dispensations, makes utter nonsense out of the word of God. I referred the other night to the passage in Luke, xx:34, 35; which according to the gentleman's rule of interpretation, would read: "The children of the Jewish dispensation marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain the Christian dispensation shall neither marry nor be given in marriage!" And adding further that under the Christian dispensation (for that is what the gentleman says *aion* here means) "neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels." The gentleman has never answered that, and he never will. Look likewise at I Timothy, vi:7: "We brought nothing into this (*aion*) Jewish dispensation, and it is certain we can carry nothing out." Is that what the apostle means? Again, "The God of this (*aion*) Jewish dispensation hath blinded the minds of them that believe not," etc.

Let us look a little more closely at the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth of Matthew, which my friend finds so troublesome. You will recollect that in the last verse of the twenty-third chapter, after lamenting over Jerusalem, and exclaiming: "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate," Jesus says they should not see him henceforth till they should say: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!" Have the Jews ever said that yet? No: Then the coming of which he spoke is yet in the future. Passing on into the twenty-fourth chapter, we find that certain singular occurrences are to take place. First: "As the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall the coming of the Son of Man be;" that is, it shall be sudden, and unexpected, and a matter of universal perception. Reading on, we find that immediately after the tribulation of those days the sun shall be darkened, the moon shall fail to give her light, the stars shall fall from Heaven, etc.; and then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in Heaven; then all the tribes of the earth shall mourn, and "Shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Then, "He shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, and from one end of Heaven to the other." The Universalists tell us this is figurative language; that the darkening of the Jewish heavens, the blotting out of the Jewish polity, is all that is meant. But how can this be, if the blotting out of the Jewish heavens was to be the judgment executed by Christ *after* he should come? The coming of the Son of Man was not to be until after the sun was to be darkened, and the moon to refuse to give her light, and the stars to fall; and these things were not to occur until "after the tribulation of those days"—a tribulation thus described by Luke: "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Jerusalem is *yet* trodden down by the Gentiles; the "tribulation" therefore

continues; as Mr. Skinner himself is compelled to admit. And if the coming of the Son of Man was not to be till "*after* the tribulation of those days," then it is yet in the future. But Universalists quote for our benefit the thirty-fourth verse of this twenty-fourth chapter, to prove that all these things must occur during the life-time of the persons then in existence: "Verily, I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." But they are obliged to admit that the word *geneo*, here translated "generation," means as well "race," or "nation," and is so translated in the New Testament. And the race, the Jewish race, has not passed away; it is scattered, and scathed, and peeled, but wherever the Jews may be found, they remain separate and distinct from the nations in the midst of which they dwell.

Now, we come to the parable of the ten virgins, who went out to meet the bridegroom. This opens the twenty-fifth chapter. Next comes the parable of the ten talents. All these statements and illustrations and parables taught the same grand truth, viz: that the Saviour was to go away, to be gone a long time, and to return unexpectedly to enter into judgment—a description of which judgment is introduced at the thirty-first verse: "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"—which phrase Mr. King asserts, means every individual of the race. And when the process of judging is concluded, the wicked are to go away into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into life eternal. Such is my exegesis of this passage; but with Mr. King's theory there are many things which he has not yet reconciled, as I have already pointed out. I hope the gentleman will not fail to give us a clear explanation of all these things.

I deny the gentleman's assertion that the apostles never taught the doctrine of eternal punishment. Have I not already given scripture after scripture upon this point? Because they did not see fit to use a peculiar word *gehenna* in

teaching it, does that prove they never taught it at all? As I have already said, if this proves anything, it proves too much; it proves that whatever the Saviour taught, if not taught by the apostles, using precisely the words he used, is false.

The gentleman claims that *gehenna* can never have come to refer to a place of punishment, because it once meant a valley near Jerusalem. But, because the word "paradise" originally meant a beautiful garden, does that prove that it never could come to mean anything else? Does not the word mean something more than that now? The Hebrew word *shamayim* originally meant only the physical heavens; but does the gentleman assert that nothing more than this is meant by the word now?

I should like to introduce another new argument here, but I suppose I have not time. I can introduce it in my next speech, unless—contrary to all my expectations—the gentleman gives me so much to do that I shall not have time. I should prefer to have him do so; I would like to have him come up and manfully wrestle with these arguments, instead of passing them by unnoticed, and then putting up some man of straw to knock over, in order to proclaim his victory with triumphant gestures and mocking curl of the lips, waking up the passions of his auditors. But however much the gentleman may depend upon these extraneous influences, for he seems to depend more upon them than upon his arguments, yet he will find that those wonderful gestures, that haughty air of triumph, that scornful pout, those indescribable antics of his, can not be gotten into the book. If he wishes to influence anybody by his book, it is about time he put some arguments into it. He has not presented an argument of his own, involving the *terms* of his proposition, nor answered one of mine; he has not even repeated one of my arguments in the language, nor in the light in which I stated it. I hope he will give us one argument, or at least answer some one of mine, before he allows the debate to close. I should rejoice to have an opportunity to repair the breaches made by the terrible onslaught of his logic, and the thunderbolts of his oratory.—[Time expired.

MR. KING'S FIFTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—My brother compliments me upon my improved good nature. I have only to say that I will leave it to the audience to judge who has been the most courteous and polite during this discussion. But if we were equally impolite and discourteous to each other, he has no excuse, and I have. He claims for himself the entire stock of excellence and virtue and all the Christian graces; he is one of God's special children, but I am in the gall of bitterness and bonds of iniquity, having no saving knowledge of Christ; I am therefore the one who might naturally be expected to get out of temper; my brother will of *course* be meek and Christ-like.

Brother Hobbs says I can not get my gestures and expressions of countenance into the book that we propose to have printed. I fear there will be more of Brother Hobbs in the book anyway than he will want there. The more accurately he is set forth the better I shall be suited. He ought to appear in *propria personae*; and as the nearest practicable approach to it, if he will have his photogram taken, I will pay the expense of it, and of having them put into the whole edition!

But leaving sport to go for what it is worth—for it is well enough in its place—let us come to some of my brother's arguments, and see what they amount to.

Brother Hobbs has quoted passage after passage in proof of a future judgment; and complains that I have not answered them. The only reply I have to make is this: the question before us is not whether men shall be subjected to a future judgment; the question is concerning eternal punishment; he may prove forty-nine future judgments, and never once prove endless punishment. No matter how many future judgments he may prove, he does not touch the question until he proves that behind and beyond one of them endless punishment stands revealed. Has he done that? I leave it for the audience to determine when and how he has done it.

My brother says, the thought of endless punishment stirs up Christian philanthropy. I am dumb! I can say nothing against such an overwhelming argument as that! The philanthropic, magnanimous, Christian spirit universally manifested by its believers and defenders sustains my brother in his argument! All the kindness, all the humanity, all the generous instincts, all the philanthropic achievements of the world, are to be found among those who have held to the elevating, refining, humanizing doctrine of eternal damnation! It is all very strange to me, but since he builds an argument on that fact, of course it must be true.

Brother Hobbs says I deny pardon. I do not suppose he intends to utter a falsehood, but that certainly is a falsehood. There is a sense in which the word "pardon" seems to be sometimes used, in which I do not believe. I do deny any pardon that tramples under foot God's eternal law of perfect justice and righteous retribution. I challenge my brother to prove that "pardon," as applied in reference to God's dealings with man, means remission of just punishment incurred for sins actually committed. I read of God's pardoning sin; but I know nothing of any philosophy or theology which says God stands between the sinner and just retribution for violated law. In answer to any such definition of the word "pardon," I refer simply to common and universal experience.

