

A DEBATE

ON

UNIVERSALISM:

HELD IN

WARSAW, KENTUCKY, MAY, 1844.

BETWEEN

REV. E. M. PINGREE,

PASTOR OF THE FIRST UNIVERSALIST SOCIETY, LOUISVILLE, KY.,

AND

REV. JOHN L. WALLER, A. M.,

PASTOR OF THE GLEN'S CREEK BAPTIST CHURCH, WOODFORD CO., KY.

REPORTED BY A STENOGRAPHER, AND REVISED BY THE DISPUTANTS.

~~~~~  
CINCINNATI:

WM. L. MENDENHALL, PRINTER, 106 MAIN STREET.

1845.

BX9946  
762

288.  
P653

Y 1845  
TO  
Y 1845

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1845, by  
E. M. PINGREE AND J. L. WALLER,  
IN the Clerk's Office for the District Court of Ohio.

---

473694  
TO THE PUBLIC.

---

The following Debate is commended to your candid and indulgent consideration. The question discussed is of thrilling interest—deeply affecting the most momentous concerns of the human family. We are conscious that the subject is presented in a desultory way—an evil necessarily attendant on all oral discussions. Our endeavor has been to present it to the public as it was spoken. We were furnished by the stenographer with our respective speeches, which we revised separately; and then met and examined each other's revision, and we believe that we have, as nearly as possible, given you the Debate as it occurred. Let those who read compare the points made and argued, with the Sacred Scriptures, in the fear of God, and with an earnest desire to know the TRUTH.

Cincinnati, Feb., 1845.

E. M. PINGREE,  
JOHN L. WALLER.

---

PROPOSITION AND RULES OF DISCUSSION,

AGREED UPON BETWEEN JOHN L. WALLER AND E. M. PINGREE.

QUESTION—*Do the Scriptures teach the ultimate holiness and salvation of all men?*

MR. PINGREE affirms: MR. WALLER denies.

RULES.

1. The discussion shall be held in Warsaw, Kentucky, to commence on Tuesday, May 28th, and continue four days—five hours each day.

2. Each disputant shall have the privilege of speaking twice, in speeches of forty-five minutes each, during the forenoon's debate, (that is, from 10 A. M. until 1 P. M. ; ) and of speaking once each, in speeches of one hour each, during the afternoon's debate, (that is, from three, until five o'clock, P. M.,) of every day.

3. Mr. Pingree will open, and Mr. Waller will conclude the debate, at each meeting. In the closing speeches of the whole debate, no new matter shall be introduced.

4. The books introduced into the debate, by either disputant, shall be free for the inspection and use of the other.

5. The disputants are not to indulge in any personal reflections toward each other; but shall treat each other with respect and courtesy.

6. Neither disputant shall interrupt the other while speaking, except for the purpose of correcting a misapprehension of what he has said; or for explanation.

7. Each disputant shall choose a Moderator, and these two shall choose a third, to preside over the debate, to keep order, and to see that the above rules are observed, as well as to discharge such other duties as are usually performed by Moderators in similar discussions.

Signed,

E. M. PINGREE, *Affirmant.*

JOHN L. WALLER, *Respondent.*

March 26, 1844.

## DEBATE ON UNIVERSALISM.

---

At ten o'clock on Tuesday morning, May 28, 1844, the disputants, the moderators, and a large audience being present, at the Christian Church, in Warsaw, Kentucky, Mr. Abbott, one of the moderators, having read aloud the foregoing proposition and rules for discussion, the debate commenced.

### [MR. PINGREE'S FIRST SPEECH.]

MY RESPECTED FRIENDS—Before entering directly upon the subject of discussion before us, it will be proper for me to offer a few remarks of an introductory kind; and this will be the character of my first speech, which will, probably, not occupy all the time allotted to me.

I propose to name briefly—very briefly, the circumstances which introduced this discussion: Mr. Waller, my friend, who is engaged in it, delivered one or two sermons in this place, against the doctrine of universal salvation. Some of the friends of that doctrine then invited him to a discussion of the subject with some one of its advocates. As Mr. Waller was not disposed to receive a challenge by proxy, I wrote to him, at the request of my friends in Warsaw, inviting him to a discussion; this proposition he did accept, and we are now here to engage in it.

That the subject is important, very important, none will deny; more important than any other that can engage the attention of the human mind. A question involving no less than the destiny of all mankind, is here before us, and before the whole Christian world. Upon this question, there prevail two opposite systems of theology: one holding to the ultimate *holiness* and *salvation* of all men;

and the other to the *endless misery* of a portion of mankind. I know there is a third; that in these latter days, some hold the doctrine of the *annihilation* of a portion of mankind;—but we have nothing to do with that notion now. We do not find it either believed or advocated here; and, therefore, I speak only of the two first named. In the professed Christian world it is generally admitted, that either all men will be ultimately happy, or some endlessly unhappy. No inquiry can be more important. It comes home to you, and to me, and to all, with most thrilling power. It is desirable that the disputants, and hearers should devote their earnest attention to it; and it should be the object of the speakers, and of the hearers, to know the TRUTH; and not to gain a mere personal victory in debate. It too often happens that on occasions of this sort, both the disputants and the people assembled, think too much of the *victory* and the *triumph*, and care too little for the *truth*. I hope that Mr. Waller and myself, and all present, will seek the truth alone upon the question before us.

It is desirable, too, that all out-of-doors discussion—for there will be much of it, (and I request it of my friends particularly,) should be conducted with mildness and candor, and freedom from everything that is calculated to excite disturbance and ill-feeling. Such a state of feeling may be produced, and may last for months and years; and remember that will be according as you and we act and speak upon this occasion. But if speakers and hearers pursue the proper course, discussion will do no harm, and may produce much good. No evil results *necessarily* follow public discussions.

The last speech at every meeting will be made by Mr. Waller; (it will be perceived that I do not use the prefix "Brother," or the words "my antagonist," or "my opponent;" but the simple address of Mr., which is always respectful and proper;) and I request all who may hear his last speech upon each or any occasion, to be present, and hear my first speech on the succeeding meeting, in reply to it; because he may attempt to create an impression in his last speech unfavorable to me and to my cause; and unless you are present to hear my reply, you will not know how the matter actually stands between us. This is a plain duty to yourselves, and to the one who begins the discussion.

With these introductory remarks, I now proceed to define the terms of the proposition, "*Do the Scriptures teach the ultimate holiness and salvation of all mankind?*" They are simple and plain: there need be no mistake as to their import.

About the term, "*Scriptures,*" there is no dispute. It is the Revelation of God's will, and of the duty and destiny of man.

The term, "*Ultimate;*" what does that mean?—I propose to carefully and precisely define the terms of the proposition, as I intend to defend it. It is not the part of Mr. Waller to lead you astray by arguing points not embraced in the proposition, or by putting his own construction upon the terms of the question, as proposed for discussion. I do not mean, then, the holiness and salvation of all men in this *present life*, nor the holiness and salvation of all men, *at death*. By "*ultimate,*" is meant a condition followed by no condition opposed to it—the immortal state;—not enduring for a few years, or five hundred years, or five thousand, or five millions of years; but *final* and *immortal* holiness and happiness.

"*Holiness and Salvation.*" There is no dispute as to the meaning of "*Holiness.*" Every body understands the common signification of that word. About the term "*Salvation,*" there may be some dispute. I will explain distinctly and precisely what I mean by it; and what I shall defend. I do not mean that we shall go to heaven *in our sins*: I do not mean that. Nor do I mean that we shall go to heaven *as we die*: I do not mean that. I mean this: a *final deliverance from sin, suffering, and death, into a state of immortality, incorruption, and happiness.*

The term "*Salvation*" has various meanings in the Bible. It is used to express a deliverance from *temporal* evils. It is used to express a *moral* and *spiritual* salvation *here*, by faith in the Gospel. But it is of no consequence to discuss the various meanings of the word as used in Scripture. This is the one point I am to defend: the final deliverance of "*ALL MEN,*" every individual man, and especially all sinful men, from sin, and suffering, and death, into immortality, incorruption, and happiness.—That is the proposition. This is what I have defined to be my meaning, and will defend; nothing more—nothing less.

Having stated my proposition, my course is to present

proofs of the doctrine affirmatively: as Mr. Waller denies the proposition, he is to follow me, and set aside my proofs of it, if he can. This is his especial duty, and not to build up any opposite system of his own, but to set aside my proofs first. Till this is done, he has no right to discuss any other proposition, or to build up any other system opposed to mine.

I shall present but few passages from Scripture, in each speech—plain, explicit, and to the point. I shall not be drawn away from this course. It is common to present points to draw away one from the point in dispute, and for persons thus drawn away to follow where they are led. *I shall not do this*—I beg to be distinctly understood, further than I may have time to follow other points, *after* I have presented my own proofs. I shall devote my time to proving the affirmative of the proposition; if *then* I have time and think proper to do so, I shall go aside to discuss arguments in favor of other systems; but not otherwise.

I hope I shall utter no sentiment, or exhibit, even in tone or manner, any such spirit, through this discussion, as I shall have reason to be sorry for afterwards, or ashamed of. I hope we shall be influenced by nothing but a spirit of candor, and an honest, sincere love of truth, and a desire to establish it: because this discussion is proposed to be published. A reporter is present. It will go to the world. It will last: and if my friend, Mr. Waller, or myself, are ashamed and sorry for what we have said, we shall be ashamed and sorry for a long time.

I have no other remarks to make now, as introductory, and, therefore, enter upon the discussion by presenting the following argument, as the first. It is an argument derived from the *nature* and *character* of God, and his relationship to man. The inquiry is, what do the Scriptures teach to be the destiny of man? That destiny depends on the character and nature of God, and his relationship to man. We know from Scripture the character and nature of God and his relations to us, and we bring this to bear on the question in relation to the destiny of his creatures.

There may be difficulties in interpreting the Bible. It was written eighteen centuries ago. The languages in which it was written are different from our own; and besides that, the same phrases are differently understood.



now, from what they were then, in the same language. We bring the character and nature of God, the AUTHOR of the Bible, to bear on its interpretation. This all will readily see to be a proper mode of argument.

What, then, are the Nature and Character of God, as introduced to our view by Scripture? He is "OUR FATHER," "the Father of our spirits;" "the God of the spirits of all flesh." He is not only that, but his very Nature and Essence is LOVE. (1 John iv. 8, 12.) "GOD IS LOVE." It is his very *Nature, Essence and Name*. Again: God is GOOD to all. Not only is he our Father, the Father of our spirits, the God of the spirits of all flesh, but "he is Good unto all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." As Jesus Christ, in his sermon on the mount, commands us to return good for evil; so he teaches us that God is "kind even to the evil and unthankful"—he is good to the sinful and unrighteous. It is well to remember this; and that this nature of love, and this goodness in the Father of our spirits, are *unchangeable*. God is not mutable; he changes not. He is not one thing to-day and another thing to-morrow. He is always of the same mind; now, and through eternity. Though he may punish us for our *sins*; (and he does so, for the Scripture say we are judged, rewarded, or punished, according to our works;) yet he punishes in kindness. Being *unchangeable*, and forever the same, even if he should punish us in the future life, his punishments would be directed by love and goodness towards us, inflicted in the spirit of a *Father*. Though our punishment should last for thousands and millions of years, it would be for our benefit, "our profit," unless God changes at our death.

This truth in reference to the relation he bears to us, I wish to be remembered throughout this discussion, as bearing upon our exposition of Scripture. We must not understand Scripture as teaching any doctrine opposed to this nature and character of God. It is no *imaginary* nature and character of God that I have described. It is his known and well understood character, as distinctly revealed in his own Divine Word. It was proper for me to introduce this fact in the opening of this discussion; as it has an important bearing upon what I shall say hereafter.

With these remarks we leave the subject in the hands of our friend, Mr. Waller, for the present.

[MR. WALLER'S FIRST REPLY.]

*May it please the Moderator:*

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I feel that I owe it to this community and to myself, to explain why it is I appear here to defend truths which the large mass of well-regulated minds have, in all ages, taken for granted: and in doing so, I would remark, that this controversy was not of my seeking. I have all along felt almost an insuperable repugnance to it. True, about a year ago, at the solicitation of my friends in this place, I delivered two sermons on Universalism. I understood that the other side of the subject had been frequently presented here, and I supposed I had the right, without question and without umbrage to any, to present my views also. I had no purpose, and distinctly disclaimed any intention, of getting up controversy. But in the afternoon of that day, I received a note from Dr. Chamberlain, inquiring whether I would accept a challenge to discuss the subject of Universalism, if from a respectable source, and from such a person as the Universalists might designate. I replied, that it was well known I had said, orally and in print, that *I neither sought nor declined controversy; but held myself ready to pay attention to the challenge of any respectable individual, on any important mooted question in theology;* but that I would receive no challenge by proxy. The tone of my refusal was designed to close all further correspondence on the subject.

Judge then of my surprise, when, shortly after my arrival home, I received a formal challenge from my friend, Mr. Pingree!—and in such a shape, that in the estimation of my most judicious friends, there was no way of escape without inflicting a serious wound upon the cause of truth in this place. I accordingly accepted it with extreme reluctance. Mr. Pingree is welcome to the full benefit of this reluctance. I then thought, as I now think, that long settled truths, received by the common *sense* (perhaps I should say, the common *consent*) of mankind, need no defence. Opposite opinions, if left to themselves, usually work out their own destruction. But I had left the matter in the hands of my friends. They believed it best to have this discussion. I intended, as agreed upon, to have been here months ago. Rumor has been rife here, I understand, and it even found its way into the Universalist organ

of the West, that I was *afraid* to come! Rumor, however, in my own neighborhood, said I was dangerously sick. Be that as it may, in the providence of God, I am *now* here, prepared to defend truths, which, in my humble opinion, need no defence.

Preliminary to what I am about to say, permit me to remark, that I mean no reflections upon the rectitude of intention on the part of those who advocate the affirmative of the proposition now under discussion. I am free to ascribe to them whatever of candor, honesty and sincerity they may justly claim to be entitled to. I impeach no one's motives. But I shall freely speak of facts, and fearlessly canvass opinions.

The world, for near a century past, has given birth to many religious knights errant; aye, not *religious* merely, but to all sorts of speculative knights errant!—individuals who, judging by their self-importance, appear to esteem themselves the predestined agents of Providence rightly to adjust the crazy concerns of the world, which have all gone wrong for the last sixty centuries! It would take the genius of a Cervantes to do justice to the Utopian achievements and exploits of “airy nothing” performed by the religious and philosophical Quixotes, who have assumed that all the world, except themselves, have been involved, since the beginning, in darkness and ignorance, and that they are bright, peculiar luminaries, culminating in the moral heavens, and pouring a flood of refulgence into the night of the understandings of misguided mankind! Among the *last* and most chivalrous of these adventurers (the redoubtable Mormon leader, perhaps, alone excepted) was the renowned projector of the Universalist crusade. But more of him anon.

In no sentiments have men, in all ages, been more generally agreed than in the following: First, The existence of God; Second, The existence of the soul after death; and Third, That after death there is a state of rewards and punishments. This is evident from the history, written and traditional, of all nations. And these doctrines have generally stood or fallen together. Hence, when some of the Academic school of philosophers consigned the soul to oblivion, they denied the existence of Deity. These were the speculations of heathens. When the diffusion of the Bible irradiated with its celestial light the minds of men,

everywhere the doctrines above enumerated were received, and throughout the civilized world, the learned and the unlearned gave them the sanction of their most unqualified approval. It was reserved for the last century to produce men of learning and of genius, who, enjoying the light of revelation and of God's works, could look the smiling heavens in the face, and in defiance of the dictates of reason, of conscience, of common sense and of the Bible, and in despite of the light and the language beaming and speaking from the star-spangled heavens, and all the wondrous machinery of the Universe, boldly to proclaim that "there is no God, and death is an eternal sleep." Atheism was too grossly absurd long to receive the countenance of men; but the philosophy (if I may so abuse the term) in which it originated, gave birth to other monstrous schemes, if less hideous to the "mind's eye," yet no less calculated to lead men from feelings of accountability to God, and to wrest from the conscience of the ungodly and the sinner, the apprehension of a righteous retribution in the world without end.

The doctrine which I am here to oppose, in that peculiar phase viewed by Mr. Pingree, is of modern origin—of very modern origin! But I see already a manifestation, on his part, of a disposition not to stand *jam up* to his creed, as we say in the West. There are some parts of his system, dearly cherished by him too, and to the defence of which he has hitherto lent the might of his pen and his voice, which he *now* seems disposed to let pass in neglected silence. I am surprized at his trepidation! And, forsooth, he has happily interpreted the question at issue to suit his convenience, and informs me with a very patronizing manner, that I must follow where he chooses to lead! No doubt he would prefer that the deformities of his system should escape inspection; but I have come here prepared to attack Universalism as it is—in the mass; nor am I to be diverted or decoyed from my intention. If he is ashamed of his cause, before this audience, be it so; I hope he may be ashamed of it to the day of his death. But to pass on.

I remarked awhile ago, that we sometimes injure a truth by consenting to defend it. And especially is this the case, where it is a truth to which the mass of intelligent minds have always bowed in acquiescence. The amiable Des

Cartes unwittingly inflicted a serious wound upon truth, when he laid it down as a principle, that the first thing a philosopher ought to do, is to divest himself of all prejudice, and all his former opinions; to reject the evidence of his senses, of intuition, and of mathematical demonstration: to suppose that there is no God, nor heaven, nor earth, and that man has neither hands, nor feet, nor body. In a word, he is to doubt every thing of which it is possible to doubt, and to be persuaded that every thing is false which can possibly be conceived to be doubtful. That the only proposition to be taken for granted is, "*Ego cogito, ergo sum*—I think, therefore I exist." Des Cartes did not mean seriously to dispute the existence of matter, but only to call it in question, that he might give an exhibition of his skill in demonstrating it. But there arose upon this, a sect of philosophers who told an admiring world, to its infinite emolument and delight, that the understanding acting alone entirely subverts itself, and leaves not a trace of evidence on any proposition! That our bodies, the earth, the sun, the stars,—in a word, that *matter* had no real existence, or at least, could not be proved to exist; that it was a mere idea—a sheer impression of the mind! These absurdities, advanced with ingenious subtilty and maintained with great learning, were made so captivating and injurious as to call forth replies from minds of the most giant mould! No marvel then, that Universalism has had its advocates, honest, sincere, subtle, intelligent. And let this example, too, furnish you with the reason that induced me to appear here as its opponent.

On this subject, I wish to present another thought: That which has been received, after mature investigation, by mankind generally, and especially the intelligent, ought not to be rejected without great hesitation. A sentiment or doctrine, of which men have possessed a perfect opportunity to be well informed, and always interpreted in a particular way; and which, after all the means of information have been laid before them, and every fact and argument in favor of an opposite doctrine have been presented, examined, and dismissed, certainly deserves the utmost respect, and possesses almost invincible presumptive proof of its truth, especially if the human mind is capable of arriving at truth. Suppose a proposition, with all the facts and arguments pertaining to it, were placed before a hun-

dred competent judges, and they should come to a unanimous decision upon it; and suppose another individual should come forward, possessing no other advantages than any one of these hundred, and should deliver an opposite opinion, affirming that they were all wrong, and he alone was right—what would be the natural and inevitable conclusion? Why, if the truth of the proposition could be ascertained at all by these hundred and one persons, that the *hundred* were right and the *one* was wrong. Just so with the subject of future rewards and punishments. The learned and intelligent have had this subject in hand ever since the days of the Apostles, and from the day that the final *amen* was affixed to the book of Revelation, until the year of our Lord 1818, when Hosea Ballou flourished, not an individual existed, who admitted the authority of the Bible, and yet denied that the wicked were punished and the righteous rewarded in the world to come. How happened it that he became in possession of more information on this subject, than any man that, during the lapse of so many centuries, had existed in the civilized world? Was he possessed of more intellect, more learning? did he enjoy more of the divine light, or was he endowed with optics better adapted to pry into the Word of God, than any of the innumerable host of his illustrious predecessors? “I pause for a reply.”

I know there were those termed *Restorationists*;—individuals who admit a long and excruciating state of future punishment, and deny its eternity. A few persons holding this doctrine have been known to flourish, at different and distant intervals, from the third to the last century. But Restorationism and Universalism are two distinct systems. They are not founded in the same premises—they do not lead to the same conclusions. They have no relation the one to the other. The great mass of Restorationists turn with loathing from the doctrine of Universalism, and utterly refuse to hold communion with its advocates. Mark my declaration: The doctrine of Universalism as now professed, until A. D., 1818, had no advocate—that until then, there existed no one who admitted the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, or who admitted the truth of the Scriptures, and yet denied a future state of rewards and punishments. What then is the argument? Why, that the whole creation groaned and

travailed in birth for sixty centuries, but until the year of grace 1818, brought forth no man with sense enough to understand the Bible on one of its most thrillingly important doctrines, and to demonstrate the truth to mankind! and that this prodigy of intellect—this production of nature's long, long agony is—*Hosea Ballou!!* But at present, I forbear further comment upon this most astounding phenomenon. I will await the advances of my opponent. He says, I am not to lead, but to follow. In relation to the point last alluded to, at all events, I will submit, with the utmost humility, to his dictation.

I have said thus much by way of preliminary remarks. I shall now proceed more directly to the subject in hand. My only desire is that truth may prevail. God, who knows the hearts of all men, knows I have no other motive. I have no disposition to remain in error. I have no interest but in the triumph of truth. I must now attend to the arguments of Mr. Pingree.

His *FIRST* argument is *derived from the nature and character of God, and the relations he sustains to men.* And here I must notice a principle of interpretation which he has laid down as applicable to the Scriptures. The principle is this: *We must know the character of God in order to understand his Book.* Now, the moral attributes, (his moral character,) to say the least, can only be learned from his Book. Then we cannot interpret his Book until we know his moral attributes, and these are to be learned only in his Book! This is an old monkish error, long since exploded. The Universalists are wofully deficient in the science of hermeneutics. I would respectfully advise my opponent to give some attention to that subject.

The principle of interpretation that I am now opposing teaches, that the Bible must first be understood theologically, and then philologically!—that we must first understand that which is revealed, in order to understand the language of the revelation! This, I repeat, is an old monkish absurdity. The true principle is, that we must first understand the language, or we cannot know what is revealed. How can we understand a book unless we know the meaning of the language in which it is written? The Bible must first be understood philologically, and then we can arrive at its theology. It is only by its language that we ascertain its contents. If, therefore, we find any thing

stated on its sacred pages in plain language, we must be governed by the plain and obvious import of that language. I will lay down the following axiom: That if we change the obvious meaning of the language of the Bible by what we learn *outside* of it, then we do not give its meaning at all, but have perverted it. We are not, then, to interpret a book by what we may know of its author, but by its language. Who ever claimed to interpret the Declaration of Independence by inquiring into the temper and disposition of Thomas Jefferson? But we interpret that instrument like we do everything else in the English language; we learn by the words employed, the meaning of the author. Hundreds who read the declaration do not know anything of the character of Jefferson; and many, perhaps, do not know that he wrote it at all. And how many books are there, of whose authors nothing is known! There are thousands. I have works in my library, many of them, too, of whose authors I know nothing. Take the letters of Junius as an illustration; a work of almost unsurpassed celebrity, and of which no man knows the author. Then, according to my friend's rule of criticism, no man can understand it!

The Bible was written in the language of men and for men; and it must be interpreted, like other books, by the laws of language. Deny this, and we are thrown upon a sea of speculation, without compass or chart, tempest tost by the conflicting elements of every wild and visionary theory. That I may not be thought singular, I will sustain my positions by authority. I will quote from Ernesti, translated by Stuart, the highest authority on principles of Biblical interpretation.

*"The principles of interpretation are common to sacred and profane writings. Of course, the Scriptures are to be investigated by the same rules as other books. \* \* \* \* If the Scriptures be a revelation to men, then are they to be read and understood by men. If the same laws of language are not to be observed in this revelation, as are common to men, then they have no guide to a right understanding of the Scriptures; and an interpreter needs inspiration as much as the original writer. It follows of course, that the Scriptures would be no revelation in themselves; nor of any use, except to those who are inspired. But such a book the Scriptures are not; and nothing is more*



evident than that *when God has spoken to men, he has spoken in the language of men; for he has spoken by men, and for men.*" P. 15.

The principle of depending, in our interpretations, upon *things* and not upon words, is condemned; for, says our author, "In this way interpretation becomes uncertain, and truth is made to depend merely on the judgment of men, as soon as we depart from the words, and endeavor to decide upon the sense by the use of means not connected with them. \* \* \* \* \* The meaning is, that they decide from that knowledge of things which they suppose themselves already to possess, rather than from the words of the author; they decide by what they suppose he ought to mean, rather than by what he says." Pp. 15 and 16.

Again: "*Any method of interpretation not philological, is fallacious.* \* \* \* \* \* It is by the *words* of the Holy Spirit only that we are led to understand what we ought to think respecting *things*. Said Melancthon very truly: 'The Scripture cannot be understood *theologically*, until it is understood *grammatically*.' Luther also avers, that a *certain* knowledge of the sense of Scripture depends solely on a knowledge of the words." P. 16.

Every one must perceive that Mr. Pingree's principles of interpretation directly contravene those just read from Ernesti. The latter are based in reason and common sense. I have demonstrated the absurdity of the former, and shall now proceed to notice the arguments by which he attempted to sustain his first position.

He said *that God was our Father—his nature was love—he was good unto all. That his goodness and kindness is unchangeable. He punishes in his kindness—his punishments dictated by goodness.* If we are not to understand this language to mean that God punishes sinners only for their good, I subscribe to this character. I propose to show before I am done, that sinners are not punished for their individual good. But I will not press this point now. I now, however, charge that Universalism does not make God good and merciful; and if Mr. Pingree is a genuine Universalist; (which, from the *tenderness* he manifested in treading upon certain points in the system, during the progress of his last speech, I am led to distrust,) I charge *him* too with not subscribing to the character he has given of God! I will read, in proof of this, from some Univer-

salist books which my friend himself recommended to me as containing a fair expose of his doctrine.

The Universalist's Guide, by Whittemore, says: "Now the truth is, we do not read one word in the Bible about saving men in a future state. Jesus was anxious to save people from their sins, and their errors, and bring them to a knowledge of the truth. He was anxious to save the Jews from the awful judgments that were impending over them, and all the apostles partook of the same solicitude. Paul says, (Gal. i. 4,) that Jesus gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world. The evils from which Jesus came to save men are in this world, and for this reason he came into this world to save them." Pp. 253-4.

So writes a scribe in the Universalist Israel! You doubtless now see why it was, that Mr. Pingree gave us warning that he would not defend all of his system. He affirms the "ultimate holiness and salvation of all men." Now, according to his "Guide," this holiness and salvation must take place in this life. But his same Guide tells us that the Jews and others were not made holy and happy, and were not saved in this life! Therefore the doctrine of Mr. Pingree, by one of his masters, is decapitated. But I read this to show that Universalism cannot subscribe to the declaration, that "God is love," while it deprives the world of a Savior. I know they affirm in round phrase, that Jesus saves *all* men; but when you bring them to details, he saves no one. He saves them from what? Not punishment in a future state, for they say there is none. Not from punishment due to sin; for they say they endure that. Yea, but they are saved from sin in this world. So the Universalists affirm; but the Bible declares that "there is no man that liveth and sinneth not." Universalism robs men of the Savior provided by our heavenly Father, and that, too, by what they call God's relations to man!!

I will read just one proposition in the "Pro and Con of Universalism," another book of my friend's recommending. "*In the government of God, there is, there can be no escape from deserved punishment.*" P. 243.

Let us hear from the Father of Universalism. Ballou, in his "Select Sermons," says: "We see, my friends, that there is, in the moral government of our heavenly Father,

an established administration, which secures to those who love and obey him a present complete reward; and one which delays not to give to the wicked the reward of his hands. To deny this, however popular the contrary opinion may be, is a moral delirium, a fatal insanity, which not only exposes us to danger, but absolutely plunges us into trouble." Pp. 87, 88.

Mr. Pingree, of course, believes this. It is the same sentiment as in the Universalist's Guide, already read and commented on.

But once more. I will read from the Universalist Circulating Family Library. Mr. Everett, its editor, says: "They all (Universalists) agree in the sentiment that every man shall be justly, certainly, and *adequately* punished for all his sins." P. 6.

Again, he says: "We hold that the salvation promised in the Scriptures is A DELIVERANCE FROM SIN; and no more expect to escape just and adequate punishment for our transgressions, than we do to elude the vigilance of Almighty God, or hurl him headlong from his throne." P. 35.

So Universalism not only teaches that we have no Savior, but that there is no forgiveness with God!—that he has no mercy on sinners; that he metes out to every transgressor, under all circumstances, a full, complete and adequate punishment. Who then shall be able to stand? And what sort of a Father is he when he will not forgive his children, though Jesus, his well-beloved Son, intercedes?—not even when they come to him heart-broken for their transgressions, confessing their faults and casting themselves before his throne, imploring his mercy by the recollections of Calvary?

But really I had *supposed* that the Bible taught a different doctrine. I had, by some means or other, learned that God had said, that if we forgive men their trespasses, he would forgive us our trespasses. And surely the Bible *does* inform us, that Jesus instructed his disciples to pray to their heavenly Father, "*Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.*" What, then, are we to think of that system which represents him, like the cruel debtor, as seizing the contrite sinner by the throat, and sternly saying to the trembling penitent, "*Pay me what thou owest;*" and then casting the poor bankrupt into prison, not to

come out until he has paid the uttermost farthing! This is what Universalism means by the goodness and love of God!

But I cannot pursue this subject further at present, for the want of time. Before I conclude, permit me to say to my friends, that I hope they will refrain from indulging any appearance of excitement or ill-feeling. This is an important subject—one that demands our prayerful attention. And remember, that in a short time we must go the way of all the earth, where all controversy must cease. Good men may differ in this world, but in those bright abodes reserved in heaven for those that love God, we shall all be of one mind and of one heart. By man's erring mind, truth can only be clearly perceived in the light of eternity. My prayer to God is, that so much of it as is now controverted, may triumph in this discussion.

[MR. PINGREE'S SECOND SPEECH.]

RESPECTED FRIENDS:—It is difficult to decide as to whom Mr. Waller is discussing with; whether it be with Mr. White, Mr. Whittemore, Mr. Ballou, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Everett, or with Mr. Pingree. It would seem as if he was discussing with all of them together. It should be understood that I am the advocate of Universalism on the present occasion; and that Mr. Waller should devote his attention to me, and to my arguments.

What seems to trouble my friend most is, that, as he says, the doctrine of Universalism is *new* and *modern*, in his estimation. He says it is strange that all men should have gone astray upon the subject, and for so long a time, etc. What a pity my friend had not lived in the time of Baal's prophets, and Elijah! He would have said, if he had witnessed their controversy, that the prophets of Baal were right, because they were four hundred and fifty in number, and Elijah was wrong, because he was only *one* man. If he had lived in the days of Jesus Christ, he would have been on the side of the Jews. At that time you might have looked over the whole world, and what man of ever so enlightened a mind, had clear ideas of a future life? Jesus Christ came to bring it "to light." But he was **ALONE**. My friend, according to the spirit of his argument, would have been of the number of those who said to him: Here you are only *one man*, and the

whole world is of a contrary opinion. We will not accept your testimony. "Away with him! Crucify him!" The world has not had these views; therefore they must be wrong.

Suppose he had lived in the days of Luther. According to his present rule, he would have stood by the side of Rome and the Pope. The whole church was Roman and Popish; nay, *was* Rome and the Pope. And my friend would have been there. He would have told Luther to go away; that he was one man, right in the face of the whole church and all Christendom, and therefore in the *wrong*. When in after ages, a philosopher introduced the theory of the movements of the heavenly bodies, he would have been of those who condemned him to silence, because he stood alone, and uttered for truth what was *new*. Or when Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood, had my friend been there, he would have said that it certainly could not be so, since the whole scientific world denied it. He would have said to this great discoverer: You are but one man *alone*. It is a modern discovery—away with it!

Just so here; that is, granting, for the present, all his assumption; and upon this principle of settling questions, there could be no human PROGRESS; the world would never become any wiser. It would remain ignorant forever. It would never progress without new light being from time to time shed upon its old opinions, and if an opinion must always be held because it has once been held.

But let that pass. He says he must call on Cervantes to write the history of the Don Quixotism of Universalism. I think he is quite sufficient of himself for this task. Let him to the work!

What has the sentiment of the whole world as to the *existence of God*, to do with this discussion? I have not denied his Existence and Character. I acknowledge him as the Creator and Savior of the Human Race. The whole universe, the earth, the stars, our very bodies, and all our senses and mental faculties proclaim the fact abroad. Does he mean to represent Universalists as denying or disputing it? If he gives me the appearance of denying it by arguing for it as if arguing against me, I say it is not so. I believe in the existence of one God, the Creator and Savior of all men. To intimate that we do not, is a mere *ruse* on the part of Mr. Waller.

But he thinks I am afraid to sustain what I believe. He says he wants to make me ashamed of my real sentiments for life, etc. My friend will find me ready to sustain the proposition now in discussion; and that is all I intend, or am under obligations to sustain, at the present time. I do not choose to discuss now, even if able, all the subjects in theology. My friend may have the victory all to himself, upon other points. The audience will judge whether I advance what I cannot or will not sustain. All that he said about monkish errors and popular translations of the Bible has nothing to do with the subject in hand.

What is the proposition which I have undertaken to defend? "*The ultimate holiness and salvation of all men;*" and not any minor points. I am not to be drawn from the point in this way, by the introduction of other matters. It is absurd to talk of my being ashamed to defend what I believe. I trust this will be understood.

Who has expressed any doubt whether we had eyes, or hands, or bodies, etc.; or about the existence of the earth, and the heavenly bodies? Not I. Why, then, introduce into this discussion mere nonsense for the purpose of upsetting it? These arguments do not bear upon the subject in hand; and there is no need to introduce them.

The declaration was not distinctly made, but an impression was attempted to be produced, (and I notice it merely to deny the statement now,) that from the time of the Apostles down to the year 1818, no advocate was ever found of the doctrine of *no future punishment*.

MR. WALLER rose to explain. I said that no man was ever found prior to Mr. Ballou, who admitted the existence of God and the divinity of the Bible, and who at the same time denied the doctrine of future rewards and punishments.

MR. PINGREE. There was a book written (I have it not with me,) nearly two hundred years ago, by a man who admitted the existence of God and the divinity of the Bible, who advocated the sentiment of no future punishment. If necessary, I will produce it. But what has the doctrine of no future punishment to do with the proposition? That question is not now before us. A man might be punished in the next world for thousands and tens of thousands of years, and yet it would have nothing to do with this discussion. That is not the question, whether there be no

future punishment; but whether all men will *ultimately* be holy and happy.

We come now to the first argument derived from the nature and character of God, and his relationship to man. Mr. Waller attempts to set aside the correctness of the opinion, that the nature and character of God must be brought to bear upon the interpretation of his written Word, by ascribing a sentiment to me which I do not hold, viz. that the Bible must first be understood theologically, before we can interpret it philologically. I expressly said we must learn the nature and character of God and his relations to man from the *plain language* of the Bible, and then bring that to bear upon the teachings of the Bible. To what parts of the Bible shall we then apply it? Evidently, to *ambiguous passages*. There is no dispute about Ernesti: I subscribe to all he has read from him. I only say we must apply it to places where the language is *ambiguous*.

Now, if we should understand the disposition of a father to his children, who we were told was a kind and tender father, we should say it was not probable that he would torture his child as long as he lived, and when about to die, should exert his power to make him live again, and so continue to revive and torture him over and over and over again, as long as it was possible to make him live. Or suppose we were told that a father had made such a declaration of his intention towards his child who had offended him; would it not be proper to look at the disposition of the parent, his character, (if the language was *ambiguous*, I mean,) in reference to the true interpretation of the language expressing his purpose? This would not be violating the laws of language, but simply bringing the author's character to bear upon his own language where it was ambiguous. In this way we endeavor to find out the true meaning of the passages relating to "*Hell*," "*Damnation*," or "*Everlasting punishment*," which you must admit are equivocal. I shall not discuss these passages now. But when such passages are ambiguous, how shall we always find out their meaning, except by finding out the character of God who has revealed the truth in those words of Scripture? I pass that then for the present.

My friend, Mr. Waller, says he subscribes to the char-

acter and nature of God, and his relationship to man, as I have described them. That is therefore admitted. But how can he deny the conclusions from it? God is the Creator and *Father* of men, and his nature is Love. He is *good* to the evil and unthankful, even in *punishing* them. He is the same and unchangeable in purpose, now and forever. Does it not follow from this, that all men will be ultimately holy and saved, seeing that love worketh no ill? That his purpose must be that they shall be finally happy? I ask you where is the display of goodness in originating an order of things by which the great mass of his creatures must be ultimately and forever wicked and miserable? In putting man into a condition where he *cannot* repent or reform; where he will not be *allowed* to reform; where he may cry for mercy to all eternity, and have no mercy; where God *compels* him to sin to all eternity? Is there any goodness, or kindness, or mercy in that?—!

But according to my friend, Universalism gives a contrary character of God,—and he quotes Rogers, Whittemore Ballou, and Everett. I have heard that before: that there is no goodness, no mercy in God, because we ascribe to him such a character as the Bible teaches, viz. that he will always certainly punish the sinner. What! is it not so? Is not that the Word of God? Is it not said that he will “by *no means* clear the guilty?” that “he will render to every man according to his works?” that “though hand join in hand, the wicked *SHALL NOT* be unpunished?” Does my friend say there is no mercy in that decree of God? They are his words, and they *must stand*; and if our friend charges a want of mercy on any one, he charges it on God, and not on us.

But he thinks it a dreadful thing that God should inevitably punish the wicked—that there should be a certain retribution here or hereafter; there is no mercy there; no, even though he punishes to *reform*, and with a purpose to make men ultimately holy and happy! But there is goodness in *THIS*—this is the height of benevolence—that he should take his creatures and consign their souls to utter perdition, where they must writhe in agony to all eternity, and scream with devils and demons damned forever!! This, to my friend, is pure *BENEVOLENCE*! To punish them for their *benefit* is *cruel*; but to take them and damn them without mercy or hope, not for their benefit, but from



*revenge* and *vindictively*, for no good object; that is benevolent, and kind, and merciful; is it?—!

Take the idea that the doctrine of endless damnation is true, and connect it with that declaration that God will “by no means clear the guilty;” and this, that “though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished;” and take the idea that this punishment applies to a future life, and to all eternity; and then take the passages, “for ALL have gone astray,” “the WORLD lieth in wickedness,” and what follows? Why, UNIVERSAL DAMNATION, to all eternity, unless you deny the Divine affirmation, that God will “by no means clear the guilty.”

We do not deny “the forgiveness of sins.” We deny the forgiveness of deserved *punishment*. John says, “Behold the Lamb of God who *taketh away* the SIN of the world;” not the deserved punishment. That is what we hold: the forgiveness of SIN.

Another thought in reference to this idea of cruelty. The common doctrine of the church whose sentiments Mr. Waller represents, is that Jesus Christ *suffered* the punishment which men ought to have endured for their transgressions. There are some here, (I do not know whether my friend is an Arminian or a Calvinist; but there are both here,) who hold that Jesus Christ suffered as the *substitute* for all those who deserved to suffer endless damnation for their sins. Here we have Jesus Christ suffering as a *substitute*, in the *stead* of sinners, all the punishment that was justly due to each sin of every sinner, past, present, and to come, in his own person. (And yet, all were then not saved!) So, then, here is a double vengeance taken—a DOUBLE DAMNATION inflicted! In the first place, it is all inflicted to its full extent upon Jesus Christ as the substitute for men, and then God punishes those very men themselves eternally! It is as if a court of justice should condemn a man to death for crime, and a substitute should offer himself to die in his stead; and the court should hang the substitute, and then turn round and hang the criminal too!! That is a perfect illustration of the doctrine!

I have now noticed all that it was necessary for me to notice in the last speech of my friend. My argument from the nature and character of God, and his relationship to man, as bearing upon the interpretation of the general

purposes of God to man, revealed in Scripture, has not been removed. I have noticed what he has said, and shall wait for more from him.

I now advance another argument—my second argument—from the plain language of the Bible. I presented my first argument rather as an inference. I do not propose that this shall be so. I appeal now, for the present argument, to the Apostle Paul, in the 8th chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, verses 18, 19, 20 and 21. I will read the whole passage. “For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creature;” [I shall maintain that the word “*creature*,” here means the whole human creation; when I am driven from that position, I will yield the passage; but not till then. I assert that the word “*creation*” does not mean the *brute beasts*, as John Wesley said; that it does not mean the *glorified saints*, as some say; nor the *angels of God* in heaven, as another has said, nor the *fallen angels*—but human creatures, the whole human creation]—“for the earnest expectation of the creature—THE CREATION—waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope.” Does not the Apostle apply the word “creature” to man in general? To what else can it apply? I will read on; “Because the creature itself also [I would read it ‘CREATION itself;’ that being the true meaning;] shall be DELIVERED from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.”

I have not introduced, as you will see, a passage containing the word “*saved*;” because that word might have an ambiguous signification. There are various salvations spoken of in Scripture. It saves the trouble of disputing, to select an expression which is not ambiguous. Of such a character is the expression here: “The creature [*creation*] shall be DELIVERED from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. For we know that the whole *creation* [the same word is here translated “*creation*,” which was before translated “*creature*;” this will be admitted;] groaneth and travaileth together in pain until now; and not only they, 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 our body."

I shall enter into no details of the argument now; nor anticipate the views of Mr. Waller. If I followed his example, I should bring books of orthodox writers of distinction, and show that one said the "creation" meant the brutes; another, the angels in heaven; another, that it meant the human body only; another, the saints now in the body, etc. I might, according to his example in the case of Universalists, take what anybody and everybody has said, who passes by the name of orthodox, and combat that. Should I do this? No: nor should he take all the writings of Universalists into this discussion, and controvert them. It is not his duty, nor mine. I shall simply present the passages, with only a few brief remarks, for him to comment upon; and shall then demonstrate that they teach the doctrine of universal salvation.

I may as well introduce another passage to the same point, now, to save time. It is the 14th and 15th verses of the second chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews: "Forasmuch then as the children, [i. e. human beings in general,] are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise [i. e. Jesus Christ,] took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;" [I do not mean now to discuss the existence of a personal devil; grant all that is believed about him, for the present;] and what else? "and DELIVER them, who through fear of death, [mark! the passage in Romans 8th says that the whole creation "shall be *delivered* from the bondage of corruption," etc. This passage is to the same point;] were all their lifetime subject to bondage."

Whether this embraces more or less of the human race; whether the elect only, or the wicked; all those who "were made subject to vanity," are to be "delivered from the bondage of corruption;" and so also those who were "all their life subject to bondage." You can settle it in your minds whether this embraces all men, or not. It is certain, that if any are excepted, they are those who were not "made subject to vanity," and those who have not "been subject to bondage through fear of death." Where are such? Where are those who are not included in this promise of deliverance? If you limit the passage, I

should like to have it explained; who are they that are not included? and let us have them brought forward. I will then give up the point; that is to say, if the exception is established.

I invite his especial and careful attention to these passages, particularly the one in Romans 8th. I admit candidly, that it is one, (though not the only one,) of the main pillars of the doctrine of universal salvation. I confess that I rest much of my hope on that one passage. I shall not leave it till it is taken out of my hands. But I have no fears of its being removed.

I will make one remark in conclusion by way of warning, in reference to either Mr. Waller or myself. Either of us may present proof texts that do not sustain our positions. We may be in error on some particular passage. Possibly this may be shown. Now though this may be shown in one passage coming either from him or me, it does not follow that the system we support falls with that one passage. For my own part, though I do not intend to introduce passages which will not stand the test of discussion, I feel disposed, should I be shown to be in error, to acknowledge it. But till that is done, I shall hold on to them, and stand by them, and present them as pillars of the system which I advocate on the present occasion.

[MR. WALLER'S SECOND REPLY.]

I will, at the outset, dispose of what Mr. Pingree is pleased to term his *second argument*, based upon Romans viii. 18—23. And I cannot refrain expressing my admiration at his singular prudence! After I have taken my position on the passage, *then* he will show what it means!! Most adroit disputant, truly! He quotes a passage of Scripture as the basis of his second argument, but before showing how it at all answers his purposes, waits to hear my exposition of it! Am I to forge his thunder bolts! And, verily, I thought from his former speech that he *would* lead, and I *must* follow.

And his interpretation of the passage, too, as far as he ventured to interpret, was no despicable exhibition of Falstaff's "better part of valor." The "*whole creation*," you will see in the sequel of his course, will mean just that *part* of creation which suits his purposes! He has already told you, that it does not mean angels or brutes, or inanimate things. But he has not proved that it must stop

there. When he shows how many *parts* of the *whole* creation are to be rejected to suit the dire necessities of his cause, then, perhaps, I will want him to reject some other parts. But I will wait patiently his advances on this point. I am not wont to manufacture weapons for my opponents.

He professes to be at a loss to determine with whom I am debating; perhaps the sequel will dissipate his embarrassment. Probably he will, before we are done, learn that I war with his *whole system*. I protest against and hope to expose all of it, if the time allotted will be sufficient. I think it all necessarily included in the proposition under discussion. He says he did not come here to defend the ground of his brethren. This resolution is admirably adapted to the emergency of his affairs—it relieves him from attempting what he nor any one else can perform. He also prudently resolves not to say whether the punishment for sin is in this life or in that of the future. It suits him best to strut in the plumage of the Restorationists, as occasion may require. Like the bat in the fable, he wants to be beast or bird, according as the battle waxes. If occasion requires, he wants to sail in mid air with the Restorationists; and when this becomes dangerous he can fold up his wings, and creep on the earth with the Universalists! Is this the far-famed knight before whose prowess, according to the Universalists hereabouts, my organ of courage disappeared last fall? But he must take grounds. He must place himself either with the Universalists or the Restorationists. I am ready to demolish either system. If he admits that the wicked are in hell for one hour, I will keep them there forever. If he puts them in the prison of perdition, I will fasten the gates with the Bible.

The magnanimity of Mr. Pingree, too, seemed to be exercised altogether for his own benefit! He thought it very illiberal in me to say anything on the Universalists' view of punishment in contradistinction to that of the Restorationists; but then it was all the very pink of liberality in him to descant on vicarious atonement, Calvinism, Arminianism, etc., etc.! And while he denied my right to refer to his sentiments on the punishment of sinners, he did not hesitate to declare and to comment upon mine! He represents me as contending for the endless punishment

of the wicked; when, from ought that I had said, he did not know but I denied their punishment, and taught their annihilation! By this unwillingness to do unto others as he would they should do unto him, and his condemning in me what he allows in himself, I apprehend he feels *that he is hard pressed*.

But language would fail to do justice to the *modesty* of Universalism, as presented by Mr. Pingree in his last speech. So far from denying, he justified the claim set up by his system, that all the world were enveloped in a cloud of ignorance on the subject of a future state, until modern Universalism arose to dissipate the mists! He went further. He compared himself and his coadjutors to the prophet Elijah, in his controversy with the priests of Baal! Well, when he brings down fire from heaven, like that venerable seer, I will bow to his behests; but not until then can I admit the comparison.—But even Elijah was not of suitable stature to measure his lofty pretensions! But he was like the son of God, who spake as *never* man spake; and because Messiah found none of the people to help him, but was rejected by his own nation, therefore Universalism from the mouth of Mr. Ballou or Mr. Pingree, might be as true as the Gospel from the mouth of Jesus of Nazareth! If he did not mean this, by his allusion to Jesus Christ, what could he mean? But I cannot receive the mission of “*Father Ballou*,” to use the filial designation of my opponent, until, like our Savior, he confirms it by miracle. Let him raise the dead, cleanse the leper, heal the sick, cast out devils; open the eyes of the blind, and unstop the ears of the deaf. Then, but not till then, can I see how he at all resembles the blessed Savior in his mission, or deserves similar credit.

You were told, that had I lived in the days of the Reformation, I would have been found on the side of Rome, etc. My friend has condescended a little—“fallen somewhat from his high estate”—when he compares himself to Luther, the giant of the Reformation, after the magnificent comparison of himself to Elijah, and the Son of God! But he will pardon me if I even dispute his claims to equality with the reformer of Wirtemberg. Luther contended for the common-sense interpretation of the Bible. He waged no war against the reason and enlightened judgments of men. These he fostered, and warred

to rescue them from the vassalage of superstition and spiritual despotism. No doctrine of the Bible that had received the unanimous sanction of the mass of enlightened minds since the days of the Apostles, was ever opposed by Luther. The cases, then, are not parallel. Luther was a very different individual from Mr. Ballou, or Mr. Pingree! As to the Copernican system, and the discoveries of Harvey, when he demonstrates his theory by actual experiment; when he brings one from "that bourne from which no traveler has returned," to attest by actual observation the truth of his doctrine, then may he place his on an equality with the discoveries of Harvey. Whenever, by mathematical demonstration, he makes his system good, then it may claim to rank with the Copernican. But he has done none of these things. I cannot then consent to place Mr. Ballou or Mr. Pingree alongside of Elijah, Jesus Christ, Luther, Copernicus, Harvey, or any other great instructor and reformer of mankind.

I introduced Atheism and the Cartesian philosophy for the avowed purpose of showing that there were no opinions, however absurd, and no systems however chimerical and preposterous, but may have their advocates, and even their martyrs. To this end, and as an apology for Universalism, I referred to these monstrous abortions of misguided minds.

To vindicate himself from the charge that the Universalist's God never forgives; he alleges that my system makes him unkind and inhumane; and that even granting my position, still his system represents his character in a more amiable light than mine. I wholly deny those statements. My system blends, in glorious harmony, the mercy and justice of the Almighty. It represents him as upholding a law that is "holy, just, and good," while he extends pardon, for the sake of his Son, to the violaters of it, who seek his face sorrowing. But I intend to say more on this, in its appropriate place. Suffice it now to say, that I deem it more merciful for God to forgive *sometimes*, than *never* to forgive under any circumstances. But oh, says my friend, he does forgive! Aye, he forgives after the sinner has suffered a full and adequate punishment for his sins! Singular forgiveness! and a most singular jurisprudence that sanctions it! An individual owes another one thousand dollars, and the creditor

forgives the debt after it is all paid! And this is what is taught us in that petition of the Lord's Prayer, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors;" meaning that, as we exact the uttermost farthing of our debtors, therefore our Heavenly Father will please, in mercy and benevolence, to exact the uttermost farthing of us!! What would be said of the clemency of a father who should punish, to its fullest extent, the disobedience of his son, and then say, he had *forgiven his transgression*!! A crime is committed against the State, and the criminal suffers a full and adequate punishment for it; and this, in the vocabulary of Universalism, is denominated *forgiveness*! Such language is not of earth. No nation, or kindred, or people, ever used such speech! I defy such a meaning for the term *forgiveness* to be produced from any dictionary extant. But he says, "God does not forgive the sinner, but the *sin*!" Well, let us see how this will work. The Savior makes intercession in behalf of a repenting sinner, and God, in consequence, punishes the sinner to the full extent of his sins, and then forgives his sins! Is there another system of jurisprudence in the universe like this? But my friend discourses about the *forgiveness of the sin* and the *punishment of the transgression*! I have heard of metaphysical scissors, capacitated to

Sever and divide

"A hair 'twixt south and southwest side."

And, verily, he must be using these. What is sin? The Bible defines it to be, "transgression of law;" one tells us, that "where there is no law there is no transgression." And yet Mr. Pingree's system punishes every *transgression*, and at the same time forgives every *sin*!! This is marvelously profound! It is beyond my depth. I shall await further developments. I cannot plunge further into such a metaphysical abyss! I beseech you, however, to bear in mind, that he contends that every transgressor, or sinner, receives a full and adequate punishment. I shall have use for this before our discussion terminates.

He told you, that I had not answered his first argument, and that all I said in reply, had no application to the question. I must appeal from his decision, to you. I suspect he is not the most disinterested judge in the world. I



submit the matter to your intelligent and impartial decision. I fear I should be most signally discomfited, if the decision of this controversy were left to his judgment. We are so prone to over-estimate the strength of our reasoning. In the excitement of debate, pigmy arguments, in the estimation of him that advances them, swell out to giant proportions. Some men, when they set out to achieve some notable exploit, are certain to be successful *in their own imagination*; just so Cervantes records of his hero who went out to wage war upon giants, that once upon a time he demolished a showman's puppets, believing they were veritable giants! It is not always safe, then, to conclude that every one esteems our arguments as formidable as we do ourselves. It is not every one who is blest with the gift of "seeing ourselves as others see us." I will not therefore, in imitation of his example, venture an opinion upon the strength of my answer to his first argument. I will submit the matter, with all deference, to be judged of by the audience.

Having thus paid all the attention to his arguments, which, in my humble estimation, they deserve, I shall proceed to present a few FACTS for your consideration; for I perceive, that if I go no faster than he leads, we shall get very slowly over the ground; and I am not disposed to waste time. The following are FACTS:

1. It is a *fact*, that the Apostolic Fathers all believed that Jesus and his Apostles taught a state of future retribution—that the righteous should be happy, and the wicked should be miserable, after death. These men lived in and near the apostolic age. They were mostly Greeks, to whom the inspired language of the New Testament was vernacular. Were they more likely than Hosea Ballou to mistake this matter?

2. It is a *fact*, that the whole church, immediately succeeding the apostolic age, held and taught, as the doctrine of Jesus and his Apostles, that the righteous would be saved, and the wicked be eternally damned, in the world to come. I say the **WHOLE CHURCH** of the second century. Not a discordant voice was heard.

3. It is a *fact*, that all the Christian Fathers affirmed that this doctrine was taught in the Scriptures. Some of the more visionary of them, held that the punishment was not eternal; as Origen, of the third century, and perhaps

Gregory Nazianzen; but they did not profess to derive any support for this opinion from the Bible, but from their own crude philosophical speculations. These two Fathers were the most speculative and visionary of all the writers of antiquity. Origen laid it down as a principle of interpretation, that the letter of the Bible was never to be followed, but the spirit. "The letter killeth," said he, "but the spirit maketh alive." He is the prince of spiritualizers. I will give you a specimen of his exposition. The Bible tells us that Pharoah's daughter found the infant Moses in an ark of bull-rushes in the river, and took him out, and adopted him as her son. That, says Origen, is the letter, and must be rejected. The spiritual or true sense is, that Pharoah is the *devil*; his daughter, the *church*; Moses is *Jesus Christ*; and his being taken out of the water, *the baptism* of the Savior!! The peculiar excellency of this mode of interpretation may be seen, by its making the devil the father of the church! This was his manner of treating God's word. He, moreover, tried to conform it as much as possible to the dreamy theories of the heathen philosophy, to which he was ardently attached. His notions of the wicked in a future state were, that after suffering a long series of years, they would be admitted to a state of probation again, where, if they sinned, they were again to be punished. This he derived from the heathen philosophers, as he did all his doctrine in relation to the soul; and he urged that the soul, for transgression in its pre-existent state, was doomed to inhabit a mortal body; and that for sins in this body, it would, unless saved by repentance, etc. be sent to hell, there to be punished for a long series of years, as already mentioned. For these visionary notions, he pretended no support from the Scriptures, nor did he ever intimate that Jesus and his Apostles taught them. On the contrary, he testifies, as I will show in due time, that the Savior and his Apostles taught the eternal punishment of the wicked. Gregory Nazianzen was a disciple of Origen's. But, it is sufficient for the present, that Origen tells us that the whole church of his day, held that the punishment of the wicked was eternal.