MR. HOBBS—"If you are going to be punished anyway all that you deserve, where is there room for, or what is the benefit of pardon?"

MR. KING—I appeal to any father. Your boy has disobeyed your commands; his welfare demands that you should correct him for his disobedience. When do you pardon that boy? Before you chastise him? No. When you are half through? No: but when you have administered the needed chastisement that breaks down his stubborn will, melts his hard heart, and brings him with tears of repentance to your feet. So in

the economy of God's providence, pardon is offered to the offender when chastisement has wrought its beneficial work, and brought regret, repentance and reformation.

Brother Hobbs has had a very troublesome time with *gehenna*. He has told you, just what I had before told you, that it is a geographic proper name—the name of a valley near Jerusalem, into which the filth and offal of the city were thrown, to be burned up. But has my brother explained to you what powerful logic is hidden in that proper name, to prove endless punishment? True, he says the meaning was changed; but has he brought the proof of that fact? Has he shown you when and where *Gehenna*, the name of an earthly locality underwent such a wonderful change of meaning as to indicate a place of future punishment? And in that change, has he explained to you how the idea of *endless* punishment became incorporated into that name *Gehenna*? He says that the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel uses the word *gehenna* to denote a place of endless punishment. Well, does that prove anything for my brother? Does he not know that the date of that Targum is a matter of dispute to this day? Some commentators place its origin in the sixth century, but a majority incline to the opinion that it originated in the second or third century. But with all the authority he can claim for this Targum—even acknowledging, for argument's sake, that *gehenna* is therein used to mean a place of future punishment; where does my brother get his proof that this punishment is to be *endless*? He knows that this same expression is found in the Old Testament, and there applied, not to any future punishment, but to the burning of filth in the Valley of Hinnom, necessary in that warm climate where the decay of vegetable and animal matter would breed swarms of vermin. Such is Professor Stewart's statement of the origin of the expression, "where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched."

Now recollect that when my brother comes here and claims

that Christ uses the word "*gehenna*" in the sense of endless punishment, his own school of commentators disagree with him.

Last evening my brother quoted Parkhurst on *aion*, in the expression: "This world and the world to come." The very thing he quoted was squarely against him, and in proof of my position. He says that *aion*, in this connection, in the mouth of the Jews, meant, "this age." Parkhurst tells you just what I told you; that the Jews used the expressions, "this *aion*," and "the *aion* to come," meaning the period from the commencement of the world till the time of Christ, and the period of the Messianic reign afterward. Dr. Clarke says the same, as I have already read to you. My brother quoted passages where it made nonsense of the Scriptures to translate *aion* to mean "the Jewish dispensation." I never said that *aion* used *alone* meant the Jewish dispensation." I said, where you found the expressions coupled in the manner they are in the passage concerning the sin against the Holy Spirit, brought up by my brother, *then* there is a reference to the two dispensations. But my brother still insists that *aion* means "eternity." He complained that my rendering of *aion* made nonsense of the Scriptures; let us see whether his interpretation betters it: "In this *aion*, or in the *aion* to come:" that means, "in this eternity or in the eternity to come!" Now, whose interpretation makes nonsense of the Scriptures, Brother Hobbs?

But my brother as a last resort declares that *aion* primarily means "eternity." I do not want to speak harshly; but I must with all kindness say, that that is the most impudent assertion I ever heard any man make in a desperate endeavor to save a sinking cause. Brother Hobbs, will you stand up here, and read, just as they occur, Robinson's definition of *aion*?

MR. HOBBS.—[Reads]: "Time, unlimited duration." This accords precisely with what I have said of the Jewish usage of the term.

MR. KING.—You see just what I told you before; the very

defenders of Orthodoxy dare not be so bold as to put into a dictionary, "eternity" as the primary meaning of the word *aion*. I have read what Donegan says on this word; and you know Donegan's Greek Lexicon is authority everywhere.

And next let us look at Bullion; he, too, is orthodox—very strongly orthodox. Bullion says: "*Aion*—Time, an age, eternity." I might have hired a dray and brought a cord or two of books here, so as to have made my side of this desk look as full of scholarship as Brother Hobbs's; but among them all you could not find a dictionary that gave eternity as the primary meaning of *aion*. My brother reads from Aristotle that the primary meaning of *aion* is eternity; and every time he is out-flanked and defeated he falls back upon his only authority, Aristotle. But how comes it that the lexicographers all of them make directly the contrary assertion, and place "eternity" as the last and rarest upon the list of the meanings of *aion*, if the statement made by Aristotle is final? Does it not show how closely a man must be pressed by difficulties, when he takes refuge behind such a bulwark as that?

But my brother says, if *aion* does not mean "eternity," *aionios* certainly does. He claims that he is going to get a stronger meaning from an adjective than from the noun, from which that adjective is derived. Such a statement is an insult to a class of common-school children. There must be a noun existing before you can conceive of its quality existing; and the meaning of the adjective is limited by the meaning of the noun from which it is derived. If *aion* means what I have quoted, and what Brother Hobbs has himself read to you, *aionios* can mean no more. Suppose I stand here holding an apple, and say, "Here is a sweet apple;" how much of the quality of sweetness do I mean to express by the term "sweet?" Why, just as much as exists in the apple, and no more. I would suggest to Brother Hobbs that he had better read De Quincey's magnificent article on *aion* and *aionios*. De Quincey was perhaps the

most accomplished Greek scholar that ever lived; and he has written a most learned and scholarly article, showing conclusively that everything has its own natural *aion*, age or lifetime; that to claim any fixed duration for *aion* or *aionios*, you must first fix the duration of the natural lifetime of the thing referred to. Then in order to make *aion*, when applied to punishment, mean "endless," you must first prove that punishment is naturally and inherently endless.

Last evening I referred to his quotation of Matthew, xxv: 46, and told you that *kolasis* meant "pruning." He had the hardihood to stand here and deny it. No excuse except that of laboring under an utterly insuperable difficulty is sufficient for a man who takes such a position as that. Robinson says, *kolasis* means "curtailing, pruning."

Mr. HOBBS.—"I did not say that *kolasis* never meant 'pruning'; I said it was not used in that sense in the New Testament."

Mr. KING.—I should like to know whether his interpretation is to decide the meaning of the words used in Scripture, or whether he will interpret Scripture in accordance with the meaning there used? Because it does not suit his argument to have *kolasis* mean "pruning" in the Bible, therefore the word when used in the Bible does not mean "pruning," although it does everywhere else! I have heard considerable during this debate in reference to "correct rules of exegesis," but I never knew exactly what the brother's "rules of exegesis," were, before! And in this connection he made another statement that, whether intentionally or inadvertently made, was absolutely false: he stated that I had said *kolasis* was used in the Twelfth of Hebrews, meaning "pruning" or "chastising." You will remember that I said no such thing. I said that the use of *kolasis* in Matthew, xxv: 46, with the sense of "pruning," was in perfect accordance with the sentiment expressed by Paul in the Twelfth of Hebrews, where he speaks of God chastising his children for their good. I did not say

the term "*kolasis*" was used in the Twelfth of Hebrews. I do not want to speak harshly when it is possible to avoid, but it must be evident to all that this habit of misrepresentation and perversion is characteristic and chronic with my brother. Yet *he accuses me* of unmanliness and evasion. God knows I have stood here and met every issue presented as fairly and plainly as mortal man could meet anything. And this is a fair specimen of the way in which he continually falsified and distorted my most direct and explicit statements.

I will now return to my own line of argument.

My fifth negative argument is founded upon the fact that the doctrine of endless punishment completely vitiates the whole spirit of the Gospel. The spirit of the Gospel is, forgiveness and love to our enemies; but the doctrine of eternal punishment assumes that God himself ignores the law by which he declares all should be governed. Jesus says: "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 you may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven." And he adds: "If ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? for sinners also love those that love them. And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what reward have ye? for sinners also do even the same." Now, when Jesus asks you to love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and do good to them that hate you, in order to be like your Father who is in heaven, do you believe that the reason Jesus gives is based upon a falsehood, that God does not love his enemies, that on the contrary, in a spirit of vindictive wrath, he relentlessly crushes them into eternal torment? Any being that would purposely trample a worm into the dust, much less crush his own children into eternal agony, is a demon and not a God. Construct in your own imagination a demon, give him every conceivable attribute of evil, treachery, and cruelty, place him on the throne of the universe, and tell me what he could do worse than God does, according to the theory of the advocates of endless torment.

Jesus evidently held to no such theory of God's character as that, when he told his disciples to forgive and love and pray for their enemies, that they might be like their Father in heaven. No, my friends, my brother is wrong, and Jesus was right; God loves us all with an undying love; and the obedient son at home, and the poor prodigal far away, are now and forever in the all-embracing arms of Infinite Affection.—
[Time expired.]

MR. HOBBS'S SIXTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I am sincerely sorry that our anticipation in reference to my friend's manner of conducting himself have been so soon and so signally disappointed. I had hoped we might have this one evening without a storm; but as the gentleman has willed otherwise, I suppose, there is nothing left for me to do but to resign myself to the disappointment as best I may, going forward with the arguments, and occasionally looking over my shoulder to see if he is coming after me.

The gentleman says "he is dumb, he can say nothing, in reference to God's terrors stirring up Christian philanthropy." Well, there is just the difference between Mr. King and the apostle Paul; for Paul says, "knowing the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." And there is a great deal more difference between my friend's system of theology and that of the apostle Paul.

The gentleman represented me as saying that we—believers in endless punishment—monopolize all the philanthropy in the world. I have said no such thing as that. I said the doctrine was calculated to keep before the minds of Christians the necessity of working for the salvation of their fellow-men, to put them on the alert, to quicken their philanthropy.

The gentleman says: "I deny that pardon does away with

the penalty of the law." I know you do, sir. I have been proceeding upon that hypothesis ever since this debate began, but I did not anticipate that you would be drawn into the avowing it so plainly. For such a theory is contrary to every correct definition of the word, and to all common sense. Suppose you should carry the tidings to one of those men confined in jail for some crime against the State, that the Governor had pardoned him; what would he understand by that term? Would he not reasonably suppose that his incarceration was at an end—that no further punishment was to be visited upon him for his past misdeeds? But according to the gentleman's theory, no such meaning as that is conveyed by the term "pardon." Although the Governor has pardoned him, that does not abate his term in jail, nor prevent his being hung. Now, turn to Ezekiel, xviii: 20, 21, 22, and see if God's pardon does not remit the punishment for sin: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die. * * * But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right he shall surely live, he shall not die. All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him." Now, sir, don't you see that pardon remits the penalty there?

MR. KING.—"No, sir."

MR. HOBBS.—Well, you don't agree with the prophet, then.

The gentleman charges me with saying that he declared that the word *kolasis* was in the Twelfth of Hebrews. If he did not say *kolasis* was in the Twelfth of Hebrews, he was trying to throw dust into the eyes of the people. He was talking about *kolasis*, which does occur in the Twenty-fifth of Matthew, and which he said meant "chastisement," and then turned over to the Twelfth of Hebrews, and went on talking about *kolasis*, just as if the word were to be found there rendered chastisement.

The gentleman quotes Clarke's commentaries on the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew. I suppose that before this discussion is concluded you will all have come to the conclusion that

Clarke was a Universalist. I do not intend to defend Clarke. He is capable of defending himself. If the gentleman is willing to create the impression that Clarke was a Universalist, and Mr. Clarke's own writings will not defend him, I shall not attempt the defense. Mr. Clarke's opinions make no difference to me. I base my arguments on the Word of God, and not on Adam Clarke. Perhaps he will say I read from authors on the first proposition. I read authors on my negative arguments to show the true position of Universalism. If I were to undertake to defend all that different commentators have said, I should have a difficult work before me. A great many commentators are great helps to the people, *i. e.*, on the easy places.

The gentleman talks about *gehenna* not being in Josephus. But if Josephus has not *gehenna*, he has something on future punishment, that I will read to you:

"For all men the just as well as the unjust shall be brought before God the Word, for to him hath the Father committed all judgment; and he in order to fulfill the will of his Father shall come as Judge, whom we call Christ. For Minos and Rhadaman thus are not the Judges as you Greeks do suppose, but he whom God even the Father hath glorified; concerning whom we have elsewhere given a more particular account, for the sake of those who seek after truth. This person exercising the righteous judgment of the Father toward all men, hath prepared a just sentence for every one, according to his works; at whose judgment-seat when all men, and angels, and demons shall stand, they will send forth one voice, and say: 'Just is thy judgment;' the rejoinder to which will bring a just sentence upon both parties, by giving justly to those that have done well an *everlasting fruition*; but allotting to the lovers of wicked works *eternal punishment*. (See Josephus' Discourse on *Hades*.)

But the gentleman says Clarke is against me. Well, perhaps I am against Clarke. He says I quoted Parkhurst on *aion*. I quoted Parkhurst on the Targums and Talmuds. He says the quotation from Robinson that I read proved his position and not mine. I proved from Robinson that the Jews understood one *aion* to commence with the creation and last till the *majestic coming* of Christ, the other to commence at the *majestic coming* of Christ and continue throughout eternity. At the close of the first *aion* the Jews

believed there was to be a resurrection of the dead, a general judgment, and the advancing of the good to eternal felicity, while the wicked were sent into everlasting punishment. It is very strange the gentleman can not repeat a statement correctly a few minutes after it is made. He defied me to bring any proof that *aion* primarily meant "eternity." I brought up Aristotle, who expressly declares that the primary meaning of *aion* is "eternity." Does the gentleman deny the truth of Aristotle's statement? *Aion* is derived from *ai*, meaning "always," and "on," from *eimi*, the present tense of the verb "to be," and which was, in fact, the incommunicable name of Jehovah! Furthermore, *aion* and *aionios* are applied to the existence of God, to the happiness of the righteous; now, if the meaning "eternity" and "eternal," is not in these words, how does the gentleman prove the eternal happiness of the saints?

I know that Universalists have a peculiar law of interpretation. I will read an extract from the Religious Encyclopedia:

"Universalists adopt this rule of interpretation: that where a word is used in relation to different things, the subject itself must determine the meaning of the word. But this rule, as it here stands, involves a gross sophism. It supposes that words have no proper meaning of their own, and that they are to stand for nothing in the decision of any question, but are to mean anything that the subject to which they relate *can be proved to mean without them*. The sound rule of interpretation in all such cases is, that the subject including the connection or scope of the passage must commonly determine whether a word should be taken in a literal or figurative sense. This rule allows every word to have a proper meaning of its own, only modified by the connection in which it is introduced; while the other rule reduces words to mere cyphers, and if adopted universally would annihilate language, as the vehicle of communicating ideas."