4. It is a *fact*, that all Christian Greeks, in whose language the New Testament was written by the Evangelists and Apostles, and who of course ought to know the meaning of the words employed in the Scriptures relative to

the doctrine in controversy, have ever believed, since the first implantation of christianity among them, that Jesus and his Apostles taught the eternal happiness of the righteous, and the eternal misery of the wicked, in a future state. Now, so far as the meaning of the words in question are concerned, this settles the controversy; and the whole of it turns upon the true meaning of these words. Now, who can understand the Greek language, if the Greeks did not? Shall Mr. Pingree or myself profess to know more of it, than those who spoke and wrote it as their mother tongue? What if a German, fresh from Germany, should come here, and because he had studied English for a session or two in his own country, and could translate a dozen English books into German, should assume to know more of the English language, than all the men in England or America? would we not all spurn him as a most sublimated specimen of self-conceit? The fact, then, that the Greeks, from the day that Paul and Silas first preached the Gospel to them, down to the present time, have always understood that the Scriptures, in their tongue, taught a state of future retribution, and that the wicked should be eternally punished, settles the import of the words in debate, beyond the power of appeal. For to whom can we go, if the Greeks themselves do not understand their own language?

5. It is a *fact*, that all the translators of the Scriptures, into all the languages into which they have been made, and of which we have any information, have without an exception, so far as I have been able to learn, so translated them as to teach the everlasting happiness of the righteous, and the eternal punishment of the wicked. I have something upwards of a dozen different translations with me—they are free for the inspection of Mr. Pingree—they are all so translated. They use the strongest words in their respective languages to convey the idea of eternity. The whole host of learned and distinguished men, ancient and modern, who, under the providence of God, have given the Word of life to their fellow men by means of translations, agree in thus interpreting the language of Christ and his Apostles; at least, this is true so far as my information extends, and I have taken great pains to inform myself.

6. It is a *fact*, that all the most distinguished con-

mentators, as Gill, Scott, Henry, Pool, Guyse, Calvin, Clarke, Campbell, Luther, Locke, Lowth, Lightfoot, Wesley, Wolfius, Waple, Whitby, Burkett, Beza, Brown, Bloomfield, Barnes, Byfield, Brightman, Bengel, Doddridge, Davenport, Danbury, Atkinson, Ainsworth, Adams, Albertus, Fuller, Ferguson, Hammond, Hardy, Jermyn, Jones, Johnson, Goodwin, Good, Geier, McKnight, Mede, Newton, Stuart, Ripley, Owens, Horne, Chalmers, and a host of others, too tedious to mention, who have written commentaries upon the whole or a part of the Bible—in a word, *all critics and commentators of any note*, are unanimously of opinion that the Scriptures teach a state of future rewards and punishments; and the overwhelming majority of them teach that these estates are *eternal*.

7. It is a *fact*, that every man of the *very few* making pretensions to scholarship who deny the eternal punishment of the wicked, concede that the doctrine, in the Scriptures, is taught in the same terms and in the same connections as those which teach the *eternal* happiness of the righteous.

8. It is a *fact*, that infidels have charged the Bible with inculcating this sentiment, and Christians, in answer, have never been wont to deny the charge; but they admit and justify the doctrine. This was the course of Origen with Celsus. And I refer to this case, to show that Origen did not profess to get his Restorationism from the teachings of Jesus and his Apostles. I will quote Leland's account of the matter:

"Celsus, in a passage cited before, pretends that the doctrine of future punishments was equally taught among the Pagans as among the Christians, especially by those who were the interpreters of the sacred rites and the mystagogues, who initiated persons into the mysteries, or presided in them. But then, in what follows, he supposes, that though both the mystagogues and the Christians taught future punishments, yet they differed in their accounts of them; and the question was, which of their accounts was the truest. Origen, in his reflections on this passage, observes, that it is reasonable to think that they had truth on their side, whose doctrine on this head had such an influence on their hearers, that they lived as if they were persuaded of the truth of it: that the Jews and Christians are mightily affected with the persuasion they

have of the future rewards of good men, and punishment of the wicked. But, says he, 'let Celsus, or any other man that pleases, show any persons who hath been wrought upon by the terrors of the eternal punishments, as represented by the mystagogues;' where he intimates that the mysteries had very little effect, and made small impressions on the minds of men." *Iceland on Revelation*, vol. 2, p. 390.

The work of Celsus was written against the doctrine and practice of the Christians, as inculcated in the New Testament. He was a Greek, as well as Origen. He alleges that the Scriptures teach eternal punishment, and insists that in that they are no better than the heathen mysteries. Origen, in reply, admits the Scriptures teach the doctrine, and shows that as taught there it has a more pre-eminent influence on men's minds than as taught in the mysteries. Would Origen have made this admission if it was susceptible of a denial? If the language of the New Testament admitted of a different interpretation, who more competent to show it? And if disposition was requisite to the attempt, being a Restorationist, who likely to be more willing?

9. It is a *fact*, that of all Christians—martyrs and confessors, learned and unlearned, orthodox and heretodox, churchmen and schismatics—of all who ever professed the name of Jesus Christ, not one is known, until the *nineteenth* century, to have disputed that the Bible taught the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked, in the world to come. The gentleman told us, that the Universalists have a book written some two or three centuries ago, denying future punishment, and he has promised to produce it, if he can. Will his friends remember this, and help him to find it?

10. It is a *fact*, that, since the final *amen* was affixed to the Word of God, no one is known to have disputed future retribution, but visionary pagan philosophers, heathens of the worst sort, atheists, and some infidels, until the commencement of the career of the remarkable Hosea Ballou!

11. It is a *fact*, that the large and overwhelming mass of all the most pious and learned, the most self-denying disciples and most laborious students of the Bible, now, as in all ages of the church, believe that the Scriptures teach the eternal punishment of the enemies of God.

12. It is a *fact*, that the large and overwhelming mass of professed Christians, now, and ever since the apostolic age, whatever may be now, or may have been formerly their differences of opinion touching other points, are and have been perfectly united on the sentiment that the righteous will be eternally happy, and the wicked eternally miserable.

I have but few comments to make. Here are TWELVE FACTS, bearing upon the history of this question. I wish you to take them home with you and ponder them well. They will not be disputed; or if they should be, I am amply provided with the proofs. I do not claim them as infallible proofs of the truth of my position, nor of the falsity of that of my opponent. Only God can furnish such proofs. But I do claim them to be the strongest proofs possible for the human mind to furnish in favor of future eternal punishment. My friend may say it is not Scriptural evidence, and in that way attempt to escape the force of these facts. It is his only way. But how is it possible for men to understand the Scriptures, if such means as these be discarded? Only an infallible church can understand them. The human mind is wholly inadequate to the task. Can the human mind do more than I have shown it has done on this subject? And if it is mistaken, we must forever abandon its guidance. Look at it again. All men, for seventeen centuries, with the whole subject before them, arrive at the same conclusion, *that there is a future state of rewards and punishments*; and no one disputes it until Hosea Ballou. His advent is an epoch. He, in our own day and generation, proclaims the whole Christian world wrong, and assumes to be a bright, peculiar star in the moral heavens, destined to outshine and eclipse all the lesser lights of learning, philosophy, piety and criticism, which have shed on man their feeble rays for upwards of seventeen centuries! And who is this Hosea Ballou? Has he proved his title to this assumption by an exhibition of such learning, and talents, and piety, as were never witnessed before? If men *can* interpret the Bible at all, why must we believe that he only has interpreted it aright? Must we believe that all the Christian world, of every sect and denomination, in all ages and all countries of the Christian religion, with all the aids that learning, application, and mental vigor could afford, were unanimously wrong in opinion and belief on

this all-absorbing point, until this individual arose to set them right?

Universalism may be right! Aye, *it may be right*, when there is no such thing as *wrong*! If true, it would be unique—the most wonderful prodigy the world ever saw! It would be a mental phenomenon that has never had its parallel. The gentleman may claim to know more than all others. It is not impossible for one man, on a particular subject or subjects, to know more than those who have not had those subjects called to their especial consideration. A lawyer or a doctor may be more learned in his profession than all persons who have not made law and medicine their studies. But suppose there was in the law an important principle, well settled by the voice of the profession for ages; suppose it to be a principle frequently applied to important cases of adjudication; and yet that no one, however deeply interested, had ever presumed to question it; and suppose that all the learned jurists and writers whose opinions are recorded had agreed unanimously in their construction of it; and that with them had concurred all who had been in any way interested or informed on the subject. And then suppose a solitary individual should arise, and he far from being the most learned in his profession, and announce for the first time, that all were wrong, and that he alone understood the true import and meaning of that principle of law!—think you he could proselyte many of that profession to his opinion? Would they not be apt to inquire how it happened that his one head should contain more knowledge of law than the heads of all the profession that had preceded him? Doubtless they would. Let us make the same demand of the Universalists. Let them make good their information on this point, as superior to the united wisdom of Christendom in all past time. Without this, we cannot bow to their opinions.

If this question had always been esteemed one of but little consequence, it might not have received that attention it has from the religious world; and in that case, I might be willing to grant all that is claimed for the inventor and patentee of Universalism. But it is a question of most thrilling interest. The eternal destiny of the soul is a subject of immense magnitude, forcing itself upon the consideration of every mind, and filling it with anxious

solicitude. It could not have been overlooked by men. That a doctrine should be plainly recorded in the Bible, so important and so interesting to man, as that of Universalism, viz: THERE IS NO PUNISHMENT TO THE SINNER AFTER DEATH—that ALL MEN SHALL BE HOLY AND HAPPY IN A FUTURE STATE, and yet that it should escape the most vigilant research, so long, is most incomprehensible. Aye, that this doctrine should be spread out on the pages of the Bible, as they say it is, and as from its importance it ought to be, in lines as distinct and legible as if written in sunbeams on heaven's blue archway, and yet that all eyes, for seventeen centuries, should be anxiously turned towards it, without one being able to perceive it, until the more than eagle optics of Hosea Ballou were providentially turned in that direction—to ask us to believe all this, is demanding as much faith as would remove and cast a sycamore tree into the depths of ocean! Yet we cannot get along with Universalism without subscribing to all this: and it presents to my mind an insuperable barrier to its reception. If the doctrine be true, it is the most important of all others. Time is fast carrying us all to the tomb.

[Adjourned until 3 o'clock, P. M.]

Mr. Pingree rose here and requested all those then present to attend and hear his reply at 3 o'clock. It was due to the doctrine he advocated, that they should be in possession of his rejoinder to Mr. Waller.

[MR. PINGREE'S THIRD SPEECH.]

RESPECTED FRIENDS:—I shall devote my time this afternoon, as far as may be necessary, to replying to the last speech from Mr. Waller, this forenoon.

The proof text now to be especially examined, is the 8th chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, beginning at the 18th verse. This embraced my second argument, and presented definitely the doctrine of universal salvation.

My first argument, as you may recollect, was drawn from the nature of God, and his relations to all men: that he is "our FATHER;" that his nature is LOVE, and that he is GOOD TO ALL; kind even to the evil and the unthankful, and unchangeably, forever so; and cannot inflict ultimate, endless evil on his creatures, whom he loves.

My second argument was from the eighth chapter of Romans; which Mr. Waller, in his reply, neglected to



notice, because I had not said all that could be said on the subject of the word "creature." That I had not done that to the fullest extent, was no excuse for his not examining the passage. But I will read the passage again, and again call his attention to it. "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. 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 sons of God" etc.

I will read and comment again upon the whole passage, in order that no further excuse may remain for Mr. Waller's not examining it. I now state what I stated before, that the 20th and 21st verses above quoted, are those that are relied on by Universalists as distinctly supporting the doctrine of universal salvation. I said that the word "creature," in the 20th verse, is the same word in the original, as the word translated "creation," in the 22d verse; and that it therefore may read, "the *whole* CREATION shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption," etc.; meaning, of course, all the creation here spoken of, which "was made subject to vanity;" i. e. the human race.

Now the inquiry comes from my friend, why does not the word "creation" here refer to the brutes, and the angels, etc., as well as to man? And this being answered, he says will present the passage in such a light that he can look at it. Let us see therefore if we can answer his question, and if there be really any difficulty in the way of its proper interpretation. We will take the passage and see, in the first place, in what manner it will apply to the *brute* creation. How would it read when thus applied? Let us read it so: "For the earnest expectation of the (*brute*) creation waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God! For the (*brute*) creation was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same (i. e. the *brute* creation) IN HOPE. [This hardly corresponds with our view of brute intellect. Do brutes "*hope*?" ] Because the (*brute*) creation itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God."

What then is to become of the human creation? Where can be the spirit of a Father in this? *Men* are sent

to the world of wo to suffer the pains of eternal perdition, and to writhe forever in the agonies of Hell; but the *brutes* are they to whom the glorious promises of the Gospel apply, and who are to be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God!! The passage cannot by any possibility be construed to apply to the brute creation. I cannot pretend to say, because nothing is revealed upon the question, what is to become of brutes hereafter, if there be any hereafter for them. But that this passage does not apply to them, is very certain; and it cannot be possible that my friend so thinks of applying it.

Again, the inquiry is made, Why does not the passage apply to *angelic* creatures? Let us again make the passage, thus applied, answer for itself: "For the earnest expectation of the (*angelic*) creation waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the (*angelic*) creation was made subject to vanity, (!) not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same (*angelic creation*) in hope." Is it so? Is this the fact? Is the *angelic* creation made subject to vanity? Let us read on. "Because the (*angelic*) creation," that love and adore around the throne of God, "shall be delivered from the *bondage of corruption* into the glorious liberty of the children of God!" Is that their condition? Do the angels of God stand in need of that kind of deliverance? If so, the language may apply to them; otherwise, not.

But I once heard one say, in speaking of this passage, that the word creation applies to the *fallen angels*. Let us see how the passage will read when thus applied: "For the earnest expectation of the *fallen angelic* creation, (that is, of the devils, so called,) waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God! For the fallen angels, or devils, were made subject to vanity—not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope! For the fallen angels, devils, themselves shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God"! According to the last reading, what does the theory involve? That a man must believe in the salvation of DEVILS, but that the HUMAN RACE are doomed to eternal perdition! We see, then, on the very face of the passage, that it *cannot* refer to brutes, or angels, or devils.

Then to what does the word "creature," or creation,

refer? There are some who say it refers to the *saints*. The passage is plain in itself, and on its very face; and the more we examine it, the more evident it is that it must *necessarily* be explained in only one way. Let us now see how the verses read, when applied to the saints: "For the earnest expectation of the *saints* waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the *saints* were made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope." Is this the condition of the *SAINTS* alone? The passage relates to the period *before* they were saints. "For the *saints* shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God." Have not the saints already the liberty of the sons of God? Were they made subject to vanity, *as saints*? does it, or can it apply to them exclusively? It certainly cannot. If it does not apply to saints, therefore, to whom does it apply? *To men, in general*. What can we think it applies to, except the human creation; men that have sinned; that were made subject to vanity—that are in the bondage of corruption, and who hope for a deliverance into the glorious liberty of the sons of God?

Let us look at an example or two where the same word, "creature," is used. Colossians i. 15. "Christ the first-born of every *creature*." Of what "creatures" is Christ here spoken of as being the first-born? I presume not of angels, or brutes; but of men. Again, "the Gospel should be preached unto every creature." What creatures does this refer to? *Brute* creatures?! or angelic creatures? Are these the creatures to whom the Gospel is preached? No. To whom, then, does the word "creature" apply? I press the question. Ans. To human, sinful men; does it not? The Savior commanded his disciples to go throughout the world, and "preach the Gospel to every *creature*." What is the meaning of the word "creature," here? To whom was the Gospel to be preached, but to sinful man? who needed it, and who was to be delivered by it? and to whose nature and condition alone was it adapted? Mr. Waller tells us he may drive me to embrace more in the word, "creature," by my interpretation, than would suit my argument; and then that it embraces less than the whole human creation. Well, let us hear what kind of creatures it can embrace, beyond

human beings. My reading of the passage is, that it embraces just the whole human race, and no more, and no less; because the creation that shall be *delivered* from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God, is the "creation" that was "made subject to vanity;" the creation that is in "the bondage of corruption," the "creation" that has an "earnest expectation of the manifestation of the sons of God," and the creation to whom the preaching of the Gospel was exclusively adapted;—in a word, sinful, HUMAN BEINGS. The word cannot be made to *seem* to mean anything else. Then I say that the passage does not apply to the brute creation, or the angelic creation, or the fallen angels or devils, or to the glorified saints; but to sinful human beings; and if this be the fact, it is conclusive evidence, so far as the plain declaration of Scripture can go, in favor of the doctrine of final universal salvation.

I think I have now said enough upon the plain language of the passage itself, to entitle my argument to a little of the attention of Mr. Waller upon the present occasion. We shall anxiously look for his reply.

I wonder if the audience recollect the proposition? I will repeat it: "Do the Scriptures teach the ultimate holiness and salvation of all men?" That is the proposition. What was the object of the last speech of Mr. Waller, during the morning's discussion? Was it to show from Scripture that the proposition was untrue? No; but to overthrow the doctrine of universal salvation, by *vote*—by the opinions of men, by the authority of uninspired, fallible men. I appeal not to them; my appeal is *from* them, to the sacred Scriptures, to the Word of God. It is a strange affair, he says, an unparalleled phenomenon in the history of the world, that Universalists should discover the doctrine of universal salvation in the Scriptures, when so many commentators, and all the learned and pious men of the world, for so long a time knew nothing about it. His argument is this: that the existing Church believes in the endless punishment of all the wicked; therefore it must be true.

Mr. Waller professes to be a Protestant. I ask, is he Protestant in that? If he means to argue this question in that manner, I say to him, let him go back into the bosom of the Mother Church, and remain there! Let him listen

to, and be bound by it, as he seeks to bind me by the voice of the Universal Church. There would then have been no Reformation, had such arguments prevailed; but it was this very idea, this mode of reasoning, that the Reformation overthrew. (I speak of the Reformation of Luther; not that of Alexander Campbell.)

Mr. Waller represents me as taking the position that I am equal to Elijah, and to Jesus Christ, and to Luther; nay, as if I presumed to place myself above them all. Was that the point of my remarks? Did I make any such assertion? Did I say anything in disparagement of those great, high, and holy names? or elevate myself to their height? What then was my argument? It was simply this, as you know; that according to Mr. Waller's argument,—that what the mass of the world believe must be true,—if he had lived in the days of those men, he would have been on the side of the *majority*, and would have been opposed to receiving anything from these reformers, believing that because they stood single and *alone* against the mass, they must be false; and that, *upon his principle* of deciding questions, he would have been an opponent of all reformations that have ever been commenced in the world. My remarks did not go to convey any such idea as that I considered myself equal to Luther, etc., but simply to show, from referring to those cases, that the mass of minds were not necessarily, nor always right; and that even things which the world had *unanimously rejected*, might be true; aye, things *universally rejected*, have been demonstrated to be true, notwithstanding that the "mass of well regulated minds" was in opposition to them.

Why, Sir, "he is a setter forth of strange gods," was the language of the polished Pagans to the Apostle Paul. So Mr. Waller says; that it is a "strange and unheard of thing" that the doctrine of universal salvation taught in the Bible should not have been discovered before the time of Ballou! Just so the Greeks thought of the Gospel preached by Paul! They believed in the infallibility of the *MAJORITY*; and would not my friend have done the same thing, had he been there? acting, I mean, upon the same principles he has advocated here to-day.

So far from such principles being applicable to the question, I believe—and has not Jesus Christ himself said it?—that the *majority are generally in the wrong*. Christ has

said, "Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and *many* there be that find it. But strait is the gate and narrow is the path that leadeth unto life; and *few* there be that find it." Watts has expressed it thus—

"Broad is the way that leads to death,  
And THOUSANDS walk *together* there!  
But wisdom show a *narrow* path,  
With here—and there—a traveler!"

And the history of mankind shows this to be a general truth. I repeat it, it is generally the *few* who are correct, and not the many. It has been so in all ages. Mr. Waller talks about *the mass*. If left to the mass of minds, I ask what would have become of truth in past ages? Did not the mass of minds, from the earliest times, depart from the one true God, and give themselves over to many gods? Are not the mass continually tending to forget the true God, and to believe in many and false gods? There was a time when the truth that there was but one God began to be preached, in opposition to the unanimous opinion of the whole mass of human minds. My friend, if he had acted upon the principle that the opinions of men of wisdom and learning must decide questions of this sort—which is his principle to-day—would have said, Away with it! it is a *new* and *strange* phenomenon, unheard of before; and the whole world has always been the other way;—away with this new doctrine of one God! There are many gods—see them all around—upon the heights of Olympus, in the temples of religion, in the groves, and in the rivers. The great and learned of all ages have so thought. "These be *thy* gods! O people!" Thus he would have been a polytheist in the days of polytheism, upon the principle that the majority—"the mass"—are right.

Did not the Universal Church believe, for a time, in the doctrine of the "Real Presence?" Had not the great body of the learned and pious and distinguished—the "*mass* of well regulated minds" who professed Christianity throughout the world for ages, been unanimous in this belief? Even Luther himself admitted it, when he commenced the Reformation. If my friend had lived at that time, he would have held to the doctrine of transubstantiation, if he had been consistent with his present principles. My friends, we did not come here to ask what "THE CHURCH" has taught on the subject before us. If that were the rule

of faith, I would go at once to Rome, and ask the Cardinals and Pope to instruct me; for upon that principle, Protestantism and the Reformation are a nullity. We profess, however, to be governed by a different principle. We come here to ask what the WORD OF GOD teaches, and to abide by its decision; and no such question as this can be decided by the authority of the Church, or by the mass of men's opinions.

I am obliged to be somewhat desultory in my remarks, in consequence of the different points which Mr. Waller has brought up. I come now to another of his remarks, made this morning. My friend, it seems, is determined to have some in Hell; and he says, if he gets them there *one hour*, he will keep them there *eternally*.

MR. WALLER explained. I said if you put them there, for one hour, I would keep them there.

MR. PINGREE. I will neither put them nor keep them there. I do not wish to be "the turn-key of Hell." But I will show where men have gone to Hell, and have come out again, if he likes. And I may refer to David, who says, "The sorrows of death compassed me about and the *pains of Hell* got hold upon me;" and he also says, "Great is thy mercy to me, O Lord! for thou hast *delivered my soul from the LOWEST HELL!*" Mark! even "*the lowest.*" I may refer also to the prophet Jonah. You all recollect his fate. He refused, when commanded by God, to go and preach at Nineveh; and according to Scripture he went to Hell, as his punishment; for he says, "Out of the belly of HELL cried I, and thou heardst my voice." He also speaks of his having been there "forever;" though he was really there only three days and nights. Peter, speaking of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, says, "Thou wilt not leave his soul in Hell." Thus, our Savior went to Hell; but he did not remain there; he was delivered from it. These instances are enough for the present. Men do go to Hell, and then *come out again*—Mr. Waller's assertion to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Waller began to talk about my being hard pressed, in his first speech, before he had begun to produce his arguments. I wonder if there is to be much of this? If there is, why, I must wait and endure it. It is one of the ways of some men in discussion, to speak of their opponents being "hard pressed," etc. What is the object of

this? It is for you to decide whether I am "hard pressed," and whether there is weight in the considerations which I bring forward. I shall not devote much time to such remarks. I hope they will not often be repeated. I think they will not. But if they are, I shall not pay much attention to them.

We come now to the subject of the *forgiveness of sin*. I shall here make a few remarks on his reply to the views I have expressed.

It seems a strange thing to Mr. Waller, that sin should be punished under the government of God, and yet that there should be forgiveness of sin; and so he illustrates it by comparison with courts of justice; and asks if a court of justice should compel a man to pay a fine of one thousand dollars, and after it was all paid, forgive the crime for which the punishment was inflicted, etc. I propose to appeal to Scripture, and not to human governments, in this question. The forgiveness of God, as the Bible uses the word, differs from the forgiveness of man, in the legal sense, in this: It implies a *cleansing of the sinner from sin*; a making of him pure and holy. He is said to be "*washed from his sins*." It does not apply to the *punishment* of sin; but the *sin itself*. Sin is sometimes represented as a *disease*; and forgiveness then is the *cure*. Suppose a man is sick; he suffers the pain of that sickness. Will you say that because he is cured of his disease, therefore he has not suffered all its pain? His pain lasted as long as his disease. So it is with sin. When we sin, we suffer for it; and not until we cease to sin, do we cease to suffer.

To illustrate this by Scripture. In the first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. 5th chapter and 3rd verse, it is said by the Apostle, "For I verily, as absent in the body but present in the spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath done this deed." [You will recollect that Jesus Christ received a kingdom; and therefore he judged mankind. He also appointed his Apostles judges in his kingdom. Now Paul in the exercise of this authority exercised judgment upon this man.] "In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ to deliver such a one unto Satan for the *destruction of the flesh*, that the *spirit* may be *SAVED* in the *day of the Lord Jesus*."



Here is an instance of punishment; then, and of its coming to an end, as well as being remedial. Turn now to 2 Cor. ii. 6. The Apostle Paul says, "SUFFICIENT unto such a man is the *punishment* which was inflicted of many;" —[here it is stated that this punishment was *sufficient*, there was *enough* of it;] verse 7, "So that, contrariwise, ye ought rather to FORGIVE him and comfort him, lest perhaps, such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow. Wherefore I beseech you that ye would confirm your love toward him."

Here, then, is an instance of a man delivered over to *Satan* for punishment. Here is an instance of the punishment being *sufficient*, and here the sufficient punishment was followed by FORGIVENESS. If Mr. Waller wishes to ridicule the idea, let him turn his ridicule upon the language of Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ, and not upon the Universalists.

We turn now to Isaiah, xl. 1, 2, for an illustration of the same doctrine. "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably unto Jerusalem, and say unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is PARDONED"—why?—"for she HATH RECEIVED of the Lord's hands double for all her sins." Here the sense of "double" is, *full, entirely*; as where we read of "double destruction." The punishment, then, was entire and complete; and yet the sinners were "pardoned"—in the scriptural use of that word; Mr. Waller's sneers to the contrary, notwithstanding. These examples are enough to show that sin may be punished fully, and yet the sinner be pardoned.

I do not propose to go through the column of "facts," presented by Mr. Waller, this morning. He says that the Greek church and Greek writers believed that the Bible taught the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked. Be it so. It is generally admitted; and so are all his facts generally. If this were to decide the question, it is very easily decided. Admitting that almost the entire church has believed in the doctrine of endless punishment, that is not the matter before us; the question is, "What do the SCRIPTURES teach us?" The Church became *corrupt*, after the Scriptures were given.

There are one or two points remaining to be noticed. The Greeks, he said, have always used the same words

that are applicable to the future punishment of sinners in the New Testament, in their ordinary language, and, of course know the meaning of those words better than any one else. But it must be remembered that the Greek language now is not the same language as was used at that time, and in which the Greek Testament was written. Then the argument derived from the sentiment of the Greek Church has no bearing upon the point. If it were identically the same, and used in the same sense then attached to it, it might apply. But it has essentially changed in its meaning, and the fact of the Greeks using the word *aionios*, for instance, in the sense of endless, does not prove anything as to its precise meaning in the Bible. Because all languages change from age to age. I have here two writers, whom I will refer to—both Orthodox, and distinguished for learning. One is Dr. Adam Clarke, and the other is Professor Stuart, of Andover. Both these writers are considered good authority; and they both say that the English word "Hell" has itself changed its signification, and that two or three hundred years ago, it did not exclusively signify Hell, in the sense in which it is now used; i. e. to mean the world of damnation in a future life. But it now means that, because the language is changed. So in all spoken languages; they all change their signification in the lapse of time.

A remark as to Origen. If I mistake not, Mr. Waller appeared to be in error in referring to the reply of Origen to Celsus, and saying that Origen did not deny that the Scriptures taught the doctrine of endless damnation. Mr. Waller *admitted* that Origen believed in universal salvation. It would be very strange, indeed, if he should have admitted a contrary doctrine to be the doctrine of Scripture, professing to be a believer in the Bible, as he was! I suppose Mr. Waller was led astray by this fact:—that Origen used the words "Everlasting," and "Eternal," in a limited sense. How else could he have used them? Not, certainly, in an unlimited sense; for he is admitted not to have believed in endless punishment. What, then, is the true inference? That he used those words in the same sense in which, being a Greek, he understood them to be frequently used by the sacred writers; i. e. in a limited sense, especially when applied to punishment. The inference is that that was their signification at the time the New Testa-

ment was written. Soon after the time of Origen, the words acquired in the language an unlimited sense; just as the word "*Hell*" has acquired a new exclusive meaning in the English language within the last two centuries.

My friend disputes the early corruption of the Church. What does Paul say? That "the mystery of iniquity *had already* begun to work," in his lifetime; and the end was to come when it had done working. Some taught that the "resurrection had passed already." The church went astray very soon in theological and religious truth. It is of no use to appeal to the church after the days of the Apostles. One of the Apostolic Fathers themselves, so called, is said to have written a book called the Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus Christ, (or of Mary)—an absurd book, in which, among other stories, he has it that the swaddling clothes of the infant were taken to cover over the eyes of the blind, and that they cured the blindness! Great authority on the true teaching of Scripture! Can we imagine more absurd nonsense? And yet these are among the men who are appealed to, to establish the doctrine of endless misery! Permit me to say that they are not sufficient. Let my friend show what the BIBLE teaches. That is the proposition here, and that should be his inquiry.

All this talk about the smallness of my body, sneers about my mind, etc., are not entitled to attention. "Great men are not always wise," and less wise men frequently arrive at the Truth. Do you suppose that Luther and Calvin were the greatest and wisest men in their age? No; there were men greater than they; and if we read of some of their conduct, there were better men than they. But they conceived and executed a great work; the establishment of the BIBLE as the ground of faith—not "the CHURCH." My friend could not have learned that from them. If it had depended upon the great and learned of that day, we should have had no Reformation. My friend had better go back to the bosom of the Mother Church!

What said Luther? Carlisle represents him as saying, "I stand solitary, friendless, *one man*, on God's TRUTH; you, with your tiaras, triple hats, and your treasuries and armories, thunders spiritual and temporal, stand on the Devil's *lie*, and are not so strong!" My friend Waller, as a

Reformer and a Protestant, ought to accede to this, instead of going for the authority of the Church, in the face of the few who hold the truth. But enough on the subject of human authority, for the present.

Arg. 3. I now present another distinct argument from Scripture, in favor of the doctrine of universal salvation. It is found in the Epistle of Paul to the Romans. I drew my last argument from the eighth chapter of Romans; and will now take the fifth chapter for my next. I do not wait to see whether my previous argument will be set aside; because if I should, I shall have no opportunity to present all the arguments I wish to bring before you on the present occasion. I proposed in my first speech to present a few passages in each speech, for Mr. Waller's attention. But whether he notices them or not, I want all to understand the grounds of our Faith, as found in the Divine Word.

Romans v.; commencing with verse 12: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon ALL MEN, for that all have sinned;" [observe such is the condition of *all men*, especially sinful, suffering, dying men, as I said at first.] "For until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed where there is no law: nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over thine that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. But not as the offence so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead:—[here is a new term, "many," introduced. What does it mean? How "many" are dead?—Turn back to the twelfth verse, and you will see. "So death passed upon ALL men." All, therefore, die. "*Many*" here means *all* men; here, and throughout the Apostle's argument. I wish you to remember this, for I shall depend upon it;] "much more (fifteenth verse) the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many;"—[*how* many? why, as many as were *dead*; that is, *all men*, as said before, and as we know to be the fact.] "And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one Jesus

Christ."—[How many were to "receive" this grace? The next verse will answer—all men.] "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon ALL MEN, to condemnation; [here the Apostle uses the word ALL; because all sinners are damned or condemned while unbelievers and sinners;] "even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon ALL MEN unto justification of life."

Mark one thing: all those are to receive justification who were adjudged to condemnation—whether more or less. If all are condemned, then all are to be justified. If any are excluded, they are those that never sinned—that never die—that were never condemned, or damned. "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." [This is the way in which they are to be justified;—not in their sins, as our enemies slanderously affirm.] "Moreover the law entered that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound:" [Not true, if Divine grace never overcomes or destroys all sin; if sin shall prevail forever!] "That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." I repeat the declaration, and wish it to be remembered; that if any do not receive the gift of righteousness and eternal life, they are those who have not been judged, or condemned, or have not sinned, or died. But all men are sinners—all die, all are judged, all are damned or condemned; and the same all shall have the free gift, according to Paul's argument. So if there are any who will never be saved, it is those who have never sinned, and never die;—remember this.

With this doctrine, corresponds the teaching of the Word of God elsewhere. Jesus Christ himself, says, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Matt. ix. 13. Paul says, 1. Tim. i. 15, "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance;" [and I wish my friend Mr. Waller would accept it;] "that Jesus Christ came into the world to save SINNERS." If there are any, therefore, who shall never be saved, they are those who are not sinners, and those who have not died. I wish you to remember that, until this declaration of the Bible is set aside.

But it is asked, *How* are sinners justified? How are they received into heaven? Do they go to heaven in their sins? That is the charge made against our doctrine. I

pronounce this charge a *slander*—a false and wicked slander. Universalists never uttered the thought that men were justified in that way—*never!* They have never preached, and never said, that the wicked and polluted go to heaven as such, or in their sin and pollution. How then are sinners justified and saved? The next verse (Romans v. 19,) answers that question, as already shown: “For as by one man’s disobedience **MANY**—*the many*, as Dr. Adam Clarke and others say,—were made sinners,” [how many? **ALL**—see verse 12;] so by the obedience of one shall **MANY**—**THE** many, or the mass—*be made* **RIGHTEOUS**.” That’s the way sinners are justified. When righteous, they need no salvation; but they are *saved* by *being made* righteous. Perhaps my friend will say that the word *many* refers only to “the Elect.” It refers to *as* “*many*” *as have sinned*. This is apparent on the face of the passage; and he must acknowledge it. It is those that have sinned, and that die, who shall be blessed in this manner; and if there are any who are not saved, let me emphatically repeat, once more, it is those who have not sinned, and do not die. All that sin, all that die, all the condemned, or damned, shall certainly be saved.

Such is the next passage I now present for Mr. Waller’s examination. I have given and sustained my views of it; and Mr. Waller is under obligations to take it up and examine it, and endeavor to set it aside. But we will show its application to the question, whether he does or not. I do not know what his views of it may be. Whatever explanation he may give of the passage favorable to his own position, we shall endeavor to set aside his objections when we hear them.

Arg. 4th. In the meantime, I shall present still another argument from Scripture, before I sit down. It is derived from Paul’s Epistle to the Colossians, chapter i., from the 12th to the 20th verse. I will read the whole. It is a plain, unfigurative, irrefutable passage in favor of the doctrine of universal salvation; for it teaches final **UNIVERSAL RECONCILIATION**. “Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the saints in light: who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for by him

were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to RECONCILE ALL THINGS unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven."

The Apostle here teaches the universal RECONCILIATION of the unreconciled to God, through Jesus Christ. The sinner is now unreconciled, is in rebellion against God. The object for which Christ came was to reconcile the whole world to God. So Paul says, "God was in Christ reconciling THE WORLD to himself." The whole world will be saved, therefore, if reconciled with God. All shall be finally reconciled, and "if reconciled, saved;" as Paul affirms in Romans v.

The question may arise whether Jesus Christ will *succeed*. It is admitted what he has undertaken to do—to reconcile all. He will either *succeed*, or FAIL! Has he undertaken too great a work? Will the Devil and his angels finally and forever prevent him from doing what he has undertaken to do? Some say so. But I say No: he shall not fail. In the language of the prophet Isaiah, "The pleasure of the Lord SHALL PROSPER in his hand," (Isaiah liii. 10:). "my counsel shall stand; *I will do all my pleasure*, saith the Lord." Permit me to introduce an illustration, in the Savior's parable of the foolish tower-builder. He asks, "For which of you intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish it? Lest haply after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish it, all that behold it begin to mock him, saying, This man began to build, and was not able to FINISH." Luke xiv. 28—30. The question is whether Jesus Christ is to fail, or succeed; whether he "counted the cost," and can "FINISH" the work, or not.

I request all those who now hear Mr. Waller's concluding speech for the day, to be present and hear my reply, to-morrow morning.

## MR. WALLER'S THIRD REPLY.

I find my task unexpectedly easy; for really I had a right to anticipate a very different state of things. Those of you who have been favored with the light of that most brilliant luminary, ycleped the "THE STAR OF THE WEST," may recollect that it was recorded in the columns of that most veracious hebdomadal, that the reason I failed to meet Mr. Pingree here last fall, was a defect in my organ of courage. And ought I not to tremble? For, according to the same authority, I find myself in the presence of one before whom the orthohodox clergy of Louisville quailed! whom the redoubtable Hodgman would not venture to meet: and one, the fame of whose prowess in full many a bloody and bloodless field, afflicted me for months with fever and rheumatism, and brought me near the brink of the grave! and before him too, in this town, the theatre of his most valorous achievements! But whatever of trepidation I may formerly have felt, it has all vanished now; and I really feel equal to the task of demolishing his last speech in a quarter of an hour.

Respecting the passage he has quoted from Romans 8th, which he has adduced in proof of his doctrine, it is not necessary at this time that I should go into an exposition of it only so far as to show that *his* exposition *will not do*—will not serve his purposes. He quoted at first, with great emphasis, the words "creature" and "whole creation;" and then told us, almost in the same breath, that the terms did not include angels, or inanimate creation. He has also exposed, with great satisfaction to himself, the sentiment which he is pleased to ascribe to Mr. Wesley, that it means the *brute creation*. I predicted he would have to limit those terms—that the necessity of his affairs would force him to reduce the *whole creation* to a very inconsiderable *part*. My anticipations have been more than realized. For he now says that "creature," the "whole creature," means the human family, but that it does not mean the *saints*, or the new creation! They are excluded! They make no part of the human family! They do not wait for the manifestation of the sons of God—the redemption of the body! But sinners do; and therefore the ungodly and the sinner, but not the saint, are *to be* ultimately holy and happy! This is *limiting* the *text* with a witness! Can this intelligent audience receive such an exposition?



To sustain the interpretation that *creature* meant the human family, he quoted Colossians i. 15, where Jesus is said to be "the first born of every *creature*" to show that the word *creature* in the original (*ktisis*) meant the human family. If an appeal is made to the original word, every tyro in Greek can tell you that it just as properly means stocks and stones, the earth and stars, as the human family: It is the word universally employed in the New Testament to represent that stupendous transaction, when God, in the beginning, called all things into being. This word, therefore, can prove nothing for him; and only forces him to a *limitation*. I need not then pay further attention to it.

But once more to the magnificent assumptions of Mr. Ballou and his followers. You have read that among the seven wonders of the world was a *brazen* statue at Rhodes, one hundred and five feet in height, striding across the entrance of the harbor, and yet vessels could sail under it. But a greater wonder and equally *brazen* is modern Universalism. The mighty Colossus dwindles to a pigmy before it. It assumes, and Mr. Pingree vindicates the assumption, that all the Christian world, from the Apostolic age to the nineteenth century, were incapable of understanding one of the most vitally important and plainly revealed doctrines of the Bible; and that Hosea Ballou was the first man who did understand it! and Mr. Pingree himself is at the head of the giant handful in Kentucky who can rightly divide the word of truth!! Well, I know my friend is small in stature, but his soul, no doubt, is large; and possibly he says to himself, (and perhaps with great propriety too)—

"Were I so tall to reach the pole,  
Or grasp the ocean with my span,—  
I must be measured by my soul:  
The *mind's* the standard of the MAN!"

What more than a Colossus mind he must possess so easily to bestride all the tallest intellects of earth!

I do not propose to settle this question by *vote*. I have intimated nothing of the kind. But I do say, it is a strange affair; one wholly inexplicable, that this doctrine, so clear to Universalists, so self-evident from the plain declaration of Holy writ, as they assert should not have occurred to any one, notwithstanding the intense

thought and application bestowed upon its investigation; but should have remained beyond the reach of all human research until a quarter of a century ago! That it was so plainly written upon the broad pages of the moral heavens that all eyes might have seen it; and that all eyes should be anxiously turned towards it, and yet that no individual from the foundation of the world ever suspected its existence, until it was discovered by Hosea Ballou in 1818—this, *this* is the miracle of Universalism, and the one to which I have called your attention! I hope the gentleman will now be able to see my position on this subject.

He need not try to class me with the adherents of the papal church. Indeed, I should think he has great cause to study church history. And what has my argument to do with the church, or with the pope of Rome? Did I not go back to the days of the Apostolic fathers, and of their teachers, the Apostles—long before the papal church began to tower in her iniquity and to tread upon the necks of men? But he argues as if all professed Christians were papists from the Apostolic age until the Reformation! Does not the gentleman know that the Greek church, comprising a full moiety of professing Christians, had all along repudiated the supremacy and the infallibility of the papal church? That there were numerous denominations of Christians, scattered all over the world, that from its beginning, loathed the papal church as the mother of abominations, the “whore of Babylon?” If he does not, he ought not to refer to church history until he has studied it more attentively.

“A little learning is a dangerous thing;  
Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring.”

I marvel, that any one making pretensions to having read, should not know that long before Luther the majority of professed Christians were opposed to the papal Church! This is almost as marvelous as that all Christians should have conspired in concealing this most cardinal doctrine of the Bible—*man's future destiny*—and should have actually kept it buried until Mr. Ballou disinterred it! Really, it is an honor to our country, to the age we live in, that it should have given birth to a mind [REDACTED] in such a wonderful mould; and that the world will [REDACTED] jog on right after having gone wrong for six thousand years.

Mr. Pingree says he did not intend to put himself on a level with Elijah, the Savior, Luther, etc., and complains that I should throw out such an intimation. Well, he certainly reckoned me with Baal's prophets, the pharisees, the papists, etc. And I supposed, that inasmuch as he and myself were in controversy, that if I was on one side, he was on the other. I certainly put him in better company than he put me. Do you complain of the company I have assigned you? [Turning to Mr. Pingree.—A laugh.]

But he says that he merely meant that this doctrine might be true although new, and although the great majority might be opposed to it. This is most true. I have not disputed it. He seems not to understand my ground. I say it would be a very strange affair that Universalism should be true—*very*; still I grant that its novelty of itself is no argument against it; but that it should, under all the circumstances, be a *novelty*! The fact that only a little handful advocate it, of itself proves nothing; but under the circumstances, a doctrine so important, and in which all are deeply interested, to which so many honest and candid minds have given the scrutiny of their investigation, it is a marvel, I say, that it has so few advocates! When Elijah stood alone against the prophets of Baal, he did not vindicate himself by the assumption that he was more wise than they: that he was in possession of a secret hidden from the foundation of the world. No: fire from heaven attested the truth of his doctrine. And when Jesus and his Apostles proclaimed to the world a doctrine which the wisdom of this world had not known, they were armed with miracle and the might of the Holy Ghost! Jesus knew that only proof of this sort was adequate to make men receive what none of the wise of earth had ever known. But Mr. Ballou arrays himself against the wisdom, the learning, and the piety of the world, and introduces a doctrine in opposition to it all, and without miracle, without fire from heaven, and without any pretensions to the extraordinary influences of the spirit; aye, without any pretensions to extraordinary intellect, or information even, demands our implicit faith to his doctrine, which for six thousand years was indeed above the *wisdom* of this world; and which he, by some means or other, has been so fortunate as to pluck down! This is the marvel with me. And I insist that the gentleman *must put himself*

on a level with Elijah and Jesus Christ, before he can reasonably demand our subscription to his creed. They never would have insulted the common sense of mankind with a demand like his.

As to what he said respecting my being in sentiment with the philosophers of Greece, instead of Paul, and about the majority's always being in the wrong, as well as the quotation, "Broad is the road that leads to death," etc., they are already answered. They are "as the idle wind." I cannot see for what purpose they are introduced, except to evade the very plain proposition that I have again and again pressed on his consideration. It is politic, I suppose, when one cannot withstand the force of a blow, to *dodge it*, if he can.

We have not been talking about majorities; for on this question Christians have all been on *one side*. It so happens, unfortunately for the gentleman's theory of majorities, that until 1818, the whole human family, except a few atheists, infidels, and the lowest order of heathens, existing now and then during the lapse of ages since the creation of the world, have been unanimously opposed to his doctrine. Let him produce another instance, parallel to this, when all, for so long a time, were gone out of the way, and there was not one that could understand. His illustrations, until he does this, do not apply; indeed, are "bolts of nothing shot at nothing."

His effort to put people in hell, and take them out, was a signal failure. He told us that David was in hell, and was delivered from it; that Jonah was in hell; and, by the way, gave us the startling intelligence that *forever was three days and nights!* Now, I used the term *hell* in the common received sense; I spoke of it, you remember, in connection with the view of the Restorationists. Does Mr. Pingree know anything of the original language of the Scriptures? If so, he knows that the word used in the passages he quoted,—which I will not comment on at present, but will in due time,—is not the word which we claim as *necessarily* meaning a place of torment in a future world. And he very correctly said, too, that when our version was made, the word *hell* in English was not always used in the sense it is now. He must then have presumed very much upon my ignorance, in quoting passages that had no bearing upon what I said. Yes, I re-

peat; I *dare* him to take the ground of the Restorationist. Let him once put a person in hell, and I will attend to him when he is getting him out. Was David dead, or had he been dead, when he penned the Psalm from which he quoted? Or was Jonah dead when he used the language that you heard mentioned? You see then that this was a miserable effort to evade the ground of the Restorationists; to seem to vindicate them, while he was opposing them: He was stabbing them under the fifth rib, while he was saluting them with a kiss. But all this by the way. I really suppose that Mr. Pingree intended no harm, for I seriously doubt if he knew what the original word was.

I wish you to remember one important admission: he concedes that the Greeks have always held the doctrine of eternal punishment. True, he makes a feeble effort at retreat from the consequences of this concession, by saying that he had supposed the modern Greeks did not use the precise language of the New Testament. This is true of the modern Greeks; their language has changed, although it retains much of the ancient language. But mark; my position was this, and he does not, and he *dares* not dispute it: That the Christian Greeks have *always* held that Jesus Christ and his Apostles taught the doctrine of eternal punishment. But I need not say more on this matter now.

The gentleman insists—and I am glad that he had the nerve to stand up to one position of his brethren—that a man, though fully punished for his sins, is nevertheless forgiven! True, he esteemed it due to the common sense of the audience to apologize for the declaration, by assuring them that the forgiveness spoken of in the Bible differs from that spoken of among men. That in the two cases they are not to be understood at all alike. That in the Bible it means to *cleanse, to purify, to wash*, etc. This is something I had not learned before, that *forgiveness* in the Bible was not a *human* word. I should like to know how he found it out. I grant that in no *human* language was it ever said, after a man had suffered the full penalty of his crime, that he was *pardoned*; and, indeed, I had supposed that the Bible made a vast distinction between forgiveness and purification. But enough; I am conscious he has taken me in water beyond my depth. I have all my life long supposed the Bible was written in the lan-

guage of men. If the word forgiveness is not to be understood as a word belonging to the language of men, I have no clue to its signification. I do not profess to understand any language that is *superhuman!*

The gentleman asserted that the Christian church very early went astray—that “the mystery of iniquity worked in the days of Paul;” and as a most convincing proof of the early aberrations of the church, he alleged that one of the Apostolic fathers wrote a book called the *Infancy of Jesus*. Now I happen to have that book with me; and I am just now informed by my friend for the first time as to its authorship! But I believe he did not name which of those fathers wrote it. I think I can promise him a premium if he will prove by whom it was written. Indeed, what he said on that point, was the latest intelligence I have heard—the very latest! Nor did I know either that *all* the early Christians apostatized; and I am yet to learn that the Bible teaches that *all* Christians were ever to do so. *It teaches no such thing*. Nothing can be more untrue than such a charge against the early Christians. Nowhere in the Bible is it taught that *all* Christians were to go astray so soon as the last Apostle died, and should remain so until the nineteenth century, in the night of ignorance and error, and then that a monstrous flood of light was to deluge the earth, in the person of Hosea Ballou. But the Scriptures do teach that extraordinary events shall characterize the latter days. “This know also,” says the Apostle, “that in the *last days* perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, *boasters*, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof: from such turn away. For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning and never able to come to a knowledge of the truth. Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these men also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith. But they shall proceed no further; for their folly shall be manifest unto all men, as theirs also was.”

2 Tim. iii. 1—9. Such is the character of some of the projectors of new things in the last days, but there is no intimation of such a personage as the gentleman would have Mr. Ballou to be—*No, not an intimation!*

His argument based on the 5th of Romans is soon disposed of. He omitted to read a very important part of the connection, and one that throws a flood of light on the whole passage; it is the twenty-first verse: "That as sin hath reigned unto death; even so might grace reign *through righteousness* unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." The Apostle knows of no "eternal life" by Jesus Christ, except that which is "through *righteousness.*" This does not suit the necessities of our friend, for he is contending for an *eternal life* nor "through *righteousness.*" Now why did he omit to read this, the *conclusion* of the Apostle upon his foregoing premises. Indeed, Mr. Pingree is proving the "ultimate holiness and salvation of all men;" where? in this life? No, he will not dare affirm it. But Paul is talking about this life—a righteousness "unto justification." Now he proves that we are justified by *faith* only; and moreover, he declares that "faith comes by *hearing*, and hearing by the word of God;" and asks, "how can they hear without a preacher." Now, mark Mr. Pingree's dilemma: The passage he quotes to prove his doctrine promises no salvation to any except "through righteousness," except upon "*justification.*" to avail him anything then, he must assert that *all men* are justified by *faith* in this life—and the Bible teaches no other way of justification,—or else they are justified by *faith* in the life to come! To say that all men have faith in this life is to contradict all experience and to give the lie to the word of God: and to say they obtain it in the next life, is to assume they hear the gospel, and that they have preachers there; for "how can they believe in him of whom they have not heard, and how can they hear without a preacher?" And who is it that preaches to the tenants of the charnel house? He assumed from this passage the holiness and salvation of all, but it was all assumption. For Paul promised salvation only to the righteous; and he recognized none righteous or justified without *faith*. But even the gentleman admits that all are not saved in this life; and as there is no punishment in the new life, there can be no sin there, *for all sin is ad-*

quately punished; then there is nothing to be saved from in the next life; and his whole cause vanishes like "the baseless fabric of a vision!" He cannot escape this conclusion: For you observe, while he asserts that it does not pertain to the question whether there is future punishment or not; yet all his argument shows that he believes there is none. He has not dared to take the Restorationist ground. Besides he is an avowed Universalist. I was challenged to meet him as such. And in spite of his efforts to the contrary, I mean to argue with him as such.

He says that Jesus came to "reconcile all" to God, and that he is able to accomplish his purpose, and will do it. Without wasting your time in pointing out how the text referred to is garbled and misinterpreted; let us grant that it is stated in so many words that Jesus came that all men might be reconciled to God, *which it is not*; and the question arises, was he to reconcile them *vi et armis*, whether they were willing or not? Was he violently to force them to reconciliation? And besides many, alas! *very many* of them die unreconciled; and are they reconciled in the grave? Do the coffin, and the winding-sheet, the worm and the rottenness of the grave bring about this reconciliation, which the preaching of the cross of Christ could not do in this world? The gentleman says, he is not bound to respond to such inquiries. This is a convenient way to escape what he *cannot* do. But how not bound to answer? Does he want you to embrace his system, no matter how numerous the absurdities it involves? It is an insult to common sense.

I now proceed with my argument. I did intend to read from Clement, Barnabas, Ignatius, Polycarp, Hermas, Tertullian, and some other of the fathers, but the concessions of Mr. Pingree render it unnecessary, and I will not consume time. I will now call your attention to the twelve following ASSUMPTIONS OF UNIVERSALISM:

1. Universalism assumes the charge of falsehood against the Apostolic fathers, and the whole Christian community immediately succeeding the Apostolic age, who all affirmed that the Apostles taught in their sermons and writings the eternal punishment of the wicked. Could it not, just as well, join with some of the infidels, and charge these same men with testifying falsely in relation to the authority of the New Testament. I must press these matters upon your



attention, notwithstanding the pain it evidently gives my friend. He won't let his God be merciful, he must not, therefore, complain if I should be found unmerciful too.

2. It assumes that the whole Church in the second and third centuries were grossly in error on what the Apostles taught respecting this most fundamental and important doctrine.

3. It assumes that the Greeks were not so capable of understanding and rightly interpreting plain and common Greek words, and which they were in the constant habit of using, as Hosea Ballou!

4. It claims for Hosea Ballou and his followers a better knowledge, and a more critical acquaintance with the word of God, than that possessed by all the most eminently learned commentators that ever flourished.

5. It assumes that all Christians for seventeen centuries were too blinded by prejudice, or ignorance, to see one of the most plainly revealed and most thrillingly interesting doctrines in the word of God.

6. It asserts that Hosea Ballou was the first man since "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy" over new-born creation, who had the capacity to perceive and the boldness to declare the truth in relation to the final destiny of mankind.

7. It claims that the sentiment peculiar to atheists, the meanest infidels, and Pagan philosophers of the lowest sort—that there is no retribution hereafter—is the true doctrine of the Bible.

8. It asserts that, of the millions now living who profess the name of Jesus Christ, only the little handful of Ballou's followers have a true knowledge of the Scriptures!—that only they walk in the light of God's countenance!—that only they possess the right paths!—in a word, that "they are *the* people, and wisdom will die with them!"

9. In asserting that all who professed to be guided by the Bible were misled for seventeen centuries, and that the millions who now take it as the man of their council, are in error on one of its most fundamental doctrines, Universalism assumes that the word of God cannot be understood by the mass of mankind; that it is a sealed book to ordinary and extraordinary intellects; and, without the special illumination of Hosea Ballou and followers, that all way-

faring men, whether foolish or wise, will err in the high-way of holiness.

10. In declaring that Hosea Ballou was the first man since the Apostolic age, who rightly understood and interpreted the Bible, they assume that he knew better how to proclaim the truth to man—what language to employ and what illustrations to use, to prevent misrepresentation—than Jesus Christ, who knew all things. For all men, aye a child, can easily understand Ballou's books, while no man for seventeen hundred years was found capable of understanding God's book, on the subject of the future destiny of mankind.

11. It assumes, in effect, that the Scriptures were not written in the language of men, nor for men, or else surely some man would have understood them on this vital point, in the lapse of centuries between their being written and the rising of the star *Ballou*.

12. It asserts and claims your assent to a most astounding impeachment of God's wisdom and benevolence—that God gave the world a book containing his will to man; a book revealing his character and his laws, and to teach us every good word and work; and yet on the most material points, involving the greatest concerns of the soul, it was expressed in language so obscure—words so ambiguous and deceptive were used, that for seventeen hundred years there was not found a man who could interpret them! Or if, as Universalists contend, his will on this point was so plainly revealed that he that runs may read, then surely the Almighty smote all his professed worshippers who flourished in past ages, and the overwhelming majority who flourish now, with *judicial blindness*, so they could not see this important truth. Viewing it in either aspect, and this is a most marvelous affair!

But the assumptions of Universalism do not end here: it assumes to save unbelievers, though our Savior says they shall not be saved. He declares, Mark xvi. 16, "He that believeth not shall be *damned*." The word *damned* is opposed to *saved*. The meaning is, the unbeliever shall not be *saved*. The Universalist says he *shall be saved*! Again, we read, John iii. 36, "He that believeth not the Son shall *not* see life." But the Universalist says, He *shall* see life! The Bible says, 2 Thessalonians ii. 11 and 12, "For this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they

should believe a lie: that they *all might be damned*, who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." The Universalist, on the contrary says, "God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, that they all might be *saved*, who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness!" The Bible declares, 1 John iii. 15, "Ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him:" The Universalist tells us that every murderer shall be holy and happy!—that all the murderers that ever lived are now holy and happy!!

The Bible declares, Jude xiii. "These are raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the *blackness of darkness* forever:" the Universalist declares, that these are raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the *brightness of glory* forever!!

In short, Universalism assumes by the force of logic, to forgive the sin that "hath never forgiveness," to put an end to that punishment which is "everlasting" or "eternal," to give life to those who "shall never see life," to bestow the light of heaven upon those to whom is reserved "the blackness of darkness forever," to quench the fire that is "unquenchable," to kill the worm that "dieth not," and to save those who shall not be saved!!! Oh, how omnipotent is the might of Universalism! And oh, how terribly it desolates the word of God!

I will now introduce another point, as I have nothing else to do, and to fill up the time. I can easily fill up *my time*. I affirm, in opposition to Universalism, that the Scriptures teach that there is not a perfect retribution in this life. The doctrine of Universalism is, that *sin receives its full reward in this world, and also righteousness*. This is contrary to experience and fact. But I must, before I proceed, read a passage in the "Pro and Con of Universalism." My friend complains of my reading from the writings of Universalists. But he ought not. He specially recommended this book to my perusal, as a fair expose of his doctrine. I am sorry to afflict him, but hope it will result in his good. I hope they will hereafter write better books. Our author says:

"Thus it is seen, that such is the order of things in the economy of Providence, that each sin necessarily entails its own penal consequences; that escape from these, other-

wise than by an avoidance of the causes which produce them, is absolutely impossible. \* \* \* \* \* Suppose he were equally sure that sin will produce suffering, would he not have equal reason for avoiding it also? He would undoubtedly: and hence is proven the importance of convincing men that misery is an absolutely certain result of wickedness; and in order to their being so convinced, they must be shown that the two things are naturally and necessarily connected together." pp. 259-60.

I need not quote more. The result of the matter is, that Universalism teaches that sin necessarily and of itself inflicts full and adequate punishment—that God has so ordered it, that sin carries with it adequate misery. To this I object, *first*, because God, in the law he gave to the Jews, required the infliction of punishment for certain crimes beyond what sin inflicts upon itself. For proof of this, I refer you, without stopping to quote, to Leviticus xx. 14; and xxiv. 16, 17; Numbers xv. 32, etc., etc. These passages show, that the Almighty, under the Mosaic dispensation, instituted divers severe punishments, as death upon the murderer, above what sin brings upon itself. If "each sin necessarily entails its own penal consequences," why did God ordain "penal consequences" beyond these? Is God unjust? If sin "necessarily entails its own penal consequences," then to put the murderer to death is unjust, because undeserved and superfluous!

*Secondly*. In opposition to the assumption of Universalism, that there is a perfect retribution in this life, I affirm that the prophets and other writers of the Old Testament, assert just the reverse. I need refer but to a few passages. Psalms ciii. 10, "He hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities." Now, if God did not deal with the sinners mentioned, and all other sinners, *precisely after their sins*, and reward them *precisely according to their iniquities*, then there is not a perfect retribution. Then Universalism is false, or the Psalmist was mistaken. Again: Ecclesiastes viii. 14, "There is a vanity which is done upon the earth; that there be just men unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked; again, there be wicked men to whom it happeneth according to the work of the righteous." If the wise man tells the truth, Universalism asserts a doctrine that is false. Both statements, the one contrary to

the other, cannot be true. Again: Ezra ix. 13, "And after all this is come upon us for our evil deeds, and for our great trespass, seeing that our God has punished us *less, than our iniquities deserve*, and hath given us such deliverance as this." Universalism says that we are never punished less than our iniquities deserve; Ezra says, we are. Now, which will you believe? Again: Nehemiah ix. 30, 31, "Yet many years didst thou forbear them, and testifiedst against them by thy spirit in thy prophets, yet would they not give ear. Therefore gavest thou them into the hands of the people of the land. Nevertheless for thy great mercy's sake, thou didst not utterly condemn them, nor forsake them, for thou art a gracious and merciful God." So they were spared in *mercy*; and if this be in the language of men, it necessarily means, that there was punishment withheld, and a punishment that might justly and righteously have been inflicted. Indeed, Universalism in asserting that every sinner is fully and adequately punished, denies the Scriptures, that say, "By his *mercy* he saved us"—"by *grace* are ye saved;" because whenever grace or mercy is extended, it implies that the man is released from a punishment that might justly be inflicted. Once more: Lamentations iii. 22, "It is of the Lord's *MERCIES* that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not." Here again we are taught, that sinners are spared in *mercy*, and of course a perfect retribution did not take place. Finally, Ezekiel xx. 44, "And ye shall know that I am the Lord when I have wrought with you for my name's sake, not according to your wicked ways, nor according to your corrupt doings, Oh ye house of Israel, saith the Lord," But the Universalists say, that God wrought with them according to their wicked ways and according to their corrupt doings. Thus flatly contradicting the Most High; for he says, *he does not!*

*Thirdly.* The various cruelties inflicted on the ancient worthies prove incontestibly that there is not a perfect retribution in this world. Speaking of all the holy men of old who suffered persecution *for their faith*, the Apostle says, "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 the mountains, and in the dens and caves of the earth. And these all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they, without us, should not be made perfect." Hebrews xi. 36—40. Here holy men are stoned, sawn asunder, driven outcasts from life and all its comforts, persecuted in every way that ingenuity could invent or malice inflict, and it follows, according to Universalism, that they received nothing but justice—that this was all the recompense these holy men were ever to receive for their devotion to God!!

Behold the doctrine!—Universalism comes like an angel of mercy, to the proud and haughty sinner—who despises God's law and regards not man—who, like the rich man in the parable, fares sumptuously every day, who is clothed in purple and fine linen, and enjoys his good things; surrounded by friends, honored, admired, flattered—to such a man it comes and says,—“Sir, you are now suffering the torments of hell; you are now in the agonies of the second death, in the flames of that fire which is never quenched; on you now gnaws the worm that never dies; and this is all the pain you will ever suffer. You have blasphemed God's name, and persecuted his saints, and you are now reaping the fruits of your doings to the utmost extent, and you now suffer all that you ever will for your sins!!!” Oh just and righteous Father! have they not cried peace to the sinner, when thou hast said there is no peace?

But if it is an angel of mercy to the ungodly and the sinner, Universalism comes like a “goblin damned” to the persecuted children of God—to the stake of the martyr, to those persecuted for righteousness' sake, to the sick chamber of the poor, the pious and the bereaved. It says to the faithful, but suffering Christian, writhing in the agonies of a martyr's death—[MODERATORS: *Time expired.*]

[MR. PINGREE'S FOURTH SPEECH.]

RESPECTED FRIENDS:—Before entering upon my reply to the last speech of Mr. Waller, it may be as well briefly to notice the progress of the discussion so far. In the first place, I will again name the proposition for debate: it is,

“Do the Scriptures teach the ultimate holiness and salvation of all mankind?” The terms involved in this proposition were defined by me in my opening address: that is, what I proposed to defend, and not what other men have advanced on kindred and minor subjects. I shall not be expected to defend other propositions, and leave this; I have not sufficient time to defend them, nor any sufficient motive at this time to do so.

Do the Scriptures, then, teach the ultimate holiness and salvation of all mankind? This being the proposition, my first argument was drawn from the nature and character of God, and his relationship to man;—that his nature is LOVE—that this is his essence and name;—that he is GOOD TO ALL; the FATHER of our spirits; kind even to the evil and unthankful, and unchangeably the same, now and forever: so that, if he is good to his creatures now, and to the evil and unthankful, he will continue so forever and forever. If he inflicts endless misery upon any of his creatures, it will be done from a spirit of goodness and love, and for their benefit. But this strikes us as absurd; therefore he will not inflict such misery. We are led rather to believe,—and this is our faith and hope,—that he will purify and make holy all those whom his power and goodness have for benevolent designs brought into being.

My second argument was from the 8th chapter of Romans; where the Apostle declares that the “creature *shall be delivered* from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.” I showed that the word “creature” meant CREATION, and that it could apply to nothing but human creatures, whose was “the earnest expectation, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God,” who were “made subject to vanity,” and who were in “the bondage of corruption;” and that therefore they are the ones who “shall be delivered,” *finally*. I stated no time for the accomplishment of this. The Bible states none. No day is fixed in Revelation, for this to take place; but ALL SHALL BE DELIVERED; no matter when, or where, or how.

The only reply Mr. Waller has made to this is, that I excluded “the saints” from the deliverance. *I did not exclude* the saints. I said it could not apply to the brute creation, nor the angelic creation, nor to the glorified saints who are already delivered. I did not *exclude* the

saints—they were *once* sinful, once in “the bondage of corruption,” from which they are delivered. The promise reaches farther back than the time of their becoming saints. So the Bible throughout teaches us. Though they are *now* saints, they were not *always* saints, but were *once sinful*, and *from that* condition have been delivered as all mankind—the whole human CREATION—are ultimately *to be*; and more perfectly. I hope this will be understood. I was talking about the condition of sinful man that was subject to vanity, and in “the bondage of corruption.” The passage of course applies to all men while sinful. But it does not embrace the saints *alone*, after they are made saints, and are *already delivered*. I also quoted Hebrews ii. 15; “and deliver them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage;” after the destruction of whatever has “the power of death.”

My third argument was from Romans v.; where Paul himself urges the truth, that all have sinned; but whereas they have been subject to sin, they shall be made pure by the grace of God: And as a condition *following* the condemnation of all men for sin through Adam, is the reception of the free gift of righteousness through Christ. Verse 19. “For as by one man’s disobedience *many* [i. e. ALL—see verse 12,] were made sinners, so by the obedience of one, shall *many* [the *same* many] be made righteous.” It is because they are to be made *righteous*; that they are to be saved; not *in* their unrighteousness. To this argument there was no reply from Mr. Waller. He entered into no examination of the passage, and made no attempt to set it aside. It stands as a firm and unshaken pillar of the doctrine of the final righteousness and salvation of all mankind, through the gift and grace of God. It makes men righteous. It goes farther back than sin. It makes them righteous, and thus saves them.

My next and fourth argument was from Colossians and Romans, where it is declared to be Christ’s design to RECONCILE all the world to God. That, this being his design, he is able to *accomplish* what he intends, and will do it, sooner or later: and to this argument I have heard no reply from Mr. Waller, but the questions, “Where, and when, and how? where, and when, and how?”—To this I will only say, that the proposition before me does not require me to tell *where*, and *when*, and *how*, Christ will



*ultimately* accomplish his purposes: and having made this remark, I shall pay no more attention at present to these questions of Mr. Waller. The time may come when I shall do it, if I think proper. But this is not the time for it. The passages themselves teach no time or place; nor shall I now. They only say that it shall be accomplished. When passages are brought forward which *show* the time, I will speak of it. I establish the proposition as it stands. I *care not* when, or where, or how, in the Providence of God, these things are brought about. I care not, so far as the proposition and argument are concerned, if it be after a thousand millions of ages, if it is done *ultimately*; and all the creatures who were made subject to vanity be delivered from the bondage of corruption, become righteous, and reconciled to God. He wants proof, and is waiting for it. What I *have* proved is enough; is it not?

The gentleman wants to introduce new points into this discussion. The doctrine of *no future punishment* is one. We may speak of that bye and bye. He defines that to be Universalism. It is *not* Universalism, exclusively. Many hold it. I do not myself believe in future misery. Of that we shall speak bye and bye; but not yet. We want first to show that great and glorious and central truth of the Bible, the **ULTIMATE** holiness and salvation of all men. Whether punishment is confined to this, or extends into the future world, is not the question. I shall not be drawn away from the true question by all Mr. Waller's efforts in that direction. He is welcome to all the advantage he can gain by discussing such questions now; and may have all the impression, and make all the use he pleases of them. He may have what triumph he imagines himself to have gained, and may keep it for the rest of his life. We shall see.

What has Mr. Waller done to set aside my first argument? my second? third? and fourth arguments and proofs from Scripture? What has he done? He has only appealed to the **MASS** of mankind, and the learned and distinguished in all ages! He has not advanced a Scripture argument, nor attempted to explain the Scriptures I have adduced. I have not heard a word of it. But he has appealed to the "**MASS** of well regulated minds," and the opinions of other fallible and uninspired men; and says that all men believe as he does, except

Universalists—a principle at war with all human progress, as I have shown; and when the occasion demanded argument, what have we had? Argument? No; the most we have had has been witticism of various sorts; such as commenting on my size, that I was a small man; and quoting verses about “a little learning being a dangerous thing,” etc., etc., and “small boats keeping near shore in deep water;” intimating, of course, his ability to navigate safely and far in deep waters. Perhaps the language of Solomon might not be unappropriate here: “Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him!” I did not make pretensions to superior learning. Have I expressed any such thought? Have I claimed to be any wiser than others? Have I used any such language? Not at all. I have attempted to read the Bible and to explain it, according to the Protestant principle. That is proper, and right; is it not? If we are to appeal to *tradition*, I repeat once again, let us go back to the *Mother Church*! I *profess* to have but little learning. Why, then, am I taunted here before all this intelligent audience, with my want of it, as though I had made *assumptions*? Is it not enough to have “little learning,” but I must be ridiculed, as if I had made some *great pretensions*? I hope we shall hear no more of it.

I am sorry that my friend is disappointed in the present encounter; that he expected to meet a great man, a mighty champion, etc. But how am I to help his chagrin and disappointment? what *can I do*, in view of not being so great a man as he expected to meet? I must endure his witticisms in silence, and be as patient and quiet as possible.

It seems a monstrous thing to my friend, that the world should be in blindness so long on this subject; that all the learned and pious should be in the dark, and that now a light should appear, rising like a “bright peculiar star,” to clear up this darkness. Yet it is not strange, when we know that this has been the way from the creation of the world; that when any new truth has been discovered, and promulgated, men have said, Away with it! *away with it!* The whole world thinks the other way. It is a new thing, and therefore *can not be true*. According to the gentleman’s reasoning, when Universalism becomes *popular*, then it will be *true*; wont it? When it is a new thing, and but few men advocate it, it is *false* and *heterodox*; but when

all men begin to believe it, then it is *true*; and the signs of the times are, that it will be generally received. Universalism, seventy-five years ago, had but one Preacher in this country. Now it has more than six hundred. Then it had but here and there a believer;—now it numbers seven hundred thousand; not including Unitarians and others. Well now, bye and bye, we may be in the majority at that rate; then Mr. Waller will perhaps *come over to us*, when he finds himself in a minority, and think we are right, because in the majority.

I wish you, my friends, to call to mind his concession that there are but *two words* in the Bible signifying a world of wo in the future life. I do not intend to argue that point now, but only to call your attention to this admission.

He said that the Greek Church held, from first to last, that Jesus Christ and his Apostles taught the doctrine of eternal punishment. That is not the question. But Origen himself, it is admitted, did not believe the doctrine taught by Mr. Waller *to be a doctrine of Christianity*. How then could he have attached my friend's meaning to the language of Christ and his Apostles? On the contrary, the fact is evidence that the words in the Greek did *not* convey to his mind, being a Greek, that meaning, in his day. He took them and believed in them as the teaching of the Bible; but not in the modern sense of those words. So did Clement of Alexandria, who lived before Origen's time. So did Didymus, if I am not mistaken, and Gregory Nazianzen; and so I maintain the Christian world took them, till the Catholic church condemned the doctrine of final salvation, and established that of ENDLESS DAMNATION, about five hundred years after Christ. No, the Church never held this latter doctrine, till the time of Tertullian, so far as history informs us. I know of not a single man who advocated it till his time, who said that the misery of the wicked was *equal in duration* to the happiness of the righteous. He is the *first man of distinction* in the Christian church, that I am aware of, who ever distinctly taught it. And how? What was his spirit? It was the spirit congenial to the doctrine itself. For Tertullian, in speaking of the persecutions of the Christians, and relating how they suffered at the hands of their enemies, exclaims, in view of their enduring "all Hell-hor-

rors" hereafter, "How I shall laugh! and how exult! how rejoice! when seated in heaven, and our enemies in Hell, to see them writhing in the tortures of Hell fire! To see them spitted, and roasting upon gridirons, or dancing in the flames of eternal fire!" This would fill his soul with delight and exultation! This would sweeten to him the joys of heaven! a *worthy man* to say that the punishment of the wicked must equal in duration the happiness of the righteous! But let that pass.

Mr. Waller said that the forgiveness of God was according to the meaning of the human language; because that is the language in which the Bible is written. He said that therefore the sinner could not be fully punished, and yet the sin forgiven; because the same could not happen in human courts of law; and therefore forgiveness means the same in God's law as in man's language. Has he attempted to set aside the Word of God which I quoted, where the penalty was all suffered, yet the sinner forgiven? No. But he has applied himself to *ridicule*. That was the amount of his argument. Let him set aside the passages I have quoted: unless he chooses to rest upon ridicule in such matters; ridicule, too, not of us merely, but of the Bible. Let us have the Word of God. Did not David, the anointed king of God's people, commit murder and adultery? and what was the sentence of the Prophet of God upon him? Nathan told him, "your crime is pardoned, or forgiven. But *nevertheless*, your child shall die, and the sword shall not depart from your house." Now did not David endure the penalty of his offence; yet was he not pardoned? When he sets this aside, not by ridicule, but by Scripture, I shall find more to the same effect.

His quotation from Origen in reference to his being mistaken, only confirms what I said as to his use of the word, "everlasting," as applied to punishment. The use of this word he did not understand as a proof that it was *endless*. Jesus and the Apostles applied the Greek word which is translated "everlasting," to the punishment of the wicked. So Origen naturally used it in a similar sense; that is, in a *limited* sense. But let us pass on.

We hear the inquiry, "*saved from what?*" I answer, saved from sin and death, to holiness and immortality. I ask him now, if he says it is from an endless Hell, to show the place where it is taught? As to us, we find the

place where our doctrine is distinctly expressed: "For he shall save his people *from their sins*"—not from endless damnation. If he thinks the latter, we ask, Where is it taught? I challenge the producing of such a passage in the Oracles of Truth.

As to his twelve assumptions of Universalism, I pass them all by. Let them have all the weight they are entitled to. They all relate to the great sagacity and wonderful and marvelous doings and character of HOSEA BALLOU. His last speech was *filled*, almost, with ironical praise of the greatness and sagacity of Hosea Ballou. "He was the man; and wisdom was to die with him:" and what a wonderful thing it was, that he should be the one to make these strange discoveries in Scripture, etc. But I pass it all. If Father Ballou were here, he could look after these things for himself; but he is not. One other thought Mr. Waller had,—that the Bible did not teach any thing about the coming of Hosea Ballou in these latter days; not in 1818, at least; or any other such person in any other year, though a good many other men were to appear, as "deceivers," etc. He will recollect probably that in Revelation, an "angel" was to appear "having the Everlasting Gospel to preach to men." I do not know but *that was HOSEA BALLOU*. We can say, at least, that this *may* be a prophecy of his coming, and of the present revival of original Christianity; and I also maintain, that Hosea Ballou's is a greater Reformation than Luther's itself, or Calvin's, or those others which are considered so great in these days; and will work greater things in the purification of men's hearts, and in turning their minds to God.

"But Universalism saves unbelievers." Who but they *should* be saved? Why save believers only? Salvation goes *farther back* than belief, and *makes* them believers and righteous. In Romans xi., it is said, "For God hath concluded them all in UNBELIEF"—what for? to damn them endlessly? Then it is *universal damnation!* *none* are saved; but what follows? "*that he might have MERCY UPON ALL.*" To the same effect are the proofs which I have presented on this occasion. The Bible just states how many of mankind have sinned and gone out of the way, and then by that we are told how many will be made holy and saved. Sinners and unbelievers are the *only* ones to

be saved—saved *from* sin and unbelief. “The whole need *not* a physician,” says the Savior; “but they that are sick.”

Mr. Waller brings up a number of passages relating to the punishment of sinners, and then contrasts the Universalist doctrine with the doctrine claimed by him, by way of *opposite readings*; namely, such passages as say that the drunkard, the liar, etc., “shall *not* see life,” and that the Universalists say they “*shall* see life,” etc., etc. What does Mr. Waller preach for? Is it not to bring men to believe on the Son of God? Is not that his mission on the earth—whereby the *unrighteous* may “see life?” How *can* the unrighteous see life? Can they see it while they remain in darkness and unbelief? No; they see it in the light of faith and righteousness. The Bible says that while men remain sinners they are in *condemnation*, and the wrath of God abideth on them. How long does it abide? While they continue sinful. But they are made to see the light, and become righteous; and then the wrath of God is removed.

So with the passage quoted by him,—“no murderer,” etc., “hath eternal life.” What have we to do with that? Who disputes it? Did he ever know a Universalist deny it? Never, never? What is it quoted for? Is it to prove that murderers never can be saved? If that is not the object, the text has no place in this discussion. But I ask my friend *if he does not believe murderers may be saved?* I should like an explicit and direct answer to this in his next speech. I insist on this from him in reference to the passage quoted. My friend, allow me to say, *does* believe that some murderers *are* saved. But he will say, not *as murderers*. Neither do we. I have hinted no such doctrine as that. We say they are saved *from* their revengeful dispositions. That is what constitutes them murderers. “*He that hateth his brother is a murderer.*” Does the passage sweep all such into damnation, and is that damnation endless. What then are we to do with it? Is it quoted to bear on this discussion! Can no murderer ever be saved? Yes, all. If the gentlemen dare deny that some murderers are saved, I want to know why he preaches to the sinner? If he admits that *some* are saved, why quote this passage as bearing on this discussion? We admit the passages as applied to the punishment of sin, in this life.

But if he denies that *any* murderers are saved, I shall have something more to say. I add nothing more at present. I hope he will not pass over these remarks; because he quotes a great many such passages; such as that "all liars shall have their portion in the lake that burns with fire," etc. He will find that he must believe that *all men* must be damned eternally; because all men sin while they live. "No man liveth and sinneth not." But if he wishes us to understand that these passages apply to a future state, *he himself does not believe the declaration.* I charge it upon him: He don't believe the declaration. Not an orthodox man in the world believes it. They are continually talking upon the eternity of future punishment, and quoting such passages, and I now charge it on Mr. Waller that he don't believe the passages, if taken to mean punishment in a future life, and that the second death is in a future state. *He don't believe the passages.* I repeat this, and insist upon it; because of the frequency of such quotations, and the importance attached to them in this discussion. I admit all the passages to be true. I admit that all murderers, liars, etc., have not eternal life, but are condemned to Hell, etc. We shall have this word, Hell, in debate bye and bye. If the words rendered Hell, are brought to bear on the doctrine of endless punishment, I shall have something else to say about them. If these remarks are turned aside in the next speech of Mr. Waller, I shall set it right when I make my next reply.

The punishment denounced in such passages is in the present life; because denounced against *all*—and all are *not* punished *hereafter*, as is admitted. He insists upon my arguing the question whether all punishment is in the present life, or whether there is any future retribution for sin. *I shall not go aside from the main proposition.* I have too frequently noticed small matters as we go along, however; and I will here notice a remark he made about the sufficiency of retribution in this life. He quoted a passage where God authorized the punishment of murder by the Mosaic law. The murderer was to be stoned to death; and that was a proof that sin did not adequately punish itself. I ask who punishes sin? or when or where shall we say it is punished? Does he want to take a cudgel to knock his own brains out? *The very facts quoted,*

show that the punishment brought on by the sin was inflicted *in this life*, on his own admission; and that, while he is contending that men are *not* rewarded according to their deeds in this life. He should refer to cases in Scripture, where men are *not* rewarded, and where all the punishment denounced by God is *not* inflicted, in this life.

In Proverbs xi. 31, it is declared that "the righteous *are recompensed* IN THE EARTH; much more [or assuredly] the wicked and the sinner." Is there a solitary passage where the Bible has said the contrary? There may be passages where it is told that the wicked had not been adequately punished *at some one point of time* in their lives; and yet there may have been still a point of time when they were to be fully punished, though that time was not then. It does not follow that they are never fully punished in this life, because at any particular point of time, it has not been all endured.

There is one passage from Hebrews ii. 2, which settles the question conclusively, as to whether men may be fully punished in the present state of existence. "For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and EVERY transgression and disobedience RECEIVED a *just recompense of reward*.; how shall we escape," etc.? Mark!—"RECEIVED a JUST recompense of reward." Is it not a strange thing under the Divine government, that they should be declared to *have already received* their punishment—a *just* punishment; and that God should damn them endlessly—punish them *over again*! Every transgression and disobedience *had* received its reward, and yet those men are to be taken hereafter, and judged, and sent to Hell forever! But let that pass, for the present.

The next point is the present *misery* of the *righteous*, and the *happiness* of the *wicked*. Mr. Waller teaches that; he says the righteous are not rewarded, nor the wicked punished, in this life. Hear what the wise man says on this point: "He that *justifieth* the WICKED, and he that *condemneth* the RIGHTEOUS, both are an *abomination* to the Lord." Mark you: "He that JUSTIFIETH the *wicked*, and he that CONDEMNETH the *righteous*, BOTH are an *abomination* to the Lord." Now Mr. Waller makes God commit this "abomination." The wicked are happy and the righteous miserable under God's government. Oh! but they are to be recompensed *hereafter*: justice is not done



them in this world, to be sure; but will be in the next. Well, if God is not just *here*, there is no evidence that he *ever will be*. If he is *unjust* here, he will be unjust *forever*, unless he *changes*. If he is unjust to the wicked man, and to the good man, in this life, he must be so to all eternity. For he is *unchangeably the same*, now and forever.

People are accustomed to argue that because the good man is not rewarded and the wicked punished in this life, they will be in the next. This would be the very reason why they will *not*; for the Supreme Ruler changes not. But it is asked, Is not immortal life the reward of the righteous? No. It is simply the *gift of God*; as is the present life. If there are *sinner*s hereafter, and if any suffer temptation, and yield to it, in the next world, I admit they will be punished hereafter. If *sin* is to be endless, punishment will be endless; because where there is sin, there must be punishment, whether in time, or in eternity.

Arg. 5. One other argument I will now advance; and will quote a passage or two containing the word "salvation." I am aware there is a debate as to the meaning of this term. But as we are so far advanced, I shall take the liberty to refer to it. I shall claim it in the sense assumed in the proposition. However many other meanings it may have elsewhere, I shall claim this meaning for it in the following passages; and defend it.

1 Tim. ii. 4: "Who (God) *will have* ALL MEN to be *saved*, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." Here the Apostle does not say when or where men are to be saved. That he does not tell us; nor do I, now. He states only the great central truth, that God *WILL HAVE* all men to be *saved*.

One word as to the certainty of the accomplishment of all that God wills. See Isaiah xliii. 13: "I *will work*, and who shall let it?" Daniel iv. 35: "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 doest thou?" The will of God will certainly be done. The question now is, does the phrase "all men" here, *mean* all men? I shall not touch that question, until Mr. Waller denies that position.

1 Tim. iv. 9, 10: "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance; for therefore we both labor and suffer

reproach, because we trust in the living God who is the Savior of all men, especially of those that believe."— Here is a plain declaration of the salvation of all men, and especially of those that believe. We admit that there is a *present, special* salvation to the righteous; but insist that the salvation of *all men* is the *ultimate* salvation. In what sense is God called the "Savior of all men?" in *the present life?* as some assert.

I will resume this subject, in my next speech, nothing preventing.

[MR. WALLER'S FOURTH REPLY.]

MR. BRUCE, one of the Moderators, here said that he wished to read one of the Rules of Discussion, viz. "5. The disputants are not to indulge in any personal reflections towards each other, but shall treat each other with respect and courtesy."

MR. WALLER. The reading of that rule after Mr. Pingree had set down, and since I have arisen to speak, authorizes the conclusion that the reader of it designed somehow to apply it to me; either that I had violated it, or that unless I was careful I would do so in responding to the last speech. He need have no fears of my response. I feel no disposition even to come as near violating it as Mr. Pingree thought proper to do. And if it was designed to apply to any thing past, I am sure this audience will vindicate me from the implied imputation. I am sure I have intended no personal reflections upon my opponent, none whatever; nor do I believe I have used any. True, Mr. Pingree has complained because I quoted Pope in reference to "a little learning;" but I made no application of the passage. If it suited him to apply the quotation to himself, and as suitable to his circumstances, am I to be held responsible? I have a right to quote the poets, nor will I yield that right: and I am not at all disposed to question the gentleman's right of making any application of them that suits his convenience.

It will be proper, this morning, to spend a little time in recapitulation. You will bear in mind the question, "*Do the Scriptures teach the ultimate holiness and salvation of all mankind?*" It is the business of Mr. Pingree to establish this proposition; and I have done all that the conditions of the question require when I simply show that he has not

proved it. I am not bound to do more, although I intend to do much more.

Now how does my friend prove this proposition? By direct proof? No, but by the most tortuous ratiocination. In the first place, he infers from the character of God, his goodness and his love, that all men will ultimately be holy and saved; and yet the plenitude of that goodness and love is made appear by asserting that God metes out to every transgressor a full and adequate punishment for every sin! and consequently, in denying his mercy, his grace, and his forgiving love!! Our heavenly Father, according to him, forgives no debt, but in marvelous goodness, exacts the uttermost farthing! And in this way, without grace or mercy, makes holy and saves all!!

But he goes further; and in connection with this point, draws another inference in favor of his doctrines, from the unchangeable goodness and love of God. God loves his creatures now, even sinners, and is good towards them; and as he is unchangeable, this goodness and love must continue forever, and hence follows the ultimate holiness and salvation of all mankind! But this argument is two-edged: it cuts both ways; and if it establishes Universalism one moment, it decapitates it the next. Thus: God's goodness and love to his creatures are manifested in the sin and misery of his creatures in this world, and since his loving kindness changes not, they must remain in sin and misery through eternity! Now this, so far from proving universal salvation, squints awfully towards universal damnation! But let us extend this argument: We were told that God is good to all in this life, even to the evil and unthankful; but why infer hence that he will make all holy and happy in heaven? Is not the legitimate inference from the premises, that he will make all holy and happy in this world? Why does his goodness not operate to their holiness and salvation here, seeing that Universalism asserts that all salvation is confined to this world? It is a monstrous deduction to conclude from a goodness and love which permit sin and misery in this world, that there will be none in the next. The premises and the conclusions are wide as the poles asunder. Or is it contended that God, on account of his cruelty in permitting sin and sorrow here, will *change* and not permit them to exist hereafter? Oh no! for it is asserted that he is unchangeable! Very

well; the goodness that permits sin and misery in time, being unchangeable, must permit it through eternity! The gentleman is buried in the ruins of his own castle. And yet you are boastingly told by the gentleman that he established this position by arguments that had not and could not be met!

His second argument, founded upon Romans viii. 19—23, is of a piece with the last; it proves too much for him, as we shall see. I need not recapitulate what I have already said. Permit me, however, to pause a moment, to remark, that I suspect Mr. Pingree has misrepresented Mr. Wesley. Here are Wesley's Notes on the New Testament, and he does *not* say that the word "creature" or "creation" means the brutes. I suppose Mr. Pingree never saw this work. Mr. Wesley, in his comment upon this passage, makes no such application of the word as the gentleman has imputed to him.

MR. PINGREE. He says it elsewhere.

MR. WALLER. I have no other of Wesley's works at hand. He does not say it in this work; and if he says it in any work, the gentleman certainly owes it to himself to make it appear. I hope he will relieve himself from the suspicion of misrepresenting a man, because he has not read his writings. But to proceed.

Now the argument on this passage in Romans turns upon the meaning as here used of the word "creature," or "creation." The word itself and alone may just as well mean brutes as men, and frogs as angels. The word, then, must be limited to suit the context. The gentleman himself has limited it, as I showed on yesterday; and limited it just to suit his purposes. He is anxious to include in it all mankind, and especially the ungodly and the sinners. Let us then examine the context. The Apostle commences the chapter by telling us, that there is "now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." He does not mean that there is now no condemnation *to any*. For he says, verse viii., etc. "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God: but ye [believers, not all mankind] are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be the spirit of God dwell in you. Now, if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of

righteousness. \* \* \* \* \* The spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we [believers] are the children of God; and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us," [believers.] And then follows the passage in controversy. Now who was the Apostle talking about? Not angels, nor brutes, nor stocks, nor stones; not drunkards, nor liars, nor murderers, nor thieves, nor robbers; but BELIEVERS, who walked not after the flesh, but after the spirit. If Mr. Pingree must include the murderer, the drunkard, and all liars, I shall insist too that he take with his cargo, the brutes, and all things else that have been made. The Apostle, and not Mr. Pingree, the context and not Universalism, must make the limitation. In the immediate context we find nothing more said of the unbelievers and the ungodly, than we do of the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air: and if one must be included, so must the other.

But how can he possibly include all mankind in this term as it stands connected? Will he affirm that infants and idiots are earnestly expecting and waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God? Dare he affirm that this is true of the heathen, who know nothing of the matter? That it is true of the atheist who denies the existence of God, and affirms that death is an eternal sleep? Or will he even say that this is true of unconverted men? I demand an answer to these questions. I invite him to hazard, if he dares, his reputation for critical acumen, I almost said, for *common sense*, by assuming such positions before this audience. He will not do it. Mark the prediction.

His third argument was derived from Romans the 5th. Now read that chapter. The Apostle is proving that the righteous shall be saved through Jesus Christ. That "they which receive *abundance of grace*, and of the *gift of righteousness*, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ"—that "even so might grace reign *through righteousness* unto eternal life." Now in the face of these plain declarations, Mr. Pingree affirms the salvation of the unrighteous? Does the Apostle here, or anywhere else say, that

the unrighteous shall have eternal life? What man has everlasting life? Let the Bible answer: "He that *believeth* on the son hath everlasting life?" Aye, more; we are told, also, "He that *believeth not* the son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." But Mr. Pingree contradicts this, and proves the salvation of unbelievers and the unrighteous, by a passage which affirms the salvation of the righteous!!

He next attempted to derive an argument from Colossians i. 20. I will read the passage in its connection: "For it pleaseth the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace, through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were some time 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 unblameable in his sight, if you continue *in the faith* grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel, which ye have heard," etc. Now the only possible reason why this passage should have been quoted, was in consequence of its using the phrase "all things;" or rather, simply because the word "all" occurs in it as well as in the question in debate. I can conceive of no other reason. The Colossians were reconciled in this life—all the reconciliation that takes place between man and God, that the Scriptures know anything about, takes place in this life. Perhaps Mr. Pingree is ready to take the ground, that unbelievers, and drunkards, and atheists; in a word, all mankind, in this life, are in a state of reconciliation with God! If so, why does he mince the matter? Why does he not speak out? If he will not speak out, or if he does not believe this, but holds that such persons dying, leave the world in a state of irreconciliation, then let him point to the passage which mentions the reconciliation that takes place in *hades*!—of the "work and the device" by which it is brought about in the grave. If he will not condescend to tell us *how* men are reconciled after they die, (and I suppose of course he will not,) surely he will so far stoop from his lofty elevation as to tell us, at least, where he obtained his information that any were reconciled after death. Such knowledge cannot be derived from the word of God. The Nauvoo

prophet professes to believe such a doctrine; but as impudent as he is, he has not the effrontery to profess to derive it from the Bible. No; he claims to have learned it by special revelation! Has Mr. Pingree had a vision? Has he been caught up to the third heavens? Has he been sent to utter oracles? Unless he has, he cannot persuade us to believe that those who die impenitent and in their sins, are reconciled, without faith, or repentance, or even hearing the Gospel, in the grave.

Thus far the gentleman has progressed. Upon such "pillars" he proposes to rear his system! He has as yet quoted no passage in which he professes to find his doctrine, except by inference; and I have shown you it is not to be found even then.

In his last speech, Mr. Pingree told us that he did not believe that salvation was confined to this life, and also that there was no punishment in the next life. He has, hitherto, time and again, endorsed the position that every sin meets a full and adequate punishment. Now here is his dilemma: He has to contradict his standard writers and say that all salvation is not in this life, because he wants to save those who die in their sins: but now he says there is no future punishment, and consequently men are not punished at all for those sins in which they die, although he has contended, with the zeal of martyrdom, that every sin is fully and adequately punished! Really, he can run across his own track with a facility perfectly astounding. But if there is no punishment after death, there can be no sin after death, Mr. Pingree and Universalism being witnesses, for punishment necessarily follows sin; and if there is neither sin nor punishment after death, in the name of common sense, how can there be any salvation? Did he not tell us, that salvation was from *sin*. It is astonishing that a disputant so adroit, should run into so many absurdities and contradictions. It is the cause and not the advocate which is at fault.

But he told you with as much coolness as if he supposed *you* could believe him, that I had made no appeal to the Scripture, but only to the opinions of men—to the mass of mankind! Now, I have quoted at least two passages of Scriptures to his one, as you all know; and if time will allow, I shall quote one hundred to his one. The fact that he made such a declaration shows that he is reduced to great

extremities, and does not know what to say or do. But this is merely by the way, and as another proof of the desperate condition of my friend's affairs.

But the gentleman still insists that Ballou and his followers are endowed with capacities to perceive the truth, beyond all the wise, and learned, and pious men that ever existed before them! That with no more evidence than others possessed, with no greater amount of mental culture, with no greater stimulus to investigation, they nevertheless have mounted immeasurably higher in the regions of light and truth than ever did the boldest adventurer in all past ages! And it would seem that he sets up these high claims too with the greatest modesty, and in the utmost abhorrence of the folly of one's being "wise in his own conceit!" But I will not trespass again upon your patience to explain my position in reference to the decision of the learned and pious of past ages, against Universalism. Mr. Pingree either finds it convenient not to understand me, or else he cannot. He has not met my argument on that point. It would be folly for me to press it further on him. I grant that Christians professedly have been and are divided in sentiment, and that too on some important points; but now nor never were they divided on so important and vital a question as this. The reason of the division has been that lack of information requisite to comprehend the matter, and the prevalence of a spirit hostile to free and dispassionate investigation. But nothing of the kind ever pertained in relation to this subject. The only way we can account for their unanimous rejection of it, is to be ascribed to a deliberate conspiracy against the truth! No other explanation can be given. But I have hitherto said enough on this question.

But my friend seems to think he will not always be in the minority. That wonderful sagacity of intellect, which he has in common with his "father Ballou," has all of a sudden imparted to him a seer's optics; and he has cast his eyes through the darkness of the future, and has decried the brightness of the day when Universalism shall possess the earth, and shed its mellow influences in all hearts! I am sorry he got off the tripod before he uttered all his oracle! He ought to have told us the times and the seasons, aye, "the day and the hour;" for surely that was no ordinary revelation he had—the oracular *inflatus* was



very great! But, indeed, that glorious event, he intimated, was close at hand; for he dropt the hint that I might live to see it. I do not suppose that he thought me likely to be blessed with antideluvian longevity. My impaired health and shattered constitution would forbid such a supposition. No, the time is at hand surely. It will doubtless be coeval with Miller's conflagration, and the Mormon millennium. Oh, how the world will be amazed, when such a trio of glorious events shall burst at once upon its vision!

By the same gift of second sight—that gift of the redoubtable McFingal, which enabled him to see what could not be seen,—I say, I presume it was by some such aid, that Mr. Pingree was enabled to see seven hundred thousand Universalists in the United States! But he must pardon me if I am less credulous in relation to this part of his oracle, than the rest. I am willing to grant that, should my life be spared to see the Universalist millenium, that it is highly probable I will be a Universalist; but really I cannot believe this seven hundred thousand story, until I see it made out by figures. I demand the statistics. He ought not to settle such a matter by oracle. No, we must have the figures—*they cannot lie*.

In due time, I will attend to the words in the original language, translated *hell*, in the common version. I pass them and what the gentlemen said in relation to them, for the present.

He says, that Origen, and before him, Clement, Gregory Nazianzen, etc., used the word *aionios*, in reference to punishment, in a limited sense; not as meaning endless. I will give him a premium to make that statement good by quotations from those authors. *They do no such thing*. All the writings of the "fathers" may be seen in the library of Lane Seminary, Cincinnati; and I defy him to prove that this word was so used by any of them; or that Origen ever attempted to prove his peculiar notions from the Bible.

Nor is it true, that no one until Tertullian asserted endless punishment. The Apostolic fathers asserted it. Irenæus says, the whole church of the second century asserted it. These works are here, and the gentleman is welcome to consult them. But I do not believe he will venture to dispute what I say. Indeed, the passage he pro-

fessed to quote from Tertullian, to say the least, if in the writings of that father at all, has been very freely translated for the gentleman's use. I have read the works of Tertullian, but I do not recollect the passage as it was quoted. But admitting it, it proves nothing whatever, further than that Tertullian, as was his custom, carried a doctrine universally received, to an unnecessary extent.

The gentleman has the most fruitful of fancies. Its creations are most marvelous,—I had almost said *most ridiculous!* He was almost ready to assert that his "father Ballou" was the apocalyptic angel, flying through the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach! And indeed, he did affirm, that Ballou's reformation was greater than that of Luther's!! No marvel that you smile. For myself I am firmly persuaded that if any thing prophetic was ever recorded of Mr. Ballou, it was a prediction of one of the Mahometan seers, to the effect that antichrist was a huge donkey, which should appear in the latter days, and attract millions to perdition by the music of his braying! But notwithstanding he one minute thus clothes his spiritual father in robes of glory, he the next minute, with paracidal ferocity, would tear them from him: for he asserts that Universalism did exist prior to 1818, when it came forth from the prolific scone of Mr. Ballou, as erst of old did the goddess of wisdom from the brains of Jupiter! But Mr. Pingree should not do so. The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. He is wrong in spirit and in fact. In *spirit*, because he is wholly indebted for his present commanding position in the religious world to that man whom he would thus rob of his honor—he is a *consequence* of Mr. Ballou. In *fact*, because he has been wholly unable, although challenged to do so, to adduce a solitary individual who traversed the road of Universalism before the said Hosea Ballou. But to come to more grave matters.

He charges that I hold that unbelievers will be saved—that I preach to them for that purpose,—that I hold that murderers will be saved, etc. Now to all this I give a most emphatic denial. I do not teach that an unbeliever will be saved; nor would I tell one so for my right arm. Nor am I wont to contradict the Bible, and tell a murderer that he hath eternal life abiding in him, when God declares he has not. I am not wont to cry, "peace, peace," to the

wicked, when the Almighty has declared there is no peace to the wicked. I will not, as do Universalist ministers, hold out the prospect of eternal felicity to the drunkard, the liar, the swearer; the man polluted with every vice and stained with every crime, when the voice of heaven declares that such "shall not inherit the kingdom of God." No, I teach that the believer, and not the unbeliever "hath everlasting life." I say to the poor in spirit, that "theirs is the kingdom of heaven;" to mourners, that "they shall be comforted;" to the meek, that "they shall inherit the earth;" to those that hunger and thirst after righteousness, that "they shall be filled;" to the merciful, that "they shall obtain mercy;" to the pure in heart, that "they shall see God." I say to those who are led by the spirit of God, that "they are the sons of God." And in so doing I speak as He, by whose authority I profess to preach, authorizes me to speak. But never, no never, will I proclaim peace and safety to the sinner. I tell the unbelievers that "the wrath of God abideth on them"—that "without faith it is impossible to please God." That they must repent or perish—turn or burn. That to be carnally minded is death—that they that are in the flesh cannot please God—that "the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolators, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." No, I do not preach peace to the ungodly and the sinner. Mr. Pingree wholly misunderstands me.

But I *do* hold to the transforming influences of the Gospel. I *do* teach that by the grace and spirit of God, men are "born again"—that they become new "creatures;" that "old things pass away, and all things become new." That by this new creating process, I teach that unbelievers become believers, sinners become saints, that children of the devil become children of God, slaves of the wicked ~~one~~ become Christ's freemen, drunkards become temperate in all things, etc. But my Bible teaches that these opposite characters are different moral beings—that they are not the same, not what they once were: that they are new creatures—that they have passed from death unto life—that they are born again. This is the genius of the Christian religion—it changes, remodels men, creates them anew in Christ—they are washed and justified: but

it takes no murderers, or liars, or drunkards, etc. into heaven. None but the spirits of the *just* are in heaven; nothing unclean can enter there. But why enlarge on a point so plain. I hardly think it possible that Universalism itself can blind the eyes of any to this subject.

But Mr. Pingree will tell you that he subscribes to this doctrine—that he holds that no man is saved in unbelief—that he must become a believer first—that the murderer, etc., must be changed. But when is the change effected? In many instances, he will tell you, not in this life—consequently not by the Gospel, not by the spirit of God. The man dying in unbelief, according to his theory, becomes a believer in the grave! He believes without hearing!! The murderer's heart is transformed, without the influence of the spirit of grace, in the grave! Let us trace this absurdity further. The Gospel is preached to men, and they reject it. God calls, but they refuse. He stretches out his hand all the day long, and no man regards it. They die impenitent, unbelievers, atheists, infidels, blasphemers, foul with every sin: and yet in the grave, without hearing, they believe: the atheist gives his heart to God, the infidel embraces the Gospel, the blasphemer chants the praises of Jesus, and every sin is washed from the soul without the blood of Christ, without the spirit of God!! *How?* Mr. Pingree says he cannot tell! that he is not bound to tell! But who informed him it was so at all? He has quoted nothing from the Scriptures to prove it. Common sense startles at it. I again call for the proof to authorize the supposition of the existence of absurdities so monstrous and nonsensical. Let him make good his implied superiority in knowledge respecting the affairs of the spirit-land.

There was a passage quoted by the gentleman in his last speech, and it is quite a favorite among Universalists, which demands a passing notice, if for no other reason, to show the sandy foundation upon which this system rests. The passage alluded to is Proverbs xi. 31: "Behold the righteous man, shall he not be recompensed in the earth? much more the wicked and the sinner." So it was quoted by Mr. Pingree, and so it reads in the common version. It is in the mouth of every Universalist, to prove that there is not a state of rewards and punishments in another life. But this is a wrong translation. It is rendered in

the Septuagint, "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear." That this is a correct rendering, is evident from the fact, that the Apostle Peter, by inspiration, quotes it, 1 Peter iv. 18. This quotation, by Peter, gives divine sanction to the rendering of this passage in the Septuagint, and dashes this delicious cup forever from the lips of Universalists.

Mr. Pingree, in order to show that sin was fully punished in this life, quotes Hebrews ii. 2, 3: "For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" etc. Now this was quoted to show that when a murderer and other criminals were punished under the Mosaic law, it was a "just recompence of reward," and, therefore, all the punishment they would receive. Now a thing is just which is done according to an equitable law. Hence, the murderer was justly punishable with death; that is, suffered according to law. This is all the passage means. But this was a law of human society; it could neither annul or supercede a divine law, under which he might also justly suffer. The parallel passage ought to have been taken in connection with this: 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 unto the Spirit of grace?" Here then is a punishment *much sorer* than to die without mercy, threatened those who despise the Gospel—*much sorer* than the worst punishment inflicted by the Mosaic law; can such a punishment be inflicted in this life? If so, what can it be? How can it be inflicted?

There was another singular position assumed by my opponent, which I will just state. It is one of those arguments with which his speeches abound, that *cannot be answered*. If I understood him, he contended that the sufferings experienced by the righteous here were somehow or other conducive to their happiness in this life! And that the happiness of the wicked in this life, was no happiness at all, but punishment! I merely state the matter as I understood him, and frankly confess I have no answer to give to *such* argumentation.

I come now to notice his *fifth* argument. This was founded on 1 Tim. ii. 4, (if I did not mistake his reference,) "Who will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth." Well, Universalism asserts that "the evils from which Christ came to save men are in this world;" and Mr. Pingree tells us that salvation is from sin. Then this passage means, that God "would have all men to be saved" *from sin in this world*, "and come to the knowledge of the truth." And Mr. Pingree says that God's will cannot be frustrated, and, therefore, we must conclude, although every thing gives the lie to the conclusion, *that all men are saved from sin in this life, and come to the knowledge of the truth!!* Universalism must be one of the "*lying wonders*," mentioned in prophecy.

But he quoted in confirmation of this position, 1 Tim. iv. 10: "We trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of those that believe." Here is a book called "*Exposition of Universalism*," by "Rev. I. D. Williamson;" and in it is a sermon on this very text, p. 155. In this sermon, he proves, in strict accordance with his system, as I have already shown, that this *special salvation takes place in this life*. He says, "1. The believer is saved from sin, the direst foe of man. 2. The believer is saved from ignorance of God and his character. And 3rd. The believer is saved from the bondage of the fear of death." The *especial salvation* is in this world, where then must the *common salvation* be? The *great salvation* of the text, the Universalists tell us, is in this life; and then leave us to infer, and marvel that we do not infer, that the *less salvation* is in the life to come! The believer is saved in this world, and the unbeliever in the world to come! Such an exposition is worthy only of the lunatic asylum. But so Universalism expounds the word of God.

[MR. PINGREE'S FIFTH SPEECH.]

RESPECTED FRIENDS:—You will permit me to make one remark,—and I am grateful to the Moderators for calling attention to it,—respecting the gentleman's quotations from the poets—"a little learning is a dangerous thing," etc., which he says he had no intention to apply to me. If he did not intend them to apply to me, I should like to know their relevancy to the present discussion. What have such quotations to do with the question, "Do the Scriptures teach the ultimate holiness and salvation of all men?"—

whether all men shall be holy and happy; or some howl in endless despair?

Mr. Waller says that according to Universalism, there is no *goodness* in God, because he punishes the sinner according to what he deserves. Parents! is there no goodness in you, if you punish your children according to what they deserve? Wherein is there a want of goodness in a parent who punishes children as they deserve, and for *their own benefit*? That God punishes sinners as they deserve, is not denied; but it is denied that he punishes them endlessly hereafter, for the transgressions of this life. That is Mr. Waller's doctrine; not mine. I say there *is* goodness in punishing the sinner, to reform and benefit him. But where is the goodness of God upon the theory of the gentleman? Is there goodness exhibited in TORTURING men to all eternity, and in incapacitating them from all repentance hereafter! There *is* goodness in a parent who punishes his child to improve his character. It may be done with all the kindness of a father, in a spirit of *love*, for the good of the child. But if he should TORTURE him in a cruel manner, and to gratify a malignant nature, we may say he is *not* good. By adopting the latter as the conduct of God, we impeach him with an act which we would not permit a man to do. We cannot believe it is consistent with the nature of God to do an act we should attribute to the gratification of a revengeful spirit. But as to limited punishment, for the benefit and improvement and ultimate happiness of the sufferer; this we say is good; and we see in it the work of a Heavenly Father. This is all we say; and all it is necessary to say as to that argument. Especially with reference to the idea of the gentleman, that for the sins committed in this life the punishment is *unlimited*, ENDLESS, not for the reformation of sinners, but for *vengeance* only, and that consequently God's creatures are delivered at once and finally to the power of the Devil, to be tortured in eternal fire, with the power of repentance taken from them by their Creator; and this I suppose the gentleman claims to be the height of goodness! This is the *perfection of* BENEVOLENCE in the Heavenly Father of our Spirits, and the God of all grace and mercy!! whose very nature and essence is LOVE!! That is *logic*; is it? That is logic worthy of a man who appeals to majorities in such discussions, and to the "mass of well regulated minds!"

Let us pass on. We hear next the inquiry, if God is so good as to save all, why does he not save them *now*? God knows; I do not. There is sufficient testimony that we were made and are now "subject to vanity," in this world. If the gentleman wants to know *why*, he must ask not men, nor angels; he must ask the Being that made us so. I have shown from the Bible that we "shall be *delivered* from the bondage of corruption." All I can say as to the rest, is that God so *designed* it, that we should be subject to vanity; for what object, He only knows. We must not "be wise above what is written." The declaration is as plain as the Word of God can make it, and as written in human language.

The gentleman says that the works of Wesley do not contain the statement that the word "creature," (Romans 8th.) is applied to the *brute* creation. The declaration was taken from a *sermon* of Wesley, and not from his Notes. If any individual here has Wesley's Sermons, I should like to see them. The sermon I think was on that text.

Let us read what he says here, in his Notes. He quotes the passage: "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God." It includes all the visible creation. Believers are expressly spoken of apart, (and "not they only but *ourselves* also,") yet embraced in it. It is like a passage in John (1 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." Here "the world" is distinguished from "ourselves," and separated, yet, though a special notice is taken of "ourselves," the whole world is embraced afterwards in the propitiation. Should we believe that because believers are *special*ly noticed, that there is any exception meant either in favor of or against them? I now read from Wesley:

"19. *For the earnest expectation*—The word denotes a lively hope of something drawing near, and a vehement longing after it; *of the creation*—Of all visible creatures, (believers excepted, who are spoken of apart.) Each kind, according as it is capable. All these have been sufferers through sin. And to all these (the finally impenitent excepted"—

Do we find that exception in the Bible? the passage itself (15th Corinthians,) makes *no such exception*; and none can be allowed. But let us read on:—"shall refreshment



redound from the glory of the children of God. Upright heathens are by no means to be excluded from this *earnest expectation*. Nay, perhaps something of it may at some times be found even in the vainest of men; who (although in the hurry of life they mistake vanity for liberty, and partly stifle, partly dissemble their groans, yet) in their sober, quiet, sleepless, afflicted hours, pour forth many sighs in the ear of God."

"20. *The creation was made subject to vanity*—Abuse, misery, and corruption, *by him who subjected it*—Namely, God, Gen. iii. 17; v. 29. Adam only made it liable to the sentence which God pronounced; yet not without hope."

"21. *The creation itself shall be delivered*—Destruction is not deliverance. Therefore whatsoever is destroyed, or ceases to be, is not delivered at all. Will then any part of the creation be destroyed? *Into the glorious liberty*—The excellent state wherein they were created."

Thus we see he embraces all creation in a strict sense. I spoke of the word "*creation*," as meaning the *human creation*. But if my friend includes stocks and stones, I have no objection. But I do not ask it. I ask only so much of creation as is properly "subject to vanity, and to be *delivered from* the bondage of corruption," etc.

He attempted to show that *Christians alone* are spoken of in Romans viii. He read the preceding context, where the Apostle speaks of "you," and "we," addressing the Roman Christians who were then living, and actually enjoying, in part, that condition of salvation which is afterwards spoken of as the promised gift to the whole creation. Mr. Waller wishes to make it appear that the whole chapter relates to the Roman Christians, to whom he was writing. If this were so, literally, what would become of my friend, or any of us living now, and in this place? Why, no man now living has any thing to do with this promise of Scripture, if it was meant to be confined to Roman Christians then living, whom he addressed. The true explanation is, that in one part, he is addressing them, and in another part he is speaking of *the whole human creation*, as destined to be "delivered." The righteous are spoken of in a peculiar manner, as worthy of notice; but all are embraced, as experiencing the *ultimate* deliverance.

He says I made an argument in favor of universal salvation from a passage which expressly states that men are

only saved "through righteousness"—and that we say therefore that men are saved while *unrighteous*.—Not so. I said on Paul's authority that men will "be made righteous," and *thus* saved. That they will, is proved by the passage I relied on; for it says, as I showed before, that all will *become righteous*, through the obedience of Jesus Christ. I do not believe I made any such argument as he attributes to me. I certainly did not use the passage in the sense he now charges. He foists a passage and argument upon me, which I never used, and thus attempts to lead you astray. I *did not* found any argument on that verse.

He asks whether all men are saved in this life? No; all know they are not; nor have I argued thus.

With respect to the passage I read, (Colossians i. 20,) "by him to reconcile all things to himself," he says this was addressed to the Colossians; and they were reconciled already. Now if this be the case literally, no man can claim this promise as applying to himself. Where is *his* reconciliation, (pointing to Mr. Waller;) and where is the reconciliation of all the Baptists now living, if the "reconciliation" concerned the Colossian Christians *alone*? And if *not* them exclusively, Mr. Waller's objection is forceless. The Colossians *were* reconciled, it is true; but the promise of reconciliation applies to us too, and to all men. Does he not see that all these things are done *now*, as well as *then*; and that this, according to his argument in reply to mine, is a direct contradiction of the promises of Almighty God? The language and expression of the promises forbid their *exclusive* application to the individual Christians then living, to whom they were addressed; and show them to apply to the ultimate condition of all mankind. The Colossians were reconciled *already*—but all men were *to be* reconciled, finally. Christ is to reconcile the whole world to God.