If there be not a sophism in the rule for interpreting *aion* which the gentleman has given here, I do not know what a sophism is. Now let the gentleman understand: my argument here is upon the etymological meaning of the word, and not upon an incidental or figurative usage which the lexicons give.

I quoted Robinson, who gives as the definition of *aionios*,

"time, unlimited duration." I deny Mr. King's assumption that an adjective can not mean more than the noun from which it is derived, as he illustrated it. He gave an illustration in reference to an apple; I do not know whether you understand it or not; I am not certain whether I understood it; in fact, I am not certain whether he understood it himself. But if I understood his illustration correctly, according to his logic, if he has in his hand an apple, that is in the slightest degree sweet, no apple can be any sweeter than that apple, because it has sweetness in it.

I will now proceed to my last argument on the affirmative of my proposition.

My fourteenth affirmative argument is, that whatever shall be the condition into which every man shall enter at the surrender of the mediatorial kingdom to God, or at the resurrection, or at the "song of victory," (I Corinthians, xv:55), that condition shall be changeless and endless as to moral character. Those who die in willful disobedience to the Gospel of Christ shall enter into a condition of punishment or suffering. Hence, those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ shall suffer endless punishment. Mr. King, on his affirmative of the former question affirmed the truth of the major premise of my syllogism; but I was astonished, when I took the very scriptures that he alleged in support of his affirmation and turned them against him to prove the minor premise of my syllogism—I was astonished to hear him assert that he had not said there was no change beyond the resurrection. He has denied it so strongly, and so often, that I have taken some pains to examine the report, and find out precisely what he did say. Here are his own words: "All souls will at last become reconciled to God, holy and therefore happy, and can never fall." This was his definition of salvation and conclusion from it. In his final speech, Thursday night, he uses the following language: "When I quoted the language of Paul, that Christ should reign until all enemies should be put beneath his feet, and then surrender to the Father the kingdom, that God might be all in all, and *then* the song of victory

be sung over death vanquished, and the grave robbed of its trophies—the song, 'O Death, where is thy sting?'—I asked him *what kind of condition this was, of punishment or of joy, thus heralded by that triumphant song?*" On Wednesday evening he said, after quoting,—"O Death, where is thy sting?"—"Now, my brother, how could Paul sing the 'song of victory' over the grave and the sting of death, if sin, which is the sting of death, is to continue forever?" Thus it is shown that Mr. King has admitted my major premise. The arguments that I have adduced, and the last one, which I will now adduce, abundantly established my minor premise; therefore, my conclusion is irresistible. But in fact, I need adduce no further argument; this change of position which he made in order to circumvent me, when he found I was driving him to the wall, was a surrender of the whole matter—a confession that he was utterly defeated, and had no answer for my arguments.

My last argument is based on the concomitants of the second coming of Christ, II Thessalonians, i:4-10: "So that we ourselves glory in you in the churches of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations that ye endure; which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God that ye may be counted worthy of the Kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer; 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 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,*" (is there any endless punishment here? You will remember that in one of his negative arguments, Mr. King said the apostles did not preach any hell. Here is my answer to that statement), "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 Thessalonians, iv:16. Mr. King says that all the prophecies which are ordinarily misunderstood to refer to the second coming of Christ were fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem. Let him show us anything that occurred at the destruction of Jerusalem that corresponds with this description: "For the Lord himself" (as my friend would say, the Lord Titus, commander of the Roman armies), shall descend from heaven with a shout, and with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive 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." Does that sound like a description of the destruction of Jerusalem?

I Corinthians, xv:51-55: "Behold, I show you a mystery: We shall not all sleep, but we shall 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 incorruptible 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. O Death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

Cobb and Whittemore admit these last two passages to refer to the same coming.

In this connection, read Justin Martyr upon this point. Justin Martyr, the great apologist of the Christian faith lived within hand-touch of the Apostles, and may be presumed to know what was the understanding of the Scriptures by the Christians of that age. Justin Martyr says: "But these filthy garments which you [the Jews] put upon those who from the name of Jesus are called Christians, God will show they are taken away from us, when he shall raise up all men, and shall make some incorruptible, immortal, and free from pain, and place them in an eternal and indissoluble kingdom, but shall consign over others to the punishment of eternal fire."

—Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, page 249.

Cobb and Whittemore also admit the coming spoken of in I Thessalonians, iv, and I Corinthians, xv, to be a personal coming. There is no avoiding this conclusion, from the following scriptures: Acts, i:9, 10, 11: "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, 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;" Matthew, xxv:31, 32: "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;" Matthew, xxiv:29, 30, 31: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken; and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory;" (Universalists admit that the "tribulation" here spoken of is yet going on; then not yet has the "sign of the Son of man" appeared in heaven); II Thessalonians, ii:1: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him," etc; Jude, 14-15: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all," etc; Revelation, xx:11-15: (I will go to Revelation for proof-texts, for the Universalists set me a precedent by going there for proofs, even though my friend says the book is uncanonical):

"And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them: 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 book, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them, and they were judged every man according to their works;" II Peter, iii:7-10: "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 the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in 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;" II Corinthians, v:10: "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;" Revelation, i:7: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him;" Colossians, iii:4: "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory;" I John, iii:2: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is;" Philippians, iii:20-21: "For our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," etc.; Jude, 6: "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness into the judgment of the great day." See also Matthew, xxv:33-46, before read.

From the foregoing Scriptures, we find that the following events will be concomitant with the coming of Christ:

1. The coming is to be personal.
2. He is to come in the clouds of heaven, as he went away.
3. Every eye shall see him; even his murderers; hence it must be at the resurrection.
4. It will be with shouting, with a voice of the archangel and the trumpet of God.
5. Then the resurrection will take place.
6. The righteous are to be changed; their bodies to be glorified.
7. The wicked are to be punished with everlasting destruction.
8. The angels are to attend him.
9. The saints will accompany him.
10. The elect are to be gathered to him.
11. "All nations," *i. e.*, according to Mr. King, all the race, are to stand before him for judgment.
12. The heavens and the earth are to perish by fire.
13. Rest is to be given to the saints.
14. Tribulation to be meted out to those wicked Greeks who troubled the Thessalonians. (See I Thessalonians, ii:14).
15. The wicked are to go away into everlasting punishment, the righteous into life eternal.
16. The wicked are to be cast into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.

Now, if there has been no coming of Christ in the past, with all these concomitants—and even Mr. King will not be so venturesome as to affirm that there has been—then the coming referred to in Scripture must be in the future, and at the resurrection and the "song of victory." And if punishment is to be *then* inflicted upon the wicked, it must be an endless punishment, for Mr. King has repeatedly affirmed that there is to be no moral change beyond the resurrection and the "song of victory." Hence, those who die in willful disobedience to the gospel of Christ will suffer endless punishment.—
[Time expired.]