He says if God is good enough to make all righteous and happy in a future world, he would do it *now*. I deny it. *Now*, we are "subject to vanity." *That* is God's will *now*. That is our present condition. The righteous suffer now in consequence of the violation of his laws. No man would violate them, or suffer from their violation by others, except by the peculiar social condition of the human race and being "made subject to vanity." If there is "vanity" hereafter, then there will be suffering. Man is made sub-

ject to vanity here. It is so arranged under the Divine Government, for great and glorious ends to human beings. *Why* and *how* it occurred, we are entirely ignorant. None "can find out God to perfection."

My friend asks, if there is no punishment after death, what are men saved from? They are saved from "vanity," and "the bondage of corruption," and *sin*, and *death*.

He says he can boast of having quoted six more texts than I have. He may easily read a string of six or eight passages, or sixty even, as he does, without showing how they bear on the discussion, as he required me to do. I quote a few passages at a time, and show their bearing upon the subject.

He says that Hosea Ballou was "wise in his own conceit;" and talks about the great wonder and marvelous thing, that he should have been the first to discover what is so plainly revealed in Scripture, etc. The time will come when justice will be done to that great and good man. If he were here, doubtless he could speak for himself;—but he is *not* here, and Mr. Waller shows himself a brave warrior by contending with an absent combatant! Perhaps he had better attend to *my* arguments, in *this* discussion, and save Father Ballou's until another time. This course would be more satisfactory to me, and to this audience.

I did not bring a load of books here to refer to, because I thought the appeal was not to "authority," but the words of Scripture. I may have "little learning," it is true; but I have enough to read the Divine Word, and attempt to present its teachings to men.

The Apostolic fathers did not all use the word "eternal," to signify *endless*, in our sense of that word. Clement did not use it so; and the farther back we go towards the sacred writers, we find less use made of it in that sense; till we come to the Apostles, and find that none of them used it so. But as we come down in the history of the church to the more corrupt times of Christianity, we find religion filled with absurd, monkish, and false ideas; and so down to modern Partialism, as it prevails in the present day.

I gave you an example of some of the writings attributed to the fathers. Mosheim says that many absurd writings were attributed to the fathers; but there is *no absolute* proof that they were written by them.

That, however, is not the question. It has nothing to do

with the question, "Do the SCRIPTURES teach the ultimate holiness and salvation of all men?" If we were to appeal to human authority, we should go to the Mother Church, and obey her, and die in her communion. I have read Eusebius' history of the Church in the first three centuries; and this ancient Christian, in speaking of the persecution of the saints and of the punishment of those who persecuted them, does not once speak of misery and torment in the life to come: and Eusebius lived back near to the time of the Apostolic fathers.

"I affirm that *no murderer and no liar can be saved*," says Mr. Waller. Was not DAVID a murderer? and was he not saved? Peter LIED, denying his Lord and Master, with cursing and swearing: was Peter not saved? "Oh! but those who *die* unbelievers cannot be saved." Where does the Bible say that those who *die* murderers, liars, etc., cannot be saved? "But the Bible says no murderer hath eternal life." It does not say that *after death* the murderer *may not have* eternal life.

There is one thought which I wish to express here. It is the common belief among the Orthodox, that the eternal condition of men depends upon the state of mind and heart when *they die*. Yet they are always quoting the Bible to prove that men are recompensed "according to their *works*." They themselves do not believe it; I charge them with not believing that men are recompensed "according to their *works*." They believe that a man may be wicked, and do all the works of the devil, during life, and until the hour of death, and then repent, and go to heaven. Is there any recompense to this man according to his works? And on the other hand, they believe that a man may be good, and do the works of godliness during his whole life, almost, and then die in sin, and go to an everlasting Hell, without hope of repentance or salvation. Is this man recompensed "according to his works?" I repeat, then, that they *do not believe* that men are rewarded and punished "according to their works."

What does salvation depend upon? The state of the mind at death? The Scriptures do not teach that. They teach that our *reward* depends on our works; and that for every sin done we are punished. But we deny that this punishment is for all eternity. We believe men are punished according to their works, and that salvation is the *gift of God*, in *another life*. They affirm that it depends upon the

state of the mind and heart *at death*. The word of God does *not* affirm this.

To affirm that unbelievers can never be saved, would be to sweep the whole entire race of man with the besom of eternal destruction into the pit of Hell! The *mass* of men *die* unbelievers; and *all men* were *once* unbelievers. There is but a small company of believers in the Christian Religion, compared to the whole human race. The whole Pagan world who have lived in all time, must be sent to eternal perdition! Do you believe that? Not only the whole Pagan world; but I should like to know what is to be the fate of *idiots, infants, etc.*? Will the gentleman set this argument aside, by saying that we have nothing to do with the fate of such persons? Nothing to do with it!? No concern of ours?! I do not profess to be guided by such views and feelings, I am interested in the whole human family, as a common brotherhood of the children of God; and if they are unbelievers here, in that they are "made subject to vanity," I believe that God has better things in store for them at the resurrection hereafter. I believe the Scriptures to teach that there is DELIVERANCE for them hereafter from the "bondage of corruption."

He says it does not follow that a man *once* a liar is *always* a liar; once a murderer *always* a murderer, etc. That's what *we* claim. We say they will be *changed*. They will become not liars — not murderers; and will be saved. That is the promise. He has admitted the very point. The passages he quoted to show they could *not* be saved, have no bearing at all. Because he *admits* that *SOME murderers, liars, etc.*, (not those who *die* so,) *can be saved*. And we say *all* can be, by the same grace, and by being changed.

He says I must tell *where* the salvation takes effect, etc. He is troubled about *where* men are saved. Are they saved in Hell? he asks. Where are they saved? etc. Does not the gentlemen believe in a *judgment* in the life to come? *When* is that to be? at the Resurrection? When is that to be? When the gentleman tells me, then I will tell him where and when all men are to be reconciled and saved. But this is a question not in the proposition before us. The Bible does not tell us when or where men are to be reconciled and saved: though we may yet, when we come to the proper passage, see some signs there of the time.

My friend, Mr. Waller, has explained himself on the sub-

ject of sin not punishing itself. He does not contend so. Their "own wickedness sometimes does correct them." The cases he referred to are punishments *in this life*. As to the expression I quoted from Proverbs, and its affirmed parallel in Peter; take the passage as quoted in Peter: will the gentlemen explain where it is that "the righteous are scarcely saved?" Is that in a future life? Dr. Adam Clarke says it relates to *temporal* matters. Thus, "where shall the ungodly be if the righteous are scarcely saved?" refers to another kind of salvation, than the final salvation. Either passage is sufficiently to the point, in proving present punishment.

The passage in 2d Hebrews, he says, referred to the Mosaic dispensation. It is granted a "just recompense" was received then. I wonder if Mr. Waller believes that under the Mosaic dispensation no man expected to be amenable to endless future punishment? This seems to be the admission. I should like to know. If it were so, and they endured it, what shall we do with this passage, "*received a just recompense,*" as applied to the Mosaic dispensation? and if they did not expect to endure endless future punishment, what did men gain by Christianity? The knowledge and expectation of being consigned to "all hell-horrors" in a future life forever?! Glorious Gospel this! a glorious "life and immortality" it has brought to light; has it not?! "Life and immortality are brought to light by the Gospel," say the Scriptures. "Life and ENDLESS DAMNATION," say the modern theologians.

The gentleman quotes, "how much sorer punishment shall they endure," etc.? Yes, if they were to suffer through life and death, and after death hell-horrors to all eternity, for the sins committed in life! Christianity was a *curse*, an everlasting curse to the human race, if such be Christianity, and if men did not expect endless suffering under the Mosaic dispensation, but expected it under the Christian. I say if *this* be the change effected by Christianity—to expose mankind to endless suffering in Hell fire, (and the mass of men will certainly go thither, upon the doctrine as now advocated) it is a horrible CURSE TO HUMAN SOULS! But perhaps he may think it is no sorer here than was endured under the Mosaic dispensation. Let us see. In the 24th chapter of Matthew, Jesus Christ, speaking of the tribulation that should come upon Jerusalem, says, (verse

21.) "For there shall be great tribulation, such as WAS NOT since the beginning of the world to this time, no, *nor ever shall be!* Now here are tribulations to happen in *this world*, GREATER than ever were, or shall be hereafter. Does he deny this? Is it not proved? How emphatic, clear, and explicit is the language of our Savior! Then there shall be great tribulation, such as NEVER WAS. This embraces those who had died before, and been punished. "*No, nor ever shall be.*" This embraces all that is to happen hereafter. Such was the tribulation he speaks of to occur in *that generation*. Jesus Christ knew no greater punishment than this, which is to be endured *in this life*. Enough on the point of the "*sorer*" punishment spoken of by my friend. Men may be more guilty under Christianity than under the Mosaic law; but not *infinitely* more so. There is not that difference between men then and now, that *they* should be punished only in this life, but *we* to all eternity! Yet the revelation of Christianity is called a revelation of life and peace and joy secured to all men!

The gentleman insists that if God wants all men to be made holy and saved, he would do it in this life; and asks, Is it not his will that all should be saved in this life? *No*. It has not been God's will. Had it been, he would have sent the Truth to the millions of men in darkness; but they have been left without the Truth for near six thousand years. Would he not have sent it to them, if this had been his will? "The Lord *doeth* his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth." Does my friend *deny* the final accomplishment of his will, as declared in this passage? Then he says that God *wants* to save all men, but is *disappointed*, and will be eternally disappointed of his pleasure. He will possess an ungratified desire—he will be tormented by an unfulfilled desire, to all eternity!

If Mr. Waller is a *Calvinist*, he believes in the accomplishment of the will of God. If not, if he is an *Arminian*, he takes the position that Jesus Christ CANNOT accomplish the object of his mission; but is like a man who undertook "to build a tower without counting the cost, and could not *finish* it:" he was MOCKED! because not able to FINISH his undertaking;—that's *Arminianism*. God has declared his *will* and *purpose* that all men should be saved, and has PROMISED it; and said he was able to accomplish it. - But *Arminians* say he CAN'T DO IT!! The DEVIL is *stronger* than

the Almighty, and will prevent him! If my friend is a Calvinist, therefore, he is right, in believing that God will and can do his pleasure. But he asks me why God does not do it in this world? why are we not all saved in this life? I cannot tell him. We are told in the Bible that God has made us "subject to vanity, *here, not willingly*, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope." But beyond that he says—"Moreover the law entered, *that the offence might abound.*" Who brought the law? what was the will of God in reference to the law? was it that sin should have power to all eternity? "But where sin abounded, GRACE did MUCH MORE abound." That was the result. That follows after. We do not see it *yet*. Does he argue therefore that it will *never* be done at all? That would be directly against the positive word of God. It is *not* God's will that all should be saved in this life; because he does not give all any *opportunity* of being saved, possibly.

Oh! the work of salvation is left for Christians now to effect by sending and preaching the Gospel! What! man's immortal doom depend on the conduct of Christians *now*? Are men to suffer endlessly, for the *neglect* of Christians now? All those who are in darkness in the Pagan world are to be punished in eternal Hell-fire, for this! Is this the goodness of God! and this his *justice*, too? to damn the Pagans because Christians neglect them, and then save those very Christians!

It may be a strange thing to Mr. Waller that the doctrine of universal salvation should not be known till the appearance of Hosea Ballou in 1818—though it *was* known to the Apostles and the fathers, and from their day unto the present. But grant all he says, it is far stranger that the Pagan world should be doomed to endless misery from the neglect of Christians, than that Father Ballou should have been the first man to discover the Bible doctrine of salvation.

A few words more in relation to 1 Timothy iv. 10. "We trust in the living God who is Savior of *all men*, specially of those that believe." There is a special salvation in this life, to those that believe. But God is to save *all men*, FINALLY. There is no propriety in confining this to the present life. It refers to their *immortal state*; because in *no sense* is God the Savior of all men *now*. The gentleman



dares not deny the declaration of Paul, that God is the Savior of all men: he says he saves all men here; but cannot see *how* he saves them in another state. I ask him, from *what* are all men saved in this world? From death? Then there is *no death*. From sin? Then there are no sinners, and no suffering. From temporal evils? Then there are no temporal evils; no trials; nor temptations, etc. I ask again, what are all men then saved from in this life? When he shows in what sense all are saved in this life, I will then have something more to say on that subject.

I now proceed to advance another argument, which is my sixth, to wit; The destruction of all man's enemies. I have quoted a passage already which states that Christ was to destroy the DEVIL. I will now read 1 Corinthians xv. 25 and 26; "For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is DEATH." This is the LAST ENEMY. There is no death beyond that. Again; "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the SIN of the world."

But as my time is expired, I will resume this subject hereafter.

—

[MR. WALLER'S FIFTH REPLY.]

If I should not now reply to all the positions and assertions in Mr. Pingree's last speech, it is not because they have escaped my notice, (for perhaps, if time allows, they will receive due attention,) but because I want to bring before you the main points of this subject. Our time is limited, and if we suffer ourselves to be diverted after every little issue that may be started up, the merits of the subject under discussion will be lost sight of. I wish to give the chief place to those arguments that are considered fundamental; and then bestow the spare time, if any, upon subjects of incidental or minor importance.

There is one position of the Universalists which, by the consent of Mr. Pingree and all his brethren, if stricken down, their whole system falls to nought. It is vital to their cause, and as such I claim your attention to it. The position is this: *That all punishment of sin is disciplinary — inflicted for the good of those punished.* Now I grant it is a Bible doctrine, that "the light afflictions of the righteous, which are for a moment, work for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." But is it true

that the punishment of the wicked is always inflicted for their good? If not, then Universalism, by its own friends, is conceded to be false. On this point, they willingly stake their whole cause. If punishment be for the sinner's good, then it is a *mercy* in some sense. Whatever is for the good of man is a grace—a mercy. This is self-evident. This being the case, I remark, it will introduce some most unique readings into the Bible: indeed, make it a book of absurdities. Let us see. Gal. iii. 10: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." This means, according to Universalists, that the more a person neglects to do the things of the law, the more *blessings* from God in the shape of *curses* he will receive! Of course their version of the matter would be this: "*Blessed* is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them!"

Again; 1 Cor. xvi. 22: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maranatha"—*let him be accursed, our Lord cometh*. If the punishment here threatened be for good and be inflicted in mercy; in a word, if Universalism be true, the meaning of the text is, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be BLESSED; the Lord cometh!" Matthew xxvi. 46: "And these shall go away into everlasting *punishment*," that is, *into the reception of everlasting BLESSINGS*: "but the righteous into *life eternal*;" that is, since "life eternal" is the antithesis of "everlasting punishment," it means, of course, that the righteous shall go into PUNISHMENT *eternal*!!

Indeed, according to this view of the subject, to be cast into hell-fire is to be cast into a blessed place. The lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, the unquenchable fire, the worm that never dies, the fire that is never quenched, etc., etc., are so many phrases expressive of the means employed in the laboratory of heaven for making men holy—for purifying the soul of its dross! The hell of the Bible is a divine hospital, where those who cannot be cured by the mercy of God through the blood of his Son, may be made spotless and pure by damnation!!! Hence there is no need to fear hell, nor to indulge a mistaken wish to escape it; it is a place of mercy and manifold blessings! The sooner the incorrigible experience its purifying flames, the sooner they will have paid the wages of sin, and be

cleansed for the joys of heaven! "*Hell* is the gate of endless joys; why should we dread to enter there?!" Nor is this all: for, according to this doctrine, God's raining upon the wicked "snares, fire and brimstone" is synonymous with sending upon them *sanctifying* MERCIES! And the threat against the ungodly, of "indignation, and wrath, tribulation and anguish," refers to the distribution of the different sorts of *blessings*! The Scripture expression, "fierce wrath of God," means simply, *fierce goodness of God!* and "the fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries," means *fiery mercy which shall save the adversaries!!* And "the smoke of their torment which ascendeth up forever and ever," must be understood to refer to the *smoke of the salvation of the damned!!*

The Universalists are wont to ascribe all the passages in the New Testament which speak of *gehenna fire*, to the destruction of Jerusalem, and in strains most melting and horrific to descant of that event: but really, they weep when they should rejoice; for according to their own showing, what they would persuade you to believe was the greatest wo ever inflicted on mankind, was no wo at all; but one of the richest displays of divine goodness, ever witnessed! And what a rich display of mercy was that experienced by the antideluvians! And how gloriously was divine goodness poured out upon Sodom and Gomorrah! And Pharoah and his hosts were destroyed for their good!

Again, in Matthew xi. 21-24, we read—"Wo unto thee, [but, as amended by Universalism,—*blessed art thou,*] Chorazin! wo unto thee, [*blessed art thou,*] Bethsaida! It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment than for thee," [for thou shalt experience a more abundant outpouring of God's mercy in the shape of punishment than they!] "And thou Capernaum! it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee," for I will pour out upon you of blessed and purifying punishments, more abundantly than ever I did upon them!!

But the doctrine bears another absurdity upon its face. How can punishment be disciplinary, or for the good of men, when in a great many cases its very infliction precludes the possibility of reformation? The antideluvians, the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the untold millions who have been cut off in their sins and *for their*

sins, could not reform after their punishment—could not experience the benefits, to bring about which Universalists argue, the punishment was inflicted upon them. Again: If disciplinary, the salutary results of it were to be experienced in this life. Universalism teaches that nothing in this life makes an impress on character in the life to come. That death is an act of oblivion in regard to the actions of all men, whether righteous or wicked. It follows then, that punishment was instituted to prevent the individual from the commission of sin in this life. It has no other end. Taking this view of the subject, and heaven's is the most inefficient government ever established. It never has, in one solitary instance, with all its disciplinary punishment, succeeded in keeping one solitary individual from the commission of sin. Seeing then that the law is inadequate to produce the ends designed by its enactment, wisdom and humanity would long since have dictated its repeal!

So much for this point at present. Universalism has staked its existence on its truth. I have shown, I trust, to your entire satisfaction, that the doctrine that all punishment for sin is disciplinary, is alike abhorrent to reason and to revelation. I will now proceed.

I did not come here to defend Mr. Wesley. But I am not disposed, nevertheless, that the gentleman shall change the issue, and thus evade the consequences to himself of misrepresenting Mr. Wesley in his former speeches. You remember that he said, time and again, with great vociferation, that Mr. Wesley said, that the word "creature" or "creation," in the 8th of Romans, meant specifically and only the *brutes*. This I questioned, and adduced Mr. W.'s Notes on the passage to the contrary. Now the gentleman, seeing that he is in a corner, that there is no way to rid himself of the charge of misrepresentation, with great coolness undertakes to excuse himself by showing that instead of saying the *brutes alone*, he says, all "visible creation!" This is an admission of all that I charged. He *did misrepresent* Mr. Wesley, grossly and palpably, as he himself is compelled to acknowledge. I repeat, it is no part of my business to defend Mr. Wesley's exposition. I call no man my master. No one claims that Mr. Wesley was an infallible interpreter of the Bible. He may have erred on this passage. I believe he did. Homer, it is said, was wont to nod; and Mr. Wesley sometimes gave his opinion hastily.

It is enough for me to show that this passage does not prove Mr. Pingree's doctrine. He seems to be laboring under the sophistical delusion, that if he shows that his doctrine *may be* taught in a passage, that therefore it is taught! But this is not enough. He is bound to show that it contains his doctrine beyond all reasonable cavil or doubt. Admit that a doctrine is legitimately established by showing it *may be*, and no error, however monstrous, and no heresy, however destructive, but can be sustained. Now I assert, and have shown, that this passage cannot afford *positive proof* for Mr. Pingree, (and that is what his cause demands,) nay, I have gone further, and demonstrated that it does not furnish a hook to hang a reasonable inference upon. Mr. Pingree will not insult your common sense by telling you, that infants and idiots who are ignorant of every thing: that infidels and atheists, who do not believe in a hereafter, and that the heathen who know nothing of the matter, earnestly expect "the manifestation of the sons of God;" and yet, unless he will venture this declaration, which would blister the tongue of falsehood itself, he can never claim this passage as affording the slightest proof of his doctrine.

And I beg you to observe, that not a passage quoted by Mr. Pingree, from his own showing, clearly asserts his doctrine. Strange to say, that he thinks it is enough to rest a doctrine involving the eternal interests of the untold millions of the human family, upon the shadowy and insubstantial foundation of *it may be so!* Yes, he asks you to freight your hopes for eternity and the tremendous concerns of your immortal souls, upon a bark of fancy, launched upon the ocean of conjecture! Yes, he asks you to mount to the skies, on a ladder, "placed on the brink of an abyss, and leaned against a cloud!" Dying men! I warn you against the fearful hazard of such an adventure.

Mr. Pingree complains that I misrepresented him, in saying that he argued in favor of the salvation of unbelievers from a passage which says we are saved only through righteousness. He says, his argument was from another text, and was, that all were to be made righteous. Admit the explanation; and will he affirm that the righteousness of Christ is imparted to unbelievers, in face of the positive declaration, that it is "unto all and upon all them that BELIEVE?" But he misunderstood me. I did not say, that he

argued from the passage that I read. No: but that he perverted the reasoning of the Apostle by *not* reading that passage. He stopped too suddenly in his quotation. The Apostle was proving the salvation of the *righteous*, and Mr. Pingree quoted him as if he were proving the salvation of the *unrighteous!* That was the charge I preferred against him. And I cannot see what his explanation amounts to, unless it is the admission that he argues one way and the Apostle another; and that I ought not to have charged them with reasoning alike! If I made such a charge, I was very wrong, and I now, without the slightest reservation, retract it, as alike grossly unjust both to Mr. Pingree and the Apostle.

The gentleman now says, that he does not believe that all are saved in this life! This shows that he is reduced to great extremity; or why would he thus confront and beard the lions of his own party? But grant that he does not believe it, and he subverts his own cause; for he, in effect, asserts that all are *not* saved! For he tells you that salvation is from sin—that *that* is the Bible meaning, and consequently the only true meaning of the term. He tells us moreover, that there is no punishment after death, consequently no sin; for he is equally positive in the assumption that punishment necessarily follows sin. Then there is no sin after death; consequently no one can be *saved* after death, for the term *saved* necessarily implies sin. It follows then, if all are not saved in this life, then they are not saved at all, seeing they cannot be saved in the next life, for there is no sin there, and where there is no sin, there is no salvation! Thus in avoiding Scylla, he has plunged into Charybdis—in shunning the rock he has foundered in the whirlpool!

He says that I quoted Origen as teaching eternal punishment, and yet admitted he did not believe the doctrine. Of course Mr. Pingree did not understand me, and for his benefit I feel bound to re-state the facts in relation to Origen; although I suppose this will be a work of supererogation, so far as this entire audience is concerned, for I doubt not that *you* all understood me: I stated that Origen believed and taught, that eternal punishment was the doctrine of the Bible; but that he held that the Scriptures were not to be followed according to the *letter*. Indeed, that his mode of *spiritualizing* set aside the Bible, and

enabled him to weave a system under the name of Christianity, that had full as much of the dreams of Pagan philosophers as of the doctrines of Jesus and his Apostles. That he taught punishment was not eternal, but professed to derive no support from the Bible. His doctrine on this subject was purely heathenish; it did not profess to be any thing else. But in defending the *Scriptures* from the attacks of Celsus, he admitted that the *Scriptures* taught the eternal punishment of the wicked, and defended the doctrine by showing that as presented in the Bible, it was better calculated to reform and restrain mankind, than the same doctrine, as presented by the *Mystagogues*. I repeat, then, that neither Origen nor any other Greek writer ever uses the term *aionios* as applied to the punishment of sinners, in a limited sense. Origen, as I have shown, taught the very reverse. We cannot take Mr. Pingree's assertions for proofs. I now repeat my challenge, to make good what he has said of Origen by one solitary quotation from his writings; aye, I will be content with a solitary quotation from any Greek writer.

Now I will show you that he makes such statements, not because he is informed on the subject—for *he is not*—but because the dire necessities of his cause requires it. You remember he said, that Clement did not use the word *eternal* in the sense of *endless*. Let us hear from Clement himself:

“Jesus said,—And ye also, fear not those that kill you, and after that have no more that they can do unto you; but fear him who after you are dead, has power to cast both soul and body into hell-fire. \* \* \* \* For, if we do the will of Christ, we shall find rest: but if not, nothing shall deliver us from eternal punishment, if we shall disobey his command. \* \* \* \* Thus speaks the prophet concerning those who keep not their seal; Their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched; and they shall be for a spectacle unto all flesh. Let us therefore repent, whilst we are yet upon the earth: for we are as clay in the hand of the artificer. For as the potter, if he make a vessel, and it be turned amiss in his hands, or broken, again forms it anew: but if he has gone so far as to throw it into the furnace of fire, he can no more bring any remedy to it; so we, whilst we are in this world, should repent with our whole heart for whatsoever evil we have done in the

flesh, while we have yet the time of repentance, that we may be saved by the Lord. For after we shall have departed out of this world, we shall no longer be able to confess our sins, or repent in the other." 2d Epistle to Corinthians.

I mean no disrespect; but I think my friend, Mr. Pingree, ought not to use edge tools; he may cut his fingers. He ought not to venture in water beyond his depth. He remembers the homely proverb, "little boats should keep near the shore." This instance of Clement shows that he has been talking on a subject he never investigated, and of which he is as profoundly ignorant, as he is of the geography of the moon. On a subject so important as this, he ought to hazard no statement at random. The destiny of souls is at stake.

In answer to my statement, that no murderer, or liar, could be saved, Mr. Pingree refers to the cases of David, and Peter, etc. Their examples do not touch my position. David, the *murderer*, was NOT SAVED; it was David, the *new creature*, not David *born of the flesh*, but David *born of the spirit*. David, the *murderer*, was killed; the David of whose salvation the Bible mentions, had *passed from death unto life*, was *quicken*ed and *made alive* by the spirit of God. He was altogether another man, in a moral sense, from David, the *murderer*. The David of whom we speak, was *just*, because *justified by faith*: he was innocent and pure, through the blood and righteousness of Jesus Christ. The same remarks apply to Peter, and every similar case. No: I believe God when he says that no murderer, nor liar, can inherit his kingdom. I protest against Mr. Pingree's efforts to place me alongside of himself in relation to this matter.

But my opponent still insists that he contends for just what I do, except that I urge that the Bible teaches that man must believe—must be changed in this life; and that he insists that this may take place in the life to come—that unbelievers, the drunkard, etc., are changed and saved after death, in another world. And this is a very great difference; they are as opposite as light and darkness. On my part, I have the plain declarations of Scripture for such a change in this life—can tell *how* it is done, and *wh'n* it is done. It is a plain, common sense subject. But he has nothing but the wildest conjecture to support his



position. He teaches that men in the grave believe without hearing the Gospel!—that a moral change is effected in them without the presentation of motive!! Now, if Mr. Pingree's fancy is to be your guide—if the *ignis fatui* of his imagination are to be your leaders on this great subject, why not substitute them for the Bible altogether, and discard the “book of God's inspiration,” as worse than “old wives' fables?”

If such a change as he contends for takes place in the grave—if men become entirely changed in their feelings and sentiments, without motive, and reason, and consciousness—if it is effected instantaneously and by miracle—without repentance or a knowledge of the Gospel; but suddenly, in a moment, he becomes a new creature, with new principles and new affections, then *all identity is destroyed*; the man does not know himself, and will be unconscious that he ever existed before. Shakspeare relates, that a nobleman finding a drunken tinker asleep in a gutter, had him taken and placed in an elegant bed, in a fine room, and clothed in costly apparel: servants were placed around him, and when he awoke they addressed him by the title of “lord,” and induced the poor fellow to think that he had been deranged for some fourteen years—that he was indeed a *lord*, and never Christopher Slie at all! A similar experiment was tried on another drunken man, by one of the emperors of Germany, and the man on coming to himself supposed that he had never been any thing else than a courtier and a prince, and that all that thing about his being a beggar and a drunkard was the result of a disagreeable dream! Now apply this. If experiment has proven that by a mere change of external circumstances, men can be led to reject their former existence and treat it as a dream, what must be the effect when an external change far transcending those alluded to, accompanied by a change equally as radical and as thorough in all the sentiments and feelings of the soul? Why, such a change would destroy the possibility of their ever supposing they had even *dreamed*. They would be, to all intents and purposes, other persons. Suppose that some of us, to-night, should lie down, firm believers in Christianity, and one of the genii of eastern fable, were to convey us away while asleep; and in the morning we should awake, and find ourselves dressed in Arabian costumes, in the great mosque of Mecca, sur-

rounded with all the paraphernalia peculiar to Mohammedan worship; the memory of our country blotted from the recollection, and all traces of our holy religion erased from the mind, and our mouths ready to utter from the abundance of our hearts, "Allah is great, and Mahomet is his prophet!" Who, I say, supposing such a change possible, could recall the past?—would dream that he ever was other than a worshipper of the prophet?—who would not date his existence from that morning!

Much more unlikely would a man remember the past, after the change Mr. Pingree contends will take place in the ungodly and the sinners after death. Take, for example, an atheist of the last century, who believed there was no God and no hereafter. Who wished as his epitaph—"DEATH IS AN ETERNAL SLEEP!" Who derided the Savior as an impostor and a "wretch," and pronounced the Bible a book of fables and of lies! Such a man dies, and in *heaven* lifts up his eyes, being in *glory*! The world has faded from his senses and memory. His heart burns with love to God. His tongue chants rapturous hosannas to the King of kings and Lord of lords. His ears drink in the melody of angels. His eyes dilate upon the beauty and the splendors of the celestial city. He himself is clad in the robes of righteousness. Palms of victory are in his hands, and a crown of glory sparkles on his brow. Every feeling and sentiment that once animated his bosom and controlled his actions, have been obliterated, and their places supplied by those of the very opposite nature. With such a change, how would it be possible for him to identify himself with the atheist and blasphemer of the moment before? There is no identity. Every trace of what may be termed the individual-sentiment, feeling, circumstances, internal and external—all destroyed, and others the very opposite, put in their stead. He has nothing of his former self; and is, indeed, wholly another being!

You remember that I showed that the famous passage so much relied upon by Universalists, and quoted by Mr. Pingree with a great flourish—"The righteous are recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked," had been rendered by an inspired translator, "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear." I offered no explanation of the translation; and only quoted it as one of many evidences, that Universalism is indebted to

ignorance for its support. Now, how does Mr. Pingree get out of this matter? Does he dispute what I have said? Not at all; that he dares not do. What then? Why, he labors to show that the passage as quoted by Peter does not prove future eternal punishment! Had not the gentleman better have waited until I said it did? Why did he not meet the issue that I made? Does he think to escape the charge of *ignorance of the Scriptures*, which I made and *proved*, by diverting attention to a new point? He will find himself most egregiously mistaken, if he does. When I feel it at all necessary to use the passage in Peter for other purposes than to prove that the *foundation of Universalism is laid in ignorance*, I shall do so. But I shall be governed by my own judgment in relation to that necessity.

But we are now coming to something tangible. My friend feels now the necessity of doing, what I have told him all along he must, but which he stoutly declared he *would not do*; that is, tell us *when* and *how* the wicked were made meet for heaven. He now answers by saying, it is *at* and *by means of* the resurrection. He bases his argument on 1 Corinthians xv., and calls this the *main pillar* of his system. Before I proceed to examine analytically this chapter, I beg leave to present in connection with it, and as fatally subversive of the gentleman's exposition of it, other passages of Holy Writ, bearing on the great subject of the resurrection of the dead. It is a rule of interpretation never to be departed from, that the Bible must explain itself; and that it does not contradict itself. If I produce then other passages palpably and unequivocally contradicting Mr. Pingree's exposition of this, then I have proved him to be wrong. Bear this in mind, whilst I read: Daniel xii. 2: "And many [more literally—*the multitude*] of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and *some to shame and everlasting contempt.*" Now Daniel asserts with Paul in relation to the righteous (and Paul in 1 Corinthians xv. was speaking only of the resurrection of the righteous) that they shall awake to everlasting life; and adds in relation to the wicked, of whom Paul does not particularly speak in this chapter, that they should awake to *shame and everlasting contempt*. Of course then, in the resurrection, all are not saved and made holy.

John v. 28, 29: Jesus himself settles this matter: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that

are in their 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.*" Will Mr. Pingree contradict the Son of God, and say those who have done evil shall come forth to the resurrection of holiness and salvation, when he declares they shall come forth to the resurrection of damnation? But I need not ask the question: my opponent has already uttered the awful contradiction!

But let us hear the Apostle himself on this matter: 1 Thessalonians iv. 14-18 and v. 1-4. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words. But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you: for yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord so cometh as the thief in the night. For when they shall say, peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape. But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief."

That the Apostle was talking about the consummation of all things, and not about the destruction of Jerusalem, as the Universalists argue, is evident from his next epistle. It seems that the Thessalonians were alarmed as if the day of the Lord was at hand, (and if the destruction of Jerusalem had been that day, *it was at hand,*) and the Apostle wrote them this 2nd Epistle in part to disabuse their minds on that very point. We will read what he says on the subject, in its connection: 2nd Thessalonians i. 4-10 and ii. 1-4. "For your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations that ye endure [are] 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 Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day. \* \* \* \* \* "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that you be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, *as that the day of Christ is at hand.* Let no man deceive you by any means; *for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first,* and that man of sin be revealed, the Son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped," etc. Now here Paul teaches the very reverse of what Mr. Pingree says he teaches in his first Epistle to the Corinthians! You must believe then, that Paul contradicts himself, or else that Mr. Pingree has misrepresented him.

But let us hear him again, 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 the unjust." Here he declares his views to correspond with those of the Pharisees on the subject of the resurrection; and they, it will not be disputed, held that the unjust should be raised to everlasting punishment. This settles the question beyond controversy, that Paul has been misrepresented by Mr. Pingree.

Let us hear from another Apostle, Revelations xx. 11-15 and xxi. 8: "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 books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell [hades] delivered up the dead which

were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell [hades, or those who had been in *hades*] were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire. \* \* \* \* \* The fearful and the unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death."

I repeat, *the Scriptures do not contradict themselves*: but they do most emphatically and unequivocally contradict Mr. Pingree's assumption, that the wicked receive holiness and salvation in the resurrection. The passages already quoted as plainly contradict him as it is possible for language to do it. And you will see in the sequel, when the subject of a judgment and kindred matters are introduced, that these are but a very few of the multitude of passages, directly against his position. Let these, however, suffice for the present.

I wish you to observe his assertion, that all those who die unbelievers, murderers, liars, idolaters, atheists, deists, etc., are changed in the resurrection. He has told us that there is no sin and no misery after death. Now he must affirm that those persons are changed the moment they die; or else that they remain in a state of sin and misery from their death until the resurrection! Or will he take the semi-infidel ground of the materialist—that the soul does not exist without the body? That the soul with the body rots and mingles with the dust until the resurrection morn?

As I have a little more time, there is one other important point to which I will direct your attention: it is respecting what has been said, *relative to the will of God*. Now, Universalists teach, (and Mr. Pingree, if he has not directly affirmed, has nevertheless countenanced the doctrine,) that sin—every thing that transpires, is by the will of God; and inasmuch as he wills sin for man's good, that therefore he will not punish it in the life to come. The same reasoning would prove that he would not punish it in this life. But I deny the position, as nothing short of downright blasphemy! It is to assert that God is the author of all the sin committed in this world. Aye, it makes him the violator of his own law! He has commanded, "Thou

shalt have no other gods before me:" and can he then be the cause of all the idolatry upon earth? He says, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain:" and is he the author of all the blasphemy upon earth? Again: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy:" and then does he cause it to be violated? "Thou shalt not kill:" and has he caused all the blood to be spilled which has defiled the earth? In a word, he has required that we should love him supremely and one another as ourselves: and can we believe that he wills at the same that we should not love him at all, and that we should hate our neighbors? This doctrine degrades Jehovah from the high and holy habitation that he occupies down to the level of the divinities of paganism! The heathens worship

"Gods partial, changeful, passionate, unjust;  
Whose attributes are rage, revenge, or lust."

To be a Universalist, a man must divest himself of all those notions of God, which make him a being worthy of reverence and veneration.

[MR. FINGREE'S SIXTH SPEECH.]

RESPECTED FRIENDS:—Mr. Waller, in the opening of his last speech, remarking upon the *disciplinary* nature of punishment, made this declaration: that if the punishment inflicted by God for transgression, was not disciplinary and for the reformation of the sinner, Universalism was *false*; and *vice versa*. His language was, "The whole doctrine turns upon this point." He admitted that if punishment was disciplinary, and for the reformation of sinners, Universalism was *true*. Now, though we hold that punishment is disciplinary and for reformation; yet we deny that the doctrine of universal salvation depends and turns upon that. Even though that doctrine should not be true, Universalism would not consequently be false. But if Mr. Waller does not admit it to be true, it follows that punishment must be *vindictive*, and inflicted purely and only in a *revengeful* and *malicious* spirit, which measures to the sinner according to his sins, without reference to his being made better, and for the purpose of RETALIATION only. We believe that the object of all God's punishments is to bring all men to goodness, and purity, and happiness.

We have following this declaration a number of passages quoted; and Mr. Waller ridiculed the idea of pun-

ishment being intended for reformation. We have been referred to all that class of passages containing the words, "cursed," "wo," "anathema," *fire, Hell, snares, sorrows, indignation, wrath, terror, torment, etc.*, and then the same passage with the word "blessings," substituted, etc.; such as, "blessed is he that continueth *not* in all things of the law to do them."

Now you know that punishment is frequently spoken of as a "curse," a wo inflicted by "fury" and "wrath" even; especially in the Old Testament; but that notwithstanding this language is so often seen in the Old Testament, yet the Old Testament itself expresses that it was inflicted for the *benefit* of sinners, and was followed by *happiness*. I refer for example, to Jeremiah xxxiii. I would quote a number of other passages, but have not time. It is enough to notice this now: Jeremiah xxxiii. 5-8: "They come to fight with the Chaldeans; but it is to fill them with the dead bodies of men whom I have slain in mine *anger*, and in my *FURY*, and for all whose wickedness I have hid my face from this city. Behold I will bring it *health* and *cure*, and I *WILL CURE THEM*, and *will* reveal unto them the *abundance of PEACE AND TRUTH*. And I will cause the captivity of Judah, and the captivity of Israel to return, and will build them, as at the first. And I will *cleanse* them from *all their iniquity*, whereby they have sinned against me: and I will *pardon* all the iniquities, whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against me."

Here is an instance of God's inflicting punishment, but followed by future peace, and holiness, and joy. But as Mr. Waller attempted so seriously to ridicule the idea of punishment being inflicted in order that a blessing might follow, I will quote some passages bearing directly upon that point, to show that God's punishments are inflicted generally for the *benefit of the sufferer*.

Hebrews xii. 9-11. "Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; *but HE for our PROFIT*, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless afterwards *it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness* unto them which are exercised thereby."



Does not this again prove that the very object of Divine punishment and chastisement is the benefit of the sinner? My friend has challenged me to produce a single individual case where punishment has effected the object of discipline and reform. Did not Nebuchadnezzar proudly exalt himself against God, and was he not for this changed into a beast, as it were, and driven out for seven years from the society of man? And did not Nebuchadnezzar afterwards acknowledge that the punishment was for his benefit, and praise and worship God? David speaks of being put into the "lowest Hell;" and he thanked God for deliverance from it; and said, he was made better by it: "Before I was *afflicted* I went *astray*—but now have I kept thy law." So with Jonah. God told him to go and preach to the Ninevites. He disobeyed, and God sent him to *Hell*, where he was punished. "FOREVER"—that word being used in a limited sense, as always when applied to punishment. Jonah after he was sent to "Hell," was again ordered to go and preach at Nineveh, and he *went*; though he refused before. He was *no more* disposed to disobey the command of God, because the punishment had *reformed* him. So with the incestuous Corinthian. No doubt he was made a better man after his punishment. It is said his punishment was "*sufficient*;" and the brethren were requested to "comfort" him, lest he suffer "over much." This would not have been said unless his punishment had made him better. Now here are cases where the Divine chastisements were for the benefit of those who endured them.

Mr. Waller refers to many cases of punishment; but not one of the passages expresses suffering in a *future life*. They all rather establish punishment in the present life. Even concerning the *Sodomites*, about whom Mr. Waller inquires, the sacred writers represent God as saying, "I took them away as I saw good." It was not from *vindictiveness*; but for their benefit. If my friend ridicules the idea that punishment is for the benefit of the sufferer, he ridicules the plainest declarations of God's Word, such as those already quoted.

Mr. Waller spoke of the language of Jesus, and stated that the Universalists applied it all to the destruction of Jerusalem. I ask the favor of him not to refer such words to the destruction of Jerusalem, as the opinion of Univer-

salists, till I do, in this place and on this occasion. As yet, I have not done it.

Mr. Waller remarks that "*creature*" in 8th Romans, means the *intelligent creation*. He once before applied it to the stocks and stones. He says now it refers to the *intelligent CREATION*. This is all I ask; and my argument is established on his own admission.

On the passage from the 5th Romans, he says the salvation is "through *righteousness*," and not in *unrighteousness*. The preceding verses embrace the doctrine, and express the fact, that ALL MEN are to "*become righteous*." The concluding verses then express the truth that men are saved "through *righteousness*." The fact that righteous men are saved, does not exclude others; because it is declared that *all* are to be "*made righteous*." The promise of salvation reaches back to their condition as *sinner*s, and denotes the purpose of God to bring them into a state of holiness and happiness—*thus saving them*. The 5th chapter of Romans *can not* be taken out of our hands, as a proof of final universal salvation.

He states that my Universalist brethren affirm that all men are saved *in this life*. I have not heard of it, nor have I read it; nor do I *believe it*.

He quotes from Clement; and I confess I was somewhat surprised after the remarks I had made, by his quotation on that subject. Since then I have looked over Clement's remarks to the Corinthians. I find that in his *first Epistle* to the Corinthians, there is no allusion made to misery in a future life; and it was in reference to the impression made on my mind by that circumstance, that I made the assertions I did. The quotation is from his remarks in the *second Epistle*. The heading to this Epistle says that this treatise is not of equal authority as first Corinthians; that it appears to be written in a different style, etc. The first Epistle to the Corinthians is more lengthy; the other is evidently not by the same author; and the opinions the second expresses would have been called out in first Corinthians, if anywhere. The mistake was that the *general remark* I made about Clement's opinion, derived from my impression from reading that *first and most authentic Epistle*, was made to apply to the *other*; which we do not believe to have been written by him at all!

It does not follow that because drunkards are to be

saved, they are saved *as drunkards*. Universalism does not teach that men are saved *in sin*;—for that would be a contradiction in terms;—but *from sin*.

The common doctrine is, as before stated, that a man's everlasting condition hereafter, depends on the state of mind and heart in which he *dies*. Suppose there cannot be a change after death, as Partialism asserts:—a man dying drunk, must go the Judgment, *drunk!* remaining *forever DRUNK!* to haunt the grog-shops of Hell to all eternity—*DRUNK!!* So with all classes of sinners: they must continue in active commission of those particular vices to all eternity. So Pagans, idiots, etc.; infidels, all who die morally depraved beings, must remain so to all eternity. The idea is, that dying corrupt, physically and morally, they go to judgment thus, and thence to Hell; and thus remain corrupt beings to all eternity. Pagans die *idolaters*. They must go idolaters to the judgment seat, from there they go as idolaters to Hell, and there remain such to all eternity! All this, if there be no change after death.

But Mr. Waller himself believes in a change after death. Whether the doctrine be *true* or not, will appear by and by. Does he not believe that even the saints die sinful, to some extent? Are they *perfectly* fitted for Heaven, in this life? Then if not perfectly cleansed from all sin, before death, they remain sinful *FOREVER*,—unless after death they have an opportunity to change? Must a man who curses God once, and now, curse him to all eternity? Is there no chance of ever ceasing from doing evil, when once beyond death? Must a bad man, who up to death *could repent*, lose that power forever, and retain that of doing *evil ONLY*? This would be a change of constitution and character, the greatest that could happen to a moral being—and will not occur under the government of a holy God.

If it were so that the doctrine was that they who suffer most here generally, will enjoy most hereafter, to pay them for all that was endured here, as in Mr. Waller's appeal to the case of the wicked man who *oppressed* the widow and fatherless, I could not so much object to it. But it is *not* so, according to Mr. Waller's theory. The *oppressed* may go to *Hell*, and the *oppressor* to glory! Such generally have an opportunity of repenting, before death,

as they *intend* to; but the oppressed and suffering, left in ignorance and moral darkness, die and go to perdition! Those sons of perdition who have abandoned themselves to wickedness, for *ninety* years, may go to heaven, if they repent the last moment of their lives; and those good men who have done their duty all through an equal number of years, may go to Hell eternally, if they happen to commit *one sin*, and then die suddenly. The *best* men may be *lost*, and the *worst* saved, by conceding this.

Take an illustration of the doctrine: We may imagine an individual of good moral character, and one who has been generally a virtuous man. He offends a scoundrel—an infamous wretch—who suddenly, and without notice, cuts him off, and dying unregenerate, he goes to *Hell*; while his murderer is tried, and convicted, and sentenced to be hung. While in jail, a minister of the Gospel visits him, and exhorts him to repent. He repents and is converted, and from the gallows he swings into everlasting life and glory! The generally virtuous, good citizen, whom he cruelly murdered, is suffering the torture of an immortal HELL, while the MURDERER is shouting in glory! Such things may and do occur, if the doctrine of endless damnation is true,—the current doctrine which is believed and acted on by the Orthodox.

An anecdote is told,—I cannot vouch for its truth, as I was not there,—of a Moor who had been offended by a Christian. He swore revenge; and meeting the Christian alone one day, he required him to abjure Christianity; and holding a poignard at his breast, told him if he did not, he would kill him. The man, to save his life, abjured his Master. The moment he did this, the wretch plunged the dagger to his breast, exclaiming with the exulting laughter of a fiend, “Now I have taken double vengeance! I have taken his life in this world, and have damned his soul in the next!” That man, if converted afterwards, went to glory, and enjoyed from his seat of happiness, and gloated over the sufferings of the victim of his demoniacal revenge in Hell! He had indeed taken a double vengeance! Such effects *may* be produced, according to this doctrine.

Mr. Waller quoted a passage in Peter, which he said was parallel to the passage I quoted from the Wise Man in Proverbs: “If the righteous be scarcely saved, where shall the ungodly and the wicked appear?” Does

this refer to the final salvation? Are the righteous "SCARCELY saved" there? Is it the view taken by his Orthodox brethren? No. Dr. Whitby, Dr. Lightfoot, Mr. Gilpin, Mr. Macknight, and Calmet, do not say this. I have a compilation of their opinions, written by Rev. L. R. Paige. What do they say? Listen:

Dr. WHITBY says: "For the time is come, that judgment must, according to our Lord's prediction—Matt. xxiv. 21, 22, Mark xiii. 13, Luke xxi. 16, 17—begin at the house of God; and if it first begin at us—believing Jews, what will be the end of them that obey not the Gospel of God? And if some of the righteous scarcely be saved, i. e., preserved from this burning, ver. 12, being saved, yet so as by fire, 1 Cor. iii. 15—where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear in safety from these dreadful judgments which are coming on the Jewish nation?" Prov. xi. 31.

Lightfoot says: "'The time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God;' that is, the time foretold by our Savior is now at hand, in which we are to be delivered up to persecution, etc. These words denote that persecution which the Jews, now near their ruin, stirred up, almost every where, against the professors of the Gospel." Matt. xxiv. 9.

Gilpin says: "Thus, amidst the general ruin which is coming upon these wicked times, the Christian shall have his share. But his afflictions will be light, in comparison of that great overthrow which shall destroy the Jewish nation."

Macknight says: "That the Apostle is not speaking here of the difficulty of the salvation of the righteous at the day of judgment, will be evident to any one who considers, 2 Pet. i. 11—"Thus there shall be richly ministered to you an entrance into the everlasting kingdom." What he speaks of, is the difficulty of the preservation of the Christians, at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. Yet they were preserved; for so Christ promised, Matt. xxiv. 13. But the ungodly and wicked Jews were saved neither in Judea, nor any where else."

Calmet says: "If the righteous be scarcely able to escape, in these days of wrath, what shall be the fate of the ungodly? When God began to exercise vengeance upon the Jews, he first permitted the Christians to suffer many afflictions and persecutions; but after he had purified

his church, and proved the virtue of his elect, he admonished them to depart from Jerusalem, and its borders, and to remove beyond Jordan. Ecclesiastical historians relate that they retired to Pella, under the protection of King Agrippa, a friend and an ally of the Romans, to which place the violence of the war did not extend. But the remaining Jews experienced the fury and the power of their conquerors, who leveled the temple, and Jerusalem itself, with the ground, even ploughing the earth on which it stood, and slew eleven hundred thousand of the Jews. St. Peter alludes to Prov. xi. 31, "If the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, how much more the wicked and the sinner?" The Apostle follows the version of the LXX."

These are admissions from Orthodox writers of distinction and authority in the Church. They are compelled to concede that this salvation was in the *present life*; consequently the punishment was in the *present life*. Thus it corresponds to the declaration of the Wise Man: "The righteous are recompensed IN THE EARTH." *Either* rendering bears alike upon the doctrine as held by me; and does *not* teach the doctrine of future endless misery.

We will now go back, for a moment, to another point—the punishment by "*fire*." He quotes passages where men have suffered punishment by "*fire*," and ridicules the idea that such a punishment could be for their *benefit*. Now I will read a passage from 1 Corinthians iii. 13, 14, 15. "Every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by *fire*; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a *reward*. If any man's work shall be *BURNED*, he shall suffer *loss*: but he *himself* SHALL BE SAVED: yet so as BY FIRE." Now let him ridicule God's Word, if he wishes.

But let us change the figure. Suppose a man to be suffering under a disease. He suffers a painful operation, or he takes an offensive medicine. Is it not for his benefit? But will he therefore *desire* the operation, or the medicine? Will he bring on the disease again, in order to be benefited by them? None are so foolish. It is absurd to say that punishment is of itself and for itself a benefit or blessing. It is only so, because it removes the sins, and purges the

moral nature of its diseases. This is one of God's means of saving men.

This leads us to Malachi iii. The prophecy refers to Jesus Christ, and speaks of the influence of fire. My friend *ridicules* the idea of purification by fire. Now let us see. Malachi iii. 2, 3, "But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he [Christ] is like a refiner's FIRE, and like fullers' soap: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he shall PURIFY the sons of Levi, and PURGE them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness." And John the Baptist says, referring to that prophecy, (Matthew iii. 4,) "I indeed baptise you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I: whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: He shall *baptise* (or purify) you with the Holy Ghost and with FIRE." [My friend admits, I presume, that *baptism* purifies.] Here John the Baptist speaks of purification by the Holy Spirit and by fire. This is the fulfilment of that prophecy of Malachi. Both Malachi and John the Baptist speak of *purification by fire*. If my friend ridicules the doctrine of purification by fire, he must ridicule the plain declarations of the holy men of God, as recorded in the Sacred Writings.

Mr. Waller says there are two or three "wills" of God. I should like him to say what will it is where it is said, "Who WILL have all men to be saved." Is it a "will of purpose," or some other will? Let him tell us this. Till then, I will not add anything concerning it.

I will now proceed to my affirmative argument. You will recollect that my last argument was the *destruction of all man's enemies, even to the LAST, which is death*. I first quoted 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." Keep this in mind. You have had quoted the passage, "Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his angels." The passage in Hebrews shows that not to refer to endless punishment; because the Devil will be "*destroyed*."

I next showed the destruction of SIN, the great enemy of man; sin, through which he endures so much wretched-

ness here on earth. John the Baptist says of Jesus, "Behold the Lamb of God who *taketh away the sin of the world.*" Also, it is said that Jesus Christ came "to destroy the *works of the Devil.*" Here we have the destruction of the Devil and all his works, including sin.

I now refer to 1 Corinthians 15th chapter. "The *last* enemy that shall be destroyed is DEATH." Man has a great many enemies: that is the *last*, and it is here declared that Death shall be "*destroyed*;" is to be "swallowed up in victory." Now if every enemy of man is destroyed; if the Devil, Sin, and Death are all destroyed, where is there an enemy to fear that can make man miserable in the future life? If there be an enemy beyond THE LAST, then I give up the question. I know not of any; I cannot imagine any: I know of no evil that is to follow death.

But as we are now in the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians, I shall say more on the subject of the resurrection of the dead. Mr. Waller has quoted from Daniel, John, Thessalonians, Hebrews, Revelation, Corinthians, in reference to the "resurrection," "judgment," "damnation," and punishment, without any remarks to show their bearing upon the question. For the present, therefore, I shall not say anything about them. I admit the correctness and truth of all the passages, and believe them fully and subscribe to them. If he wishes for other passages to illustrate and explain these, it will be time to produce and comment upon them, after he has shown their bearing upon the alteration of our condition *hereafter*. In Corinthians xv., cited by Universalists, there is a passage relating to the resurrection of the literally dead. The Apostle discusses, at large, the subject of the resurrection of the dead. I deny that the passage in John v., or Daniel xii., quoted by Mr. Waller before, refers to the resurrection of the literally dead, to a state of immortality. They do not refer to eternity. But this in 1 Corinthians xv. is admitted by all to refer to it.

Look at the argument of the Apostle. He founds the doctrine of the resurrection upon the fact that Jesus Christ was raised from the dead. I need not read that; I will begin at the 20th verse: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead." [The Apostle now proceeds



to show who are to be raised—all that die in Adam, he they more or less.] “For as in Adam ALL die, even so in Christ shall ALL be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ’s at his coming. 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 all power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.” [He is now reigning, therefore, in his kingdom, as King and Judge.] “The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.” Mark the fact, “that God is to be ALL IN ALL.” If the resurrection to shame and contempt, and to everlasting fire, refer to the literal resurrection of the dead to an immortal state, how can this passage be believed? Will God be “ALL IN ALL” to them who are in shame and contempt? If so, he is all in all to those who are in the world of wo!

Let us proceed further; Mr. Waller holds that there is no change after death,—that as *we die*, so we remain forever. So if a man *dies drunk*, he is raised drunk—remains *drunk* FOREVER! Look at this matter. What says Paul? Ver. 35. “But some man will say, How are the dead RAISED UP? and *with what body* do they come?” [The inquiry is not, how do men die? but how are they raised? The inquiry in these days is, “How do men die?” Paul asks, “How are they raised?” He does not concern himself to ask how they die; but “*how are they raised up?*” He did not say they were raised up drunkards, idolaters, in dishonor? He taught exactly the contrary.] “Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest *not* the body that shall be.”

In reference to the doctrine that we are raised as we die, see the 20th and 22nd chapters of Luke and Matthew, which bear on the doctrine of the literal resurrection of the naturally dead. See Matt. 22, 23. The Sadducees came to our Lord and put the question to him as to the

woman who had had seven husbands. They thought to puzzle him by the question, "Whose wife shall she be in the resurrection?" They took it for granted that the future life was *like this*. Hence the difficulty, to them, of this question. The seven husbands might all claim her. But the Savior says to them, (verse 29,) "Ye do err [and I say the same to our friends now;] not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God," [and what then follows?] "For *in the resurrection* they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the ANGELS OF GOD IN HEAVEN." That is the condition of those who shall experience the resurrection to a future life. Here, they are "subject to vanity," temptation, sin, and suffering. But in the future state they are "as the angels of God." They shall not die any more. They become "the children of God." If stress be laid on the expression, "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world," (Luke xx. 35,) "and the resurrection of the dead," I will notice them hereafter.

Mark now the language of the Savior. In the resurrection, men "are as the angels of God in heaven." NONE are so now. The highest saints, the holiest men, are not equal to "the angels of God in heaven." Now introduce Paul. "How are the dead raised up?" Are they raised *as they die*? Is their condition in a future life similar to the present? We shall see. Jesus Christ says, "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." Paul says, (verse 37,) "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die; and that which thou sowest thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain: it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain: but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body. All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds. There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the glory of the celestial is one and the glory of the terrestrial is another. There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differeth from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead." [How? Here is the point:] "It is sown in *corruption*; it is raised in *INCORRUPTION*. It is sown in *dis-*

honor, [the opinion of men now is that they rise thus, and live forever thus:—not so says Paul;] “it is raised in GLORY: it is sown in *weakness*; it is raised in POWER:” [Here is a change *after death*,—a great, a wonderful change! greater than any ever experienced before death—a change from dishonor to glory! Let us go on again:]—“It is sown a natural body: it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body: and so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.” [So it was God’s *purpose* that we should be “subject to vanity” here; but that we should be delivered from that “into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.”] “Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural: and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from Heaven. As is the earthy, such<sup>r</sup> are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such<sup>r</sup> are they also which are heavenly; and as we have borne the image of the earthy, we *shall also bear the image of the heavenly*.” [This is the change after death, in the resurrection, effected by the power of God. And so on afterwards.] “Now this I say brethren: that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery: we shall not all sleep, but we *shall all* BE CHANGED, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed—[that word so abhorrent to the minds of some; WE SHALL BE CHANGED.] For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruption 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. Oh death! where is thy sting? Oh grave! [*Hades*, or HELL, if you please,] where is thy victory?” All are destroyed by the resurrection to glory. There shall be no more sin, misery, or death, after we are raised from the dead. We shall rise in glory and honor, in incorruption and immortality: and this declaration of St. Paul corresponds to the declaration of Jesus Christ:—“they shall be as the angels of God in heaven.”

I shall insist upon this argument, until it is fairly taken

out of my hands. If Mr. Waller sets it aside, or takes it out of my hands, I shall yield the point. But unless he does so, I shall rest much of my hope of a future state of happiness, upon this language. It is the most lengthy, explicit, and elaborate statement of the doctrine of the resurrection to be found in all the Word of God.

Why have men been raised to wretchedness, and sin, and shame forever? We don't here find expressed the doctrine of misery and torture. What a vast difference St. Paul's account of the resurrection, and the modern popular one! I will add no more at present, but wait for my friend to notice and set aside the passage, if he can. This is not the last I shall have to say upon this subject.

I cannot tell what course Mr. Waller will pursue upon this passage. There are three different opinions among the Orthodox as to the meaning of this chapter. I wait for Mr. Waller's views, so as to see what bearing they have upon this controversy. I hope you will all be here to-morrow, to hear my reply to his next speech. It is due to yourselves, and to me, and to the truth.

[MR. WALLER'S SIXTH REPLY.]

It is written, that the first shall be last, and the last, first: and my notice of Mr. P.'s last speech shall be in this order. The connection of our argument requires it. The doctrine of the resurrection then demands again, our primary attention. My opponent seems to think it is very plainly taught in 1 Cor. 15, that all men are to be made holy and happy in the resurrection. This is his grand argument—his main point.

In my last I showed that God, in the resurrection, would make an everlasting distinction between those that served him, and those that served him not. But I expected the gentleman would make the effort, as all his brethren do, to show that the passages quoted by me, had reference to a moral and not to a literal resurrection. But he assumes this ground without any warrant in criticism; and without the slightest countenance from the context. The only reason he possibly can give for such an interpretation is, that *his cause demands it!* Admit such a rule of interpretation, and the whole Bible must fall without a struggle before the vain conceits of dreamers and errorists. It will be impossible to prove that it teaches any thing. The

passages I read, assert the resurrection, in the same terms as in 1 Cor. 15. If the latter proves that event, so do the former. And by the same rules of criticism that it can be shown that the term *resurrection*, in the passages which I read, does not literally mean a resurrection, I will show that the same is true of the term in 1 Cor. 15. Or, am I to be told, that because the passages which I adduced spoke of the sinner's being raised and of his punishment, that therefore it cannot mean the literal resurrection? It would seem that such is the reasoning of Universalists; and without this, they feel that their whole system vanishes into air! But they cannot be permitted thus to beg the question. If they must insist that the portions of the Scripture which mention the resurrection of the wicked, are poetical, and to be interpreted in a figurative sense; then they must reap the consequences of their folly, and admit this "main pillar" of Universalism, as Mr. Pindree is pleased to call it, is a pillar of *vapor*—as impalpable to the touch as the ghost of Fingal!—that Paul in this place, as in those places of his that I read, and like Daniel, and our Savior, was giving loose rein to a very vivid imagination; and that this whole 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians is but a glowing fancy sketch of a moral resurrection! The gentleman will thus see, that what he sows he must reap; that if he sows the wind, he shall reap the whirlwind.

What then is the doctrine of the Bible on this subject? Why, that there shall be a resurrection of the *just* and of the *unjust*—that the *dead in Christ* shall rise *first*. The main intention of the Apostle, in 1 Cor. 15, was to comfort Christians by showing that they should be raised to happiness. He made it no part of his business to establish especially the resurrection of the *unjust*. This the whole chapter proves. His whole reasoning is subversive of Universalism: for his first and main position is, that if there is no resurrection, it is all folly to be religious. Now, Universalism teaches that religion has no connection with the next life—that it benefits man only in this world: and of course, with or without a resurrection, it is equally beneficial. But the Apostle argues just the reverse of this, and shows that if there be no hereafter, religion is the very summit of absurdity. Hear his language—"But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not

risen, then is OUR PREACHING VAIN and YOUR FAITH IS ALSO VAIN." And further he says: "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, YOUR FAITH IS VAIN; YE ARE YET IN YOUR SINS. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If IN THIS LIFE ONLY WE HAVE HOPE IN CHRIST, WE ARE OF ALL MEN MOST MISERABLE." Now, this could not be so, if Universalism be true; for according to that system, the Christian religion makes people happy here, and has nothing whatever to do with their happiness hereafter. But, I repeat, the Apostle argues that the profession of religion would be ridiculous folly—sheer madness, if there were no hereafter and no resurrection of the dead. Let us hear him further to this point: "Why stand we in jeopardy every hour?"—"What advantageth it me, if the dead rise not." The meaning is, that if there be no resurrection of the righteous, then they act a very simple part in suffering persecution for the cause of Christ. Let them take their pleasure, for their is no advantage in religion. Now, bear in mind, that the Apostle's great position is, that the whole of Christianity is a most miserable farce if there be no resurrection of the dead—that the cruel persecutions endured by himself and his fellow Christians would indicate madness except for the rich reward they were to reap in the resurrection, and then you will see the force of his reasoning: "And as we [Christians] have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, [Christians,] that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery: WE shall not all sleep, but WE shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and WE shall be changed: for this corruptible must put on incorruption and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed in victory; O death, where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, MY BELOVED BRETHREN, be YE steadfast, unmovable, always

abounding in the work of the Lord, FORASMUCH AS YE KNOW THAT YOUR LABOR IS NOT IN VAIN IN THE LORD." Thus he predicates his argument in favor of a resurrection, on the folly of religion without it. His reasoning is what logicians denominate the *argumentum ad hominem*. And he concludes by an exhortation to them, to persevere in good works and to endure with patience all persecution, inasmuch as they were promised a glorious resurrection.

It is obvious then, that Mr, Pingree has taken a passage written for the comfort of saints to encourage them under trials by the hope of their resurrection, and has applied it to sinners! He has, in effect, said unto them, "Eat and drink, for to-morrow you shall be raised to inherit the kingdom of God! Do not be like the foolish Christians, who are enduring persecution for a faith that will make them no better than you in a world to come! Continue in your sins: avoid the frown of men: shun the company of the despised Nazarenes: go on in your unrighteousness: and you shall be just as happy and as holy as the Christians in the world to come!" This is the syren song of Universalism! Thus it lulls the ungodly to sleep. But the Apostle did not tell them so. Compare this chapter, with what I have already quoted from his Epistle to the Thessalonians, and you will see he is writing of the same event, only in the latter, he mentions the resurrection of the wicked. In both he speaks of the Savior's coming "with the trump of God," and raising the dead (compare 1 Cor. xv, 52, with 1 Thess. iv, 16,) but in the latter he tells us, that "*the dead in Christ shall rise first;*" that when the wicked shall say: "Peace and safety, then *sudden destruction* cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child, *and they shall not escape.*" In reference to the righteous he says: "Behold I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed," (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52) In relation to the wicked he says: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power."

How different is the condition of the wicked, in the morning of the resurrection, as given by Paul and Mr. Pingree by the pen of inspiration and by the dreams of Universalism!

But I must proceed. The argument of Mr. P. from the resurrection fails in another point: the *change* effected in that great event is *physical*, not *moral*—is of the *body* and not of the *soul*. Unless I have been wholly deceived in the terms of our proposition, Mr. Pingree is here to prove a *moral* change, and not a *physical* one:—that he asserts the ultimate *holiness* and *salvation* of all men. Or are we to understand him to assert that the moral diseases of the soul are to be remedied by medicines which heal the body? That the more vigorous and healthy the body, the more pure and hallowed the emotions of the soul? If so, let him speak out. He must prove that a change of body effects a change of soul, or this vaunted passage proves nothing for him. Now, I affirm, that he has not quoted the first passage of Scripture which remotely alludes to a moral change after death. I deny that there is such a passage between the lids of the Bible. I admit a moral *growth*, but I deny a moral *change* after death. Mr. P. must attend to this point. He shall not evade it. It is what he came here to establish. And I am not to be put off by passages which, to admit all that he has claimed for them, only prove a change of body, as sufficient to show that the man dies a sinner and rises a saint; dies an infidel and rises a believer; dies an atheist and rises singing the praises of God! This is the change he asserts; and it is to this I call his attention. Every one sees that Paul urges no such doctrine to the Corinthians. He is talking of the body, and not of the soul: "It is sown a natural BODY, it is raised a spiritual BODY. There is a natural BODY, and there is a spiritual BODY."

Mr. Pingree told you he would follow my example, and not notice any passage I might adduce until I commented on it. I do not remember, that I refused to notice any passage of his until he commented on it. True, he adduced, in his second speech, a passage which he said proved his doctrine, and asked me for an explanation of it; *this* I declined giving, which drew forth a complaint from my friend. He thought I did wrong: but now, forsooth, he plumes himself in doing the very thing he condemned in me! "The case being altered, alters the case!" He also condemned my



quoting from Universalist authors; but he finds it necessary to himself, and, without a scruple or a blush, quotes orthodox writers by the half dozen! Very well.—He will find that I am not to be outdone. I will give him book for book. And as he has become convinced that it is not wrong to read from books, I will invite your attention to what Universalists have said. “He that hath ears to hear let him hear” how those whom Mr. Pingree claims as brethren, talk to him: I will read from Smith on the Divine Government, a work that Mr. Pingree’s paper has highly commended:

“To the impenitent and obdurate sinner, who in the midst of light and knowledge, with clear conceptions of his duty, and strong convictions of his obligations to obey it, has lived without God in the world, violated the laws of morality and religion, outraged the best affections of the heart, and trampled on the dearest interest of mankind, there must be a day of awful retribution. Though we cannot conceive more nobly of the Deity, than to suppose that benignity constitutes the essence of his nature, yet, from this very circumstance, he must punish the wicked with a necessary degree of severity. They carry in their own breasts the sentence of condemnation: they feel within themselves a terrible consciousness, that they must suffer the just judgment of their crimes, and the dictate of their heart is the voice of God, announcing to them their future destiny. They cannot be happy. Were a seat prepared for them at the right hand of God, were angels and archangels, and the spirits of the just made perfect, to encircle them, and were the most rapturous joys of heaven offered to their acceptance, they would still be wretched. The very bosom of enjoyment would be to them a thorny pillow: for the turbulence of malignant passions would even there disturb their repose. Like those miserable pageants of grandeur, who live in gorgeous palaces, and whom earthly joys encircle, while some foul crime weighs heavy on their conscience, the paleness of whose cheek the surrounding splendor does but deepen, and whose quivering lip moves but the more tremulously for the pleasure which invites their participation—anguish and despair are in their hearts.”

Really this brother of my opponent would seem to advocate the necessity of more than a bare *physical* change

after death. But let us hear him discourse on the solemn matters of the resurrection and the judgment to come :

“With an evidence which no *reasonable mind* can resist” [will Mr. Pingree please hearken?] “and with deep and impressive solemnity, the Scriptures assure us, that after death cometh the judgment—that all mankind must appear before the tribunal of Jesus Christ—that they must be judged according to the deeds done in the body, whether they have been good or evil—that the virtuous of every nation, kindred, people, and religion, shall be admitted to a state of pure and exalted happiness, where all their faculties shall be enlarged, where every object calculated to exercise and satisfy them shall abound, where every natural and moral imperfection, and therefore every painful sensation, shall be forever excluded, and where, existing in immortal vigour, they shall be continually rising higher and higher in the scale of excellence and enjoyment, till they attain a measure of both, which at present we can neither calculate nor comprehend. But they assure us, too,” [once again I invite my opponent’s attention] “that the wicked shall be doomed to a state of suffering, awful in its nature, and lasting in its duration—that they shall be excluded from the habitations of the just—that between them and the virtuous a great gulf shall be fixed—that no song of joy shall be heard in these regions of remorse—that weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth shall be there, and that the recollections of the sins they have committed, the mercies they have abused, and the privileges they have lost, shall fill them with intolerable anguish,” page 68.

Let us hear another of those whom Mr. Pingree calls his brethren, or Universalists. I will quote from *Petitpierre* on “Divine Goodness :”

“St. Peter remarks, [and I let Mr. Pingree’s brother in the cause of Universalism, as he says, refute Mr. Pingree’s exposition of this passage]—“St. Peter remarks, that ‘if the righteous scarcely are saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?’ as if he had said, if so many trials and afflictions are necessary for the salvation of the just, of those who have acquired the habits of virtue, and are sincerely attached to their duty; how great and terrible both in degree and duration will the sufferings be, which are reserved for those, whom long habits of sin have corrupted and hardened? With what just abhorrence should it fill

us for sin, that fatal enemy of our peace, that tyrant of the soul, from whom it will require such dreadful sufferings to free us! The Gospel, that dispensation of mercy, which was given that we might flee from the wrath to come; that ineffable gift of the only begotten son of God, whereby whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life, however compassionate to the penitent offender, speaks nothing but terror and alarm to the guilty and hardened sinner. How striking, how awful, and at the same time how merciful, are the representations of future torments! Let us collect the leading features of the striking picture, and we shall see that it is indeed 'a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.' It is represented under the figure of perishing, of being cast into outer darkness, of a worm that never dies, of a fire that is never quenched, of a lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, into which the wicked shall be cast; and where they shall *perish eternally*. And though neither the word *perish* is here to be understood as a total extinction of being; nor can that of *eternal* imply endless duration; nevertheless they are undoubtedly employed to signify bitter anguish, deep and durable distress, which can be only terminated by a total change in the disposition of the sufferer." Page 26.

And let us hear once more from another of his brethren. I now quote from White on "Universal Restoration."

"Let him that denies hell take heed lest it be verified upon himself; we have as much for hell as we have for heaven," etc. Page 27.

I hope you will duly heed [turning to Mr. Pingree] this affectionate warning of your brother White. It may be that he speaks an awful truth to *you*!

Mr. Pingree is certainly no ordinary disputant. When he does not find it convenient to reply to my arguments, he fancies such as I ought to use, and replies to them. He is quite an adept in such fancy warfare. I certainly did not once intimate that *fire* always meant punishment. Hence all he said about *fires* denoting purification sometimes was sheer extra work. It had nothing whatever to do with any thing that I said; unless he meant that you should infer, that because it *sometimes* meant purification, that therefore it *always* had that meaning! With the same propriety, he might ask you to believe, that because the

old world was destroyed by water, that therefore men are drowned in baptism! I took no such position as that fire was never used in the sense of purify. The gentleman seems to desire to be rid of my argument by *dodging* the passages I read. He seems afraid lest their fire should burn his fingers if he touches them.

Mr. P. tried to amuse you with the anecdote of the Moor and Christian, and disconted at some length on those who had lived mere moral lives, and yet died and were lost; while others who had lived immoral lives were converted and saved, etc. Such reasoning is but the *ad captandum vulgus*. I might retort: I could easily turn such guns against his system. I might show how his doctrine took Judas Iscariot to heaven before his Master whom he betrayed! That according to it, pious Noah was left here many years in sorrow, while the antideluvians for their wickedness were wafted on the waves of the deluge to the beatitudes of heaven! That Lot, for his piety, was retained in this world of misery, while the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, for their beastly iniquities, were taken to heaven in a shower of brimstone and fire!! Aye, this doctrine congregates the most opposite characters in heaven! There will be some curious meetings there! There the man who has made gold his God; who has ground the face of the poor; who has coined the tears of wretchedness; taken the widow's mite and the orphan's pittance; whose swindling under the color of law has robbed poverty of its last resource, and brought misery and starvation upon innocent and unsuspecting hundreds—such a man, will, perhaps, be the first to greet the victims of his merciless rapacity in the climes of bliss!! But I forbear for the present. I choose to meet his argument, if it deserves to be so called, in another way.

The wise man has said, that "fools make a mock at sin." What is sin? and what has it done? It is a violation of God's law. It is the cause of all the evils, moral and physical, which afflict the world; and we stop too short in our estimate of the sinner's character, when we judge of it simply by what he does. He is under restraint. Providence, society, the laws of the land put a rein upon his disposition to carry out the fiendish purposes of his soul. No sinner does all the evil he would like to do and which his heart prompts him to do. In the estimate of

his character then, we ought to take into account his disposition to do—what he would accomplish if all restraints were removed, and he left free and unfettered to act out the promptings of his nature. Thus we act in every thing. Maj. Andre, was executed by the patriots of our revolution, not so much for the injury which he actually inflicted on our country, as for what he would have done ; and what, if unpunished, his example would have led others to do. The farmer does not wait until his corn is destroyed by the weeds, before he kills them. No ; but believing that they would do it, he destroys them before they can accomplish it. It is not because the young snake has stung any one to death, that we crush its head beneath our heel ; but because we know its poisonous nature, and that it may and can kill and destroy. Now apply this test to the sinner :—one of Mr. P.'s honorable and moral men, if you please ; but yet who is in love with sin ; whose heart is under its influences. True, he may not have committed any outrages upon society, but God sees the heart—it is prone to evil and that continually ; and from that he estimates the character. If he covets any thing belonging to his neighbor, he is a thief ; and but for the restraints thrown around him, he would take it. If he hate his brother or neighbor, he is a murderer ; and if unchecked, he would put him to death. God sees not as man seeth. We are deceived by external appearance—a fair show in the flesh imposes upon our judgment. God's all-searching eye penetrates the flimsy exterior of the painted hypocrite, and the deep and dark places of every heart is open and plain before him.

The sinner hates the law of God—he would destroy it : and the violations of it have caused all the woe and misery under which the earth has groaned from the fall of Adam to the present hour. It has loaded every breeze with the sighs and made every hill echo the groans of suffering mankind. “The sweetest and the strongest ties of life have been rudely and ruthlessly torn assunder. Lewdness has changed the world into a lazarhouse of corruption ; and anticipated the work of death and the grave. Deceit and fraud have mocked human expectation, tortured confidence, and hurried their miserable victims to beggary, despair, and death. Rage and revenge have plunged the midnight dagger in the unsuspecting bosom of the neigh-

bor and the friend ; and in their sanguinary progress have multiplied widows and orphans, childless parents and helpless mourners, without number and without end. Ambition has turned the earth into a stall of butchery and of blood, and covered its surface with the bones of men : while tyranny, like the Nubian blast, has spread decay and death in the ranks of the unhappy millions found in its course—withering the last remains of comfort and hope, and converting provinces and kingdoms into scenes of desolation and woe.”\* Sin which has brought all this misery upon the world is the controlling principle in the breasts of those whom Mr. P. has presented to you for sympathy and esteem. But we must not stop here. Let us ask what would be the ravages of the same spirit, goaded on by the same passions, unrestrained in its desires, and unfettered in its powers, and turned loose upon other worlds than this ? The law of God, that golden chain which binds all created intelligences to the throne of God and to one another, would be sundered forever ; and hatred and malice, instead of love, would be the controlling principles in all minds ! Those bright and holy orders, angels and arch angels, cherubim and seraphim, that now “adore and burn” in the presence of the eternal, would be hurled out of heaven ! Every celestial harp would be silenced, the song of the redeemed would be rudely hushed, and moral desolation, disease, and death would prevail, where now all is happiness, holiness and life ! Instead of the harmony which now marks the course of suns and systems wheeling on “adamantine spheres through the void immense,” chaotic, frenzied, reckless confusion, “the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds,” would break with “horrible discord” upon every ear ! In a word, God would be dethroned, and the universe in ruins ! Such would be the career of every sinner, if empowered and permitted to carry out the unhallowed promptings of a heart hostile to God. It is the right—it is the *duty* of every government to punish those who are at open war with it ; and who propose to subvert its principles and its laws, and to introduce anarchy and misrule in its stead. And this is what sin proposes to do in the government of God. It will not do then to mock at it—to speak of it as a light and

\* Dr. Dwight.

trivial matter. The sinner of every grade is a traitor to all that is holy, just and good. He is in arms against the government of the Most High. He feels uncompromising hostility towards, and is waging an exterminating warfare not only upon the principles, but upon the good and legal subjects of the Divine administration. His then is the traitor's cause, and his, in right and justice, must be the traitor's doom! So much for *little* sinners.

Mr. Pingree attempted to be facetious at the position, that the man retained *after*, the moral character he had *in*, death; and says, he supposes then if a man dies drunk, he will remain drunk through all eternity! Really I had supposed that the appetite for strong drink was *animal* and not *moral*; and I beg leave to insist that I am right in this supposition, the ponderous authority of the gentleman to the contrary notwithstanding. And all that I contended for, and which I hope he will squarely meet (for he manifests a disposition to dodge it) was, that if the man died with his moral faculties so corrupt as to lead him, in contempt of God's law, to gratify the beastly appetite of drunkenness, I was bound to believe that these faculties would remain unchanged through eternity—that I knew of no passage of Scripture teaching their change after death, and demanded of Mr. Pingree, if such a passage existed, to produce it: or if he had no scriptural authority for his position, to explain on reasonable and philosophical principles how this moral change was to be effected without moral means; and if the Gospel had been inadequate to the change of the man in this life, what more powerful means had been provided to effect his change in the life to come. All of this Mr. Pingree has declined to do, and we are bound to infer that he had the best reasons for it—he *could not respond*. I beg he will not forget again, that my position is, that the *moral* disposition which prompts to the violation of God's law in the indulgence of the *animal* appetite of drunkenness, if predominant in death, will remain unchanged in eternity.

But my opponent told you, that Univeasalists do not say that salvation is confined to this life. Here is a book which he told me contained a fair representation of their doctrine. It is called "Plain Guide to Universalism." Now hear what this writer says:—

"Now the truth is, we do NOT READ ONE WORD IN THE

BIBLE ABOUT SAVING MEN FROM PUNISHMENT IN THE FUTURE STATE. Jesus was anxious to save people from their sins, and their errors, and to bring them to a knowledge of the truth. He was anxious to save the Jews from the awful judgments which were impending over them, and all the Apostles partook of the same solicitude. Paul says, (Gal. i. 4,) that Jesus gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from "this present evil world." THE EVILS FROM WHICH JESUS CAME TO SAVE MEN ARE IN THIS WORLD, AND FOR THIS REASON HE CAME INTO THIS WORLD TO SAVE THEM." pp. 253-4.

This is too plain to need comment ; and shows that Universalism teaches just what I said it did. And I think the gentleman will generally find that I know what I am talking about. Besides, I have shown already that he himself holds and teaches this very doctrine. But enough : he must be strangely bewildered in the mazes of his system, to lose sight of his "Plain Guide."

Mr. P. insists that the doctrine that punishment is solely inflicted for the good of the sinner, is one of the plainest doctrines of the Bible. I feel that it will be waste of time to notice this matter further. The arguments which I have hitherto adduced remain untouched. And to show you how deceitfully the word of God has been handled ; you remember Mr. P. quoted Heb. xii. 6—11, "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth," etc. Now this passage is applicable to the saints alone—to those who "are the children of God by faith," and yet Mr. P. quoted it as applicable to the wicked, with whom God is "*angry every day!*" This is a fair specimen of his manner of dealing with the Scriptures on this point. I cannot then waste time in making an exposure of such trifling. But if he is disposed to try his hand in proving that all punishment is for the reformation of the sinner, and will not, because he cannot, answer what I have already adduced on this point, I will give him another passage or two : Rev. xvi. 10, 11—"And the fifth angel poured out his vial on the seat of the beast ; and his kingdom was full of darkness ; and they gnawed their tongues for pain, and *blasphemed the God of Heaven, because of their pains and their sores, AND REPENTED NOT OF THEIR DEEDS!*" Now, if God intended this punishment for their reformation, and Mr. P. affirms that he did, then the Al-



mighty failed in his purpose. He intended to produce one result, and produced the very reverse of it! The Scriptures abound in similar instances, and we see corresponding examples in the conduct of sinners in our every day's observation, and Universalism says that God is inflicting this punishment for men's reformation, when it produces the very opposite effect!—the Almighty "cannot do the things that he would."

You were told that the Lord sent Jonah to *hell*. Now Mr. P. either knew or he did not, that the word in the original there employed, was not claimed by any man of information as necessarily implying a state of future punishment. If he knew this, what shall we think of his morality in quoting it as if it was so claimed? And if he did not know it, then he ought not to engage in controversies of this kind. When the common version of the Scriptures was made, the English word *hell* did not so commonly mean a place of future torments as it does now. In the Greek of the New Testament, there are three words corresponding to the term *hell* in our English Bibles, viz: *hades*, *Gehenna*, and *tartarus*. The word *sheol* in the Old Testament corresponds to *hades* in the New, and is not claimed as necessarily implying torments in a future state. Among Jews and Pagans it meant that state into which the soul entered when it left the body. It was often used as we sometimes use the word *grave*—meaning the state of the dead. In Pagan mythology, *hades* had two apartments;—the *Elysii Campi* or *Fields of the Blessed*, where the souls of the virtuous dead enjoyed happiness; and *Tartarus*, surrounded by impenetrable walls and by the impetuous and burning streams of the river Phlegethon, where the impious and the guilty among mankind were punished. Among the Jews too, according to Josephus, a similar doctrine prevailed in relation to *hades*. They supposed it was the *place* into which the soul enters when separated from the body. They supposed too that it contained two apartments; the one above, called "Abraham's bosom," a place of happiness and light, into which the souls of the righteous entered: the other beneath, a place of darkness and anguish, into which the souls of the wicked entered. In the general sense of the *state* of the souls of the dead, it is sometimes used in the New Testament. Hence it is said, that the soul of Jesus was not left in *Hades*; that is,

it would not remain in a state separate from the body: And understood in this sense it is represented as destroyed. That is, the souls of the dead, at the last day, will be united with bodies again. All that we contend for is, that it generally means the state of the soul after death, and *that there may be punishment in that state*. This is clearly taught in Luke xvi. 19-31; "There was a certain rich man who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus who was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died and was buried, and in *hell* [*hades*] he lifted up his eyes being *in torments*, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue: *for I am tormented in this flame*. But Abraham said, son, remember that thou in thy life time receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted and thou art *tormented*. And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from us to you, cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence. Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldst send him to my father's house; for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they come into **THIS PLACE OF TORMENT**. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham; but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

Universalists are reduced to great straits by this passage, and have agonized much over it! All their attempts at explanation fail. They give most contradictory and curious interpretations of it! Mr. Ballou (who if he had not come, my friend Mr. P. would not have been—*what he now is*) tells us that it is a sheer fable! That there is no place of torment after death! That the idea of a dead man's being tormented was but the monstrous abortion of Jewish

superstition! That Jesus Christ used this pernicious *falsehood* of the Jews to inculcate the *truth*! Another Universalist writer, whose conscience seems not at all eased of the burden of this passage by Mr. Ballou's explanation of it, has made an effort of his own to roll this weight off his mind. He tells us, with great gravity, that Lazarus was the Gentiles, who some how or other were full of sores and were licked by dogs, and who all died and were carried by angels to Abraham's bosom; and Abraham, he tells us, was the high priest: and it was in the high priest's bosom that all the dead Gentiles were stored away! The rich man was the Jews who also died in some way, and after death were tormented in some inexplicable way! The five *brethren* are the five foolish *virgins*, mentioned by the Savior elsewhere; but how those *brethren* became *virgins* he does not explain! [A laugh.] The great gulf, he says, was the wall of partition between the Jews and Gentiles, which, he says, is impassible and unalterable, although Paul says it has been broken down! I might adduce many other specimens of the absurd and ridiculous nonsense uttered by Universalists in their efforts to dispose of this very troublesome passage. But let these suffice.

Now what are the FACTS upon which this parable is based?—1st. That the pious, who are often poor and neglected here in this world, die, and are conveyed by angels to happiness and heaven. 2nd. That the wicked, who are often wealthy and surrounded with the good things of this life, die also, and go to a place of torment. And 3rd. That the righteous and the wicked are forever separated in the next estate. But we are told, that this is a *parable*: Grant that it is; it nevertheless is no *fable*. All the Savior's parables are based upon *facts* that do, or may exist. They are never based upon mere dreams or falsehoods. For example; the parable of the lost sheep—It is a *fact* that there are such animals as sheep: there *may be* one hundred in a flock; it is not impossible for one to go astray; it is entirely probable that in such a case, the owner would leave the ninety-nine, and go in search of the one lost, and when he had found it would rejoice more over it than over the ninety and nine that had not been lost. This is true of all the parables—they are all based on what *may occur*; not one of them is based upon what is *impossible to be true*. The Universalists in this parable will grant that

it is a *fact* that some rich men are *wicked*, and that some poor men are pious. They will admit also that the rich and poor, the wicked and the righteous, all die. Thus far they must admit the Savior has based his parable on truth. Nay, they will not deny but that the righteous are "comforted" after death; that they are admitted into the association of the just, with Abraham etc. Thus far too, they will grant the parable has truth for its basis. But here they pause. They say it is wholly false that a wicked man dies and in hades "lifts up his eyes being in torments," that it is false that he is "tormented" or is in a "place of torments" after death!! So they reason, and so they charge falsehood upon the Son of God! But more of this, when we shall hear from Mr. P. In due time you shall hear our views on the words *Gehenna and Tartarus*.

Mr. P. argues, if I understand him, that under the Mosaic economy, the Jews who "died without mercy under two or three witnesses" in that way received "a just recompense of reward" for their worst transgressions; and that for "every transgression and disobedience" they received a *just* recompense of reward" in *this life*; that it consequently would be unjust to punish them in the life to come; and he argued that if the Gospel brought in as a "sorer punishment," eternal torments, then the Gospel was a curse and not a blessing. Now all this is easily met and exposed. The Mosaic law had the promise of the life that now is; not of that which is to come. Its rewards and punishments were proportioned to this life. A law that takes cognizance only of this life, if violated is justly satisfied by a temporal punishment; if observed, can only give temporal rewards. This was true of the law of Moses; the ceremonial economy under which the Jews lived. But the moral law, which belongs to all nations, and to all worlds, in its principles demanding not only an external but an *internal* observance of its precepts, must be fulfilled in every jot and tittle, and until this is done, the violator is under its curse. Now God proposes through the mediation of his Son, who magnified the law and made it honorable, to save men from the curse of the law. If they reject this proposition, they aggravate their guilt, and pull down additional wrath upon their heads. Such is the reasoning of Paul to the Hebrews. In other words:—A temporal government can inflict only corporal punishments; a moral government can inflict only spiritual punishments. If Mr.

P. will only keep this distinction in view, the mists and darkness that now envelope his understanding will disappear, as the morning vapor and the early dew melt away before the sun in his strength.

In relation to Mr. P's, inquiry respecting the salvation of infants and idiots, I hesitate not to avow my belief that they are all saved through Jesus Christ. There is but one opinion on this subject in the Orthodox world. But he asks, are the heathen saved? I will too ask him one question, *Does he believe that the heathen are saved in this world? Are they saved from sin in this life?* If not, where and when does Universalism propose to save them? If they are not saved from sin before death, I frankly confess, that I know not when or how they are saved; and Mr. P. positively refuses to throw any light upon the subject. I do not assert that they all die in their sins; but I do assert most emphatically, that if they do thus die, Mr. P. has not shown how they get out of their sins after death; and until he does this, I am bound to believe they will be punished, for he says that punishment necessarily follows sin, and if sin goes into the next world, according to his own showing, punishment must go with it. He has found no authority for arresting it, and keeping it in the prison of this world, unless he detains sin here too. So after all, this case of the heathens is a very ugly matter for the Universalists. The Scriptures speaking of them say, they are "filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful;" and Universalism asserts that dying in this state they are saved, it does not profess to tell or know how! That they die ignorant of God, in love with idolatry, and foul with every sin; and that in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, without the impartation of an idea, without the spirit of God, without the bath of regeneration, they rise knowing and loving God, hating idols;—washed from every sin and as pure as the angels of light! Now I cannot believe all this without some better testimony than mere round assertion. I cannot venture so far into the dark, unexplored territories of the spirit land without some lamp

to my feet, some light to my path. And mere earthly light will not do, or I might take the brilliant coruscations of Mr. P's fancy. But I want the light of heaven—of the Scriptures. I will not go one step without it. If then Mr. P. says that none of the heathen are saved from their sins on earth—that they all die wicked and polluted and impenitent, then I adopt the consequences of the Bible; *they cannot see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them.* Here the Bible leaves all such, and hear I leave them. I will not—I dare not go further.

Mr. P. has several times quoted such passages as these; “as by one man’s transgression many were made sinners,” “as in Adam all die.” Now I respectfully ask, and I wish a categorical answer—DOES HE BELIEVE IN THE FALL OF MAN AT ALL? ARE NOT ALL MEN IN THE SAME MORAL CONDITON THAT ADAM WAS WHEN CREATED? But I must close.

[MR. PINGREE’S SEVENTH SPEECH.]

RESPECTED AUDITORS: My first duty, this morning, is to refer to the arguments already adduced to establish the proposition, that the Scriptures do “teach the ultimate holiness and happiness of all men.”

The first argument was derived from the nature and character of God and his relationship to man. The argument from this character of God, is, that he will not inflict endless torture upon his children, to whom his infinite benevolence and love extend.

The second argument was from the declaration in the 8th of Romans, that “the creature” there spoken of, which is the whole human creation, “shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.” Mr. Waller’s first remark on this was that the word “creature” included *more* than man, viz: stocks and stones, and all the visble creation. He afterwards thought it meant “the intelligent creation.” I will read the opinion of Dr. Lightfoot, etc., as found in the commentary of Dr. Clarke on the passage, “There is,” says he, “a *two-fold* key hanging at this place, which may unlock the whole, and make the sense plain and easy. 1. The first is the phrase, *pasa he ktisis*, which we render *the whole creation*, ver. 22, and with which we meet twice elsewhere in the New Testament, Mark xvi. 15: *Preach the Gospel, pase te ktisei, to every creature*; and Col. i. 23: *The Gospel was preached, en pase te ktisei, to every creature.* Now it is

sufficiently apparent what is meant by *pasa ktisis* in both these places, viz. *all nations*, or the *heathen world*. . . . And this very phrase in this place lays claim to that very interpretation," etc.—*Dr. Clarke on Rom. viii. 19*.

I need not read the whole. He says the "creature" embraces ALL NATIONS. That is enough. But it does not depend on authority. The passage itself—its language—is explicit and clear, and *requires* this interpretation, and no other. The same "*creature*," whether more or less, that "was made subject to vanity," etc., "shall be delivered." If any therefore are *not* delivered, they are those who were not "made subject to vanity." I know Paul afterwards says, as distinct from the "whole creation," "and not they *only* but we *ourselves*," etc.; but this does not *exclude* the "creation."

Again, the third argument was from the 5th of Romans, where we learn that *all* have sinned; as "there is none that doeth good, no not one," and that by sin "death has passed upon all men;" and that as through one many are dead, (that is *all* are dead,) so through one all shall be saved—as *many* shall be saved as *die*; that is, "all men."—Nothing has been said to set aside this argument.

My fourth argument was founded on the promises of Scripture, that Christ will "*reconcile* all things to God." The whole world will finally be reconciled; and if reconciled, then saved. This is the declared purpose of God. I then argued that what God *designs*, will be accomplished; and that Christ is not like the man that began to build a tower, and could not FINISH it. Reading passages not containing the word *salvation* or *saved*, about which terms Mr. W. might start a question, I simply put the inquiry, Do you believe God will *damn* eternally those of whom he says, they "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God?" If *delivered*, are they not *saved*? Will he endlessly DAMN men after they are *reconciled* to him? Certainly he will not. If reconciled, they are saved.

My fifth argument was founded on the fact that God WILLs the salvation of ALL MEN. In connection with this, was the declaration, full and explicit, that "God is the Savior of all men." He wills the salvation of *all mankind*; and he "DOETH his will:" none can resist him. He does his pleasure: none can withstand his power. If it is denied that the terms "all men" embrace all men, really, I

will prove it by other means. If it is denied that this will of God is a *will of purpose*, I will also prove that it is. If it be only a *desire*, according to Mr. Waller's doctrine, then, if all men shall never be saved, GOD must possess an eternally ungratified desire!!

In relation to the other passage, declaring God to be "the Savior of all men," I have called for *one thing*, from which God saves all men in the present life. Does any one say he is *now* the Savior of all? Where is the thing in *this* life, from which all are saved? Nothing, absolutely nothing. It must then be a *final* salvation; and that to be enjoyed by "ALL MEN."

My sixth argument was founded on the declaration of Christ, that in the resurrection, men "shall be as the angels of God in heaven;" and the declaration of St. Paul, in 1 Corinthians xv., that all who die in Adam shall be made alive in Christ. All men shall be raised to incorruption, immortality, and glory.

My seventh argument is founded on the prospective fact of the destruction of all the enemies of man, by Christ;—the *Devil* and his works; *sin*, and the *grave*; with *death* "the LAST ENEMY:" all shall be destroyed. This last will be destroyed, by raising all men to an immortal life of happiness.

Do we need more? Must I quote more texts of Scripture? I might quote others; but are not these enough, if sustained? I shall not, at present, occupy time further in quoting passages and commenting on them.

I shall now give the rest of my time entirely to an examination of Mr. Waller's passages. I am not bound, logically, to do this, until he has set aside mine; but for the benefit of those who may not understand them, it may be proper for me to do so.

I here pause to ask a favor. I do not mean to "dictate," but to ask it as a favor, that Mr. Waller do not introduce a great many passages at once. I have not time to examine a great many. He read in half an hour as many as would take ten hours to examine. Let him pick out the best, and *strongest*, and most *explicit*, and take his position as to the question; and if I do not set them aside, I will give up the point; or at least, acknowledge my ignorance of their meaning. I know I may be ignorant of some of them. I do not profess to "understand all mysteries;" but I shall endeavor



vor to explain them; and if I fail, the fault will be—somewhere, besides in my doctrine.

I shall now pass briefly over the last speech of Mr. Waller, and notice the points he made, establishing the Scripture doctrine of a judgment, the two kinds of resurrection, and then notice the passages he introduced. His first remark was that the whole of 1 Corinthians xv. refers only to the resurrection of the *just*; while I appeal to any one who read the passage, whether it is so. Where is the evidence of it? He might perhaps tell us it is because the Epistle was written to the Church, and the saints. This is, I know, a common cavil—a common quibble upon such subjects. Try it: says Paul to the Corinthians, in the second Epistle, chap. v., “WE must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ”—a passage quoted to prove a general judgment for *all men*. If stress is laid on the word “*we*,” mark you, whether good or bad, the meaning must be carried out; and none are concerned in the judgment, but *the saints!* So also in relation to the resurrection, in 1 Cor. xv. What will he do with me, or you, or any man living, unless the term embraces *all men?* Away with such narrow interpretations of Scripture! It applies to *all men*, Another passage—Heb. ii. 3—“How shall *we* escape,” etc.? Will Mr. Waller confine this to the saints alone, because addressed to them? Are the plainest declarations of *general doctrines*, in the Word of God, all to be confined to the church at Corinth? What will Mr. Waller do? He calls himself a saint, I suppose; but he was not one of the saints of Corinth. The promises were addressed to *them*—not to the saints in Warsaw. They have no part nor lot in it, if that is the way the language is to be restricted.

What does the passage say itself?—“As in Adam ALL die, so in Christ shall ALL be made alive.” This is the key to the whole passage. If there are any that shall not be saved, they are those that do not *die in Adam*. What is meant by “all”? Oh! it means the *saints* that die in Adam! Does Paul say so? He says “ALL.” Do only the *SAINTS die?*

True, we have a “resurrection of the just, and of the unjust,” from Acts xxiv. 15. I believe in a resurrection of the just and of the unjust. Paul says he had HOPE of this. He *hoped* for the resurrection of the just and the unjust. Suppose the consequences to be as Mr. Waller says; would

Paul "*hope*" for it? Would he WISH the resurrection of those who are doomed to future and endless PERDITION? This would be as bad as Tertullian, who said how he would *exult*, how *laugh*, when he found himself with the righteous in heaven, and witnessed the sufferings of his enemies in Hell! Tertullian was the first known in the Christian church to preach the doctrine. He hoped for the resurrection of the unjust, to *continue* unjust, that he might *enjoy* their sufferings! Was this the benevolent Paul's "*hope*"? It is afterwards taught in the 15th of Corinthians, *how* and *with what body* we are raised; spiritual, incorruptible, immortal, glorious. But I have said enough on this point.

He quotes the phrase, "resurrection of damnation," etc.; and says that "resurrection" *means* resurrection. He is cautious, certainly. There is no dispute as to what the word is. But it does *not* always *mean* the same thing. It is *admitted* by all that in 15 Cor. it is a resurrection to *immortal life*. Jesus Christ used the same word, rendered "resurrection." That is admitted. But about the passage Mr. Waller refers to, there is a dispute. I will give an example of the figurative use of the word. In Luke ii., it is said by Simeon, of Christ, "Behold this child is set for the falling and *rising again* of many in Israel." This does not mean the rising of the literally dead. Though the same word (*anastasis*) is used in the original, that is translated "*resurrection*" elsewhere. I suppose Mr. Waller will not say this is the resurrection to immortality, that Simeon speaks of.

If Mr. Waller says the *righteous* ONLY have the resurrection spoken of in 15 Cor., because the Epistle was addressed to the church, it cannot apply to any saint being in Warsaw, in the 19th century. He says moreover that the chapter relates not to any change of soul, but a mere change of body. Says Paul, "*corruption shall not inherit incorruption.*" If there be a corrupt soul, therefore, it shall not inherit an incorruptible body. The language relates to the *whole man*, as such. *How* are THE DEAD raised up, and *WITH* what body shall we rise? is the question. Paul does not speak of the body *merely*, or the soul, as such. He does not write metaphysically; but speaks of men—all men, as mortal, dying creatures, to enjoy a resurrection to immortal life.

A *moral* change after death is denied by Mr. Waller;

but he admits a *physical* change. He says the drunkard will not have that bodily appetite to drink, but that the *disposition* to be a drunkard remains, although the appetite to drink is gone! He has got an incorruptible body, as proved from 15 Corinthians: If he retains however the disposition to get drunk, the Devil who is his keeper will certainly accommodate him in that respect, and furnish him with the liquor! So he may remain drunk to all eternity; because the evil appetite with which a man dies will remain to all eternity; and men will carry out their evil dispositions forever, according to the doctrine referred to. So it will be with all other sins.

I say there is an absolute necessity of a great moral change after death. I urge it upon you—"all are gone out of the way; there is none that doeth good"—"no man liveth and sinneth not," says the Bible. If the Pagans are all sinners, they are all lost: they die idolaters, and must remain idolaters forever, in Hell! So with all infants and idiots. They die ignorant, imperfect, impure—not fit for heaven: they have indeed no real *moral character*; not fit for the abode and purity and bliss, nor deserving of Hell: what will be their destiny? They will remain hung up forever, between Hell and Heaven! will they not, on this principle?

Carry out the principle of this doctrine. Where is there a man who dies fit for heaven?—I mean in moral character, entirely fit for a world of bliss and glory, without a change in death, or after? Look at the strife between Christian sects—between pious, learned, and great men. Do the mass of professed Christians agree one with another? are they morally in a suitable state for heaven? Is this strife suitable? I presume they are good men; or at least, it is so believed by themselves, and by the world; but look at the strife between the best Christians, one with another. Can they dwell in peace and harmony in heaven, unless they are *morally changed after death*? Look at the Methodists for example; how they are divided into opposing ranks. Will they not need a moral change, before they can dwell together in heaven? Look at the Baptists. The close communion Baptists cannot commune at the table of their Lord with other sects of Baptists. They unchurch and exclude from this rite, all not immersed. Now suppose the Sprinklers should go to heaven. Neither of the antagonists, we will suppose, is changed. They

have carried to heaven the same moral tempers they had here: how can they agree together!? Heaven is not partitioned off for all the sects; some Roman Catholics, and some Protestants, etc.; and this strife has continued for 300 years. Sincere professors of religion are involved in dissension one with another. What will they do in heaven, unless changed? There is an *absolute necessity* for a change after death. Not a soul lives that can be the same in heaven: no man dies entirely fit for the perfect purity of the life to come.

Mr. Waller referred to Thessalonians, where it is said, "the dead in Christ shall rise first." In reference to what, and to whom is this said? Is it said in reference to the *just*, as distinguished from the unjust? Is that it? No, we that are *alive* shall not "prevent" or go before them that are *dead*. That is, the *dead* shall rise *first*, "in Christ," and then those who are *alive* are to be changed. It is not that the *righteous* shall "rise first," and then the *wicked*. So the force of the passage, as he applied it, is lost. There is not a word about the resurrection of the unjust, as a distinct resurrection from that of the just. Men are not divided in this manner;—all will rise at once, and all in one state.

I do not find fault with Mr. Waller for reading Universalist authors. He may read as many as he pleases. But I refuse to be responsible for all the sentiments, all the things and all the doctrines, that he may bring up here from other sources, which have *nothing to do* with the question we proposed to discuss. But so far as the doctrine of universal salvation is concerned, he may show any thing which has a bearing on it. They all agree upon that doctrine, though they may differ about minor matters, that are not before us. I admit Dr. Southwood Smith believed in future punishment. Many Universalists in times past believed in future punishment. Their opinions have been read. I have no objection. You may make the most you can of them, and he may do the same. But, let it be remembered, that is *not the question before us*.

He attempted to retort to my referring to the doctrine he advocates, as having the effect of sending some of the *worst* men to heaven, and the *best* to Hell, by saying that Universalism would keep Noah here in Hell while the Antediluvians went to heaven. Who said that Noah was in Hell here? Nobody, except Partialists.

It shocks him much that wicked men should get to heaven. Is there any thing in this so very shocking? What does Mr. Waller *preach* for? What, but to make the wicked repent, that they may go to heaven—to make the man who *hates* his brother, *love* him? *If not*, his preaching is not worthy of the Gospel; for it is the object of the Gospel to bring those who are far apart, near together;—and so we teach. Yet the promise of the accomplishment of the thing for which all the Orthodox pray and labor, shocks him! He thinks it a shocking idea that Judas should go to heaven before his Master whom he betrayed, even if he did, which is not asserted; that is, that Judas should be morally changed, and be fit for heaven. We teach that it shall be finally accomplished. By the blessing of God it will come to pass, through his goodness and grace. And this is better than to take a man whose days have been spent in righteousness, and for *one sin*, hurl him with the besom of destruction into endless Hell-horrors, as the doctrine of Mr. Waller does. That is not what we believe is the purpose of God; but to bring all men TOGETHER—the oppressor and the oppressed, and cause them all to love God and one another. That is the glory of our Holy Religion. But my friend is shocked at this!

All that talk about making a mock at sin—What is it introduced for? Nobody here is making a mock at sin. Sin is a disease; and God will purge it out, and make sinners holy and pure. We all agree about the evil of sin. Hence all that disquisition on sin is not necessary to be noticed in this argument: it has no place in this discussion.

He referred to some place where the punishment inflicted for sin did not have the effect to reform the sinner. I have a passage in my mind, Levit. xxvi. I will read it. And upon this point, the people who were said to be afflicted in Revelation, and who blasphemed, were not *at that time* reformed. Hence he argues that they never were reformed at any subsequent time. This is the whole argument, and it amounts to nothing; for the conclusion does not follow. What is not accomplished at a *certain period*, may be *afterwards*. Levit. xxvi. 18. “And if ye will not yet for all this hearken unto me, then I will punish you seven times more for your sins.” It then goes on detailing the punishments to be inflicted; and again, v. 21, “and if ye walk contrary to me, and will not hearken unto me, I will bring *seven times more* plagues upon you, according to your sins.”

These plagues are there detailed; and it is again repeated, if the punishment does not produce reform, if the people are still disobedient, still further and worse punishments are threatened; and this is several times repeated. But when they are *finally* reformed by these sufferings, the punishment ceases, and they are to be BLESSED and HAPPY. In the latter portion of the chapter it reads, "If they shall *confess* their iniquity, and they then *accept* of the punishment of their iniquity, then will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember: and I will remember the land." So it goes on; and so throughout the Scriptures, wherein punishment *for the time* does not effect the reform intended. But if he finds where punishment is extended to eternity, it might have some bearing on the point. These *do not*, because where punishment is inflicted in this life, it cannot be said at *any one point of time* that it will *never* have the desired effect.

He says the chastening for the soul's profit, declared in Hebrews, which I referred to, applies only to the saints. Then it was to make *the holy* partakers of God's holiness; and yield the peaceable fruits of righteousness to *the righteous!* Why wish *saints* punished for their good, when they sin, more than *common sinners*? For what purpose could that be done, except to gratify the malice of him who inflicted punishment? But I have not time to examine that passage in this speech.

One fact is worthy to be remembered; that *Sheol* in the Old Testament, and *Hades* in the New, are synonymous words. This is nothing new to Mr. Waller; but may be so to some; and moreover does not mean endless damnation in the future life. So in the Bible, the passage "the wicked shall be turned into Hell, and all the nations that forget God," does not mean, as Mr. Waller says, endless damnation.

Mr. WALLER—I did not say so.

Mr. PINGREE—I understood that the wicked entered into *Hades* at death, and were afterwards taken out of *Hades*, and sent to Hell. So the good were taken out of *Hades*, and sent to heaven. If *Hades* is the place of damnation, "Abraham's bosom" is there, and Lazarus in Abraham's bosom—then *Abraham* is there *in Abraham's bosom!* I'll *prove* that *Hades* is not a place of endless damnation, if it be not conceded.

Mr. WALLER—I said nothing about it.

Mr. PINGREE—We will pass on. It seems, then, according to Mr. Waller's previous remarks, that Jesus Christ adopted the Pagan notion of *Hades*. I ask what did the Pagans know about Abraham's bosom? The other department, however, was Tartarus. The wicked went there; but both the good and wicked were to go to *Hades*.

Now I ask what *new doctrine* did Christianity give us, if the Pagans had their Tartarus and their Abraham's bosom, and Jesus Christ acknowledged the correctness of their notions? Why send Missionaries to the Pagans? The Pagans had their Styx and Tartarus. What was the difficulty? Better to be a Pagan, and not have this *new thing*, which after all gives no new idea.

Mr. WALLER—Did I admit it was a Pagan notion?

Mr. PINGREE—Yes; for where do you find such notions, except among the Pagans? Says Hosea, "O Death! I will be thy plagues: O! Grave, I will be thy *destruction*;" that is, *Hades*, or Sheol, (the same word with the *Hades* where the rich man went,) O *Hades*! I will be thy destruction. It is not therefore the place of *endless* punishment; for it shall be DESTROYED.

Paul says, "O grave! where is thy victory?" (the grave—*Hades*, where the rich man went.) If *Hades* be a place of endless misery, it has a great "victory" over God, and Christ, and holiness, forever! If it were the place of endless damnation for the souls of men, Jesus gained no victory over it. But it is *not* the place of endless damnation: you *see* it is not, in the light of these passages. "Death and Hell (*Hades*) shall give up their dead," says John in the Revelation: they shall be destroyed, and shall deliver up what is in them. Whatever *Hades* is, therefore, whether with its literal or figurative signification, it is at last to be *destroyed*, and deliver up all that is in it. Whether he admits it is not eternal, or not, we *prove* by Scripture, that it has no victory over the souls of men.

He admitted as to the Mosaic dispensation, that men under that had no promise except of the life that now is. Where then was there endless punishment? In Rom. ii. 12, it is declared that "as many as have sinned under the law, shall be judged *by the law*." Admitting that the law had only to do with *this life*, in the Mosaic dispensation, where is the endless punishment threatened in any law of God? They were judged "*by the law*." If the law does

not deal with the immortal life, it is certain they would not by that law suffer endless punishment.

He said the Gospel was delivered to Abraham, and to Adam and Eve in Paradise. Was it a Gospel of endless damnation? Let us see. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." "In the seed of Abraham, ALL THE NATIONS OF THE EARTH shall be BLESSED." That was the Gospel preached to Adam and to Abraham. The destruction of the serpent, and the blessing of all the nations of the earth. Men were to be punished by the law, but after that, there is a blessing for ALL.

[MR. WALLER'S SEVENTH REPLY.]

It appears that the long agony of Universalism is over! My friend has finished his argument! He has said all that he can say for his cause! Five or six of what he calls arguments, based upon sheer inference, have been adduced, and upon these he would have ungodly men build their hopes for heaven, although they should never repent and believe the Gospel! You have heard my answers. He has done a great deal of recapitulation. His last speech was scarcely any thing else but what he has hitherto said again and again. I shall not trouble myself to notice what I have already answered. Phrenologists say that the developments of my head show that I have a good deal of *combativeness* and no small share of *distractiveness* about me. That may be; still I have very little of the old hero, who, as Dryden sings,

"Thrice fought his battles o'er again,  
And thrice he slew the slain."

I have no disposition to prey upon the dead. Mr. Pingree's arguments which I have hitherto answered, and for which he has such an affection that it seems he will never tire in repeating them, I will, therefore, leave without further remark. I am aware that my friend has taken some exceptions to my quoting poetry; but really when he announced in his last speech that he was *through*, and I called to mind his great solicitude for this discussion, and the great ado made here and elsewhere by his friends because I was providentially prevented from meeting him last Fall, there was a line in an old Latin poet that seemed so pertinent and appropos, that *I must quote it*:—

"Parturient montes, et nascetur ridiculus mus."

But I will not translate it; of course Mr. Pingree will take



no exceptions, since those in the audience who do not understand Latin, do not know its meaning.

My principal business to-day, since all the arguments of Universalism have been adduced and answered, will be to lead on the phalanx of truth, and bear down with all its crushing weight upon the enemy's entrenchments. And I will try to be as benevolent and indulgent to the feelings of Mr. Pingree, as the nature of the case will admit. But I find it extremely difficult to accommodate myself to his taste. You remember, that on the first day he complained of my not using the Scriptures; but now he complains that I use them too much! He wants me to select a few of what I esteem *strong texts*! He asks me to do what I cannot. The Bible abounds with passages in our favor, and none of them are *weak*—not *one*. But I should be pleased to hear from him in relation to those already quoted. If he would bestow a little attention upon them, he would not be under the necessity of recapitulating so much, in order to fill out his time.