MR. KING'S SIXTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.—Brother Hobbs has poured forth for your edification an overwhelming tide of texts. They would be overwhelming arguments, were it not for one thing; that is, they have nothing to do with the subject. He has been wasting his time in attempting to prove a future coming of Christ, and a future judgment, and I know not how many other future events, but not a text to prove a future state of endless punishment. He has not done what he told me I must do or my proposition was not proved—he has not brought a single text with the word “endless” in it. And he can not; for the word “endless” occurs but once in the Bible in reference to condition, and that applies not to endless punishment but to “endless life.” In all my brother’s talk about a future judgment at Christ’s future coming, and the concomitant events, he has not brought up a text that even squinted toward the idea that these events were to be followed by a punishment that should be endless, to any portion of the human race. I might safely grant all he has tried to prove, and his proposition would be as far from being established as ever.

My brother presents you with a wonderful specimen of logic, which he assures you I can not deny or evade, and then demolishes it himself in the very next breath. He tells you if there is any change after the resurrection, it must necessarily be a change from holiness to unholiness; and then turns around and tells you he believes that there will be a change in the condition of the saints in Heaven. He says the saints will change from glory to glory—and that after he had declared that if they change at all it must necessarily be downward; I think I need not spend any time upon that argument, when he has so completely answered it himself.

In a former speech, he claimed that even though I should prove that sinners were finally redeemed from their sin and its

consequences, and made happy, I had failed to sustain my proposition, because I had brought no proof that they would *remain* eternally sinless and happy. And he referred to the war in Heaven; he takes that story literally; he imagines there was a regular rebellion up there—an actual fight among the angels; and that a part of them were driven out of heaven, and plunged into hell. There is heathen mythology for you! He brought up that story to prove that even if sinners finally became sinless and happy in Heaven, they might not forever remain so. But if that argument proves anything, it proves as much against the endless happiness of saints as of sinners. If the angels, created pure and perfect, and dwelling near the throne of God, were tempted and sinned and fell, what sainted soul, born of weak and erring humanity, dare assert that it will escape a similar doom? If that argument proves the eternal damnation of the disobedient, there is nothing but hell in reserve for every creature, sinner and saint, angel and arch-angel!

If man can sin in heaven, it can only be because he has moral agency and is free to sin in heaven. Certainly! Then not only saints in heaven, but sinners in hell have free, moral agency, and the sinner can so conduct himself as to rise from hell and enter heaven. I should deem it far more probable that a soul tormented in hell would seek to learn to do well and win heaven, than that a saint in heaven should choose to sin and be thrust into hell. But if my brother claims that saints, and angels, and archangels in heaven may sin and be thrust down into hell, while those who are in hell have no power to become virtuous and rise to heaven, then all men who ever went, or ever will ascend to heaven, together with all the angels and archangels, may follow in the path of those of whom my brother speaks, till heaven is depopulated, and hell has swallowed up the universe! Such is a fair statement of my brother’s theory, carried to its logical and inevitable result.

I will show you the absurdity of my brother’s idea of temptation and sin in heaven. The apostle James tells us that a

man is tempted when he is "drawn away of his own lust, and enticed." Now, men do not sin, except through temptation; and temptation presupposes two things—something outside of man to tempt, and a depraved nature inside of man to respond to the temptation. Now, in heaven, what temptation will be presented; and what depravity is there in the angels and spirits of the just made perfect, to which temptation can appeal?

Brother Hobbs quoted Justin Martyr to prove endless punishment. You will observe that he can find the doctrine of endless punishment in Justin Martyr and Josephus, but not in Christ and the Apostles. His argument that *aion* and its derivatives were used by the fathers of the Church in the sense of "endless," is suicidal to his own argument. He knows that Clement, one of the earliest Christian fathers, believed in the final restoration of all things; yet Clement applies the terms *aion* and *aionios* to punishment, which Clement himself says is to have an end. He knows that Origen, a pupil of Clement, and strong defender of the doctrine of the final salvation of all, used the terms *aion* and *aionios* to describe the punishment of the wicked; yet he, too, believed that *aionian* punishment was to have an end.

My friend indulged in a repetition of the old thread-bare sophistry in reference to the meaning and effect of pardon; referring to the case of the prisoner pardoned by the Governor. There is one in the jail below, sentenced to be hung on the tenth of the coming month. When he is swung off from the scaffold my brother will feel better, I hope. If he believes this world is the only place of probation, I wonder how he dare to cut it short, and preclude him from all possibility of repentance and salvation! I showed you, by reference to punishment in the family, that the parent punished first, and pardoned afterward. To this my brother replies that I would have the pardoned man suffer the punishment to which he is sentenced, and be hanged all the same, even after the Governor had pardoned him. Now, where is the fallacy? I will show you where. It is in taking God down from his throne,

and subjecting him to human conditions—crippling him by human limitations. It would be impracticable and unsafe for the Governor of a State to pardon every man who says he has repented. But if it were a fact that the Governor could know as well as God can know when punishment has secured the desired beneficial result, would you not want the man to be pardoned, and his punishment to cease, the moment its design was accomplished? My brother's position reminds me of the answer given by Charles Speer to Dr. Cheever, when the latter declared that the great majority of those who are hanged have an opportunity to repent, and become Christians, fitted for heaven. Says Speer: "Why do you want to hang Christians, then? They are the very men we want on earth!" My brother's error lies in subjecting the omnipotent all-wise God to the limitation of human weakness and imperfect judgment. Human law subjects the offender to an amount of punishment deemed in ordinary cases to be sufficient to accomplish his repentance and reformation; after which he stands before the law with all the rights and privileges of his fellow-men, upon the same footing as if he had not sinned at all. When the Governor of a State has sufficient evidence that repentance and reformation has been secured by a less amount of punishment than that to which the law sentenced him, he is allowed to pardon the prisoner out, because the end contemplated by the law has been attained. So the divine law anticipates sufficient punishment to bring repentance and reformation, and then the offender is forgiven.

Brothers and Sisters, I will now hastily review some of my arguments on the negative of the proposition under debate, which, I claim, cover the whole field of revelation, and completely demolish any attempt to sustain the doctrine of endless punishment. You shall be judges. I shall not boast how I have "annihilated" anybody. No shrewd debater would do that. But I will say that it seems to me my arguments have anticipated every attempt at mere textual defense, every verbal criticism my brother has made, or can make.

My brother has argued that the doctrine of endless punishment is needed as a restraint upon sinners. Then I referred him to the Old Testament, wherein is recorded the story of the first man, the first sin, and the first punishment. Then and there, when the destinies, temporal and eternal, of all humanity were dependent upon the action of the progenitor of our race, God was bound, by every principle of justice and honor, to say nothing of his love, to reveal to man the full consequences of his transgression, should he disobey; yet God gave no warning of eternal punishment to follow human disobedience, nor after Adam had sinned did God give the least hint of any punishment in waiting for him, beyond that which should follow him until he should return to the ground from whence he was taken.

The Mosaic law, the bloodiest code the world ever knew, was found necessary by God in order to restrain his people at that time. But amid all the warnings and threatenings of that law, not a word was said in reference to punishment in the world to come—much less *endless* punishment. The strongest word in the Old Testament bearing upon this subject is the Hebrew word *sheol*, equivalent to the Greek word *hades*—sometimes rendered “hell,” sometimes “grave,” sometimes “pit:” that is sometimes relied upon to prove a place of future torment: why has not my brother quoted that? I will tell you why; it is because he knew better. He knows there is no argument for his side of the question to be founded upon the word *sheol*. Yet I wish to say a word upon it, because I shall have a word or two to say upon its Greek equivalent *hades*, when I come to the New Testament. Dr. Smith, in his Bible Dictionary upon this point, says that *sheol* means the underworld, or place of the dead. It is not, he adds, a Christian idea. We have no word in English that is a synonym for the Hebrew word *sheol*. Dr. George Campbell, of Scotland, says, and in this he is supported by the best Orthodox commentators, that it means the state of the dead without regard to goodness or badness of character.

MR. HOBBS—“Messrs. Moderators, I call the gentleman to order. Do not the written regulations of this debate declare that neither party in his closing speech shall introduce any new argument?”

MR. KING—But this is not the closing speech of this debate. That rule is to prevent either speaker’s introducing arguments to which the other has no opportunity to reply; but Mr. Hobbs is to follow me, and can answer any new argument I may introduce; consequently there is no reason in restricting me at this time. I know what my intention was in drawing up the rules, and I think the audience will agree with me that this is a fair and reasonable construction of them.

MR. HOBBS—“Under that construction, the gentleman could leave his strongest argument—if he had any such—to the very last moment, and compel me to reply to it without a moment for thought or reference to authorities, and crowd out everything in the shape of a review I had contemplated making; and thus in every way place me at an immense disadvantage.”

[The rules not being in the room, but at the residence of the moderators, were sent for.]

MR. KING.—Well, I will proceed with other points till the rules are brought, so that we can refer to them, and see how they are worded.

The gentleman, though carefully avoiding any attempt to build an argument upon the Hebrew word *sheol*, has used its equivalent, the Greek word *hades*, to prove his position.

MR. HOBBS.—“No, sir, I have done no such thing.”

MR. KING.—Have you not used texts containing the word *hades* to prove endless punishment?

MR. HOBBS.—“I have made no use of the word *hades* to prove endless punishment.”

MR. KING.—Have you used the English word “hell” to prove a place of future punishment?

Mr. HOBBS.—“Have I used the word “hell” to *prove* a place of future punishment?”

Mr. KING.—Yes, sir, that is the question I asked.

Mr. HOBBS.—“No, sir.”

Mr. KING.—Brother Hobbs, will you be so kind as to mention any word you *have* used in proof of future punishment, so I can proceed upon *some* subject before my half-hour is entirely wasted?

Mr. HOBBS.—“If you want to say anything on *gehenna*, you can proceed.”

Mr. KING.—Very well. Now, Brother Hobbs, how do you translate *gehenna*?

Mr. HOBBS.—“How do I translate *gehenna*?”

Mr. KING.—Yes, sir, how do you translate *gehenna*? As I do not propose to talk Greek to this audience, I want you to give us your translation of the Greek word *gehenna*, so that we can all agree and understand what it is we are talking about.

Mr. HOBBS.—“Well, sir, I will leave you to translate *gehenna* to suit yourself.”

PRESIDENT MODERATOR.—“I think this discussion better stop till the rules of debate arrive.”

Mr. KING.—All right, only so you will permit me to make up the time I lose by it.

PRESIDENT MODERATOR.—“Certainly.”

Mr. KING.—Very well; then let me have a glass of water; Brother Hobbs can't object to that—he has great faith in water.

[When the rules were brought the point was decided in favor of Mr. Hobbs.]

I hardly know where to begin, for Brother Hobbs seems to deny having said *anything* during the debate. It may be the audience will agree with him—I don't know.

I showed that endless punishment was not to be found where of all places it might have been expected, if anywhere—in the Old Testament. This I claimed to be presumptive proof against the truth of the doctrine. Then, if it is to be found anywhere, it must be in the New Testament.

Coming to the New Testament, I showed that the very meaning of the word “gospel”—“glad tidings”—is a perfect mockery on the supposition that it contains the first plain announcement of the doctrine of eternal torment to the majority of the race.

I showed that on this supposition, the song of the angels over the plain of Bethlehem was equally a mockery.

I showed that on the supposition that my brother's theory is true, the life of Christ was a bundle of inconsistencies and absurdities. We have a record of his weeping on two occasions—once over Lazarus, a good man, who had died and whom he was about to raise to life again; and once over the temporal calamities of Jerusalem, from which, however, she was to be restored, and to exclaim: “Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!” But not a tear had he to shed over these infinitely greater calamities—the endless agonies of millions upon millions of human souls then in hell, and millions upon millions more yet to share their fate. I challenged my brother to explain these strange, these to me unaccountable paradoxes, in the life and conduct of Christ. Has he done so? He has never referred to these points at all. I showed you that his own rebuke of a man who should commence building a tower without first sitting down to count the cost, and seeing whether he was able to complete it, was a tremendous rebuke to himself; for he came from heaven to earth to save a ruined race, and instead of finishing what he had undertaken, finds himself entirely balked and defeated. According to my brother's theory, the walls of that spiritual temple, in which every human soul was intended to be a stone fitly hewn, are not half reared, before the devil thwarts all the purposes of the Divine Architect, and steals three-fourths of the material; and the partially-reared walls stand forever incomplete, mocking a defeated God and Christ to all eternity.

The apostle declares that God hath made Christ heir of all things; my brother claims that there was some flaw in the

will, so that the Devil has succeeded in cheating the rightful heir out of his inheritance.

I have shown you conclusively that the very terms upon which my brother relies to prove his position, primarily possesses no such meaning as he attributes to them. The terms used in teaching such a doctrine as this should be so plain that no mortal can misunderstand them. I have quoted from numerous lexicographers, every one of whom believes in his theory, but not one giving to the words upon which he relies the meaning he claims for them, as their primary and natural signification. I have shown you that the texts upon which his school rely for proof, instead of being plain and indisputable in their meaning, are so ambiguous that the most learned commentators disagree as to what passages have any bearing upon the doctrine; that one acknowledges that one text does not teach it, and another commentator repudiates another text, till among them they have given up *every* text that anybody ever claimed in proof of endless punishment. I take my opponent's witnesses, and wring from their unwilling testimony my best evidence. Had I quoted from authors who disbelieve in the doctrine of eternal torment, you might have said, "O, that is Universalist sophistry!" But when I quote from Adam Clarke, and McKnight, and Pierce, and Wakefield, and Campbell, and from dictionaries whose authors, like Donegan, and Robinson, and Bullion, are men of the strictest orthodoxy, you can not claim that they were inspired and their opinions perverted by "Universalist sophistry!" I know my brother treats the commentators very slightly, and says they are very useful in explaining the "easy passages." Well, so far so good; and for an explanation of all difficult passages, Christians the world over will henceforth please refer to A. I. Hobbs, Des Moines!

I showed you that if the doctrine of endless punishment were true, it is but natural to suppose that the apostles would have preached it; yet we do not read of their ever

doing so—not even to the murderers of Christ; nor on any other occasion; or if they said anything that could be tortured into some sort of an indorsement of the doctrine, they never quoted their Lord and Master as authority. If the apostles believed the doctrine, and understood his teachings and parables as my brother here does, why did they not at once refer to them in support of it?

But my brother tells you that the Jews in the time of Christ believed in endless punishment, and consequently the doctrine must be true. What sort of an argument is this? Does he assume that because the Jews believed it, Jesus must have taught it? What people on the face of the earth did Jesus ever so rebuke for falsifying their laws and their prophets, and "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," as he did the wicked and bigoted Jews? A man must be driven into close quarters, indeed, for arguments to support his position, when he attempts to argue that because the Jews believed a thing, therefore Jesus must have taught it!