Some time ago in this discussion, I forget when, I warned the gentleman of deep water. I tell him again he should exercise great caution in his approaches to it. With most astonishing recklessness, he has plunged into Hades, Sheol, Abraham's bosom, Pagan notions, etc. I admire his daring, but I fear he will drown himself. He is already so near suffocation, that his brain reels under its influence, as I shall show.

I never said or insinuated, that *anastasis* always meant the resurrection of the dead, and yet Mr. Pingree reasoned as if I did, and really almost ran himself into the absurdity, that it never was used in reference to the dead at all! Now all I said was this, That certain passages quoted by me meant the resurrection of the dead, just as much as the passages quoted by Mr. Pingree, seeing that the language, in the original and English, was the same in all. I argued that if the *resurrection of the dead* did not mean the *resurrection of the dead*, in the passages I quoted, then it could not mean it in the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, seeing that the same language was used. And how does Mr. Pingree meet this position? Why, forsooth, that the word *anastasis* or *anistemei* is not always used with reference to the dead! And who ever thought it was? But not content with announcing a proposition which he seem-

ed to suppose was original, he took the pains to prove it for our edification; and quoted the passage where Jesus is said to be set "for the RISING and falling again of many in Israel!" And he might have quoted many, very many others, more to his purpose, viz: "Mary *arose* and went into the hill country," "Paul *arose* and was baptized," etc. But for the life of me, I could not see how such *learned* criticism proved that the *resurrection of the dead* did not mean the *resurrection of the dead* in one place as well as another. And yet it was to elucidate this very point that he launched out into this mighty sea of Greek criticism!! I repeat, this is deep water; and little boats ought not to venture too far into it.

Since it is confessed that Universalism mainly rest upon 1 Cor. 15, where the resurrection is spoken of, and since it is also confessed that if men dying in their sins are not changed in the resurrection, they are not changed at all, you will pardon me for calling your attention to these matters again. And let us see what has been done? I have shown from the Scriptures that there will be a "resurrection of the just and of the unjust." That they are not all made righteous then, as Mr. Pingree affirms; but that they "shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt;"—"they that have done good [shall come forth] unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." These and kindred passages I have adduced to show that all do not rise alike—that they are not all made holy and saved in the resurrection; that "the dead in Christ shall rise *first*." I have shown that the chapter in Corinthians, relied upon by the Universalists, does not conflict with my views: that chapter refers mainly to the "resurrection of the just," to those "who come forth to the resurrection of everlasting life." The Apostle is speaking of those who "have fallen asleep *in Christ*," (verse 18,) not in drunkenness, in murder, idolatry, etc. He is speaking of those "that are Christ's," and not those who are sold under sin, and belong to the devil. Now we believe as the Apostle elsewhere tells us, (1 Thess. iv. 14-17) that "them which sleep in Jesus [not in sin] will God bring with him"—that "the dead in Christ [not the dead in drunkenness and debauchery] shall rise *first*;" and shall be caught up "to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall ever be with the

Lord." And that the wicked "shall not escape," (see next chapter, verse 3rd,) for "then sudden destruction cometh upon them." This makes the Scriptures harmonize; and the whole subject appear plain and easy.

But 1 Cor. 15 is wholly unsuited to the necessities of Universalism. The Universalists hold that all the resurrection which takes place is immediately upon death. I charge Mr. Pingree with not believing in the resurrection as *one event*. He holds that it is a work which has been going on since the creation—a work that is now going on in the world. Of course then this chapter is wholly unsuited to his purposes. The resurrection here spoken of is one which takes place at *Christ's coming*—"AT THE LAST TRUMP, for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible." This accounts to you for Mr. Pingree's insisting that the resurrection effects a *moral change*: the truth is he does not hold to a literal resurrection of the body. Then, I say, this chapter is wholly unsuited to his purposes; for the Apostle does not allude by the remotest intimations, to a change of any thing else but the body. The soul is not corruptible—neither can you bury it: it would be nonsense, then, to talk about *raising a soul incorruptible*. It is not mortal: and therefore it would be the grossest absurdity to say, in relation to the soul, that "this *mortal* shall put on immortality." Besides the body is expressly named: "It is sown a natural *body*, it is raised a spiritual *body*." So this chapter cannot be tortured to speak in favor of Universalism. I will not pause to repel the misrepresentation, that I said the language of the Apostle was applicable only to the Christians in Corinth, and not to saints every where and in every age. That and many other such misrepresentations only prove that Mr. Pingree feels that he is in great tribulation. Paul wrote to *Christians* and of *Christians*, and not to *sinners* nor of *sinners*. His language applies to a *class* no matter whether in Corinth or where—then living, or living since.

He told us that the Baptist at least would need a moral change after death, because they now *unchristianized* all other denominations. *This is notoriously untrue*. I do not suppose that he wilfully misrepresented us: I mention this as another instance in proof, that he does not understand the subject he came here to discuss. He further argued

that no man would be fit for heaven, unless a moral change takes place after death. This I deny. The mind must be conformed to the law of God, or no man can be saved; and every mind conformed to the law of God needs no further moral change—is fit for heaven; for “the law is holy, just, and good.” The question then is, can this conformity take place in this life? If so, Mr. Pingree’s position falls to the ground. That it can and does, let Paul testify. He says, “*With the mind I myself serve the law of God.*” Again: “*I delight in the law of God after the inward man.*” Now I appeal to every Christian who hears me, if he would not be holy? if he does not ardently desire it? If he does not wish he might never sin again, but be as free from its influences as the angels in heaven? What then says the Apostle on such cases?—“If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me: For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that when I would do good evil is present with me: *for 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. O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then, *with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.*” I ask, what change did Paul need? Not of mind; for that was conformed to the law of God—that delighted in the law of God. But of what did he complain? Why of the law in his members that warred against the law of his mind: He found that in his *flesh* was no good thing; and he prayed to be delivered from the *body* of this death. So all that he needed was a physical change. Had the emotions of his body accorded with those of his mind he would have been free from sin. It was then a change of body and not a change of mind, or moral change, which he sought. Paul speaks the experience of every Christian upon earth. So then Christians need only a *physical* and not a *moral* change after death.

Mr. Pingree admitted that Judas Iscariot went in advance of the Savior to heaven: or rather he concluded that his doctrine inculcated that sentiment, and he justified the doctrine.

MR. PINGREE. I do not know where Judas went.

MR. WALLER. He does not know where Judas went! His mind has suddenly become foggy! He is in perplexity about Judas, and does not wish to speak his sentiments definitely. But the Savior called Judas a *thief, the son of perdition, etc.*, and said it were better for him, had he never been born. It is recorded of him that he hanged himself, and went to his own place. Really it speaks, in my estimation, rather to the praise of Mr. Pingree, that he shrinks to declare in so many words, that the abandoned wretch who betrayed the Lord of life and glory, and who miserably perished by his own traitorous hands, went directly to heaven! This sense of shame manifested for a proposition so monstrous, is at least an indication that his mind is not so easy in the reception of the system which necessarily brings forth such frightful abortions.

He says that according to our doctrine a man may be righteous all his life, and then be lost for one sin. We teach nothing of the sort. And he seems to think too that if a man has been wicked all his life, abominably wicked, that we teach he is pardoned by one emotion of the mind—by an empty wish. But we do no such thing. Our doctrine bearing upon each of those points may be seen in the following language of the prophet;—Eze. xviii. 21–22, “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.** All his transgressions that he hath committed shall not be mentioned unto him. In his righteousness that he hath done, he shall live.” The Almighty hath no pleasure in the death of the wicked; and Jesus is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him.

The gentleman in his last speech again alluded, rather tremblingly I thought, to the subject that a punishment was for the reformation of the individual punished; and to this end quoted a passage in Leviticus xxvi, the purport of which in its connexion was, that if the Israelites, after being repeatedly punished, should reform, then God would spare them for the sake of his covenant with their fathers.

All of this does not meet what I have said in objection to the doctrine, so essential to his system, that all punishment is inflicted for the good of the individual. I grant that punishment is for the good of society—to prevent the commission of crime; and to that end it is inflicted: and I supposed that this was the very doctrine the Universalists opposed; and certainly the very one against which my opponent professed to be reasoning. His proof then did not apply to his case. It was rather in support of what I affirmed.

But I must pass to weightier matters, alluding to such things as Mr. Pingree has recapitulated as I may find leisure.

Universalism assumes, and makes the assumption a vital principle, that the term *pardon* or *forgiveness*, in the Bible, is not to be understood in the ordinary acceptation of language: that it does not mean what it means every where else; but that it means to *make holy*—to *take away sin*. Well, taking that for granted; or taking the word in either sense, that is, in the *true*, or in the *Universalian* sense, and I propose to show that some are NEVER *pardoned*. To the law then and to the testimony; for I speak according to these:—Heb. vi. 4–6:—“For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again to repentance, seeing they crucify the son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame.” Unless Universalism has the effrontery to declare that to be done which inspiration affirms to be “impossible” then we must believe there are some who cannot be renewed unto repentance.

Again: Heb. x. 26–27 —“For if we sin wilfully after that we have received a knowledge of the truth, *there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins*: but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries.” Mark iii. 29 —“But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath NEVER *forgiveness*, but is in danger of eternal damnation.” James ii. 13—“For he shall have *judgment without mercy* that hath showed no mercy.” 2 Kings xxiv. 4 —“And also for the innocent blood that he shed, [for he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood,] which the Lord would not pardon.” Isaiah xxvii.

11—"When the boughs thereof are withered, they shall be broken off; the women came and set them on fire: for it is a people of no consideration; therefore, he that made them will not have mercy on them, and he that formed them will show them no favor." There are other passages of similar tenor which I will not detain to quote. Here then it is declared by the God of truth, that to certain persons there is "never forgiveness"—that it is "impossible" to renew them to repentance—that there remaineth for them "no more sacrifice for sin;" that the Lord "would not pardon" them—that "he that formed will not have mercy on them," and will "show them no favor." Universalism flatly contradicts all this, and says they all will be *pardoned!* that is, *made holy and happy!!!* "Let God be true, but every man a liar."

But I will press this assumption of Universalism still more closely: for if pardon of sin is equivalent to making holy and taking away sin, then I affirm, if the Scriptures be true, *no one was ever pardoned in this life!* The passage adduced from Paul, (Rom. vii.) awhile ago, proves this matter beyond doubt. He says, that "in our flesh dwelleth no good thing"—that "with the flesh we serve the law of sin." It is written (1 Kings viii. 46,) "There is no man that sinneth not." Again: says Solomon, (Eccl. xvi. 12,) "No man liveth and sinneth not." Again: says an Apostle (1 John i. 8,) "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us." And again: James iii. 2—"For in many things we offend all." And Mr. Pindree admits that no man is free from sin. If therefore, there is any truth in Universalism, no man is ever pardoned in this life: that is, *made holy or free from sin*, for so they define pardon. But in opposition to this, we have the most plain and positive declarations of the Scriptures, that *men are pardoned in this life!* So if you receive Universalism you must reject the Bible for its numerous contradictions!

Now mark our position: We have seen that according to the Universalist definition of pardon, no one was or can ever be pardoned in this life: I now propose to show that the Bible teaches that sins are pardoned in this life.

To this point, I will let a few quotations suffice. Doubtless a number of others will suggest themselves to your minds, for the Bible is full of them. Indeed, I have already

quoted many of that class—Matt. ix. 2—“Son, be of good cheer; *thy sins be forgiven thee.*” Luke vii. 47, 48—“Wherefore I say unto thee, her sins which are many are *forgiven.* And he said unto her, *Thy sins are forgiven.*” 1 John ii. 12—“I write unto you, little children, because *your sins are forgiven you.*” So then Universalism makes the Bible contradict itself, by asserting in one breath that no man can be forgiven in this life, and in the next, that men are forgiven! and because of these contradictions, the system which makes them, must be false.

Nor does the matter stop here. The gentleman must persist in making the Bible thus contradict itself; for if he grants that men are forgiven or made holy in this life, then he must surrender the position so vital to his cause, that all men must experience a moral change in the resurrection! So Mr. Pingree is reduced to the dreadful alternative of giving up his system; or else, in maintaining it, to insist that the Bible contradicts itself!! Yes, he makes the Bible destroy itself!—to assert one moment, that no man can be without sin; and the next moment to declare, that all Christians are forgiven—are free from sin!!—and in another moment still; that no man is forgiven or made free from sin until raised from the grave!!! Such is the preposterous nonsense of the Universalian system.

But I have some criticisms to make on some passages relating to the resurrection of the dead. Paul says, Acts xxiv. 15—“I have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.” But asked Mr. Pingree with great emphasis, *Would Paul hope for the resurrection of the unjust if they are punished?* Paul had hope or *expectation* [for so the original, *elpis*, means] of a resurrection of all the dead, both of the just and unjust. Now cannot a pious man hope for such a resurrection, when himself and all saints will be happy? Or is it true that he cannot even *desire* such a resurrection because some will justly be punished for their sins? With the same propriety, we must not desire good laws and a good administration of government, because if so, all the poor thieves and murderers will certainly be punished! The passage shows, that Paul held the sentiment of the Pharisees, and *expected* a resurrection of the just and unjust; the former, to everlasting life; and the latter to shame and



everlasting contempt. I have hope of a resurrection; all Christians have that hope. And they look forward with pleasing anticipations to the time when these bodies of theirs shall be fashioned like unto the glorious body of the son of God—when free from sickness, sorrow, pain and death, they shall be kings and priests unto God forever. Nor do they suppose they will love God the less or that it will mar in the least their happiness, to find, in the morning of the resurrection, that the Almighty is holy, and just, and good, punishing iniquity, transgression, and sin. They loved him in this world because such was his character; nor will they love him the less because that character displays itself through the ages of eternity. As no virtuous mind can respect that government which permits every transgressor to go free; neither could it contribute to raise the divine government in the esteem of the righteous, if the unclean, and the abominable, murderers, and fornicators, and drunkards, and all liars should have their portion with the saints in glory. They would not associate with such here in this world; surely then they would esteem it hard to be compelled to do so in the world to come! But Mr. Pringree says they are changed after death and made holy; and then of course there is no hardship in the case. Very well; let him prove this. This he has not done: and until he does this; he ought not to think it strange that Paul *desired* (if he must have that meaning) to be forever free from such companions in the glorious abode of the just.

There is a passage much relied upon by Universalists and has been referred to by Mr. Pringree to prove a moral renovation after death. It is found in Matt. xxii. 30—“In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, *but are as the angels of God in heaven.*” The same incident is recorded in Mark xii. 25, 26, and Luke xx. 35–38. Now these passages are said to teach that all men in the resurrection will be made holy as the angels of God in heaven. But I object to this view of the subject: 1st, Because admitting it to refer to all men, it asserts that they shall be like the angels in reference *to marriage*, and no farther. This is the fair construction of the language in Matthew and Mark. But 2nd, The language as in Luke shows that all men were not intended. It reads: “But they which *shall be* ACCOUNTED WORTHY *to attain that world*

and *the resurrection from the dead*, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Thus reads the passage commented upon by Mr. Pingree. You will perceive that he is not speaking of all, if so why mention those "who shall be accounted *worthy* to obtain that world?" Why this qualification mentioned, and why this discrimination made, if he were speaking of all and if all were equally worthy? And why, in further elucidations of his subject, did he mention only pious individuals, as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and not as well Balaam and the prophets of Baal, if he intended to teach that the wicked and the righteous were both to be "equal unto the angels" and "the children of God" in the resurrection? But he is speaking of a "resurrection *from* [*ek nekron*, OUT OF] the dead." And so in Mark:—"For when they shall rise *from* [*ek—OUT OF*] the dead." Now I lay this down as true; throughout the New Testament, where it is said there is a resurrection *out of* or *from among* the dead, a *partial* and not a universal resurrection is meant, unless this is an exception. THIS LANGUAGE IS NO WHERE ELSE APPLIED TO THE RISING OF ALL THE DEAD. I challenge the denial of this. Let us then examine some examples of this usage.

It is used in reference to the resurrection of the Savior. All the dead did not rise with him. Hence he is said to rise *out of* [*ek*] or *from among* the dead. Mark ix. 9, 10—"He charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the son of man be risen *from* [*ek*] the dead. And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising *from* [*ek*] the dead should mean." This criticism, permit me to remark, serves to render easy of explanation, this passage which has greatly perplexed many expositors. The disciples were in no doubt about the resurrection of the bodies of men; but they believed like Martha, that there would be no resurrection until the last day, and then all would be raised. Said this sister of Lazarus, and she spoke the sentiments of all the disciples, "I know that he shall rise again in *the resurrection at the last day.*" The disciples were in no perplexity about a general resurrection. They did not question that *all* should arise at the last day. But

they did not understand this rising *OUT OF the dead*—this rising before all the dead men were raised—before the last day. This was new doctrine to them. Hence they questioned “one with another what the rising *from among* the dead should mean.” But to proceed: Acts iii. 15—“Ye killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised *from [ek—out of, or from among]* the dead.” Acts iv. 10—“Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised *from [ek—out of, or from among]* the dead.” And so, I believe in every case where his rising *from the dead* is mentioned, the same word in the original [*ek*] obtains; as Acts xiii. 30 and 34;—xvii. 3; Rom. i. 4;—vi. 4;—vii. 4;—viii. 11;—1 Cor. xv. 12 and 20;—Eph. i. 20;—Col. ii. 12;—1 Thess. i. 10;—2 Tim. ii. 7;—1 Peter i. 21;—Rev. i. 5. Now in all these passages the expression raised *from [ek, out of, or from among]* the dead is used, and with reference to the resurrection of the Savior. It did not mean a general resurrection in his case, for all did not rise with him. He arose alone. But yet he rose *from among* the dead, as it is said of those in the passages, now under consideration, in Mark and Luke. If in the former case the expression *cannot* mean a general resurrection; shall we, for the special accommodation of Universalism in the latter case, *force* that meaning upon it?

But the same usage occurs with reference to the resurrection of Lazarus: John xii. 1—“Where Lazarus was which had been dead, whom he raised *from [ek—out of, or from among]* the dead.” And verse 17—“When he called Lazarus out of his grave, and raised him *from [ek—out of]* the dead.” Now unless we believe that all the dead were raised with Lazarus, we cannot believe that, when the Savior said, “they shall rise *from [ek—out of]* the dead,” he taught a resurrection of all the dead? And if we believe that Lazarus rose *from among* the dead, leaving dead behind him; then we must also believe that those of whom the Savior spoke arose *from among* the dead, leaving dead behind them. The cases are precisely analogous; and we cannot separate them in our conclusions upon the language employed.

Again: a similar usage occurs in Heb. xi. 19, where it is said that Abraham when he was tried, offered up Isaac, “accounting that God was able to raise him up, even *FROM the dead;*” *ek—out of* the dead.

These passages show, that when a resurrection *from* [*ek*—*out of*] the dead is spoken of, a general resurrection is not meant. In the numerous examples adduced we see it has no such meaning—but means a *partial* resurrection. *Ek* is never used in reference to a general resurrection. It follows then, that Jesus only spoke of a part of the dead—of the righteous—who should be “accounted worthy to obtain that world,” and who should rise *out of* the dead, who should be equal to the angels and be the children of God. This corresponds to the position I have all along assumed, that the dead in Christ should rise before the wicked—they shall arise from among the wicked. And so the Apostles “taught the people, and preached *through Jesus* the resurrection *out of* the dead,” (Acts iv. 2;) that is, that through Jesus alone could they be “accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection *out of* the dead:”—that glorious resurrection which takes place before those out of Christ are raised to shame and everlasting contempt.

I defy the ingenuity of Satan to escape this criticism; and being admitted, this vaunted fortress of Universalism which Mr. Pingree seemed to think impregnable, turns out to be as insubstantial as a castle of gossamer. Indeed, so far from aiding the cause it is brought by Universalists to support, it turns out to be a magazine capable of blowing it into nonentity.

I wish to present another criticism before I conclude this speech. The Greek word, *aiōnies*, is used with reference to punishment; as, “These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment;”—“Depart from me, ye cursed, into *everlasting* fire, prepared for the devil and his angels;”—“Who shall be punished with *everlasting* destruction from the presence of the Lord;” “But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness; but is in danger of *eternal* damnation;”—“Suffering the vengeance of *eternal* fire,” etc. This word, according to my counting, occurs 66 times in the New Testament. It is used 51 times in reference to the happiness of the righteous in the undoubted sense of *endless*; 2 times it is used in reference to God and his glory, and means the same thing; 6 times in reference to miscellaneous matters in the same undoubted sense; and 7 times in relation to the punishment of the wicked. So that if in these seven cases it

does not mean *endless*, it has departed from its meaning every where else in the New Testament, for the especial accommodation of Universalism!! If the divine writers, by prophetic spirit, had intended to condemn Universalism, they could have found no stronger word for the purpose in the Greek language than the one they have employed. Mr. Pingree will not, I am sure, venture to deny this. Here then I rest: The prevailing usage of *aionies*, used 7 times in reference to the punishment of the wicked, shows that its common meaning in the *New Testament* is everlasting or endless. Now remember I say, that this is its common meaning in the *New Testament*. Again: it is a rule of interpretation never to be departed from: That the common meaning of a word is never to be deserted, unless from absolute necessity. Then the punishment of the wicked is everlasting or endless, unless Mr. Pingree can show the necessity for departing from the common meaning of *aionios* in the *New Testament* for the benefit of his system! Unless he can do this, he must give up his doctrine, or else dispute the eternity of God and the endless happiness of the righteous; for these are not asserted in terms more strong in the *New Testament*, than the endless punishment of the wicked. But I need not say more upon this point, until I hear from Mr. Pingree. It subverts his whole system.

As I have but little more time to speak, I will employ it in expressing a few more thoughts on Mr. Pingree's position, respecting a moral change after death.

David says, Psalms vi. 4 and 5, "Return, O Lord, deliver my soul: Oh save me for thy mercy's sake: *for in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave, who shall give thee thanks?*" Why did the Psalmist ask for deliverance, and why did he cry for salvation in this life? Because in death there is no remembrance of God, and in Hades it was too late to give thanks. That was no place, according to David for deliverance and salvation: hence he wanted to secure them in this world, before he went there. David had not heard Mr. Ballou:—*he was no Universalist*. Once more: Psalm lxxxviii. 11, 12—"Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" These questions which David seemed to think no one could

perpetrate the absurdity of answering affirmatively, Universalism not only so answers, but predicates its very existence upon that response!

[MR. PINGREE'S EIGHTH SPEECH.]

RESPECTED FRIENDS:—Under the shadow of the quotations from the poet, that “a little learning is a dangerous thing;” and in view of the consequences of small boats not keeping near shore, in deep waters; and as we are just now told we were in deep waters, it behoves me, I suppose, to be careful as to my positions, and not go very far from shore; particularly, as sundry defiances have been thrown out on Greek words, etc. As I make no pretensions of being a scholar, I shall not refer to original languages, further than seems absolutely necessary. With regard to some words, it is necessary. I shall not notice all the defiances and challenges of the gentleman as to the Greek particle *ek*, which he referred to, and laid so much stress upon. You will recollect my argument from xv. of Corinthians, in favor of the salvation of all men, from the resurrection of all. That inasmuch as all die in Adam, all shall be made alive in Christ. The reply he makes is that xv. of Corinthians relates only to the resurrection of the *saints*. That it is the resurrection of the just, and not of sinners. Because the 15th of Corinthians was addressed to the Christians in Corinth, and relates to a change in the body alone!

The particle *ek* is applied to the word resurrection, he says, wherever the resurrection of the just *alone* is spoken of—*ek*: “out of:—from among”—the unjust.

MR. WALLER.—I did not say so. I said it was never used of the general resurrection. To relieve his difficulty I will state it is not in xv. Corinthians—for the context shows what is there spoken of.

MR. PINGREE.—If it be not a *general principle*, (and I understood him to challenge a *single case to the contrary*,) his argument all goes for nothing. It is not worth a straw, if it be not universally true; and it is *not true* in 15th of Corinthians, nor in the passage in Acts. In the former, as in the latter, the particle *ek* is not used. So if given up as a matter of universal application, it has *no bearing at all* upon the question. I leave that, then, for the present.

He now appeals to the context in xv. Corinthians. The

context shows, he says, what is there spoken of. What is the context? Does the word ALL mean only the Christians? Does "how shall *we escape?*" (Heb. ii. 3,) mean the saints *alone* shall not escape? The chapter positively declares that ALL shall be made alive in Christ, who die in Adam. If there be any who do not die in Adam, then there are some who are not raised from the dead and made alive in Christ—not *otherwise*.

I shall not now, however, review the last speech. I shall proceed to show the doctrine of the *Judgment*, as we hold it.

But first a word in relation to Mr. Waller's mode of quoting Scripture;—first giving only a few and afterwards scores of passages together, without comment. Is that the way to manage a discussion on Scriptural questions? to speak for two or three days, and quote but one or two passages, and now, at the conclusion of the discussion, to string together one after another, expressed in terms about which people have preconceived notions, hoping that all will apply to them the meaning they have always been accustomed to apply, when there is not time left to examine and discuss them fully?

But let me state my position in reference to the Judgment. The Judgment under Jesus Christ, we believe to be progressive, in this world, during the reign and rule of Jesus Christ, which commenced 1800 years ago, and will continue till the resurrection of the dead, when the kingdom of Jesus Christ will be delivered up to God.

There are various judgments mentioned in the Bible. Some are limited judgments, for *particular things*, upon *particular men*, at particular times. This doctrine does not apply to them; nor to the destruction of Jerusalem. *This* is what I say: That the Judgment under Jesus Christ *embraces* the dissolution of the Jewish polity, to be followed by the reign of the Gospel. But that that was all, I do not say; but the Judgment embraced that. Yet there are passages relating to that particular event. The great doctrine is, that the Judgment of Jesus Christ continues from the beginning of his reign to the delivering up of his kingdom to God the Father.

Before I go further to establish this doctrine, I will notice another point of Mr. Waller. Admitting the fact to be that the wicked are punished immediately after death,

as Partialists believe, and admitting the passage quoted, to mean what Mr. Waller says, then *Tartarus* and *Hades* are places of punishment before the Judgment! If this sentiment be correct, the Antediluvians, Sodomites, and Egyptians, who lived thousands of years ago, have been suffering a punishment inflicted by God ever since their destruction. The Judgment is put off, according to the popular belief; then here are millions suffering in Hell before they have been judged!! Suppose a governor or other civil ruler should do this; that an accused person should be first HUNG, and afterwards TRIED? Who ever heard of such monstrous injustice? Does God govern mankind in this way? *punish* men for thousands, perhaps millions of years, and then *judge them*? It is so, if men suffer in *Tartarus*, and are afterwards judged, as Mr. Waller seems to believe. Hang a man, then try him!!

Psalms lviii. 11: "Verily he is a God that JUDGEETH in the earth." Psalms ix. 16: "The Lord is known by the judgment which he EXECUTEETH," [in the present tense.] Psalms xcvi. 10-13: "Say among the heathen that the Lord reigneth: the world also shall be established that it shall not be moved: he shall judge the people righteously. Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad: let the sea roar and the fulness thereof. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein: then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord: for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth: he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth:"—the Psalmist calls for *rejoicing*, because of the judgment. It was not so dreadful and horrible a thing as to terminate in endless perdition! It was one which all things could rejoice at, and as David did, when he said, "Before I was *afflicted*, I went astray—but *now* have I kept thy law."

Isaiah xlii. 4: "He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he has set JUDGMENT in the earth." In Revelation xx. "the earth" and the heaven had FLED AWAY; and yet Isaiah prophesied the judgment to be "in the earth." In Ga. ii. 2-5: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, [that is, of the Mosaic dispensation,] that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the



house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall JUDGE among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plough shares and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they leave war any more."

Micah i. 1 to 4, Jeremiah xxiii. 5 and 6, Psalms cx. all prophecy that the coming of Jesus Christ is for judging and ruling men; and when we come to the New Testament, we see where the prophecies were accomplished.

John v. 22—"For the Father judgeth no man—that is, *now*—but *hath committed* all judgment unto the SON." It was done then according to the prophecies before given and quoted. John ix. 39, Jesus said, "For JUDGMENT, *I am come into this world.*"

I will notice another passage in the 7th of Daniel, which presents the whole matter as we hold it, in reference to the Judgment. 9th verse: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garments were white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the JUDGMENT *was set*, and the books were opened." [Corresponding with the language in Revelation.] "I saw in the night visions and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days and they brought him near before him. And then WAS GIVEN him dominion and glory and a KINGDOM, that all people, nations and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

Now this is the prophecy of the *receiving* of the kingdom by Christ, and the judgment as exercised by him. You see the correspondence with 20th Revelations. It *differs* from Cor. 15th, in that the *latter* states that the Kingdom will then be DELIVERED UP to the Father. You see the difference. Men now place the judgment *at the resurrection*; while the Sacred Writer places it all along during Jesus Christ's reign, *commencing* with the *establish-*

*ment* of his kingdom. I wish this to be remembered—that at the “delivering up of his kingdom to the Father,” and the resurrection of the literally dead, *not a word* is said as to there being then any judgment or punishment: ALL are “in Christ,” immortal, in glory.

He quoted Peter: “For if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and sinner appear?” I asked if this meant that the righteous were to be “*scarcely* saved” in the life to come? By no means. Mr. Waller will “scarcely” venture to assert this. I presume the declaration relates to salvation *here*. What does it say of judgment? Read the preceding verse: 17th verse 4th ch. 1 Pet. “For the *time* is COME, that *judgment* must *begin* at the house of God, and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the Gospel of God?” And so Revelation vi. 17: “For the great day of his wrath is COME—who shall be able to stand?” *After* that, the Gospel was to be preached, as spoken of in Revelation. Does he say the judgment is in the future life? AFTER “the day of judgment”? That would be a ridiculous idea. I know John’s Revelation is a difficult book to understand; yet this passage may be brought against Mr. Waller’s exposition of those quoted by him, so far as relates to the prophecies of the Old Testament, and in the New Testament of their fulfilment.

Ezekiel xxxvi. 19: “According to their doings I JUDGED them.” Here judgment is spoken of as *having occurred* in time *past*; not to be in the future life. He *had* done it. So in Lamentations: “The punishment of thine iniquity is ACCOMPLISHED.” Yet we hear now that punishment is never, *never*, NEVER to cease! while Jeremiah said, in this case, that it *had been* ACCOMPLISHED.

1 Cor. v. Paul takes upon himself the authority (is it a *usurped* authority?) to “judge” the incestuous man to be “delivered to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.” And in 2 Cor. ii. 6, he says, “SUFFICIENT unto such a man is this *punishment*, which *was inflicted* of many.” “*Sufficient?*” It would be nonsense to say it was sufficient, if punishment is *endless*, and never to cease. Yet so it says here: “So that contrariwise ye ought rather to *forgive* him and *comfort* him, lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with *over much sorrow*.” People are not trou-

bled now about "over much sorrow," in the life to come. They cry out, with Tertullian, "How I shall rejoice! how exult! in those torments." Here the sinner was punished and then forgiven; and this is the doctrine of Scripture, —Mr. Waller's ridicule to the contrary notwithstanding.

So much for our doctrine of the Judgment. I have *sustained* it by the Old and New Testament, and by *FACTS*. I will now notice those passages which he quoted, relating to a resurrection in connection with those that speak of judgment.

And first, of the resurrection in Daniel xii.—a passage of great importance, and one, if the interpretation commonly given of it be correct, that will prove the doctrine of universal salvation to be false: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." This is quoted in connection with John v: "Marvel not at this," says Christ; "for the hour is coming in 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;" which is parallel with Dan. xii., by the admission of him who quotes it. If they prove the time to relate to the future life, in the first instance, it shows the same of the last; and so *vice versa*, if shown to be confined to this life. They stand together, as to their bearing on the general resurrection.

Now there are some *marks* about this chapter, (12th Daniel,) which show the time at which *that* resurrection was to be. Now it is urged that John v. and Dan. xii. refer to a resurrection of the naturally dead to immortality. *I deny it*; and I will endeavor to establish the correctness of my denial. Before that is fully done, however, I will give an illustration of the word "*graves*," in 5th John. That it is not *Hades*, where the dead in general are, I will prove at another time.

In this case, "*graves*" is not applied literally—to the literally dead. Those that believe in Jesus Christ have *now* eternal life; as seen by the context. They "have passed from death to life." For a *similar*, though not the *same* use of "*graves*," see Ezekiel xxxvii. 12: Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God: Behold O my people! I will open your *GRAVES*, and cause

you to come up out of your GRAVES, and bring you unto the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your *graves*, O my people, and brought you up out of your *graves*, and shall put my spirit in you," etc.

This shows that the word "*graves*" sometimes applies to those who are not literally dead, and that the expression "come up out of your graves," does not mean come up from natural death, to a state of immortality.

It is the vision of the valley of dry bones, that is described in this 37th chapter of Ezekiel: "And he said unto me, Son of man, can these bones live? and I answered, O Lord God, thou knowest." And after the Lord had clothed the bones with living flesh, and put breath into them, so that they "stood up on their feet, an exceeding great army;" "then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the *whole house of Israel*; behold, they say our bones are dried," &c. The house of Israel, the prophecy goes on to say, so degraded, and withered, and scattered, was to be restored to its privileges and enjoy its dominion of territory. Vitality was to be restored to those who were in the "graves." They should come forth from their *low estate*. I do not say it refers to the *same thing*, as John v.; but there is a *similar use* of the word, "*graves*;" and it shows it is *not* always applied to *literal* death; but used figuratively, as in John v.

Now for the "*marks*" in the 12th of Daniel, as to the *time* when the resurrection there spoken of was to be accomplished. The 1st verse says, "And *at that time* shall Michael stand up: the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a *time of trouble*, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." This verse contains a mark. It speaks of "a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation," etc. Now if you turn to the 24th of Matthew, you will find that Jesus Christ alludes to it, and the time will be shown by that context. Matthew xxiv. 21: "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, *no, nor ever shall be.*" The Savior evidently refers to Daniel's language. When was the "tribulation" to come? See the preceding verses:

verse 16. "Then let them which be in Judea *flee to the mountains*: let him which is on the house top not come down to take any thing out of his house: neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. And wo unto them which are with child and to them which give suck in those days! But pray ye that your flight be not *in the winter*, neither on the *Sabbath day*. For *then*, THEN—at *that time*—shall be great tribulation." etc. Does this refer to the resurrection of the literally dead to immortality? On such an occasion would he tell them to "pray that their flight should not be in the WINTER, nor on the Sabbath day"?! Yet so you must hold, if you say the time referred to is in the future life.

There is another mark in the same chapter, (12th Daniel,) verse 6: "And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, *How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?*" [He desires to know the *time when*. Hear what the man answered:] "And I heard the man clothed in linen which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and sware by him that liveth forever, that it shall be for a time, times, and a half; and when [here is the new mark,] he shall have accomplished to *scatter the power of the holy people*, all these things shall be FINISHED." This last sign is fulfilled in the scattering of the Jews—"the holy people," as spoken of by the Prophets. That is enough of itself. The time was when the scattering of the holy people should be. The Israelites were the chosen people of God, that were scattered at the establishment of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, and the resurrection of those who were in *darkness and ignorance*—some to life, some to condemnation.

I shall not dwell longer upon this, at present. I merely throw these remarks out as *marks* of the time when this resurrection should occur—and did occur; and to show that the passages had no reference to the literally dead rising to immortality.

We come now to 2 Cor. v. 10: "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ: that every one may receive the things in body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." (I leave out the words in Italics, "*done*," and "*his*," which are *put in* by the translators, and are not in the original language—as acknowl-

edged by them in the use of Italic letters.) Look at that. Where is the judgment seat of Christ? Where his *Kingdom* is—HERE: where it has stood for 1800 years, unless he has had no Kingdom. It exists now, and has stood for 1800 years. When are courts of justice established in all correct civil governments? At the establishment of the government and legislature. Who ever knew of a court being established at the *winding up* of the affairs of a nation? They are established at the establishment of the *Kingdom*, or State. You see the application of that passage to it. There is no variation in the Bible. It is while we are "*in the body*;" and not after we leave the body.

It is said we are punished "according to our *deeds*, good or evil." I have said already that Mr. Waller *does not believe this*, as it is written. He does not believe the very passages he has quoted. Are we punished "according to our *works*," if his doctrine be true? Suppose a person has lived a good life. According to Mr. Waller, he may be *unhappy* while he lives. Is he rewarded after death? No; because he happened to commit *one sin* before he died; and therefore went to Hell!—and receives no reward. A bad man, who has led a wicked life, is *converted* just at death, and goes to heaven; and receives *no punishment* for his sins. Are these persons judged "according to their *works*—good and evil?" *No!* According to the doctrine of endless punishment, *NO MAN* is punished according to his works—not one, living or dying. For the time will never come, when it can be said he *has been* so punished. If that time should come, the punishment would cease. So of reward, if endless happiness is his merited reward. If his happiness goes on millions of ages, is he rewarded? No, he has not yet *been* rewarded; nor will that time ever arrive; for if it should come, in the progress of eternity, the reward would cease. Let that fact be avoided and set aside, if possible.

But do *you* believe it? some one may ask. **CERTAINLY.** while men are good, they are rewarded. They "have **GREAT PEACE**," says the Psalmist. This is their reward. "The ways of wisdom are *pleasant*," says Solomon. Paul says, "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and *peace* and joy in the Holy Spirit." So the wicked are punished *while* wicked: *afterwards* made holy, and saved.

But according to Orthodoxy, if a man has lived like an

angel, and sins at his death, he must be sent to Hell forever. And *vice versa*. If a man has lived a bad life, and is converted at death, he will be forever happy, according to the common doctrine. According to the Bible, "*every man is to be punished according to HIS WORKS.*" But if judgment is to be followed by *endless evil*, the doctrine of punishment according to works as declared in the Bible, cannot be true: the immortal destiny then depends on the state of the *mind and heart* AT DEATH.

We have had Universalist writers read with regard to several things. Let us now hear the testimony of Orthodox writers with regard to the meaning of this passage. It is a fact of importance, that people commonly think of the doctrine of endless punishment as *settled*. They think it strange we do not believe it. They think that heretics and heterodox people "*ought to be damned,*" as I have heard Orthodox preachers say. Now it is a fact that almost every passage in the New Testament, commonly quoted to prove the doctrine of endless misery, has been explained, by *one or another* eminent Orthodox writer to relate to misery *in this life*. There are a few exceptions, perhaps; but almost all are explained by one or another of them in this way. Among these writers, are Whitby, Lightfoot, M'Knight, Hammond, Dr. A. Clarke and Doddridge—worthy, wise, learned, and pious men. They do not *all* say the same things in reference to any *one* passage; but among them almost all the passages commonly quoted are admitted to refer to punishment in this life. I quote Lightfoot on the 5th of John, merely to show an instance of this fact. The admissions of men of the truth of any point, *against themselves*, or their own theories, are of great consequence. If therefore they admit the fact in this instance, it shows that they have been *compelled* to do so, in *spite* of their creeds. Says Lightfoot on John v. "These words might also be applied to a spiritual resurrection, as were the former, (and so, COMING OUT OF GRAVES meaneth, Ezek. xxxvii. 12.) the words of the verse following being only translated and glossed thus: AND THEY SHALL COME FORTH, THEY THAT DO GOOD, after they hear his voice in the Gospel, TO THE RESURRECTION OF LIFE; AND THEY THAT DO EVIL, after they hear the Gospel, UNTO THE RESURRECTION OF DAMNATION. But they are more generally understood of the general resurrection," etc. *Harm. Evang. Part. iii. John v. 28.*

Here is an admission that the passage may relate to punishment in this life—that it is not the literal resurrection. I read from Paige's Selections—a selection by Rev. Lucius R. Paige, of passages from Orthodox writers, from books contained in the libraries in and near Boston, which are the largest in the country. I vouch for the correctness of the passages quoted in this book which I read. If I read one which shall be found *not* correctly quoted, it shall be published to the world.

[MR. WALLER'S EIGHTH REPLY.]

It seems my misfortune in this discussion to have an opponent who will not take time to give full attention to my arguments. The consequence is that he often misapprehends them, and especially the main points, so that I am under the necessity of wasting much time in explanation for his benefit. He wholly mistook my criticism, or at least failed to see the point of it, on the usage of the particle *ek* in connection with the resurrection. I did not say, that it was *always* used when a partial resurrection was spoken of, but that it *never* was used with reference to a general resurrection. Mr. Pingree had quoted Luke xx. 35, 36, to prove that *all men*, in the resurrection, would be equal unto the angels and the children of God. I rejoined by showing that he was mistaken in supposing that our Savior spoke of *all men*, because his language clearly proved he did not; for he was speaking of a resurrection *from* [*ek—out of*] the dead, which never was applied to the resurrection of all men. In proof of this, I showed that it was the language used with reference to the raising of Lazarus and of our Savior; so that if it proved the resurrection of all men, then all were raised with Lazarus and all were raised with our Savior!—two general resurrections, the one immediately succeeding the other, which is absurd to suppose. To this we have had no reply—it admits of no reply. It subverts forever the last hope of Universalism from the language of our Savior in refutation of the Sadducees. It proves that the resurrection of the righteous is distinct from the resurrection of the wicked, and consequently nullifies the *inferences* of Universalism from the Apostle's language to the Corinthians. It was not at all necessary to show that *ek* was always used when a partial resurrection was meant; it was enough



that it was never used in any other sense. I trust I am now understood; and let it be distinctly remembered, that I defy him to *shake* this position.

Mr. Pingree still complains of my course. He says that he called upon me in the commencement of this discussion to bring forward passages of Scripture, and that I would not, but now, at *the end* of the discussion I pour them out like water upon him! Indeed, I supposed we were only about the middle of the discussion. I did not know that we had arrived at the end so soon! But any way, I think the audience will bear witness that I have kept my friend fully as much employed as was consistent with his comfort. The fact is, he has been dealing in lamentations about my hard usage of him all the time. In his second speech he wailed a little, and he has been quite lachrymal ever since. I cannot please him, it seems.

There were some things in the gentleman's last speech that struck my ear as familiar. I had heard them before. It was what he said against our views of a judgment day—his attempt to ridicule it as contrary to justice to punish a man before his trial. That wit was not original—those bright scintillations, like the Promethean fire, were stolen, not like it, however, from heaven, but from—*infidelity*. I remember to have seen this sarcasm long since in the writings of Tom Paine!

Mr. Pingree asserts most emphatically that all judgment is in this life; and that too, right in the face of the Apostle's declaration, "IT IS APPOINTED UNTO MEN ONCE TO DIE, BUT AFTER THIS THE JUDGMENT!" But I am not disposed to get round this objection against a judgment day; but will meet it fairly, although it originated among infidels and is brought against the Bible. When young, this objection weighed with much force on my own mind, and caused me great anxiety. I knew the doctrine of a judgment day was taught in the Bible, as the infidels said; and the question with me was, must I believe the doctrine or reject the Bible. It struck me as a most wretched system of Jurisprudence to punish a man, and then mock him with a trial!—to hang him first, and then try him! But since I have become a man I have, upon looking more closely into the subject, put away these childish things; and I am vain enough to believe that I can remove this frivolous objection to the satisfaction of all who hear me.

The whole is founded upon the mistake, that we hold that no judgment is passed upon sinners until the last day. The truth is, we teach that the sinner "is condemned already"—that "judgment has come upon all men to condemnation"—that the sentence of the law is passed forthwith and without delay upon every transgressor; for it is written, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." And we teach too that every believer receives his acquittal in this life; for he is *justified* by faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and "shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." So then every man who dies leaves the world in a condemned or in a justified state—condemned for his sins, or justified by his faith. He has had a trial, and the court of heaven has passed sentence upon his case.

But men's actions do not cease with their lives. "It is not all of life to live." Tom Paine still acts in his writings. They are still exerting a most pernicious influence upon the minds of others. We have witnessed an instance of it this day, in Mr. Pingree's sarcasms against the judgment. The life of every man will make an impress upon others until the end of time; and with a continually enlarging influence. A pebble dropt into a smooth lake produces a ripple that enlarges and spreads to the shore. So every man, no matter how inconsiderable, thrown into the ocean of time, creates a wave that must roll and spread until it breaks upon the shores of eternity at the last day. The orators of Greece and Rome have long been dead; and their poets centuries ago were laid in the grave; yet how many hearts are now kindled by the glow of their eloquence and waked to ecstasy by the music of their song? Every man has his influence on some other, either companion or relative; and this influence is imparted through him to others; and thus like the subtle influences of the electric shock extends around the entire circle of time. The good man ceases from his labors, but his works do follow him—they continue to have their influence upon others. It is a wise and righteous regulation then; the appointment of a JUDGMENT DAY, when, after the consummation of time, after the actions of men can no longer influence, for weal or for wo, the characters of their fellow men, they should all stand before the same Tribunal,

where each could be met by all those whom his influence and example had benefitted or injured, and the state of probation be thus closed, and rewards and punishments, meted to each according to his deserts, be administered by an irrevocable and eternal sentence.

But 'as the heavens are high above the earth, so are God's ways above our ways,' and the question of a Judgment day must be settled in the light of the Bible, and not by the Jack-o-lantern light of human philosophy. But before I proceed to demonstrate this doctrine by the Bible, I beg leave to pay attention, briefly, to Mr. Pingree's manner of disposing of certain passages which I adduced against his doctrine. It is wholly unnecessary to review all that he said on Daniel xii. 2. If I show that his conclusions are preposterous in the extreme, of course his premises pass for nothing. He contended that the "sleep in the dust of the earth," spoken of by the prophet, had reference to the moral degradation of the Jews in our Savior's time; and was nothing more than *moral sleep*; and that the *awaking* also meant to be aroused from this moral slumber. Every one must perceive that if such *poetical license* be allowed in interpretation, the plain letter of the Bible may be set aside in every case, and the whole of it shown to be unmeaning jargon. But let us see how his reading will appear: "And many of them that *morally* sleep in the *moral* dust of the *moral* earth shall *morally* awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Now the force of this interpretation may be perceived, when you remember, that the wicked are to awake out of their moral sleep to be put back into their repose again forever! They are to awake from moral degradation in the dust of the earth, to everlasting moral degradation in the dust of the earth!! In other words, they are not aroused from their moral slumber at all!!! This needs no refutation. It destroys itself.

His comments on John v. 28, 29, were of a kindred nature. The "graves" spoken of were *moral graves!* Aye, *moral graves!!* I would be happy to hear a description of the length, and breadth, and depth of these, to me, novel tenements. I am persuaded that only a very vivid imagination would be adequate to do justice to these fancy abodes. I shrewdly suspect they have "a local habitation

and a name" only in the very fruitful fancy of my opponent, and that he only can give a drawing of them. But admit the explanation, and then the passage reads thus: "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in their *moral graves* shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good *in their moral graves* (!!!) unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil in their *moral graves*, unto the resurrection of damnation!" Oh, the beauties of Universalism! Here we have men doing good when morally dead and buried! and men taken out of their moral graves where they were doing evil and raised to damnation!! I will take it as a particular favor, if Mr. Pingree will honor me with the precise distinction he makes in the condition of those in their moral graves, and those in a state of damnation. No doubt too it will be a great satisfaction to the audience. But enough upon this most unique exposition. I need not make its absurdity more apparent.

You were told, that almost every passage adduced to prove endless punishment, had been explained away, by one or another of the Orthodox writers. Were this even so, I am prepared to show that they have all been explained *back again* by Mr. Pingree's very dear brethren and fellow laborers. I can, if necessary, give him concession for concession. I am prepared for all such weapons. But he has a most unfair way of making men speak in his favor. For instance: I observed that in the extract from Dr. Lightfoot, which he read at second-hand, the Doctor said the passage *might* refer to punishment in this life; and this is produced as a concession that it *did* refer to punishment in this life! This is the worst of garbling. The distance between what *may* and what *does* exist is what Dr. Lightfoot lacked of making the concession ascribed to him. And if the other concessions alluded to are of a piece with this, and I apprehend they are, then have these Orthodox writers been most shamefully garbled. I do not charge this upon my opponent. I believe him incapable of such conduct. He never saw the authors, I suppose, whom he has quoted. He is dependent for what he knows of them on the little book he has in his hand. But concessions, no matter from what quarter they come, can never make good sense of nonsense; or make any one receive his notions of moral graves and moral dust of the earth.

But I have been detained too long from another matter of more importance:—Does the Bible teach that a day shall come when all must appear before the Son of God, and be judged for their sins? Will Jesus come again to judge the quick and the dead? We propose now to examine this matter in the light of the Bible.

The Universalists are much divided in their views of this subject. Scarcely any two have written alike. God has confounded the language of the builders of this Babel. Mr. Pingree, I suppose from the hints he has let fall, believes that there is no such coming of our Lord—that his second coming was to destroy Jerusalem. That the judgment is in this life, and has been going on since the introduction of the Gospel dispensation. I admit, as I have already said, that there is a judgment passed on the actions of men in this world; but I expect to show that there is a day of general judgment which is yet future; and that Christ will then appear in person to judge the quick and the dead. The passages are so numerous to these points, that I shall have but little time to comment: indeed they are so plain as to need no comment:

Matt. x. 15—“Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, *in the day of Judgment*, than for that city.” So it appears that our Savior declared that there was a day of future reckoning for Sodom and Gomorrah. These cities were destroyed by fire from heaven long before the advent of Jesus in the flesh; but still he says they are to be judged in a future day also. I have seen a foolish criticism in a Universalist book to this effect. ‘That our Savior said the *land* and not the *inhabitants* of Sodom and Gomorrah!’ So it was *Jerusalem*, and *Judea*, and the *region round about the Jordan*, and not the *inhabitants* of those places, who were baptized of John in the river of Jordan confessing their sins!!! See Mat. iii. 5. When such criticisms are indulged in, it is a proof that the authors feel the weakness of their cause.

Matt. xi. 22 and 24—“But I say unto you [Chorazin and Bethsaida,] it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the *day of Judgment* than for you. \* \* \* But I say unto you, [Capernaum] That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the *day of Judgment* than for thee.” These correspond to the passage first quoted.

Here then it is declared, that there is a *future* trial — “at the day of Judgment”—in reserve for Tyre, Sidon, and Sodom, who shall be judged, but their cause will not be so desperate, as that of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum.

Matt. xii. 36—“But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the *day of Judgment*.” Here, in language as specific as it is possible to be uttered, it is said that *all* men, for *all* their idle words shall give an account on a particular day — *the day of Judgment*. It is not possible for our doctrine to be asserted in plainer terms.

Same chap. 41 and 42 — “The men of Ninevah shall rise in *judgment* with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and behold, a greater than Jonas is here. The Queen of the South shall rise up in *the Judgment* with this generation; for she came from the uttermost part of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here.” Here is a judgment after *death* of the generation to which the Savior was speaking. Yes, the Ninivites and the Queen of the South long before dead and the generation then living were to RISE together “in the judgment.” The blind can see that here is asserted a judgment after death.

Matt. xxv. 31–44, also 41 and 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 he shall set the sheep on his right hand and the goats on his left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. \* \* \* \* Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. \* \* \* \* And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous unto life eternal.” I am aware that Universalists apply all this to the destruction of Jerusalem. But there is nothing recorded in the history of that event at all corresponding to this description. But I will await the advance of Mr. Pingree on this passage, before I make further remarks.

John xii. 48—"He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge at *the last day*." If there shall come such a time as *the last day*, then men will be judged in it: or else, we are misled by language as plain as ever fell from the lips of the Son of God.

John xiv. 3—"And if I go and prepare a place for you, *I will come again*, and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." Here the Savior promises to come a second time. Has this promise been fulfilled?

Acts i. 10, 11—"And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which said also, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall *come in like manner*, as ye have seen him go into heaven." Will any man dare say this has been fulfilled?—"I pause for a reply."

Acts iii. 20, 21—"And he *shall send* Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things." Surely the most brazen impudence would shrink from an effort to apply this passage to the destruction of Jerusalem, or to any event that has transpired in the history of the world.

Acts x. 42—"And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the *Judge of the quick and dead*." So the Apostles were commanded to preach that Jesus would judge the living and the *dead*: but Universalists preach that he will judge the *living* and not the *dead*! Who commanded them so to preach? Not Jesus, unless he has revoked the command given to the Apostles.

Acts xvii. 30, 31—God "now commandeth all men every where to repent: because he hath *appointed a day in which he will judge* the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained." Here Paul declares to the Athenians that God had appointed a day *in the future*, when the world will be judged. Universalists say that there is no such day appointed!! Thus flatly contradicting the word of an inspired Apostle!

Acts xxiv. 25—"And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and *judgment to come*, Felix trembled." That

is, Paul as he was commanded, preached unto Felix and testified, that Jesus would judge the quick and *dead*—that there was a judgment to come. And I suspect from his character that Felix was something of a Universalist, and hence the propriety of that subject's being urged upon him. He was unrighteous, and hence the Apostle reasoned of righteousness; he was intemperate, and hence the subject of temperance was urged; and hence I have concluded that perhaps he was tinctured with something kindred to Universalism, and therefore Paul reasoned with him about a *judgment* TO COME! But this is conjecture of course, and you must take it only for what it is worth.

Romans ii. 12 and 16—"For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law,—in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel." Now into what other meaning can this language be tortured, than that there is a *day in the future* when men shall be judged?

Romans xiv. 10–12—"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." If all men *were* standing before the judgment-seat of Christ, why did the Apostle use the language, all *shall* stand? And why say all "*shall give account?*" Was he so ignorant of the propriety of speech, as to use the *future* instead of the *present* tense? And when was it since the beginning of the world, that every knee bowed and every tongue confessed unto God? Just so certain as this is future, just so certain is it yet to come to pass that "we shall all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ" and "every one of us shall give an account of himself to God." The same inspired pen, in the same connexion and in similar terms, has recorded both events.

2 Cor. 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." This is a parallel passage to the last. If as Universalists teach, all men are constantly before Christ's judgment seat, why did Paul say "we must all appear before" it? Why say that they would *then* receive according as they had done good or evil in the body; when



they must have already received it, according to Universalism?

Col. iii. 4<sup>1</sup>—“When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.” If he never was to appear again except to destroy Jerusalem, what could the Apostle have meant? Surely, he did not mean that the Colossian church would appear in glory at the destruction of Jerusalem? And if they did so appear, what pen, sacred or profane, has recorded the event?

1 Thess. iv. 12 unto v. 4—“But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus *will God bring with him*. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we that are alive and remain *unto the coming of the Lord* shall not prevent them which are asleep: for the Lord himself *shall descend from heaven* with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first: when we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words. But of the times and the seasons, brethren, you have no need that I write unto you: for you yourselves know perfectly, that *the day of the Lord* so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape. But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief.” What language could be more plain? And *could it refer* to the destruction of Jerusalem? But the Apostle renews the subject in his next epistle: 2 Thess. i. 7-10—“And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus *shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire*, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, when *he shall come* to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day.” Here is a second coming of our Lord asserted in

terms that *cannot* be applied to any occurrence at the destruction of Jerusalem. But the subject is resumed in the next chapter, in a manner that settles the question beyond controversy. 2 Thess. ii. 1-5—“Now we beseech you, brethren, by the *coming of our Lord Jesus Christ* and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as *that the day of Christ is at hand*. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, *except there come a falling away first*, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition: who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that when I was with you, I told you these things,” etc.—read the whole chapter. Now, on this passage, permit me to remark, *First*, That the Thessalonians, it appears, supposed from the first Epistle of Paul, that the day of the Lord was at hand. This was true if the destruction of Jerusalem was the event alluded to. *That was at hand*. In about sixteen years from the date of that letter, and Jerusalem was no more. The Roman plough had torn up its very foundations, not leaving one stone upon another. But the Apostle assured them that the day of the Lord was *not* at hand; therefore, he could not have alluded to the destruction of Jerusalem.