The doctrine of eternal torment vitiates the whole spirit of the Gospel, and represents God as acting in violation of his own plainest precepts and commands. We are told to love our enemies, bless them that curse us, and do good to those who injure us, in order *that we may be like our Father in heaven*; yet this doctrine represents our heavenly Father as hating his enemies, cursing those that curse him, and inflicting infinite and endless injury upon those who disobey him. If this doctrine be true, how are we to be *like him*, by being kind, loving and forgiving? Jesus must have given a very unreasonable reason for our pursuing the course he commands, or else he must have had a very different conception of the divine character from Brother Hobbs.

In one of my brother's speeches, he based an argument in favor of endless punishment upon the fact that the great majority of both Christians and sinners had always believed in it. The belief of the majority, the proof, the truth of a

doctrine? What a false and fatal logic! Does not my brother know that one with God is a majority? Majorities! what becomes of Christ and his humble disciples, if these are to rule? Majorities! does not my brother know that the foulest wrongs, the greatest enormities, the blackest crimes, the world has ever known, have been baptized in the name of the majority? Majorities! they prepared the hemlock for Socrates, and the cross for Christ; but thank God, they could not kill nor quench that Divine Spirit which moves on to conquer the world. Majorities! what truth of science or philosophy has not been condemned by them, lived in spite of their verdict, and stands to-day victorious? Majorities! how long is it since they said it was heresy to doubt that the earth was a stationary plane, while the suns and stars revolved around it? To-day we look with surprise and pity upon those mad attempts to overthrow providence by a popular vote. My brother appeals to majorities; but they can not save a false and doomed theology, nor prevent the onward march of truth to its inevitable triumph. This is a world of evil and sin; but it is not a stationary plane; it is a rounded orb, sweeping on in the path that an infinite hand has traced, and it always turns one side toward the light of heaven. In one evil overcome, one sin conquered, one soul redeemed, I read the prophecy of the final glorious end, when good shall at last be triumphant everywhere and forever. The smallest flower of Spring is a certain prophecy of all the beauty of the coming summer, and the ripeness of the fulfilling Autumn. So the smallest victory gained over sin and temptation is a prophecy of final redemption and glory. I can not solve every problem involved in God's grand providence; but I can see proofs of infinite wisdom, boundless power, and almighty love; and no human doubt or denial shall weaken my faith in the grand consummation when sin shall be forever past, suffering ended, and God be all in all!—[Time expired.

MR. HOBBS' SEVENTH SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I feel quite lifted by my friend's eloquence; for he certainly is eloquent. He tells us he "can not solve all the mysteries of God's providence." Can you solve any of them, Mr. King? You have certainly made wretched business attempting it, during this discussion. In my opinion you had better leave that alone; "God is his own interpreter."

My friend evidently thought he was making a strong point in his majority argument. I will first attend to that. He says this doctrine of endless punishment was borrowed from the heathens. Well, where do you get this testimony? Why Cicero is the witness. Cicero was a skeptic in religion, as decidedly as Paine, or Voltaire, or Bolingbroke. But though he was a skeptic when he came to *reason* upon religious matters, he often struck the truth. And Cicero lays down this test of truth: "Whatever has had the universal consent of all nations, in the remotest past ages, is to be received as true; for as men drew nearer the source or origin of things, the stream of truth would be less corrupt." See his *Tusculan Disputations*. There is the majority argument as given by Cicero; and it is undeniably correct. Then, going to the remotest past ages, we find the idea of endless punishment universally received by all nations; and by your own witness, then, this doctrine must be true; for those who lived in the most remote ages of the past, knew best what was true.

The gentleman said he quoted from commentators of my party. I beg leave to inform the gentleman that he is mistaken. When he brings in a Calvinistic commentator, he brings in one of his own party; for Universalism is only Calvinism gone to seed, and that of the worst kind. Were I a believer in Calvinism, I too would be compelled to believe that endless happiness was the final destiny of every man. But the time has come, thank God, when men can read Calvin, and

Clarke, and McKnight, and other speculatists in theology, and not be misled by an undue reverence for the past, or a blind deference to great names.

The gentleman has again and again objected to reasoning from human relations and human law up to the divine. This is the first debate of this kind I ever knew in which the Universalist has not insisted on arguing from the relationship and manner of government of a father on earth to that of our Father in Heaven. I was so sure that he would follow the same course that I had a reply all cut and dried, to meet such an argument on his part. Since he has not presented any such argument, I will not introduce my reply; but will simply state that I deny that there is a single promise for either present or future salvation based upon the relationship between God and man as creator and creature.

The gentleman talks about moral agency in hell; he says if men are free in the next world, they will not stay in hell. He forgets that in my description of future punishment, one element of that punishment was, "compulsory restraint."

Again: he says there is no conceivable way of sinning without the body; consequently there can be no such thing as sin where the body is laid aside. I knew this was the gentleman's position, and had been waiting for him to avow it. It is such positions as this that lead men of his school into confusion and inconsistency and contradiction in their interpretation of the sacred oracles, apparently arraying Scripture against Scripture, as has been the case during this debate. But worse than all, they adopt a false anthropology, leading them still deeper into error. (See my previous comments on Romans, ii:8.) The gentleman ridicules the idea of angels sinning, and being cast out of heaven for their disobedience. I said nothing about the possibility or impossibility of angels sinning, nor about a war in heaven; I simply quoted Scripture upon this point, without a word or comment of my own; he may have found it in some heathen mythology, but I have not; I find it in my

Bible, and think he might in his, if he would read it a little more carefully.

When the gentleman saw that his words, as written down from his own lips, proved that he had asserted that there was no change beyond the resurrection and the "song of victory," he tried another dodge. Did he dare say that men would change from holiness to unholiness? No: still he insists there is a change. What is it? He says it is a growth, an expansion of our powers. Granted. I believe that of the saved. But is growth a change of *moral character*? No, sir: by no means. So the gentleman's remarks have no bearing upon the question in any shape. My arguments were anchored in the fact, that whatever condition the soul enters into at the resurrection and the "song of victory," that condition is changeless as to moral character. This the gentleman has repeatedly admitted, and it is now too late for him to retreat.

Many of the errors into which the gentleman has fallen are the result of the erroneous treatment of the Scriptures, the false methods of interpretation adopted by Universalists. They interpret the Scriptures with no reference to the correct laws of hermaneutics. Let me illustrate:—

MR. KING.—"Messrs. Moderators, I call the gentleman to order. He has drifted away from the subject, onto a new proposition, which, according to the rules, can not be introduced in his final speech."

MR. HOBBS.—It is no new subject; I have frequently called the gentleman's attention, during this debate, to the fact that the Universalist method of interpretation violates every law of hermaneutics.

[Moderators decided further remarks upon this subject out of order].

MR. HOBBS.—I must respectfully dissent from the opinion of the moderators. I have again and again referred to this

very matter, and called the gentleman to meet it. That he has not seen fit to do so does not prohibit my again referring to the matter.

MR. KING.—“I shall insist upon holding the gentleman to the rule—as he did me, when I was last upon the floor. I was expecting that old sermon to come up in his final speech, when I had no opportunity to reply.”

MR. HOBBS.—If I am prohibited from referring to the erroneous methods of interpretation practiced by Universalists in general, I certainly can refer to the errors committed by the gentleman himself. He has furnished in his own case a pretty full exemplification of the false methods of interpretation, upon which his system is founded, and which his adherents adopt: 1. Prophecies uttered in reference to the restoration of the Jews, are treated as being of universal application. 2. They apply to the world at large, language addressed only to Christians—*e. g.*, Romans viii; I Corinthians, xv: 35—promises of God to his spiritual or adoptive children, they apply to all men, as being his children by creation. 4. This leads to false views of the purposes of punishment, limiting all punishment to a corrective design, whereas we know that some is exemplary, as in the case of Sodom and Gomorrah. This has been the origin of the gentleman's blunder in regard to *kolasis* and *paideuo*—*paideuo* being the proper scriptural term for “chastisement,” and never used except where disciplinary inflictions are administered under the providence of God to those in covenant-relationship with him; in other words, it is never used in reference to those punishments which come upon the opposite class, either in this world or the world to come. 5. These things lead to confusion, inconsistency and contradictions in their interpretation of the sacred oracles, apparently arraying Scripture against Scripture, as has been the case in this debate. 6. They adopt a false anthropology. (See my comments on Hebrews, ii: 8.) The gentleman has contended for an anthropology that starts the human race subject to vanity, created in

imperfection, sin and misery; as he himself illustrates it, like a man starting at the foot of a mountain. You remember how eloquent he became on that point. When I referred him to the fact that many men grew worse and worse, what reply did he make? None at all. 7. This leads to the rejection of the atoning blood of Christ as a meritorious cause of salvation; for if a man at the base of the mountain can climb to its summit by his own efforts, what need has he of a Saviour? No wonder that leading Universalist authorities should say the blood of Christ has nothing to do with the forgiveness of sin. No wonder my friend here should say God can not remit a penalty. 8. By this system, man needs no Saviour; if he wants to be saved, he must save himself by suffering; if he die, his body must remain in the tomb forever; for this system knows no resurrection of the body; its only redemption is, separation from the body, (Romans, viii: 21,) thus logically leading to suicide as a virtue, as I have before shown. In short, Universalism rejects the great central truths, which if a man rejects, he rejects everything that makes Christianity stand out with glory upon her forehead.

I will now hastily review the arguments I have presented in proof of the proposition under debate.

I submitted five arguments based upon the law of the antithesis. 1st. I took the very scriptures the gentleman himself used, applying them to the changeless and eternal state; I found in those texts, “perish” antithesized with “eternal life.” Then, as “eternal life” is endless, so, by the law of antithesis, “perish” must also be endless. Has the gentleman answered that argument? Yes: he said “perish” meant “total extinction of being;” thus turning Annihilationist. 2d. I found the term “saved” antithesized with “perish.” The gentleman's definition of universal salvation was, “all men will finally become reconciled to God, holy, and therefore happy.” This made “saved” in II Thessalonians, ii: 10, 11, 12, an endless salvation. But “perish” is in

antithesis, and therefore endless too, by the law of the antithesis. 3d. We find "eternal life" antithesized with "indignation and wrath," Romans, ii:3-10. Here "indignation and wrath," by the law of the antithesis, must be endless. 4th. "Eternal life" and "death" antithesized, Romans, vi:23. 5th. "Everlasting punishment" and "life eternal" antithesized, Matthew, xxv:30-46. In this passage *aggelos* occurs; and in his exegesis of Romans viii, the gentleman said *aggelos* means "heavenly messengers." The phrase "all nations" also occurs, which he insisted means "every individual of the human race." This passage therefore proves a future universal judgment; also, since the "life" promised to the faithful is endless, by the law of the antithesis the punishment must be endless also. He attempted to parry the force of this passage by saying that *aion* does not mean "eternal," but the argument was not built on the definition of *aion*, but upon the law of the antithesis, and upon his own admission of the meaning of the phrase "all nations," and "*aggelos*." These five arguments based upon the law of the antithesis he has never answered.

Argument sixth was based upon the passages which speak of the sin against the Holy Ghost: Matthew, xii:32; Mark, iii:29; I John, v:16. Has the gentleman answered this argument? Yes: he says *aion* means "the Jewish and Christian dispensations!" Whereupon I referred him to Luke, xx:34; and showed him that according to his translation there never had been and never could be any marriages under the Christian dispensation. He not even attempted to extricate himself from this difficulty. Again, I demanded of him to explain, even upon his own theory of translation, when and where this sin against the Holy Spirit could be forgiven, if neither under the Jewish nor Christian dispensation. Has he told you? He read various authors to prove that the penalty for this sin was temporal death; but what of it? No matter what the penalty is, that does not alter the fact that the sin is not to be forgiven,

"neither in this world nor in the world to come." My argument was not built upon the nature of the penalty, but upon the fact that that sin was never to be forgiven, and consequently that the penalty, whatever it was, must be endless.

Argument seventh was based upon the death penalty: Genesis, ii:17: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" Ezekiel, xviii:4: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Now, death is of its own nature endless; there is no life in death, nor life-generating power; any one once incurring the penalty must remain under it forever, unless he shall be redeemed from it by the merciful interposition of divine power and grace. This is true of all kinds of death. Did the gentleman answer this? Yes: he said I had thrust "ifs" into the mouth of God. Then I read to him the twenty-first verse of this same twenty-eighth chapter of Ezekiel, and showed the gentleman that he was clutching "ifs" out of the mouth of God. I connected this passage with Hebrews, ii:7, 8, 9, and proved that even if his interpretation—that the threatened punishment was physical death—were correct, before we could escape physical death, Christ must suffer death for us. The gentleman invited and dared me to come into the Old Testament, with a flourish of trumpets; I gratified him by giving him these Old Testament arguments, and he came out faster than he went in!

Argument eighth was built on the mediation of Christ: I Timothy, ii:15; Romans, iii:24-25; Hebrews, viii:6-7, and ix:11-15; logically proving that the judgment must be future, from the incompatibility of the offices of mediator and judge existing in Christ at the same time. To this he has made no reply.

Argument ninth was based upon the fact of after-death punishment. This and the remainder of the arguments I need not dwell upon, as they have been presented to you so recently.

Argument tenth was based on the futurity of judgment; Isaiah, xlv:23; Philipians, ii:9; Romans, xiv:10-14. The first of these passages was brought up by the gentleman when upon the affirmative, from which he drew the conclusion that all men would be holy and happy in the eternal state. But from the same Scripture, Paul draws the conclusion that we shall all be brought before the judgment-seat of Christ. When water-logged by his own proofs, he declares he never said there was no change beyond the resurrection. I brought up his own language, word for word, from the report; and he has not had the temerity to say a word about it since, but has let the matter go by default.

Argument eleventh was based upon those Scriptures which represent our actions as brought under divine scrutiny in the future state. The gentleman claims that at the resurrection all will be holy and happy; but I referred him to the fact that while they that have done good shall come forth to the resurrection of life, they that have done evil shall come forth to "*the resurrection of damnation.*" Has he answered that argument? Not at all.

Argument twelfth was based upon those scriptures which refer to diverse moral conditions and diverse destinies in the resurrection-state: John, v:28, 29, and other similar passages. Argument thirteenth and fourteenth I need not refer to, as they have been introduced this evening.

The gentleman talks about negative arguments. He would have been much better employed in answering my arguments, than in introducing negative arguments. He says Christ had no sorrow to express, except over the city of Jerusalem and the grave of Lazarus. He would have you forget the sad scene at the garden of Gethsemane, where he could say, "My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death." The burden of the world's guilt pressed upon his soul, and he prayed in the bitterest agony.—[Time expired.]

[The debate being concluded, both disputants thanked the Moderators for the kindness they had manifested and the impartiality with which they had presided; and the audience for their patient attention, and the good order they had observed.]