*Second*. He assures them that Jesus would not come, until there should be a falling away, and the man of sin should be revealed. Did this take place before the destruction of Jerusalem? If so, when did this falling away transpire? And who was this man of sin? And he assures them, that there were then hindrances in the way; that the mystery of iniquity then began to work. Were these hindrances removed in sixteen years? Did this mighty engine of iniquity develop itself and go into full operation in that time? Did the son of perdition set in the temple of God, showing himself that he was God? The most vivid imagination cannot, before the destruction of Jerusalem, conjure up any thing that bears a resemblance to the matters here predicted. And besides, Bishop Newton, whom the Universalists delight to honor—and since Mr. Pingree has adduced concessions he shall have them to his heart's content, and I will mete unto him according

as he has measured unto me—Bishop Newton, I say, shows conclusively, that this man of sin was *the papacy*—that monstrous system of superstition and fraud, which for centuries has flooded the world with blood and errors. And in the Pope of Rome, claiming to be universal bishop—aye, Christ's vicar, assuming the divine attributes of holiness and infallibility—disposing of crowns, and kingdoms, and continents, as if the earth was his property and the workmanship of his hands—asserting absolute dominion over the affairs, temporal and spiritual, of all mankind—requiring the most abject homage of all orders of men, from the king to the beggar—and wearing at his girdle the keys of the kingdom of heaven and even of hades, so that he should open and none could shut, and he should shut and none could open, we see the fulfillment of the Apostle's prophesy—we recognize the original of the Apostle's portrait. Now this man of sin had to appear, and rule, and fall, before the coming of our Lord. Then he has not come yet.

But *Finally*, Why should the Thessalonians be alarmed at the fate of Jerusalem? What had they to apprehend from it? They were in no way to be affected by it, and history proves that they were not at all affected by it. Why then, I ask, should they be in apprehension? And why did the Apostle treat the subject as one that did vitally concern them? I defy the powers of darkness to answer these inquiries upon the hypothesis of Universalism. The destruction of Jerusalem did not concern the Thessalonians either temporally or spiritually: But the coming of the Lord Jesus, spoken of by Paul in his letters to them, was intimately and mightily associated with their spiritual interests, as appears from the Apostle's language: Therefore, he could not have alluded to the destruction of Jerusalem. Now I challenge Mr. Pingree to show any defect in this syllogism; and he must prove it radically defective, or else admit that Jesus will come to judge the world.

2 Tim. iv. 1—"I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who *shall judge the quick and the dead* at his appearing and kingdom." Here the Apostle asserts that Jesus shall judge the *living* and *THE DEAD*? Has this event ever occurred? *Never!* And has Universalism, in order to maintain its unhallowed crusade against

the truth, the unblushing effrontery to say, that it will never occur?

Titus ii. 12, 13 — “Teaching us, that denying ungodliness, and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; *looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Savior Jesus Christ.*” This means, according to Universalism, that the Gospel teaches all Christians to deny ungodliness and to live piously in view of that blessed hope and glorious appearing of Jesus Christ *in the destruction of Jerusalem!!* What folly!

1 Peter iv. 5 — “Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and *dead.*” And yet Universalists tell us the dead are not to be judged at all!

2 Peter ii. 4 and 9 — “For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness; to be *reserved unto judgment.* \* \* \* The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto *the day of judgment* to be punished.” The Orthodox speak the very language of the Apostle upon this subject: how then dare the Universalists charge us with not holding the truth, and admit at the same time that Peter’s is the language of inspiration? What language could be plainer than the Apostle’s, to assert a judgment day, when the wicked shall be punished?

2 Peter iii. 10, 12 — “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, and the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and goodness, looking for and hastening unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat!” Has this event ever transpired? When and how? Are not the heavens still above our heads and the earth beneath our feet? Or will it be urged that all this was merely poetical?—extravagant hyperbole?—that it never has occurred and never will occur? Were we to admit this to be so, we would surrender the Bible into the hands of infidelity—no man could defend it.

1 John iv. 17—"Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness *in the day of Judgment.*" Here is also taught the appointment of a specific day, called "the day of Judgment."

Jude vi.—"And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto *the judgment of the great day.*" And yet it is denied that there is such a "judgment" and such a "great day."

Jude 14 and 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, and to confine all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." Has this prophesy been fulfilled? *It has not.* Nothing has ever transpired in the history of the world like it. Will it be fulfilled? Yes, or the word of God has failed. Then it saps the foundation of Universalism, for if the prophet had been thinking of that system, he could not more pointedly have branded falsehood inaffably upon its front.

Rev. i. 4—"Grace be unto you and peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come." It is the general opinion of the learned, that this book was written after the destruction of Jerusalem; and yet John says, Jesus "is to come."

Rev. xx. 11, 15—"And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heavens fled away; and there was 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 the things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell [hades] delivered up the dead which were in them; and they *were judged* every man according to their works. And death and hell [hades] were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire."

To conclude on this subject, I would remark, that if the Scriptures do not teach that there is to be a judgment day

—a day when Jesus will come to judge the quick and the dead, then it is not possible for human language to convey such an idea. Mr. Pingree might just as well labor to convince you that I have not taught such a thing, and that no person ever advanced such a sentiment! I have not and I cannot, nor is it in the power of man to use more strong, clear, and definite terms to convey the idea of such a period, than are used in the passages I have read. If they do not assert that doctrine, neither have I, nor has any man among the living or the dead. When my opponent shall convince you, that when I say, there is to be a judgment day, when the quick and the dead shall be judged by Jesus Christ—that all are to stand before his judgment seat, etc., that my language cannot mean what it clearly imports—that I mean nothing more than what is daily transpiring, or that I have reference to the destruction of a village of Indian huts or the burning of a prairie, then I will I believe—no—I dare not even *then* believe that holy men of old, recording the oracles of heaven, said one thing and meant another!—that when they might have used plain language, they intentionally used that which was calculated to make false impressions and to lead into the most fatal errors!!—that they so wrote, that no man could arrive at their meaning without giving the plain letter of their declarations THE LIE DIRECT!!! Ask me to believe this, and you break me from the sheet anchor of my hopes, and bid me cast the Bible to the flames as a tissue of the most monstrous falsehoods. No, unless you bid me to reject as false the plain and obvious meaning of God's word, I am bound to believe, that "as it is appointed unto men once to die, BUT AFTER THIS THE JUDGMENT; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him, SHALL HE APPEAR THE SECOND TIME WITHOUT SIN UNTO SALVATION."

I wish to make one other point before I conclude, and I invite the gentleman's especial attention to it. I have already shown that the very strongest language was used by the divine writers to express the duration of the punishment of the wicked, as "*everlasting fire*," "*everlasting destruction*," "*suffering the vengeance of eternal fire*," "*in danger of eternal damnation*," etc., which, if interpreted according to the laws of language, (and so, I insist, they *must* be interpreted,) prove the endless punishment

of the wicked beyond question or cavil. The word employed in these quotations in the original is *aiônios*; the most appropriate word that could be employed, if the writer intended to teach the doctrine of endless punishment, and the most inappropriate and unfortunate of all words in that copious language if they did not. I ask Mr. Pingree if a stronger word for endless duration in that language can be found? He has not answered that there was: and of course by his silence surrenders the point. There is another word of the same family, *aion*, used in reference to the same subject. This word is used denoting futurity, fifty-eight times, I believe, in the New Testament; and fifty-three of these, it is confessed on all hands, to be used to express indefinite time—in the sense of everlasting or without end. The remaining times it is used with reference to punishment. I will give some specimens of its usage in relation to the punishment of the wicked, to the happiness of the righteous, and as applied to God.

Of the *wicked*, it is said, Mark iii. 29, "he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath NEVER forgiveness." Of *God*, it is said, Rom. ix. 5, "God blessed FOREVER." Of the *righteous*, it is said, John viii. 52, 53—"he shall NEVER see death. \* \* \* He shall NEVER taste of death."

Of the *wicked*, 2 Peter ii. 17—"To whom the mists of darkness is reserved FOREVER." Of *God*, 2 Cor. xi. 13—"Who is blessed FOREVERMORE." Of the *righteous*, John vi. 51; "he shall live forever."

Of the *wicked*, Rev. xiv. 11—"And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up FOREVER and EVER." Of *God*, Rev. iv. 9, "who liveth FOREVER and EVER." Of the *righteous*, Rev. xxii. 5, "and they shall reign FOREVER and EVER."

Of the *wicked*, Rev. xix. 3, "And her smoke rose up FOR EVER and EVER." Of *God*, Rev. iv. 10, "worship him that liveth FOREVER and EVER." Of the *righteous*, 1 John ii. 17, "he abideth FOREVER."

Of the *wicked*, Rev. xx. 10, "And shall be tormented day and night FOREVER and EVER." Of *God*, Rev. xv. 7, "who liveth FOREVER and EVER." Of the *righteous*, John xi. 26, "he shall NEVER die."

In just as strong terms, aye, in the very terms then that the eternity of God is asserted, or that the happiness of the righteous shall be endless, it is asserted that the pun-

ishment of the wicked shall be endless. Deny the latter, and you must deny the former. They stand or fall together.

[MR. PINGREE'S NINTH SPEECH.]

RESPECTED FRIENDS:—My remarks, this afternoon, must necessarily be desultory, in consequence of having to reply to so much of the speech of the forenoon, as time will permit me to notice. I can lay down no plan for pursuing my argument, for the necessity of following him.

I shall commence where Mr. Waller commenced.

He attempts to produce an impression upon the audience that I have presented all the arguments that *could* be presented, on behalf of the doctrine I advocate. Hence that last quotation from the poets, which he did not translate. I will merely state that I had intended to present in my speeches down to this point, all the arguments which I meant to use on this occasion, except such incidental ones as might come up in the remainder of the debate. I might have occupied time by quoting many more passages; but it has not been necessary. As has been well remarked, one declaration of God, if plain, and understood, is enough—each passage is of itself sufficient. Yet for the purpose of having your attention directed to the whole subject, though not absolutely necessary, I presented the seven principal arguments which establish the doctrine. Each is plain, and clear, and simple. They correspond to the seven pillars of the house, spoken of by Solomon, in Prov. ix. 1: “Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath hewn out her seven pillars.”

All Mr. Waller's remarks upon *moral* resurrections in relation to the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians pass for nothing. *He does not himself believe anything about it.* He does himself believe it relates to the resurrection of the naturally dead to the immortality.

He calls this a mistake, which I said about the Baptists unchurching each other. If it is not true, why do they not commune together at the Lord's Supper? On what ground do they exclude each other from that rite? But there is strife between those Baptists and the Sprinklers, and has been for centuries—*bitter* strife; and that between good men, who all expect to go to heaven. I say they can



never dwell together in heaven, peaceably, unless they are *changed at or after death.*

In relation to his remarks about the sinfulness of the flesh, allow me to remark, that according to Paul and others, *all* are under the influences of sin, while "subject to vanity," *in this life*, but when the flesh is thrown off, the spirit is free. Mr. Waller will admit this in reference to *some*, but why are some deprived of their bad dispositions in a future state, while others are not? Men die in different states. How is it that immortal spirits are able to sin in the future as here? I thought all the evil influences of "THE FLESH" were confined to this life, and did not extend to the future and incorruptible state. The *Devil* and *Sin*, and *Death*, are to be destroyed by Christ; so that *they* shall exist no longer. Where then are the evil influences to lead men to sin hereafter? I put it to you, if it can be so, in the nature of things. Mr. Waller has now given us the list of passages—some thirty or forty. I cannot examine them all. What shall I do? He represents me as *complaining*, if he quoted Scripture; and also, if he did not. I have not done so; nor do I wish to do so. I only asked him in the beginning of the discussion, to quote some of his leading passages in season for free and full discussion; and not to pour them out in a mass, when it was too late to give them a due examination. But he has chosen not to do so. He rather depends upon the *prejudices* of his auditors to explain all the passages as they are *commonly* explained. I do not do so. I give two or three at a time, of the leading passages on my side. I might have thrown forty or fifty texts upon his attention at once, as he has done to me. What, then, shall I do now? I must, from the necessity of the case, select and examine a few of the most prominent, if he will not select them himself.

One of the strongest of the passages quoted by him is, that some have "never" forgiveness—but are in danger of "eternal damnation." I first remark, that if this refers to a *future life*, the inquiry arises, what does it mean? It is said "all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven, neither in this world nor the world to come." Therefore *some* sins *MAY BE forgiven* in the world to come, *aside from* blasphemy of the Holy Spirit.

The Romish *Purgatory*, instead of the Protestant *Hell*, intervening between death and the resurrection, would be established by the passage. Does Mr. Waller believe this? He *must*, if it relates to the future state of existence.

I shall not dwell upon the phrases, "hath *never* forgiveness," and "*eternal* damnation," till afterwards. All the passages which say "God will *not* have mercy," etc., are not to be understood as extending through our whole existence. For a *certain time*, he will not have mercy, and we are not not to receive pardon. But *afterwards*, we shall.

Paul says that murderers, etc., *shall not* inherit the kingdom of God. This is plain, positive, and explicit. But does he say they will *never* come into it? Shall they by *no means*, nor *ever* inherit it? Paul does not say so; for in that case, *NONE could be saved!* but the next verse reads, "and *such* also were some of you." But it says afterwards, "But ye are *washed*," etc. So the sinner can by no means enter the kingdom of God *while in a sinful state*; but the grace of God may afterwards *fit* him to enter, as in that case; and in all cases, *finally*, as I have abundantly proved.

So that none of these passages have any bearing on the point. Jesus Christ said once to his disciples, including Peter, "whither I go, you *CANNOT* come." He might have said, *never*; "but," he adds, "thou shalt follow me *afterwards*." And so it is with all the other passages of the same kind. This illustration bears on them all. None of these passages are in opposition to the doctrine of *final* universal salvation. They only relate to a certain period of time.

My friend attempted to make out that there was some inconsistency between a man being made not sinful, and being cleansed of sin. He says, "no man liveth and sinneth not." Therefore all *DIE sinners*, of course. He insists there is no change after death, except that the saints have a new body. If all die sinners, and there is no change after death in their moral character, then how are *ANY* to be saved? Some men are justified and become righteous in this life, to some extent; but it does not follow that they will never sin again. In a future life they may hold on, but not always here. I claim that a man may sin forty, or forty thousand times, and yet be cleansed afterwards. The inconsistency rests upon *his own head*; because if all men sin while on earth, and all sinners are

damned eternally, and no moral change takes place after death, ALL MANKIND, without a single exception, must go to Hell! Here we have *universal damnation* preached as a substitute for universal salvation!

He attempts again to ridicule the idea that men were *punished* for sin and then *forgiven*. Why did he not set aside the passages of God's Word that speak of it? Suppose human governments should follow this example, and forgive or pardon criminals, merely because they should *ask* it? as it is said God will do—in that sense of the word, forgiveness. When men ask to be forgiven and repent, where in all human governments is there one that pardons them on these terms? It would not do, then, to apply the law Divine, as expounded by Mr. Waller, to the operation of any human government. It would throw all things into anarchy and misrule.

He ridicules the idea that forgiveness, and cleansing, and taking away sin, are the same thing. He says that forgiveness is only taking away the *punishment* of sin. Is that any better? Does it correspond better with the idea of purification, or making holy, and righteous; that is, the justifying the sinner? Does that change, or cleanse, or wash the sinner? No; it merely delivers him from impending danger in the life to come. The ridicule falls with tenfold more force upon his own head than upon mine.

Referring to the resurrection, he speaks of the *just dead*, and the *unjust dead*. I dont know that THE DEAD, *as such*, are either just or unjust, or have any character at all; but the "just" and "unjust" are those who are alive, and doing justly or unjustly. After they are dead, I dont know that they have that character. I dont think the Bible says so. His own quotation from David, who speaks of not giving thanks "in Hell" or *Hades*, shows what use is made of that word in the Bible. Solomon says, "There is no *wisdom*, nor *knowledge*, nor *divice* in the grave"—Heb. *Sheol*. Sep. Gr. *Hades*. Is there, then, any *character*?

Mr. Waller attempted to set aside the idea of conversion *in the grave*. What Universalist has ever held that? I do not, at least. In the grave they cannot praise God, "nor have they any more a reward." Knowledge and reward are in this life; and after that, a resurrection to immortal life and happiness, as the free gift of God. So much is to

be remembered respecting the resurrection of the "just and unjust dead."

He denies, upon the strength of the Greek word *ek*, that the resurrection spoken of in the 15th of 1 Corinthians, is a resurrection of all men. The Savior settles that question as well as Paul. Paul in 15 Cor. says, that all who DIE IN ADAM shall rise in Christ, and to the glorious liberty of the sons of God. Jesus Christ says, aside from that declaration of Paul, that they shall be as the angels of God in heaven; and adds, "ALL live unto Him." Does it require no change after death, to make even the best men "equal to the angels of God?"

He quotes the allusion of Scripture to Moses and the burning bush, where Christ says, that "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," to show that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were still living, when that occurred, and not dead. And he says "*all the saints* live unto him." Jesus Christ does *not say that*: he says, "for ALL live unto him." That is proof in our favor. "All live unto God;" that is, *prospectively*, in the sense of being raised from the dead to glory; and the condition of holy angels. The word *ek*, amounts to nothing, therefore, in opposition to our Faith. Enough on that point.

One remark on Matthew xxv. 41: "Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his angels." He argues that this applies to a future life. You recollect the passage from Corinthians: "deliver such an one to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh," etc. There the sinner, delivered over to Satan, was spoken of as "SAVED in the day of the Lord Jesus." Was this man, when delivered to Satan, delivered to endless fire? No; for he is *afterwards* pardoned, because he had suffered *enough*. The Devil himself is to be destroyed; and all they will be "*delivered*," who were in his power.—Heb. ii. 14, 15. Are we to suffer by the Devil, when the Devil is DEAD? Besides, what power will there be in *fire*, in the immortal state? What influence can it have on an *incorruptible* SPIRIT? What spirit ever wanted *water*, when it had left the body, and was in *Hades*? alluded to in the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, and said to be in the future life, if the spirit is exempt entirely from the influence of the bodily appetites? So much for the influence of fire upon incorruptible beings; hence it *can not* be in eternity.

He said that Universalists had borrowed their argument about men being punished before they were judged, from Thomas Paine, Voltaire, and Rousseau. Does he wish to reject the doctrine of universal salvation, merely because Tom Paine had one idea that we have, and identify him with us? Is that right? Is it an argument to be expected from a man who intends to do fairly? to endeavor to identify us with *infidels*? Suppose Mr. Waller was to preach the doctrine that there was only one God, and Tom Paine also argued the same thing; and an Atheist should say, O! I have heard Tom Paine, the infidel, use the same argument! Would he esteem it fair, because he happened to agree with Tom Paine in one particular, that he should be held a follower of Paine, or that the point in which he agreed was therefore of course false?

But it happens that Tom Paine was not a Universalist. He believed in punishment in a *future life*, for sins committed here. He belongs therefore rather to Mr. Waller, than to me. I acknowledge him not; he held and taught the Partialist doctrine of a future judgment and punishment with Mr. Waller. Let him not speak lightly of such a friend.

Lord Herbert, another celebrated infidel, was also a believer in endless and infinite misery in a future life. He would also belong to Mr. Waller's party, upon the same principle which he attempted to apply to me. But I protest against any such manoeuvres, and such appeals to prejudice to help out an argument. Tom Paine may have held some good sentiments; so may Voltaire. But as *infidels*, we have no lot or part with them. You know it. You all know it; Mr. Waller knows it, and knows that it is gross injustice to class us as his disciples.

He has said that he was once nigh upon the borders of the same difficulty. That the same thought arose in his mind, that it was unjust to *punish before judgment*, supposing the theory to be true that men go to Hell when they die, and that they are all to be judged together at some future period. But at last it occurred to him that the reason of this was that all the evil works that sinners do in their lives, *survive* them, and operate injuriously on mankind long after they are dead; and consequently the whole consequences of their sins cannot be judged of before the final winding up of the affairs of men. There is

an interval, sometimes, of thousands of years between the sin and the judgment of it; and in the mean time the punishment is going on in Hell, from which they are never to get out.

In reply to this, let us suppose Tom Paine had been *converted* to Christianity, before he died; and suppose him brought to judgment. Would he be judged for his *evil works*? Mr. Waller himself does not believe it. This explanation then goes for nothing. While the wicked work he wrote was still on earth, to work its evil influence, he is *not* judged by its evil influence; but goes to heaven, and enjoys the blessed presence of God, while his works are working the damnation of thousands here on earth during an indefinite period of time, because by *changing* before he dies, and being converted, all his sins are washed away; he is *not* judged or punished for them. His argument, therefore, is of no consequence in getting over the difficulty.

The gentleman has said a great deal about "moral graves." I never said any thing about "moral graves." I said that in certain passages containing the word "graves," that word was not used in the signification of the state of the naturally and literally dead;—that it was used figuratively, referring to the degradation of man in his present life; and I *proved* it by Ezekiel, where the men were still *living*, to whom the same phrases were applied: "brought up out of their graves"—not "*moral* graves;" but something different from the natural signification. His attempt to cast ridicule upon me by reading passages and introducing the phrase "moral graves" into them, was useless, and not to the point. But he said "those who do good in the moral graves come forth to life." Says the sacred writer, (Acts x. and xi.,) Cornelius the centurion was a good and devout man; but it was necessary for him to have something else, before he could enjoy the resurrection to life—the moral resurrection. He must hear the Gospel, so as to be "saved." Peter instructed him: he had not known the full Gospel, before: he was in "the graves" of darkness and ignorance. Others had heard, and not believed. Hence they came forth to the resurrection of damnation; as in the case of the "five foolish virgins," in Matt. xxv.; while the others, though in the darkness of night, *watched*, were ready when the voice was heard,

"Behold the bridegroom cometh!" and received the full life of the Gospel. This parable illustrates the 5th fo John.

Before going further, I will make some remarks upon the kingdom and coming of Jesus Christ, after his first personal coming to offer himself a sacrifice for the human race. That he was to come *again*, there is no dispute. Mr. Waller asserts that his second coming is to be in person, and is *yet future*; and that he never has come since his first coming in person to give himself a ransom for man.

I will now state the doctrine as we hold it. After the resurrection and ascension of Christ, he was to come in "power," and in his kingdom, and in the glory of the Father, in the *life-time* of some who heard him speak; and then there was to be another, a personal coming, at the resurrection of man. In his coming in his kingdom, the judgment was to *commence*. In his third coming, there is *no judgment*. The judgment is then *closed*, the kingdom returned to God, and He become "all in all." There are at least three comings of Christ declared. The second was to be in power, not in person. The two others are personal, although in a restricted sense he may come frequently: any display of his power may be called his coming. Now for the proof: In 16th Matt. 27 and 28, we read thus: "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." [I suppose this to be the coming at the full establishment of the kingdom of God. The next verse answers the question, *when* is Jesus Christ to come to reward man according to his works?] "Verily I say unto you there be some standing here which shall *not taste of death* till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." This is directly to the point. If none are now living, whom the Savior addressed, he has *already come*, in that sense, if he spoke the truth. James says, (ch. 5. v. 7 and 8,) "Be patient therefore brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it until he receive the early and the latter rain. Be ye also patient; establish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord DRAWETH NIGH."

He means that the coming of the Lord was near at hand

at the time *he wrote*. How as to the declaration of Paul that "there must be a falling away first?" Is there not some difficulty here? No. Because when he wrote, it was not so near at hand, as some supposed; although the mystery of iniquity "had *already* BEGUN to work," at that time. And what does John say? "Even *now* there are many anti-christs, whereby we know that *it is the last time*." (1 John ii. 18.) And accordingly not a great while afterwards, Jesus Christ did make his appearance in the clouds of Heaven, *in his kingdom*, with power and great glory. John in Revelation, says, (and I believe it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, from internal evidence;) "Behold he *cometh*, and every eye shall see him and they which pierced him, and all the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." The angel was to show John that which "should *shortly* come to pass;" the time was *then* "at HAND." Was it to be put off for thousands of years? No: It was nigh "at hand;" though it was not so near, when Paul wrote. "Behold, I come *quickly*," is the language, in the last chapter of Revelation. We say that the coming in power and kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ was in that "*generation*;" as Jesus Christ says in the 24th of Matthew—referring to the judgment exercised by Jesus Christ, yet speaking not a word about the resurrection. When he speaks of those who go "into everlasting fire," there is not a word said about the resurrection. Hence it is not proper to take those passages as referring to a future life. The passage in the immediate connection—"pray that your flight be not in the winter, or on the Sabbath day"—*proves* that it does not refer to the resurrection of the dead.

This passage, (Matt. xxiv. 29,) is supposed by some to be literal, and to declare a real change of the heavens and the earth. I will explain this. It is like the 2d. chapter of Acts. I say it is *figurative*, as applicable to changes in governments, empires, and rulers, civil and ecclesiastical. It does not refer to a literal dissolution of the heavens.

Now for the proof of this position: Peter, addressing the Jews on the day of Pentecost, says, (Acts ii. 15,) "For these are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. But *this* is that [mark this] which was spoken by the prophet Joel: and it shall come to pass in the *last days*, saith God;" [this is spoken not of the



dissolution of the earth, but of the end of that dispensation, and embraces a period of some extent of time;] "I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams: and on my servants, and on my handmaidens, I will pour out in those days of my spirit; and they shall prophesy: And I will show *wonders in heaven above*, and signs in the earth beneath; blood and fire, and vapor of smoke. The *sun shall be turned into darkness*, and the *moon into blood*, before that great and notable day of the Lord come." Peter says this which they *then* witnessed, was that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel. Joel used that language, and Peter interpreted it to apply to events then actually passing before them.

Now see Isaiah xxxiv., on this use of language by the prophets. Speaking of the desolation of Idumea, he says, (the passage itself shows that it does not refer to the literal dissolution of the heavens,) "And all the *host of heaven shall be dissolved*, and the *heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll*: [this illustrates what is said by Peter in his Epistle;] "and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig tree. For my sword shall be bathed in heaven; behold it shall come down upon **IDUMEA**, and upon the people of my curse, to *Judgment*."

All this language relates to the temporal desolation of Idumea.

I will now read the passage in Revelation vi. 12: "And I beheld when he opened the sixth seal, and lo! there was a great earthquake: and the *sun became black as sackcloth of hair*, and the *moon became as blood*: and the *stars of heaven fell unto the earth*, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind. And the *heaven departed as a scroll*, when it is rolled together: and every mountain and island were moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens and the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from

the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?"

All these passages, then, illustrate the use of this kind of language, as applied to moral and civil, or political and ecclesiastical changes upon the earth; they do not prove the literal dissolution of the material universe.

Mr. Waller has said that Hell or *Hades* was a place for departed spirits, both good and bad; containing a department for each, i. e. Abraham's bosom, and *Tartarus*; and I have shown in the 20th of Revelation, that death and Hell were cast into the lake of fire. Here is Hell containing Hell and Abraham's bosom cast into the lake of fire. Here we have more as to the lake of fire, as I will now show, in the 34th chapter of Isaiah. I will show that the lake of fire does not refer to the eternal state. Speaking of Idumea, the desolations of the land, and of the people dwelling upon it, (verse 9,) he says. "And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up forever," etc.

Here is the same language applied to the desolations of Idumea which were temporary, and confined to *this life*. It was to become burning pitch, and the fire was not to be quenched; and "the smoke thereof was to go up forever." My friend said something about the term, "forever," and "forever and forever." Here I show the same words applied to the temporal desolation of the land of Idumea. But perhaps he will say, what of this? He may say it meant the future state of eternal damnation in that case, after all. Let us see. Isaiah says, "the cormorant and the bittern shall possess it;" [do they possess the future Hell?] "the owl also and the raven shall dwell in it;" [do they dwell in the spiritual Hell of fire?] "and thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses thereof." [Do thorns grow in the palaces of Hell? Do brambles and nettles grow in the fortresses of Hell? !]

What then do I quote this passage for? To show the figurative use of that kind of language in Scripture. It all refers to things on earth, and in time. And so I might refer to all those passages containing the same language; but it is not necessary. I do not say that they all refer to the same events, but similar ones.

I am talking now about the 24th chapter of Matthew; and the "tribulation" mentioned there, the dissolution of the heavens, etc., as contemporaneous with the coming of the Lord Jesus in power and glory, to establish his kingdom, and judge the world. The same coming is spoken of by him in Matt. xvi. 27, 28; in both which chapters, Jesus Christ says it is to be *within the life time* of some who were *then living*. Why else should he say ye that are now living shall see "the signs and wonders" preceding this event, if it is to happen in this very "*generation*" now living, or hereafter? Why should he restrict it, as he did, to *that time*? It was then he told them, *near*, at the door. Those then living were to look for all this: "THIS GENERATION shall *not pass* till all these things be accomplished."

In the face of these declarations, my friend, alluding to these very signs and wonders, asks incredulously, "Have we seen any such things come to pass?" Who is correct? Is he, or Jesus Christ? He must either say that Jesus Christ did *not* come, as he *said* he would come; or else, that the word of God is true, and he *did* come. But we are now told that it was *not* done; which is a flat, direct, positive contradiction of the very words of Jesus Christ! And the same remarks apply to all the other passages where this second coming is predicted; though in some of them, it was not *so near* at hand as the Thessalonians had supposed. I would believe that Jesus Christ did come in power and glory, when he said he would come, rather than as in these latter days it is said, that he would come in 1843.

He spoke of Bishop Newton, and of "concessions" made by him. Those concessions were not against his own system, though his system does not agree with mine. This is the difference between his concessions and those others which I quoted from Orthodox writers of celebrity—those from Whitby, Lightfoot, and others. In those cases, the admissions are directly *against the system* they held, and are therefore of importance. The cases are not in the least parallel. Mr. Waller has the privilege of bringing all the quotations he chooses from the great store-house of Universalism; the Bible itself, as well as all the writings of all the great and good men who have believed in universal salvation, upon the question before us; and I am willing he

should do so, that we may see how firmly they all write on the great doctrine of universal salvation. It is true, they differ in *minor* things; but the great point of the *final deliverance of all human souls*, they taught, as the same is now taught by all Universalists. I have nothing more to notice at present, in relation to that point.

I will now quote the 20th of Revelation, with a few remarks: "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 books, according to their works." I wonder who the "dead, small and great," are? if we understand the language literally, and to refer to the future life. Does the language mean great sinners, and small sinners? or adults, and *infants*? But Mr. Waller says that infants are not judged, because they can do nothing wrong, and nothing good.

MR. WALLER.—I say nothing about infants.

MR. PINGREE.—If they have no knowledge or will to do good or evil, they have in fact no character. But I will pass on. "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and Hell delivered up the dead: and they were judged, every man, according to their works." That is the same Hell in which the rich man was; and thus the rich man is taken out of Hell. I urge it upon him, and upon you, that it takes the rich man out of Hell; if *Hades* is properly Hell. "Death and HELL [*Hades*] delivered up the dead that were in them, and were cast into the lake of fire." Now was Abraham's bosom, [which was *part of Hades*, according to Mr. Waller,] with Abraham in it, cast into the lake of fire? I shall not enter into explanations now; I only want to show some of the absurdities which arise from the common interpretation: a Hell in a Hell is cast into a third Hell; that is, into Tartarus, that is, into itself!!

[MR. WALLER'S NINTH REPLY.]

I deem it unnecessary, and shall not therefore attempt to follow Mr. Pingree in all the positions of his last speech. They are the same that have hitherto been discussed; and

to reply to them would but be to reiterate what has been again and again said. The gentleman has such a fondness for his *arguments* that nothing seems so much to delight him as to hear himself repeat them. Their utterance in his own melodious tones appears to fall with ravishing sweetness upon his ears. If necessary, the matter of the Judgment will be further attended to.

He still misrepresents the views of the Baptists; but as I do not esteem them in great danger from his assaults, I will not now enter into their defence. If an opponent worthy of my steel, shall take the field against them, he may expect to hear from me. Until then I am not disposed to leave the weightier matters in hand.

Mr. Pingree is an opponent of no ordinary daring. He boldly confronts the Savior himself, and asserts a sin will be forgiven, although the Son of God declares it shall never be forgiven! Perhaps I misunderstood him—I hope I did. He seemed, however, to argue, that our Savior was mistaken in saying the sin against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness; for, in Mr. Pingree's judgment, all sins are forgiven! He felt that either Jesus or Universalism did not teach the truth on this subject; and he has left the former, and cleaved to the latter. Nor did he stop here. He boldly poured the waters on the everlasting fires, and declared them extinguished, although the Scriptures teach that they shall not be quenched! Of course, I cannot stand before an opponent whose giant arm is too mighty for the omnipotence of divine truth! If he will not regard the words of our blessed Savior, in vain may I hope that he will listen to my words.

He did not positively affirm, but, with some trepidation of manner, seemed to insinuate that when *et* was used in reference to the resurrection, that all the dead were included. Admit this, and what follows? Why, that when Lazarus arose, all the dead arose with him! for he arose *out of* the dead. And when Jesus arose, all the dead rose again! for he too arose *out of* the dead.

I have had no occasion to use Tom Paine's wit. The gentleman tries to excuse himself for drawing on him for some of his arguments, by alleging that Paine was a *Partialist*. Grant this, still this was not peculiar to his system—it was not original. But Mr. Pingree borrowed from his system and from what is peculiarly infidel in its origin.

Paine was not an Atheist; and until Universalism arose, nothing but Atheism ever had the effrontery to deny a future state of rewards and punishments. Paine had too much common sense to embrace the absurdities of Atheism.

Excuse me for once more referring to the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians. It is the gentleman's main fortress; and although I have driven him from it, still he lingers about its ruins. I have said and proved that this chapter was written especially to comfort the righteous under their persecutions, by presenting to them the glorious estate in reserve for them at the resurrection. The whole connexion shows this. They all die in Adam and shall all rise in Christ. They have borne the image of the earthy, and shall bear the image of the heavenly. He is speaking of those who "are *Christ's*;" and not of those who are *not* Christ's, as Mr. Pingree does. Besides it is a *physical* and not a *moral* change which the Apostle alludes to; and, therefore, is wholly inadequate to the wants of Universalism. Has Mr. Pingree met these positions which I have again and again pressed upon his consideration? He has not, and he cannot. And until he does, I deem it wholly unnecessary to notice his spasmodic efforts to evade them.

I commenced the other day to show that *this state of being is not a perfect state of retribution*. I now return to that subject, and in pursuing this course, I intend to bear down broadside upon all that Mr. Pingree has said. I care not to attack him in detail; I wish to crush his whole system in mass. I do this to save time and to spare your patience. I will now proceed from where I left off.

Fifth: *The sufferings of the Son of God proves that there is not a perfect retribution in this life—that sin does not sufficiently and adequately punish itself.*

Universalists must assert either that Jesus suffered justly for his own sins; and thus flatly contradict the Bible, which teaches that he was without sin and knew no sin, that guile was not found in his mouth; that he was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens: or else they must assert, that he died in the room and stead of sinners, bearing their sins in his own body upon the tree; and thus flatly contradict themselves; for they assert that each man's sins are borne by himself, and not by the Son of God.

If they take either horn of the dilemma, their cause fails.

Sixth: *Jesus told his disciples that they were to be persecuted in this world, not because of sin, but BECAUSE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.* Now, unless my opponent can show that persecution for righteousness' sake is a just retribution, then this is not a perfect state of rewards and punishments.

Matt. v. 10—12: "Blessed are they who are persecuted for *righteousness' sake*; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, *for my sake*: rejoice and be exceeding glad; for great is your *reward in heaven*; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." Here it is asserted that good men for their righteousness shall be persecuted in this world: and this Universalism says is just and right: nay more, that this is all their reward, although our Savior says, that their reward is in heaven!

Matt. xxiii. 29—35: "Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, if we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them of the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of Hell." This passage, I hope, will remove from Mr. Pingree's eyes all that film about God's punishment being fatherly and kind, and inflicted for the reformation of the sinner.

I intend, in due time, to offer some remarks on the term *Gehenna*—"hell." Mr. Pingree's lucubrations on it, and on Lazarus, hades, Abraham's bosom, etc., must pass for the present. They will serve for his employment and our amusement. When the right time arrives, I expect conclusively to demonstrate that he is wholly ignorant of these subjects. But to proceed:

Luke vi. 21—26: "Blessed are ye that hunger now; for ye shall be filled. Blessed are ye that weep now; for ye shall laugh. Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and

shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy, for in like manner did their fathers. Woe unto you that are rich, for ye have received your consolation! Woe unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep. Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you." Now what *can* these passages mean, except to encourage the saints under persecution in this world, in view of a glorious reward in the next; and to warn sinners who receive their pleasure here, by the fearful retributions that await them hereafter? But they can in no way be construed to favor the doctrine, that the present is a state of perfect retribution. Indeed, the idea of all rewards and punishments being confined to this life, owes its origin to the brains of Universalists, like Purgatory, which is located in the cranium of the Pope.

Acts vii. 57—60: "Then they cried with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city and stoned him: and the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul. And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit. And he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep."

Did Stephen, who was persecuted for the testimony of Jesus, thus receive his reward in this life? Universalism answers, *yes!*

Romans viii. 35 and 36: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or the sword? As it is written, For thy sake are we killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter."

Thus are the righteous rewarded, according to Universalism! You must believe these persecutions to be blessings in this life, or else you must abandon the doctrine of my opponent! Can you hesitate in your decision?

1 Cor. iv. 11—13: "Even unto this present hour we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling place; and labor, working with our own hands. Being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat: we are



made as the filth of the world, and are the off-scouring of all things unto this day." Again, 1 Cor. xv. 19—"If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." Again, verses 31 and 32: "I protest by your rejoicing, I die daily. If after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die." This argument applies with equal force to Universalism. Why suffer for religion in this world, if we gain nothing by it in the world to come? Let us enjoy ourselves as do the ungodly. Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we shall all be happy.

I bring no charge of immorality against Universalists. They may be all very moral, for ought I know; but then they are so in spite of their system; for I do charge that the tendency of their system is immoral. Now suppose a man should come here, and profess to be the advocate of industry, and yet contend that people could raise as much corn and make as much money by not working as with it: nevertheless, should urge the importance of industry from its advantages to health: think you, if he could convince people of this, every plough would not stop, and the sound of every hammer would not cease to be heard? Just so, Universalists take away the reward of righteousness hereafter, and what then is left to nerve them to forego the pleasures of sin and endure persecution for the sake of righteousness? Sin is so sweet to the natural taste, and the cross of Christ such a burthen to men, that if you take away the punishment in the life to come, and hold out a blessed immortality to all, they will be sure to say, Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we will all be in heaven! Really, this is offering a premium to sin.

2 Tim. iii. 11 and 12: "Persecutions and afflictions, which came unto me at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra; what persecutions I endured: but out of them all the Lord delivered me. Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution."

But shall the righteous *justly* suffer persecution? The Universalist responds in the affirmative: for in this life, according to his system, there is perfect retribution—men are punished exactly according to their deeds! Of course there can be no injustice, or fraud, or wrong in this life, that is not fully and adequately punished! Indeed,

he that suffers from injustice receives but his due; for this is just the case of all the righteous: they unjustly suffer in this life for their religion, and this is their reward! To say that these pious persons suffered justly for their sins is to contradict the Bible, for that declares that it was not for sin, but for righteousness.

It appears too that the sufferings of the ancient worthies were much more severe than the direst punishment inflicted upon the most abandoned in the Hell of the Universalists. I will read from the "Pro and Con of Universalism:"

"I have before considered the case of the gambler, but we may take a more difficult view of it. We will suppose, then, that he constantly rises from the game a *winner*; how, in that event, does he get his punishment? Is he not rather rewarded for his wickedness, and encouraged to proceed in it? He would be encouraged, indeed, if he fared as well as you, reader, seem to suppose; and in that case why will we not all turn gamblers, since we are lured to it by the flowers which providence strews in that path! Reader, dismiss this delusion; for such, and a very destructive one, it really is. I will tell you how the successful gambler gets his punishment. It does not follow from the fact that he has always won, that he therefore always shall; one more expert than himself may at any moment strip him of all his past gains; his very successes serve to lessen his caution, and embolden him to venture larger stakes; hence, it often happens that his entire fortune is vibrating upon the chances of the moment; he may arise with double his present wealth, or without a penny. What must be his mental perturbation when so much is depending on such shifting hazards? Anxiety of this nature, so feverish, so intense, is rapid in its progress of eating out the soul. But aside from this, has he no reason for disquietude in regard to his victims, some of whom he may have rendered desperate by despair at their losses, and may visit their ruin upon his head? Let him who wishes to portray the career of the gambler as pleasant, go to a Parisian or a London hell, (rightly named,) to borrow his lights and shades for the picture. Would you, reader, exchange your life of quiet and of honest self-approval, for his, of turbulence and apprehension?

"Consider, next, the case of the dishonest man. Suppose him so adroit in his arts that he is never detected; is

he therefore never punished? Why then starts he at every leaf that rustles near him? Why those uneasy glances when he hears approaching footsteps? Why cannot he look his honest neighbors in the face, but his eye must be constantly cowering beneath their glance?" etc., etc., pp. 247-8.

And this is the Universalist's hell! It may be, for ought I know, (for I pretend to no superior acquaintanceship with the *feelings* of such persons,) that some are very graphically described by this writer; but all history attests that there are many who have not those feelings and compunctions of conscience. It is notorious that a majority of criminals go on in their wicked courses until they become "past feeling" and are perfectly reckless in their career, and even take a pleasure in crime. Such, of course, are not in this hell! It is your novice in guilt, upon the commission of some minor offence, who is startled and abashed at the glance of the honest man's eye: but your veteran in vice will look an honest man out of countenance. He knows nothing of this hell. His conscience is seared as with a hot iron, and is as hard as the nether mill-stone. His eye never quails and his cheek never crimson, with shame. Indeed there are some rogues so adroit in their business as to steal and rob according to law, and these are often esteemed the most respectable in community. These will coin the tears of wretchedness, and wring the last mite from the wasted hand of poverty, widowhood, and orphanage. They live in splendor upon their ungodly gains, and glory in their shame!

And the *drunkard*! his punishment is *future*! While drunk, who so rich? *so glorious*? His floor is paved with diamonds, and he spits in gold dust! Every thing smiles upon him, and every sound is the sweetest music to his ears! Such a man is not in perdition surely! Even the Universalists will not dare say so. I grant that when he begins *to cool off*, he then may be tormented. "Hobgoblins and demons dire" may *then* float in his imagination. But he takes another dram or two, and he steps forth in his wanted magnificence again, the wisest, greatest, richest of mankind!

The truth is, sinners roll sin under their tongues as a sweet morsel. They take pleasure in unrighteousness.

So pleasant is sin to them, that in spite of all consequences, they will engage in it: for its pleasures, they fearlessly dare all its dangers.

And if mental anguish be all the hell known to the Scriptures, then the Christians are often in it. Aye, even our blessed Savior said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death;" and he sweat as it were great drops of blood, falling to the ground. And the Apostle had 'great heaviness and continual sorrow of soul.' And what saint has not taken up the lamentation of the prophet, "Oh, that my head were waters and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night over the slain of the daughter of my people?" or has not exclaimed with Paul, "Oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" And where in history do we read of the sufferings of any, to be compared with those experienced by millions of the disciples of Christ, of whom the world was not worthy? Their sufferings were the most terrible upon record. And what did their persecutors suffer? In a majority of cases, they experienced neither corporeal nor mental pain. They thought they were doing God service; and were even stimulated by their consciences to butcher the disciples of Christ, supposing that the blood of the *heretics* (as they reproachfully called them) would wash away their sins: and they would sing *te deums* and keep jubilee upon hearing that thousands of men, women, and children had been massacred in cold blood! The hell of the Universalists is demolished by such feelings as these.

Seventh: *We know, that in the commission of many sins, the sinner is wholly unconscious of any punishment—even believes himself engaged in doing what is right and pleasing to God; and enjoys great peace of mind.*

Idolatry is a sin—the great sin; and yet how many idolaters, in their worship, experience great peace of mind? Nay, are startled if they neglect the worship of their idols? Sons, with a good conscience, have burned their own mothers upon the funeral pyre of their fathers! Mothers have sacrificed their own infants! etc. Now if peace of mind be the heaven, and mental anguish, the hell, of Universalism, then the devotee of idolatry escapes the punishment of sin, and enjoys that peace of mind which according to the system I am now opposing, is the reward of

the righteous. This peace and joy of conscience, experienced by the idolater, is a full and adequate punishment for his sins!—for this is a perfect state of retribution.

Eighth: *This doctrine makes God unjust and unequal in the administration of justice.* I have already adduced proofs of this in the sufferings of the people of God in past ages.

Look again at history. Behold the sufferings of the people of God!—Hated of all men for his name's sake—driven into the caves and the dens of the earth—hunted like beasts: burnt, crucified, sawn assunder—robbed of their property—torn from their families—driven from their country—denied the privilege of worshipping God: and all, not because of sin, but because of righteousness! But Universalism says *it is just!* With demon ferocity, it looks upon their sorrows and their sufferings, and declares it all to be *right!* They are receiving their recompense! This is all the advantage from religion they are ever to expect! It stands near the stake, and “grinning horribly a ghastly smile,” says to the suffering martyr, as he writhes in the cruel flame; this is the reward of your righteousness! this is a just and righteous retribution! In this world, sin and righteousness receive full and adequate reward! You are suffering justly! It is the merciful visitation of the Lord!

This is foul blasphemy! It is an atrocious slander upon the character of God! I protest against this flagitious method of making the Almighty just such a being as ourselves! It is Universalism, and not the Judge of all the earth, that is possessed of these most revolting and fiendish sentiments!

But turn another way, and contemplate the career of the enemies of the cross of Christ. If Christians have their evil things, these, like the rich man in the parable, very often enjoy their good things. Loved by the world—in possession of its honors and pleasures—living in luxury and splendor—surrounded by their families and their friends—their favor courted, and their actions eulogized. Ease, comfort, opulence, and honor are their portions. Yet they are the enemies of God and his righteousness. They have persecuted his people and blasphemed his name. Universalism approaches such a one, and in bland and sweet, yet magniloquent strains, thus discourses: “Lo,

you are in hell! You are experiencing now everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power! You are burning in the fire which is unquenchable! and on you preys the worm that never dies! This wealth, these honors, these friends, and all these pleasures of yours are everlasting punishments!—the agonies of the second death! You are receiving in these the recompense of your sins!!! But look yonder at those Christians. Embrace their religion, and you will be rid of this hell, and enjoy their heaven! They are receiving the reward of their righteousness. That flame in which they are burning is life everlasting! Those dungeons in which they are confined, are the mansions which Jesus prepared in his Father's house for all that love him!—they are rooms in that building not made with hands, eternal in the heavens!! Those racks and tortures are all the manifestations of God's love they will receive for their faith in him! and those crowns of thorns on their heads, are the crowns of glory their Savior promised them!!!”

Such is the legitimate language of Universalism, which teaches that the wicked and the righteous receive the fruits of their doings only in this life! Infidelity itself, never uttered such unhallowed slanders against the Almighty!

I shall now proceed to show, that there is punishment for sin and reward for righteousness, *in the future state*. Under this proposition, I do not intend to argue the *duration* of future punishments: I only propose to show that sinners are punished after death. The other matter will be attended to afterwards. If the gentleman is truly a Universalist, should I establish this position, his doctrine falls. He has not clearly defined his position as yet—he will definitely take neither Universalist nor Restorationist grounds. He still dangles, professedly, in mid air. I have no objection to his course, and utter no complaints. He is welcome to elect whatever position he esteems the most comfortable. I wage a war of extermination against the whole system, from Restorationism down to the lowest depths of Universalism.

First: That there is a future state of rewards and punishments, I argue, *because, in this world, there is not a perfect retribution*. This I have already shown. Every man of common observation and common sense knows and feels it. It follows then, that if the judge of all the earth will

do right, he will punish in another world—that he will there do justice, which is another word for doing right. In that world, the sinner and the saint shall reap the fruits of their doings. The oppressor and the oppressed, will give an account unto God. The sinner who enjoyed his good things in this, will be tormented in that, world; while he who had his evil things here, and was poor and persecuted on account of his religion, will there ‘bathe his weary soul in seas of heavenly rest.’ The blood stained conqueror who could not obtain justice in this world, will receive it there: and over all men, however false and wrong their position here, the eternal and immutable justice of God will there forever manifest itself.

Second: *If, as Universalists affirm, every sin of each individual is as certainly punished as that God sits upon his throne, then there must be punishment after death.* Men die in their sins. “The wicked are turned into *hell* [let it be *hades*, the unseen world, if you please] with all the nations that forget God.” “The wicked is driven away in his wickedness.” Some die Atheists, some Deists; drunkards, swearers, idolaters; some in the act of murder or of robbery, with the blood of the innocent upon their souls. Nor will it do to say that their death was their punishment. Death is the common lot of the pious as well as the ungodly. Besides, on the same ship, the humble disciple of Christ, the bold blasphemer, the drunkard, etc., etc., have, in an instant, gone down into the same watery grave! The same tornado, while all were asleep, has swept the saint and the sinner into eternity. It is clear then that sinners die in their sins—enter the other world polluted with guilt, and with their sins unpunished. Ballou himself admits this. In his “Treatise on Atonement,” he says: “It is objected, as many are going out of this world daily, in a state of sinfulness and unreconciliation to God, and there being no alteration in the soul, for the better, after it leaves this natural life, millions, must be miserable, as long as God exists. The force of this objection stands on the supposition, that there is no alteration for the better, after death. Could this supposition be proved, I grant it would substantiate a formidable, and (I think) an unanswerable objection against the final holiness and happiness of all men.” p. 151.

There are sinners, then, who, dying in their sins, are

not punished for them in this life: of course they must be punished for them in the life to come: for Universalism asserts that every sin will meet full and adequate punishment. Again: "it asserts that the evils from which Jesus came to save men are in this world;" and as those dying in their sins, were not saved from these evils in this world, it follows that they are not saved from them *by the Savior* at all; for, we are told, that he saves only in this world! And if not saved by him, they are never saved at all, for he is the only Savior! They go into the grave with their sins, we are told; and also that God punishes fully and adequately every transgression and sin: the conclusion is inevitable then, that these persons are punished after death, the Universalists being witnesses.

Third: *Universalism, in asserting that no man can be happy hereafter, unless holy, in effect asserts a future state of punishment.*

The *mind* of the Christian is made holy in this world. The first coming of Christ was for the salvation of the soul: he will come a second time to save the body. Hence all his doctrine pertained to the soul—had to do with the mind. He told his disciples not to fear them that kill the body—to take no care of the body. They were to suffer in the body. But the mind was to be converted—changed—to be born again—born from above. We are to believe in him, and by so doing, receive forgiveness of sins—are pardoned, justified and saved. Our hearts are purified by faith. By it, we pass from death unto life, become heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ. In this way, the mind is made holy—is conformed to the law of God. Hence says Paul, Romans i. 25, "With the *mind* [*nous*—"The rational soul, with all its powers, faculties and affections."\*] I myself serve the law of God, but with the *flesh* [*sarx*—"the human body,"] the law of sin." Christians are "new creatures." This renovation of their minds—of their moral being, takes place this side of the grave. It is effected through the truth by the Spirit of God operating on the minds of men. But the sinner, dying in his sins, has no such change wrought in him in this world. The Atheist, the Deist, the drunkard, the liar, the wicked of every degree, dying impenitent, have experien-

\*Greenfield's Lexicon.



ced no such change in life. This Mr. Ballou admits; and confesses, that unless they experience it after death they must ever be miserable. They have not the principle of holiness within them, and they cannot be happy in the future state without it. *Where* do they obtain this renovation of mind out of this world? Is the grave the soul's crucible? Are the charnel house, the coffin, the winding sheet, the skin worms; the rottenness and stench of the grave—are these the refiner's fire, and the fuller's soap to cleanse those souls which, in life, defied the purifying influences of the grace, and the truth, and the spirit of God? Are these more effectual in administering to the mind diseased, than the potent medicines in the pharmacopœia of the great Physician of souls.

And *how*, Oh tell me, how is the soul converted and regenerated in the next state? Is it done without means? If not, what means are employed? Has God provided other means there than he has appointed for this world? If so, what are they? If the same, are the hearts of men more impressible there than here? Is the sword of the Spirit, the word of God, wielded for their conversion, in the next world? Have they faith? If not, how are they pardoned, or justified, or saved? How are their hearts purified? And if they have faith, do they obtain it without hearing? and do they hear without a preacher? and who is commissioned to preach the Gospel in the grave?

Or will it be contended, that the Almighty treats *there* the minds he has created as mere clods of matter, and changes them to holiness without presentation of motive? To allege that God makes men holy without means, and without the presentation of motive, is to deny all moral agency to man; and by so doing to obliterate all the distinction between vice and virtue. Destroy the freedom of the will, and man is powerless to do. If he has no will to do, then he does nothing, and can do nothing; and is no more accountable than a steam engine, or the wheel of a cart. If he has no freedom of will, he can render no service to God, and can commit no sin against him, any more than a turtle or a terrapin. And of course it follows, that all which has been said, and sung, and written about virtue and vice is sheer nonsense; for no man can be virtuous or vicious, upon this principle; and *right* and *wrong* are terms that have no rightful place in the vocabulary of men!

And who would think of calling on a stock or a stone to serve him? But God so calls upon man. He does *demand* service of him. This proves that the Almighty regards him as a moral agent, that may or may not serve him as he lists. He reasons with men to convince their judgments, and presents them motives to win their affections. It is thus, in this world, they are brought from the love of sin, to the love of holiness. Will the Universalist tell us how such a transformation is brought about in the next world? He admits the necessity and asserts its existence; the burthen of proof then rests upon him. Is the Atheist there brought to admit the existence of God, and his soul made to love him, without one reason being offered to change his opinion, and without one motive being presented to win his affections? Is the Deist, in the same way, brought to love and worship Jesus? The man who could not be won *here* by the Gospel of the Grace of God, presented to him in the sweet accents of love, is he *there*, by arbitrary power, made holy and righteous? changed without his knowledge or consent, without a reason or a motive, he knows not how or where!

**FOURTH. THE SINS OF THE SINNER DO NOT CEASE WITH THIS LIFE, AND IF EVERY SIN MEETS ADEQUATE PUNISHMENT, THEN THERE MUST BE PUNISHMENT AFTER DEATH.**

I have already established this point in my remarks upon the judgment. Holy men of old, though dead, yet speak. They have ceased from their labors, and their works do follow them. The ancient law givers still act through the laws they made. Great conquerors, dead a thousand years, yet live in the desolations, moral and physical, which they wrought. And who can read the writings of the illustrious dead, and not feel their influence upon their minds? And who will say that the Infidels of the last century have ceased to act? Are they not still persuading men to reject and contemn the religion of Jesus? Every man is a part of society—a constituent portion of a mighty moral machinery. Sin is an injury done to the law of God—an invasion and infraction of the moral system, ordained of God for the good of all his intelligent creatures; and if every sin is certainly punished, where do these posthumous sins receive their punishment but in the life to come.

*Fifth. Universalism in denying future punishment not only*

*makes our Savior an unreasonable master, but his Disciples the veriest Quixotic adventurers that ever tabernacled in flesh.*

The Savior commanded his Apostles to go and make disciples of all nations. Now imagine these Apostles going forth, and preaching Universalism to the men of the earth. They find a man surrounded by all the good things of this life. He is clothed in purple and fine linen, and fares sumptuously every day. He has friends and relations, whose company impart to him pleasure and delight. He has houses, and lands, and servants, and stores, and cattle. He has said to his soul, take now thine ease! An Apostle approaches him, and promises him great earthly rewards if he will embrace the Christian religion, (for remember, Universalism promises only this life to the Christian—only temporal rewards.) The man, in admiration, demands in what can it consist? Do you promise more wealth, more houses and lands? No sir; our Master says you must be willing to forsake these for his sake; and very likely your enemies will strip you of all your possessions. Well, then, I will have more friends, I suppose? No: You will be hated of all men for his name's sake. But then I will have the more pleasure with my family? No: A man's foes are frequently those of his own household; but besides, you must be willing to forsake all these, or you will not be worthy to be called his disciple. Well, surely then I shall be respected and honored by some body? Oh no, sir! you will be hated and persecuted, and be driven from city to city, and in all probability, be miserably put to death. Well, sir, you must be talking about another world; for surely I do not see how it is I can gain anything in this, by your religion? Yes sir, it is in this; for in the next world you gain nothing whatever by being a disciple of our Master!

If the man did not spurn them for fools or maniacs, he must have possessed more patience than Job, and more insensibility than a Stoic.

In making the rewards of our religion entirely in this life, an essential feature of all false religions, and especially that of Mahomet, is fastened upon it. And who would be justifiable in giving up houses, and lands, and wife and children, and his own life, for such a religion? Certainly none would do it, and I am sure none ought to do it. Perhaps this will explain the reason why none of

the great company of martyrs were Universalists. I demand of Mr. Pingree to show how, on the principles of his system, he can demand of any man to sacrifice an earthly pleasure, not to say his life, for religion? Will he answer?

Sixth. *But we will let the New Testament speak in relation to a state of future rewards and punishments.* And I regret that our time is so limited, as to enable me merely to glance at this important point; to quote but a few of the vast multitude of passages bearing directly on this subject.

Matt. iii. 12: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." That is, as the Universalist would explain, he will burn the chaff until it becomes wheat, and then the unquenchable fire will *go out*. Matt. v. 3: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven." And Universalism adds, Blessed are those NOT poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven! Verse 7; "Blessed is the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy;" And so shall the unmerciful! responds Universalism. Verse 8; "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Universalism says, so shall the impure in heart! Verse 9; "Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God. Universalism; And blessed are the peace-breakers, for they shall be called the children of God! Verse 10; "Blessed are they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven." Universalism; And blessed are they who persecute the righteous, for theirs is Heaven!! Verses 11 and 12: "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake; rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in Heaven." Universalism; This is a blunder of "the dependent creature," Jesus of Nazareth! He should have said, great is your reward *in the earth!* In Heaven, these persecuted persons will have no more reward than their persecutors! Verse 20; "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of Heaven." Universalism; But whether you shall have any righteous-

ness at all, ye shall in every case, enter into Heaven! Verse 22; "Whosoever is angry with his brother, shall be in danger of the judgment. [Universalism; that is, of being punished by the Court of Septemviri, although there is no law for that Court's condemning you for such an offence;] and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; [Universalism; and yet the council have no jurisdiction in such cases;] but whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of *Hell fire*. [Universalism; that is, to be burnt in the valley of Hinnom, for which there is no law, human or divine!"] Verse 29; "If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee, for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into Hell." [Universalism; that is, into *the valley of Hinnom*, where there is not the least danger of your being cast!!] Verse 30; "If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off and cast it from thee, for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into Hell." [Universalism; *into the valley of Hinnom*; where you never will be cast, as you very well know!]

Matt. vi. 2: "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; [Universalism; yet they shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven;] but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in Heaven, [Universalism; and he that doeth it not.] Many will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? and then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me ye that work iniquity." [Universalism; and go into Heaven!]

Matt. viii. 11, 12: "And I say unto you, that many shall come from the East and West, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of Heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness; [Universalism; and into the light and glory of Heaven;] there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Matt. x. 15: "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city." [Universalism; for their inhabitants shall mingle together in the climes of bliss!]

Matt. x. 28: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both body and soul in Hell." Luke xii. 4, 5: "And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn you, whom you shall fear. Fear him, which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into Hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him."

The Universalists have agonized much over these texts, and have made many spasmodic efforts to deliver themselves of their burden; but hitherto, they have labored to little purpose. Scarcely any two of them go the same way around them; and no one, so far as I have observed, seems satisfied with his efforts. Now, why should dead men fear, if there be no terrors hereafter? And what means that awful warning to fear him who was able to do, what man could not do, viz: "Destroy both soul and body in HELL,"—in Gehenna. "Who, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into Hell." A Universalist writer, in the frenzy of his despair, tells us that the text says, that God has *power* to cast into Hell, not that he will do it! If there is no Hell, I humbly conceive that even Omnipotence could not cast any one into it! But another, still more frantic, tells us, that it means that the disciples should not fear the Jews who could kill the body, but that they should fear the Romans, who would cast both body and *life* into Hinnom's vale! But how the life of a dead man could be cast into the valley of Hinnom, he did not explain; nor did he tell us why the Romans should be particularly dreaded, because they had power to cast dead bodies into the valley of Hinnom, (which could not have been a very great affair.) Perhaps Mr. Pin-gree has still another explanation. I will await his advance.

Matt. x. 33: "Whosoever shall deny me, before men him will I also deny before my Father and the holy angels;" [Universalism; but he shall nevertheless, be made at that time, holy and happy!]

Matt. x. 37—39: "He that loveth father and mother more than me is not worthy of me, [Universalism; but is worthy of Heaven!] and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me. [Universalism; but nevertheless is worthy of Heaven!] And he that taketh not his cross

and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. [Universalism; but shall be forever happy!] He that findeth his life shall lose it, [Universalism; and find it again in Heaven!] and he that loseth his life for my sake, shall find it again." [Universalism; in this world!]

Matt. xi. 28: "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Universalism; in this world, in the shape of bonds and imprisonments, and stripes and fire, and crucifixion; and if you do not choose to come unto me, you shall rest in Heaven any how!!]

Matt. xiii. 37—43: "He that soweth good seed is the son of man. The field is the *world*. [Universalism; *Judea!*] The good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one. [Universalism; that is, the Jews.] The enemy that sowed them [Universalism; the Jews,] is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world, [Universalism; the destruction of Jerusalem,] and the reapers are the angels. [Universalism; the Roman soldiers!] As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of the world. [Universalism; some thirty-six years hence!] The Son of man shall send forth his angels, [Universalism; idolatrous soldiers!] and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, [Universalism; a piece of service which the Roman angels, alias soldiers, neglected to perform!] and shall cast them in a furnace of fire; [Universalism; the valley of Hinnom, this also was forgotten!] there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." [Universalism; that is, they shall dwell in the town of Pella, and be hated of all men, and be persecuted for righteousness' sake!]

I hope Mr. Pingree will not esteem me impertinent if I ask him a few questions. Did not the Jewish state end when that of the Christian commenced? Did not the Christian age commence before the destruction of Jerusalem? Does not "the end of the world" then, mean the end of the Christian age? Let him answer.

Matt. xiii. 49, 50: "So shall it be at the end of the world, [Universalism; at the destruction of Jerusalem!] the angels [Universalism; Pagan soldiers!] shall come

forth and sever the wicked from among the just, [Universalism; which the Roman soldiers forgot to do, a proof that Jesus was mistaken in their character!] and cast them into the furnace of fire, [Universalism; into the valley of Hinnom, where there was no fire!] there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." [Universalism; by the lifeless corpses!!!]

[MR. PINGREE'S TENTH SPEECH.]

RESPECTED FRIENDS:—According to the course of Mr. Waller's last speech, yesterday, I shall make a slight change in my course this morning. Instead of coming up and making an argument on the subject of the coming of Christ, and other matters before introduced by him, and replied to by me, he gave new matter, and occupied himself with reading from old prepared manuscript sermons, apparently, in which he discusses various questions with Father Ballou, instead of meeting the present arguments of Mr. Pingree.

I might save trouble, and abbreviate labor, by taking the writings of Mr. Ballou, and reading them, to form a perfect reply to the arguments of Mr. Waller; though in that case, as the discussion on the part of Mr. Waller seems to be with Mr. Ballou, I would rather he should be here to defend himself, in person. But as I have not brought his works here, I must reply myself.

As an example or two of his *various readings* of Scripture, according to *his* notions of Universalism, take the 5th chapter of Matthew. I shall not notice all, but take one or two, to illustrate the principle; for I have not time for more. For "Blessed are the peace-makers;" he reads, blessed are the peace-breakers, as the Universalist reading. This I say is not correct. It is not true. Positively, *it is not true*; that is, in the sense in which the impression is attempted to be made, that the peace-breakers are blessed like the righteous—that they receive the same blessing of God as the peace-makers, and *as such*. I have never attempted, have I? to show that they go to heaven in their sins. Not once through this discussion! Has any minister ever preached it, any where? NEVER! The whole of this pretended argument then goes for nothing. We say that *peace-breakers* will be *changed*, and become *peace-makers*, and *then* in heaven, finally, all shall be blessed



together. Is there any objection to this on the part of the gentleman? My friend believes that *some* bad men will be saved: not go to heaven in their wickedness, but by being changed. Where is the difference then between us? He says, *SOME* will be saved. I say *ALL* will be saved, *from*, and not *in* their sins. Besides, what is "the kingdom of God?" My friend knows that the kingdom of God, as spoken of in the New Testament, does not always, if ever, refer to the immortal state; but to the Gospel kingdom on earth. Hence he depends on your common understanding of these passages, to apply them as he wishes. The Savior, speaking of this kingdom, says, "Neither shall they say, *Lo here, or lo there!* for behold, the kingdom of God is *within you.*" (Luke xvii. 20.) It is established in men's hearts, and only seen in the Christian's life and conduct. To have a Christian spirit, is to enjoy the kingdom of heaven. So also Paul: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." So that the very passages he brought for proof of the *misery* of the *righteous*, show the very *reverse*. They show that those men enjoyed the kingdom of God. They show them to have been happy and at *peace*. True, they were persecuted in the flesh; yet they rejoiced in those persecutions, because they had hope in the Gospel of immortal joy. Even though oppressed, they were happier than their oppressors. While the former enjoyed peace and joy of the Gospel, the latter had "NO PEACE; but were like the *troubled sea*, when it *cannot rest.*" Thus teaches a holy Penman.

I propose now to give some various readings of Scripture, to follow the example of my friend Mr. Waller. If his are correct,—as they are *not*,—mine *are* correct. If not, these will set them aside; so I propose to give them.

When God promises Abraham that "in his seed *ALL* the nations of the earth shall be blessed," the Orthodox say only *some* of the nations shall be blessed in him. Peter says, "God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away *every one of you* from his iniquities," (Acts iii. 26.) The Orthodox say, "turning away *some* of you from his iniquities."

Another case: God is "*reconciling THE WORLD* to himself, by Jesus Christ." The Arminian says he will *try* to do it, but *can not*. The Calvinist says he will try to recon-

cile a PART of the world, and will accomplish it. See the difference between Orthodoxy, in its two parts, and Bible Universalism.

The Bible says, "As in Adam ALL die, *even so* in Christ, shall ALL be made alive." Orthodoxy says, as in Adam all *Christians* die, so in the resurrection shall all *Christians* be made alive. This is the *difference* between Orthodoxy and the Bible. The Bible says, that ALL shall be subject to Christ; and God become "ALL in ALL." Orthodoxy says, *some* shall be subject to Christ; and others remain in rebellion forever and ever.

The WILL of God is in favor of universal salvation; for he "will have *all men* to be saved," etc. The Calvinist says, God wills only that *some* shall be saved; and that others were *made* to be damned. This is old fashioned Calvinism. The Arminian says that God would *like* to save all men, but will *fail* everlastingly to do it. There again is a plain and clear distinction between Orthodoxy and the Bible.

Though Paul says, God will gather *together* ALL THINGS in Christ; Orthodoxy separates a part, and says only *some* shall be gathered unto him, and that all the rest shall be *excluded* FOR EVER! Paul, in the 11th of Romans says, "Of whom, [i. e. God.] and *through* whom, and to whom are all things." Orthodoxy says, of whom and to whom are a *part*—*some only*.

Upon the subject of the destruction of the enemies of man—*death, sin, Hell*, or the grave, and the *Devil*; though the Bible says that every, even the "last enemy" of man is to be destroyed; yet Orthodoxy denies this; names an enemy *after* "the LAST," more dreadful than they all, which is God! There again is the difference between Orthodoxy and the Bible.

So Jesus Christ says, "If I be lifted up I *will draw* ALL MEN *unto me*." Orthodoxy says that Christ will draw only a *part* unto him. To prove that all will *come* to him, Jesus Christ said, "All that the Father hath *given* to me—and he hath given *all*—SHALL COME to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out." Orthodoxy says, that *some* will come to Jesus, and others will wail in everlasting despair!

Peter, in Acts iii. says there will be a "*restitution of ALL THINGS*, as spoken of by the holy prophets." Orthodoxy

says there will be a restitution of *some things*, but *not of ALL*. Here is the difference again between Peter and the Orthodoxy.

Thus you see that "various readings" can be given on both sides. Whenever the true exposition of the Bible is given, it does not bear against us. If Mr. Waller shows that *these* do not bear against *his* theory, he will do well—better than I expect. I have shown that in *his* "various readings," he has grossly *perverted* our sentiments.

I now proceed to advance one more distinct argument in favor of universal salvation. I thought I had presented all that I should, in this discussion; but Mr. Waller's saying that I have given all that *can* be given, on the side which I advocate, has induced me to add more; that the vanity of his boasting may be seen by all.

Jesus Christ commands us to "LOVE OUR ENEMIES." We are required to love our neighbor *as ourselves*. Paul says, that "when *one* member SUFFERS, all suffer *with it*." Here we are bound in sympathy with each other, to such an extent, that one cannot witness even slight suffering in another, without suffering *with him*. Suppose we go to a future world, and there is no change in our moral natures after death. What is the consequence, supposing the theory of endless torture in Hell to be true? Those who go to heaven, when they look across the gulf, what will they behold? The torments of human beings writhing in Hell; and they will hear the groans, and screams, and yells of agony of the damned, to all eternity!! Will not sights and sounds like these make them miserable, even though they sit around the throne of God? If they are not changed after death, it follows *inevitably* that this will be the case. Because the *best* men are afflicted by the misfortunes of others in this world. Mr. Waller is troubled by the sufferings of his fellow men, *now*. He is doubtless often made unhappy by them. Even though he does not sin himself, he feels for the sufferings of others. If he is *not changed after death*; if he goes to heaven; and there knows and sees that his friends are suffering unspeakable misery to all eternity in Hell, I think that even with those high and holy feelings which belong to heaven, he *must* be miserable with them to all eternity, by the power of sympathy. Hence, the happiness of the *saved* requires the happiness of *all*, to make it complete.

I will now go back, and notice the last speech of Mr. Waller, yesterday afternoon. My friend says he is willing to go into a defence of the Baptists on the subject of their disagreements with other sects, etc. I do not ask him to do *that*. *This* is the point: unless they undergo a great moral *change after death*, they cannot live in fellowship in a future life. The common doctrine is, he that believes and is baptized *here*, shall be saved *hereafter*. He that does not, shall be damned. Now look at the common idea introduced; it is that he who believes and is *immersed*, only he who is *IMMERSED*, shall be saved; and he that is not immersed must be damned hereafter inevitably. Hence, I repeat, the Baptists unchurch and damn all Christendom! I shall not now dispute the correctness of this dogma, and of the course pursued under its influence: I only mention it to show the absolute necessity of a change of disposition after death, and the consequences of no change, things existing as they do.

He argues from the Greek word *ek*, that when Lazarus rose, all mankind rose with him. If the word *ek* has that power, it has great power, for a small word. A less matter avails in this passage, with Mr. Waller, than was required by Rev. Mr. Ely, in his discussion with Rev. A. C. Thomas. The phrase, "they shall be accounted worthy," kept *him* from being a Universalist; while the little Greek particle, *ek*, keeps Mr. Waller from it. The word *ek* is a small matter—a small gate through which to send the great mass of the human family into Hell. They must all go through that little Greek particle *ek*, into Hell! I shall say nothing more of this, at present; but leave you to decide whether his argument is a sound one.

We have an argument that this life is not a state of perfect retribution. We hear the inquiry made whether the sufferings of Jesus Christ were for himself, or *in the stead of others*; and I am required to take one of the horns of the dilemma. *I shall take NEITHER*. He neither suffered for his *own* sins, nor in the *stead* and *place* of others. He suffered for the *benefit* of others. He was a kind and benevolent being, and suffered for the benefit of the world; as he was sent to suffer, by the Father, to give himself a ransom for all; and so says the Bible. I suppose my friend is an Arminian, and believes that the death of Christ atoned for the sins of **THE WORLD**, and that he died instead of all

men. What! Is not the appointed punishment of sin, *endless damnation*? and did Christ suffer endless damnation for every single sin that ever was or ever will be committed by every single sinner of the human race? He *did*, if his sufferings were *vicarious*. He endured in his own person ten thousand millions of **ENDLESS DAMNATIONS!** Admit then that he thus died, and was punished in the room and stead of all; is any human being to suffer after Jesus Christ has suffered in his stead? Then God inflicts **DOUBLE damnation** for every sin that is committed!! This is the necessary consequence of vicarious atonement, unless *all* are finally saved.

Suppose a court of justice should do so; would not all men reprobate its conduct as cruel, unjust, and malignant? A man is condemned to be hung: a substitute appears, and the court consents to take him and hang him in the stead or place of the criminal. The executioner hangs the substitute, and then the court orders him to *hang the CRIMINAL too!* Would not such a court and executioner be driven out of civilized society, with universal execration?

Just so here: Jesus Christ comes to offer himself as a substitute for sinners who have been condemned to *endless and hopeless damnation*. He suffers all the endless damnation of each of these sinners in his own person. Yet now some sinners are to be endlessly damned, the same as if their punishment had not been already paid in full! Who can believe that in the government of God there exists such monstrous injustice as that?

Jesus Christ came to "reconcile the world to God;" not God to the world: and this is just the difference between Scripture and Orthodoxy, in reference to the nature and object of the Atonement.

Next, as to the sufferings of the Apostles: did they care for the hatred of their enemies? No: they endured the sufferings *willingly*, for the reward of righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. None of these could be taken away. They endured suffering for this: not for their own sins: it is not spoken of as a punishment—it was a part of the Savior's sufferings; that is, in kind. If Jesus Christ's sufferings were *vicarious*, the Apostles' were the same; for an Apostle speaks of "being a *partaker* of Christ's sufferings."

Mr. Waller was "*amused*" by my remarks upon the

subject of Hell. He would not declare himself on that subject; but let me go on for his amusement! Is that what he come here for? to procure you and himself "*amusement*," upon such topics as that? Hell, and the torments of doomed souls! Was that the object of our meeting? is that the thing we came here to do? Not fully. If so, we know what to talk about. The fact is, if I have raised a fog about the subject, it is time he should begin to make it clear. I call on him to take hold of it, to declare himself; and we shall not be in a mist or fog, or be talking for your amusement. I prefer not to spend time in that way myself. I have something to do, besides "*amusing*" Mr. Waller and the audience.

I must here comment upon the evil and immoral tendency of preaching, as my friend does, the *unhappiness* of the **RIGHTEOUS**, and the *happiness* of the **UNRIGHTEOUS**; and also of sinning in the flesh, and at the same time being holy in mind. It is Antinomianism which does this. I am opposed to such preaching; the happiness of the drunkard, etc., and the wretchedness of the righteous. Suppose such doctrines were received generally—men would cry, True, if we sin, we go to Hell; but meantime we are happy here; we can get gloriously drunk, and enjoy ourselves wonderfully here. If the righteous suffer most in this life, I think I'll run the risk of going to Hell, for the sake of being happy while I live. So long as I have good health, I'll take my pleasure, and live in sin; but before I die, I'll comply with the conditions of salvation, and secure Heaven hereafter! That is the point. Men will sin while they *dare to*; because sin makes them, according to such preaching, so happy. This is very convenient, to have the blessing of sin here, without any punishment, and the blessings of Heaven hereafter! Such is the natural tendency of such preaching. Away with it!

Mr. Waller teaches that the oppressors are happy in this world, while the oppressed is crushed and miserable. Yet, according to the Orthodox preaching, it is most likely that the oppressors will be the ones to get to Heaven: being more enlightened, wealthy, and powerful, they have more opportunities, before death, of repentance; while the *ignorant* and *degraded*, whom they have crushed, go to Hell; they have no opportunities of learning the

truth. The Pagan world—where do they go, when they die? I suppose they live wretchedly here, and go to Hell hereafter, if Partialism be true. Such doctrines make the evils of this world worse. I see no *rectification* of the government of God, in Partialism, as it professes to show.

Again, he teaches the same error, in preaching up the happiness of the wicked. How happy, says he, are the wicked! Quoting the language of David, "They are not troubled like other men," etc., but afterwards, when he found out their true condition, what did David say? "They are utterly consumed with terror." He says his foot well nigh slipped, and he says to the Lord, "I was as a fool and a beast before thee." If we admit the sentiment of David, the same sentiment is true at the present day. Mr. Waller forgets that the sinner realizes the terrible consequences of his own sin, as David did, for a time—until he learned the truth.

The allusion was made to the persecutors of the Waldenses, Albigenses, and Huguenots. What were they persecuted for? For not believing with the "mass of men." Though righteous men, they were damned here by the "mass," and thought to be damned hereafter also! So is it with all Christians who have been persecuted on earth. It was because they did not believe and act with the "mass of well regulated minds" of the age in which they lived. Heretics, not believing with the "mass" of men, were burned, because of their opinions; and were supposed besides this to suffer eternal wrath to come, in Hell. Those who persecuted and tormented them here, died Christians, and believe they will be saved! So that they will look down on the everlasting burnings of those thus sent before their time to Hell, according to the Orthodox doctrine. It sends some of the persecuted to perdition, and admits some of the persecutors to glory!

Another argument was advanced to prove the *unjust distribution* of rewards and punishments in this life. See Ezek. xxxiii. 17, where we see the similarity of this statement of Mr. Waller and of those who found fault with the government of God, at that time. "Yet the children of thy people say, the way of the Lord is *not equal*; but as for them, their way is not equal; [mark now,] but if the wicked man turn from his wickedness and do

that which is lawful and right, *he shall live thereby.*" [This is the doctrine I have advanced all along.] What else? "Yet ye say the way of the Lord is NOT EQUAL. Oh! ye house of Israel, I will judge you every one after his ways." The ways of God ARE equal; though Mr. Waller may say they are not "equal;" he thus flatly contradicts the declaration of Almighty God himself!

He spoke of the demon cruelty of Universalism, as to saints, and the happiness it offered to the wicked. Demon cruelty? Yes, the saints *do suffer*; is that the cruelty of *Universalism*? He admits the fact of their suffering. But their sufferings work out for them glory. It is good for us to suffer, to be purified, and chastened. Demon cruelty indeed! to speak of sufferings that shall end with life! No, the "DEMON CRUELTY" is on the other side, which damns men to all *eternity*; which brings men into the world—as Pagans for example—without their own consent, and drives them through it, and then drives them out of it, and to Hell, without a chance of salvation, to all eternity! There is no demon cruelty there, I suppose! Oh! the consistency of the man; to talk of the demon cruelty of mere temporal sufferings, that result in good; yet believers in never ending, IRREMEDIAL sufferings!

My friend inquires if men are purified *in the grave*, by the charnel house, the worms, etc., etc. Where is the necessity of all this talking? He can do this after I advance such a notion.

Why is he still discussing with Father Ballou, and not with me? I again invite Mr. Waller's attention to my arguments, during this discussion, and not to some body else's.

Statements have been made here, that Universalism takes away *free agency*. Mr. Waller says, Universalism would imply that men were forced to love God. Who has talked of *compelling* men to love God? Not I, or any Universalist that I know of. I shall not discuss *free agency*. So far as this discussion is concerned, we may grant all that is asked on this subject. But I would like to know if it be not equally taking away *free agency*, to compel men to go to Hell; the Orthodox Hell, I mean—not the Bible Hell; but the Orthodox Hell, where men are compelled to HATE GOD to eternity; and besides, will men go to Hell, if *free agents*? Will they? Not if they are free agents, to the extent that Arminianism teaches. If my friend, Mr.



Waller were to find himself dead, and not perfectly prepared, and was told to go to Hell, and looked across the gulf, and saw the surges of the lake of everlasting despair, and heard the cries of torment coming up from thence, if he were a free agent, he would not go! [A laugh.] I speak this not for your *amusement*, but to show the absurdity of the sentiments advanced here about free agency. So if any others were ordered to go there, would they go, as free agents? No! They would start back with horror and say, *we will not go there!* What then is to be done with them, remaining free agents? because they can't go to Heaven, and won't go to Hell! God will COMPELL them to go to Hell. Oh! then he must not compel them to go to Heaven, for fear of destroying their free agency, but it is perfectly consistent with free agency, to compel them to go to Hell, where they must curse and blaspheme God to all eternity! Oh! yes, it is a dreadful thing for Universalists to say that God compels them to go to Heaven, to be pure and holy; but to compel them to go to HELL, is the act of a righteous and benevolent God! But I have not taught that God forces men into Heaven.

Mr. Waller said the sins of the sinner do not cease at his death. Then he is an advocate of *universal damnation!* for all are sinners; so it is held that there is no change after death. This is universal damnation—palpable and clear.

This is what the Bible says, that "men are rewarded according to their works," not hereafter, but here. Mr. Waller professes to go by the Bible. He afterwards said that the *repentant sinner* was no longer responsible for past sins. What, then, is the object of all that argument about sins not ceasing at death, and throwing pebbles in the lake, the waves of which rebounded against the shores of eternity, etc.? Now he says they are not responsible for past sins. What is the use of a judgment, then, in the future? *He has given up the point, and nullified the way* he tried to get rid of the force of the argument, that punishment took place before trial, according to Partialism.

It appears now, that Tom Paine was a pretty nice fellow, after all. (He attempted to refer us to him, as his followers.) But now he is a man of good common sense, not quite so bad as the Universalists at the present day.

He may also claim Herbert, the founder of the deistical system. If Tom Paine and Herbert repented, judgment would not be pronounced for evil works done after they were dead. Thus he overthrows his *own* position, and now thinks Tom Paine to be a clever fellow, and can claim him on his own side, as to that point! A glorious fraternity.

We have quotations of passages containing the word Hell, in which he substitutes the word Hinnom: and this was for *fun*, I suppose, for "amusement." I call on him to come out with his explanation of Hell, and say what word in the original languages of Scripture means the state of endless damnation. *Which Hell* is the place of endless damnation, in the original? When that is done I will answer him. It is due to himself, to the truth, and to you who are assembled to hear this discussion, that he should explain. If he will not, I will myself explain the meaning of the word in the Bible.

[MR. WALLER'S TENTH REPLY.]

My object to-day will be to present as much original matter as I can. I regret that the time remaining for this debate will compel me to omit many things I had prepared for the occasion, and even to condense what I may yet introduce, more than I could wish. Mr. Pingree and myself have agreed to make a speech each in the morning of to-morrow, to contain no new matter: consequently I am compelled to introduce whatever of new matter I can, in my speeches of to-day. Mr. Pingree has evidently exhausted his stock. He has shaken his wallet to the bottom, and emptied his last pebble. He has done little else than reiterate for some speeches past. He reminds one of the complaint the negro made against his fiddle: it would play no other tune but "*'tis as it twas! 'tis as it twas!*" But I must be excused from following him around his everlasting circle. These matters he keeps repeating, I have hitherto refuted. I have other matters in hand, if he has not.

Mr. Pingree complains that I am arguing with Mr. Bal-lou! Well, I must argue with some one. I came here for an argument: nor do I believe that my opponent has any great cause of complaint against me for not bestowing enough attention upon himself. I am not conscious of

having neglected him; and I have heard no complaint on that score either in or out of the house, except from himself. Nor am I to be terrified by threats of bringing Mr. Ballou to meet me. If he can do the cause of Universalism more justice than Mr. Pingree, let him be brought. I do not expect to go to Texas, and my whereabouts can easily be found. Indeed, when I consented to meet my opponent, I thought I had testimony sufficient to induce the belief that he was the Ajax Telamon of his party; if at all, but a *slight* remove below Mr. Ballou himself! But my friend seems to squirm a little under the idea of being *the child* of his "*Father Ballou!*" But why should he? In the judgment of charity, can any one suppose for a moment that Mr. Pingree would be what he now is theologically, if Mr. Ballou had never flourished? But this by the way. You observed, no doubt, that while my opponent, in one breath, complained of my arguing with Ballou; in the very next, he endorsed the sentiments of Ballou which I controverted!

Mr. Pingree took one startling position that claims attention. He said, that the sufferings of the righteous and the wicked were light afflictions endured for a few moments, and which worked for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory!

MR. PINGREE. Let me explain.

MR. WALLER. No explanation is necessary. It is a question of fact. I say you did take this position, and I appeal to the stenographer. Will he answer?

STENOGRAPHER. He did say so.

That is enough. Indeed it is in perfect keeping with the rest of his system. If the righteous and the wicked are admitted into the next world on perfect equality, without any reference to their conduct in this life, then of course, the afflictions of the wicked just as much as those of the righteous, work for them an exceeding and eternal weight of glory! And it follows too, from the fact that the Universalist hell, instead of being a place of punishment, is nothing more than a moral laboratory, purging away the dross of the soul, and making men the better adapted to eternal happiness! Let the man who is suffering in this world for his sins—the drunkard, the thief, the highwayman, and the murderer—take consolation. These light afflictions are but for a moment, and work for him a

far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory! If such be the consequences, who would not glory in committing such crimes and receiving such punishment? And why not call the man hung for murder, as well as an Apostle crucified for his faith, a saint and a martyr, seeing that their sufferings produce the same glorious results hereafter?!

It is the legitimate tendency of Universalism to release the sinner from punishment. I beg leave to make a quotation from the "Pro and Con of Universalism."

"'But conscience becomes callous after a while,' say you, 'and the sinner of every kind learns to perpetrate his deeds without compunction; hence, instead of increasing with the ratio of guilt, (as justice would seem to require,) punishment actually diminishes as crime increases.' A specious objection, I grant you, reader, very specious; but you overlook the fact that this moral insensibility is itself a punishment—the greatest of punishments." p. 249.

Here then is the deepest pit of the Universalist's Hell—this "*moral insensibility!*" When there is no longer compunctions for sin,—when the sinner is past feeling, he experiences the most acute pain—"the greatest of punishments!!" And this "greatest of punishments," adds Mr. Pingree, works out for him a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory!! I merely state this doctrine; it would be an insult to your good sense to make one comment upon it. It sinks of its own weight to the bottom of bottomless nonsense!

But I must pass on. After I have broken the phalanx and routed the entire army, it will be time enough to look out for the stragglers.

I have demonstrated the punishment of the wicked, and the happiness of the righteous in another life. I now propose to show, that *these estates are ETERNAL*. Respecting the righteous there is no controversy. My opponent and myself believe they will be eternally happy. That the wicked will be eternally miserable, I propose to show.

First. By an *argumentum ad hominum*—by applying the arguments of Universalists against themselves.

The attributes of God are unchangeable. They are not opposed to the present sin and misery of mankind. On the contrary, Universalism tells us that the Almighty decreed the existence of sin and misery in this world—that

they exist in accordance with his will and pleasure. It follows then, that they must exist through eternity, or God must change:—he must form for himself another will and pleasure!!

God is love, and his love is unchangeable: and his love to his creatures caused him to predestinate their present sin and misery. And what love decrees for them, being unchangeable, must be eternal!!!

God is just—unchangeably just. And justice to his creatures compelled him to decree their present sin and misery; and as these are necessary for their present good, the same justice requires they should continue would without end!!

God is holy—unchangeably holy: and his holiness absolutely demands the sin and misery of his children in this world. And this holiness never changing, being the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, it absolutely demands the existence of sin and misery through eternity!!!

God is very merciful and very kind, and changes not. His mercy and goodness require the present sin and misery of his children; and since his loving kindness faileth not, therefore this sin and misery must endure for ever!!!

This is the inevitable result of the Universalist doctrine. It subverts itself, and establishes beyond controversy, that sin and misery, as they now exist, must continue eternally.

Second: *The Scriptures do not reveal one idea respecting the release of sinners from their future punishment.*

I have shown that, according to the Scriptures and to Universalism, sinners are punished after death: of course, unless the Scriptures teach us respecting its termination, we have no right to suppose their punishment will ever end. If there be such a release, surely we might expect to find it written as with a pencil of light, on the pages of the Bible. A doctrine so important would not be concealed; and if, as Restorationists affirm, men are redeemed from hell, the doctrine would be so plainly recorded that he who runs might read. The doctrine of justification in this life, is clearly set forth in the Scriptures. The most simple may easily learn what they must do to be saved. Now, if sinners are to be forgiven, and if souls are to be saved in the next world, is it not of the last importance that we should know it! And yet where is it recorded in

the Bible? *No where!* If such a thing occurs, God has not given information respecting it; and no one has returned from the spirit-land bringing the intelligence. A truth so important, God would not have concealed from us. But it is not true, because not revealed.

But I will not press this point. I have no opponent on this subject at present. Although Mr. Pingree professes to fraternize with the Restorationists, yet I am persuaded he will not vindicate them on this point.

Third. *But the Scriptures employ the very strongest terms to express the perpetuity of punishment; and if it is possible for language to convey the idea of eternal punishment, then that doctrine is taught in the Scriptures.*

I have already alluded to this subject. I asked Mr. Pingree, for example, to produce from the Greek language, a stronger term than *aionios* to convey the idea of endless duration. He has produced no such word, he has made no attempt of the kind; *nor will he.* This word is used to express the duration of punishment. Mr. Pingree has quoted authors. He has read what he calls concessions. He seemed to triumph because he had a few learned men to sustain him on a point or two. He has appealed to Caesar, and to Caesar he shall go. Let us then go to those who must know the meaning of this word applied to the duration of punishment, and ask for its signification. It is a Greek word, and shall we ask Greek scholars? With united voice, for eighteen centuries, persons skilled in that language, of every creed and country, tell us that the prevailing meaning of that word is *endless, eternal!* It is a Greek word, let us demand its meaning of the Greeks themselves. If they do not know its true import, no one can possibly know it. They have expressed but one opinion on it, from the first introduction of Christianity among them to the present time; viz: it means *endless, eternal.* So the Apostolic fathers decided. So decided the Church of the second century. So did all the Latin and Greek fathers. And in this opinion have concurred all Christians, and especially all scholars and critics of any note, until the days of Hosea Ballou. If this be the general and common meaning of the term, it must be its meaning when used in reference to punishment, unless it be shown that necessity requires that it should not retain it. Can this necessity be proved to exist? *It cannot—IT NEVER HAS BEEN!*

Why should this term have been selected by the Spirit of God, to express the duration of punishment, if it was to last but a few days, or at most but a few years? A term employed to express the perpetuity of the happiness of saints in light, as well as the stability of the throne of God? Was it used to mislead?—to impose a falsehood? Who so impious as to make such a charge, and yet how else can we explain the matter, unless Universalism be admitted to be the climax of falsehood.

Here then I rest. This word alone settles the question, until my opponent proves that it *cannot* have its common and literal meaning when used in reference to punishment. The burthen of proof is his. The literal meaning must not be departed from except necessity compels. He must show the necessity in this case, or his cause falls to the earth.

As I must hasten to get over as much ground as I can, I shall leave this branch of our subject for the present at least, and hasten to consider the *propriety of punishment*, and to what end it is inflicted.

Mr. Pingree has endeavored to be facetious and then severe upon our doctrine respecting punishment for sin. But he has taken very little pains to guard his own system, which may be thus illustrated: A father takes his child, and makes him steal, and lie, and swear, and murder; and then because he does these things, he takes a cart-whip, and flogs him severely. The little son says, "Father, did you not force me to lie, and steal, etc?" "Yes, my son, I did," replies the father. "Then why do you whip me for doing it?" "Because it is my will and pleasure, and I do it for your good!" Just so Universalism represents God. He makes men sin, and punishes them for doing it, and this punishment is for their good! Well, suppose we grant it. If God, in wisdom and love has made men sin, and then punishes them for it in this world, and all for their good, the same wisdom and love will perpetuate this system of benevolence world without end; and make men forever sin and forever punish them for it! Or will the gentleman argue that God becomes a wiser legislator in the future state, and abolishes there his sublunary code of disciplinary punishment, founded in infinite wisdom, and executed in mercy and love? He must

argue thus, or abandon his system; and yet if he does so argue, he perpetrates the most egregious nonsense. For he now says, that the present code of laws is founded in infinite wisdom, so that if it is changed in the next world, it must be for the worse or the better. If for the worse, then God falls below himself, and if for the better, then he must go beyond that which is infinite! So, let Mr. Pingree turn as he may, and he is met by insurmountable difficulties.

But I wish to relieve him, if I can, from the agony he is in respecting our sentiments no divine punishment. Indeed, he wholly misconceives our doctrine. He has been fighting a phantom. No one teaches respecting punishments what he has been opposing. It is a matter of serious regret that he has not taken more pains to inform himself on this branch of the subject.

*We affirm that the punishment of the wicked is just, and that what is just is not contrary to goodness and love, but harmonizes perfectly with them.* We argue that their punishment is just,

First. *Because sinners, if saved, must be pardoned or forgiven of their sins.* Pardon or forgiveness, in human language, means to dispense with a penalty justly due for crimes committed—that the individual pardoned might justly have suffered the punishment from which he is released. This, I say, is the meaning of the term in the language of men; and if the sacred writers used the language of our race, so we must understand their use of this word. If they did not use it, in what language did they write? and how can we interpret what they have written? Now it is declared, in divers places, that men are pardoned of their sins, are forgiven,—their iniquities blotted out, covered, remitted, etc. The Universalist idea of such terms and phrases is, that no man is pardoned until he has suffered the full penalty of his crimes. This is to speak in no tongue under the Heavens. What governor ever said that he had pardoned a man in the penitentiary after he had served the utmost moment required by the law? And that would be a most inefficient pardon which should be given to the murderer, after he had been hung until he was dead! And that too would be a most singular method of forgiving a debt, which should be delayed until the utmost farthing had been exacted!—



But the Scriptures abundantly show that God intends to be understood in this matter as we understand one another. The Savior directed his disciples to pray their Heavenly Father, "Forgive us our debts, *as we forgive our debtors.*" Notice the phrase, "*as we forgive:*" the same principles apply, in human and divine affairs. If the man talks nonsense when he says, he has forgiven a debt upon receiving the last cent of principal and interest, it is equally nonsensical to say that our Heavenly Father forgives us, after we have paid the penalty of our sins. Besides, I have demonstrated it to be supreme nonsense to argue that the term pardon or forgiveness is used in one sense by the sacred, and in to totally a different sense by profane writers. As man forgives, so God forgives. We are ten thousand talents in debt, and have nothing to pay, and our Heavenly Father, who is rich in mercy, for the sake of his Son, forgives the debt. It follows then, that if our sins be forgiven us, we might have justly been punished for them, just as a man who is pardoned for an offence against the State, is saved by that pardon from a just punishment.

So then the punishment of sinners is founded in justice, because all who are saved, are pardoned, and consequently released from a punishment that might have been righteously inflicted.

Second. *The punishment of the sinner is just, because no man can be saved except by the grace or favor of God; and if by grace, then unmerited and undeserved.*

The terms of the proposition in debate take for granted that men are in a lost and unhallowed condition; and hence my opponent assumes to prove their "ultimate holiness and salvation." They are so lost, that without a Savior, none ever could have been saved. Hence, by grace, we are saved. Christ who was rich, for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich. "By his stripes we are healed." Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us; by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. We have no right to demand grace. We had no right to require the Son of God to die for us. *Then we did not deserve salvation.* We might justly have been left in a lost condition. Of course our punishment is just and righteous, and must remain forever so, until we can justly and righteously demand the grace of

salvation—until we can justly and righteously claim the death of the Son of God, in order to our redemption.

I am aware that Universalism may escape this by denying the doctrine of mercy and grace. In fact, it is a system that destroys itself. It asserts, in effect, that there is no salvation, and consequently, no need of a Savior. What does Jesus do for sinners, according to Universalism? He does not redeem them from guilt; for if so, they could not receive full and adequate punishments for it. He does not save them from the curse of the law, else why do men suffer all that the law threatens? He does not save them from their sins; or why do so many die in their sins? Aye, why do none die free from sin, according to Mr. Pingree? The truth is, if Universalism admits that Jesus is a Savior, then they must admit that salvation is of grace, and if of grace, it is undeserved, and might justly and righteously have been withhold; which is just the same as to assert, that punishment being averted by the grace of God through Jesus Christ, then sinners deserved that punishment, and had no right to expect, much less to *demand* their salvation. If by grace they are saved from punishment in this world (and they are saved from punishment, if saved from sin) then they deserved punishment in this world. The same is just as true of the next world. They have no right to *demand* grace. It is a sovereign act, wholly undeserved on the part of the sinner.

No man has a right to demand exemption from the consequences of his own voluntary act. He may seek it as a favor, but cannot demand it as a right. Sin is man's own voluntary act, and punishment the natural consequence. If he is exempted from the consequences, it must be by grace; and but for grace, the sinner might of course justly reap forever the fruit of his doings!

Third. *It is just, because of the heinous nature of sin; sin is treason against the Almighty.*

I have already explained this point. If sin were permitted, the governments of God would be overthrown. The sinner has revolted from that government, and wages unrelenting and deadly warfare against it. It is a prerogative of every government to preserve its own existence. To do this, it must punish those who would subvert it. Justice and righteousness demand such a procedure. The Universalists themselves admit that punishment, in

this world, is founded in mercy and love, and is a just and necessary consequence of sin: how then can they deny the same principles to pertain in relation to punishment in a future state? If it justly pertains in time, why not in eternity?

But Fourth. *Punishment is inflicted with a view to the good of society, and not of the individual.*

Our penal laws are for the preservation of the reputation, the property, and the lives of the people of the Commonwealth; and the punishment is inflicted for the public good. A government that would pardon all criminals, while it manifested great regard for the comfort and feelings of the violators of law, would be unjust to and reckless of the rights and safety of the good and virtuous citizens of the State. The principle of procedure in the Divine Government in punishing sinners is the same as this. Sin is an injury upon God's Government which was made for the good of his intelligent creatures. The evils of sin are not confined to the man who is the transgressor. Its baneful influences extend to others. Hence he is punished for the public good. This is the point I wish my opponent to see. He does not understand our doctrine. Like the children in the market place; we have mourned unto him, and he has not lamented; we have piped unto him, and he has not danced. We have given him line upon line, and precept upon precept, and yet he will not perceive our position. But I will make it so plain, that you shall see it, if Mr. Pingree cannot.

God condescended to be temporal Governor of the Jews, and to give them national laws. Let us hear the reason of his penal enactments; Deut. xiii. 10, 11, "Thou shalt stone him [the idolator] with stones, till he die, because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God, and all Israel shall hear and fear, and shall do no more any such wickedness as this is among you." This man was not punished for his reformation, but that the public might be deterred from following his example. This is the reason he gives for this punishment. And so he reasons in relation to future punishments; 2 Peter ii. 6, "Turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an example unto those that after should live ungodly." Jude 7, "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them, in like manner giving themselves over to fornication and

going after strange flesh *are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.*" Here then is the reason of punishment—it is an "example" to warn others—to deter from sin. Upon this principle is based the penal laws of all the governments in the universe.

It follows then, that punishment is inflicted not in hatred or in affection for the individual, but of his crime, and in view of its deleterious influence upon society if unrestrained. He is punished for the public good—to preserve the social compact. Why is the murderer punished? Not to gratify revengeful feelings, nor to gratify public indignation. It is not uncommon for deep and wide spread sympathy to be felt for the unfortunate criminal. I could never see a person hanged. He may have been a young man of respectable and extensive connexions, and, in an evil hour, he imbued his hands in the blood of a fellow mortal. The jury that condemns, and the Judge who passes the awful sentence of his doom may weep for the poor man, but they feel that his crime must be punished. The safety of society requires it.

The history of our country furnishes another illustration. You remember the case of Major Andre, taken as a spy. There was not a heart in America that did not sympathize with that amiable and excellent young man. The great and good Washington signed his death warrant with tears. He felt a father's sympathy for him. But what could he do? If his feelings as a man were left to predominate, then the mighty interests of his country must be overthrown. The public good, the independence and liberty of his country, and the fate of unborn millions demanded the execution of the unfortunate British officer, and he was hung as a spy.

So God deals with the impenitent sinner under his government, for he acts on this principle. He punishes not in anger or affection. Feelings have nothing to do in the case; they are not taken into consideration. He proceeds on principles of justice and righteousness, which are but other names for goodness and love. He is a sovereign, King of kings, and Lord of lords. His empire is the moral universe. He has ordained laws for the good of his subjects. His punishments then are not inflicted in hatred or affection for the individual, but to preserve the law, and to protect the rights of his law abiding creatures. Nor is this punishment inflicted *arbitrarily*, but is the unavoidable

able result of sin, and is inflicted from the necessity of the case. Man seeks his own ruin, he runs away from happiness. God punishes him by withholding mercies. Hitherto he has given him the blessings of life and health. Man has used them to the injury of his benefactor. That was a terrible sentence which God uttered respecting Ephraim, "He is joined to his idols, *let him alone.*" And suppose God should withdraw all his blessings from us, and *let us alone*, what greater punishment could we imagine? Suppose such a sentence now executed—the Sun is extinguished!—the Stars fall from Heaven!—the Earth flies to pieces!—the diseases and miseries hitherto restrained by his kind hand, seize upon us!—the malignant spirits heretofore confined and fettered to some extent, now in fiendish fury rend our souls! In a word, all is night and anguish, and keen despair! And why should he not *let us alone*? Who of you would continue to give money to an individual, that had been in the habit of abusing your bounty to your injury, and that you knew would use whatever you gave him to abuse your feelings, and to destroy your goods? And yet you would ask the Almighty to act thus with the sinners, who will not come unto Jesus that they may be saved!

But Mr. Pingree argues that men are not free agents in their destruction. He says they would not go to hell, and yet, according to the Orthodox, they are sent there. This is ingenious, but it has no solidity. Men do not voluntarily embrace the punishment, yet they perform voluntarily what they know will lead to punishment. The act then was voluntarily performed, in full view of the consequences. In this consists the free agency. Does Mr. Pingree deny that a murderer is a moral agent? No man is a murderer unless he kills with malice aforethought. And shall we be told that he did not do the deed of his own will—that he was not a free moral agent in the murder, because he did not want to be hanged! If such is not the point of Mr. Pingree's argument, then I am too dull to perceive it:—because a man does not want to suffer in hell, therefore, he cannot be a free moral agent in doing that which he knows will consign him to perdition! Such a conclusion from such premises is worthy only of children. Nor is righteousness or heaven *forced* upon any man. If Universalism be true, holiness and virtue are

forced upon man! He is not free to love and serve God, but is compelled, *volens volens*, to do so! If this be so, as I have demonstrated, there is neither virtue nor vice among men.

But the gentleman contends that our doctrine is, that God places the sinner in the next world where he cannot serve him, and must blaspheme him forever. Now, I protest against his imputing his own doctrine to us; for supposing that we taught such sentiments, it would be but to extend to the other world that system of things which he contends prevails in this! He says that here God makes men sin and punishes them for it. But we hold to no such views, either in reference to this world or the next. Man sins voluntarily, and God punishes him for his sins, because they are infractions of his law, and tend to the injury and misery of his intelligent creatures. He takes no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, but rather that he should turn and live. To save sinners, he sent his Son into the world, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish but have everlasting life.

But I must hasten. My time is nearly expired. I intended to correct some palpable mistakes in the gentleman's last speech; but for the want of time, I must leave them to work out their own destruction. On the subject of a vicarious atonement, I would recommend him to examine some theological dictionary. His remarks on that point were entirely harmless, because he wholly mistook the meaning of the terms. He does not know what vicarious atonement means. He owes it to his reputations to study such matters. And he is just as ignorant of Calvinism. Calvinists do not deny free moral agency. He asks me to state whether I am an Arminian or a Calvinist? *I am neither.* I profess to belong to the school of Christ; and to take the Bible as the man of my council. **THE BIBLE ALONE IS MY RELIGION.**

The plan of man's salvation is so plain that he who runs may read. God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life. This was a merciful provision. Man did not deserve it. By the Gospel of Jesus Christ, God can be just, and the justifier of him that believes. We are told in the parable, that a king provided a great supper, and invited all to come. But some

excused themselves and would not come. The king was not to blame for their refusal, but was justly provoked at their contempt of his bounty. Just so in the Gospel. Here is a glorious feast prepared, and the invitation goes forth, "whosoever will, let him come!" If men eat, they shall never hunger; if they refuse they must die. If they do not come, whose fault is it? Not God's; for he has prepared the feast, and bids all to come. But it is man's fault. He will not come, that he may have life. What more could love and mercy do? And what more can man desire or demand? Had God done more, he must have destroyed man's moral agency, and thereby rendered him as incapable of good or evil, as a stock or a stone. But the sinner must undergo a moral change, or he cannot be happy. This my opponent admits. Then the sinner must be a free moral agent, or he cannot receive such a change.

[MR. PINGREE'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.]

I will now notice one passage which has been introduced, as referring to a future judgment after death. It is Heb. ix. 27, 28. I will as briefly as possible give a hint or two, to show its proper intention and meaning. I have not time to dwell upon it, at length. I take this passage, especially, because a great impression is attempted to be made from it, as referring to a judgment in a future life. I have stated and established the Scripture doctrine of judgment, during the reign of Christ, commencing at his appearing in his kingdom; to which most passages speaking of judgment refer, and by which they are explained. I have cited the 20th chapter of Revelations, also Peter, with others, and given general explanations as to that judgment. But this passage in 9th of Hebrews is not of that kind. It relates to another judgment: "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after that the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many: and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

The context will show the subject about which the Apostle is arguing. The Epistle contrasts, or compares, the offerings under the old dispensation, and the one great offering under the new. Refer to the preceding chapter, beginning at the 4th verse; where the Apostle speaks of

the priests entering "the holy of holies, by the *blood of OTHERS*, once in each year;" with which he contrasts the offering of Christ. The verse, "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after that the judgment," is illustrated by Exodus xxviii. 15th and 30th; 16th and 9th of Leviticus, and 6th of Numbers. The high priest wore "a breast plate of *judgment*," when he came out to bless the people; and he pronounced a judgment of *justification* upon the people who were "looking" for his return; not of *condemnation*, or punishment; but a BLESSING.

So is Jesus Christ a high priest, who appeared once for all, offering *his own* life; "and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." This shows that his judgment is not followed by *condemnation*, but SALVATION. I will repeat the whole verse: "And as it is appointed unto men [or THE men, translating the Greek article] once to die, and after that the judgment, so Christ was once offered," etc. This does not refer to the death of all men, and the judgment common to all as being in a future state. It refers to the priests, who "were taken *from among MEN*," as Paul had before said. So Christ is represented as a high priest who was to die, as it was appointed unto those once to die. He was to enter the Divine presence with "*his own blood*;" and not like them, "with the *blood of others*." What likeness is there between the reconciling death of Christ, followed by judgment, and the death of *all men*, and their suffering judgment in the life to come? The Apostle says, "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after that the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; unto them that look for him shall he appear without sin unto salvation." It is clear, therefore, that if the "judgment" here spoken of be intended to apply to a general judgment of all men in a future life, and to affect their future condition in the eternal world, the passage is a proof of UNIVERSAL SALVATION; for there is *no damnation* after it. It is a "judgment" only "to salvation," according to the text itself. I challenge Mr. Waller to produce a word, a single hint, in all this passage, of misery, of *damnation*, in the life to come; or even after this "judgment!"

After this brief explanation, I pass on to review my friend's last speech. I am sorry he saw proper to refer



to my speech as disparaging to that venerated individual, HOSEA BALLOU. I have uttered nothing disparaging towards him. God forbid that I should! There has not lived a nobler spirit since the age of Luther. He was a better man than Luther, and his reformation is a greater one than Luther's. I merely said that my friend was discussing with him, instead of me, as he ought to do; and that I should be glad if he were here to defend himself. I *protest* against the charge of disparaging him. I would not do it for my right hand.

As to my remarks about the sufferings of the Apostles, working out for them a weight of glory hereafter, and of their enduring them willingly for a reward, etc., I had reference to the *purposes of God* in them; and said that they gladly endured their labors and sufferings for a reward. That reward was the enjoyment of the "kingdom of God," *here*, which was "*within*" them, and *not* the gift of immortal glory hereafter.

As to what is held by Universalists on that subject, I refer you to the work called the "Pro and Con of Universalism," by Rev. George Rogers. I desire you all to read it. It is one of the best books ever written on our doctrines, and I recommend it to all who wish to have a general view of Universalism, better than can elsewhere be as readily procured;—not that I advocate every minor idea contained in it; but in the whole view of Universalism, it is the best work I have seen.

We have now an argument for the endless punishment of the wicked, to wit: From the attributes of God—an "*argumentum ad hominem*;" that is, according to us, as God is unchangeable, and not now opposed to sin and misery, he will not be so hereafter.

I suppose, then, if a physician should have to amputate your limb, to save your life, and you should endure great agony during the operation, you would say to the physician, now you have inflicted pain, and therefore you will continue to inflict similar pain upon me through life. That's the argument. But that is not all as to unchangeableness. God has made man "subject to vanity," says Paul. But he says afterwards, "the creature [man] shall be DELIVERED from this bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God!" If it were not for that declaration, we might have imagined that sin should

continue to eternity. But the Scriptures say it shall not. But, says Mr. Waller, the Scriptures nowhere speak of the deliverance of *the wicked* from misery. I admit, that *as long as men are wicked*, they are miserable; but I have seen no proof yet that they are to be endlessly wicked; while I have proved that they shall *not* remain wicked, or miserable. Besides, David was delivered from "the *lowest HELL*." Jonah also, was delivered "out of Hell," or *Hades*. But Mr. Waller will say that was not the same place, precisely, as the one where the Rich Man was. Well, we have proved that even the Rich Man is to be taken out of "Hell." We have seen that Death and Hell (*Hades*) are to DELIVER up the dead that were in them. (Rev. 20.) Is not that sufficient?

My friend referred to Joe Smith. We lay no claim to him. Joe Smith was a Partialist! I have seen the Book of Mormon, and it teaches that *there are some who can NEVER BE SAVED*. And Joe Smith is a BAPTIST, too. He insists on *immersion*. They introduced a controversy about it, but the author of the book urged on them the positive necessity of *immersion*. He belongs to my friend, and not to me; though I have heard that lately his preachers have inclined in favor of restoration; but I dont know how that may be. The Book of Mormon has a story about the people living long ago, when a *savage looking man*, of dreadful mien and evil disposition, came and told them that all *men would be saved*; and that the same arguments were used against him, as now by Mr. Waller. Finally, this "savage" Universalist was driven from the country. Joe was not then a Universalist; that is, if he wrote the Book of Mormon. As to his subsequent views, I dont know certainly what they were.

As to the same terms being used to express the duration of *punishment*, as are applied to happiness, God, and a future life, I have a few remarks to make. I cannot promise how fully I shall expose that argument. I will notice it here, as far as I have time. If it has come up too late in the discussion, to be fairly and fully examined, the fault is not mine. As to the term rendered, "*eternal*," when applied to punishment, etc., Mr. Waller told us, and correctly, that the term rendered "*eternal*," is *aiionios*; and he claims that there is no stronger term in the Greek language to express endless duration than that. I have not

time to go into that question now, philologically. Where do we go to learn the meaning of the word? To the Lexicon? Not for entire authority: But what does that say? The Lexicon does not represent it as always meaning *endless*. What shall we do then? Take the Bible, and see how the term is used there. If it always means unlimited duration, then I give up the point; and if there are no circumstances to show a limited sense, when applied to punishment. The whole system of Universalism is false, of course, if the term in that connection means endless.

Scripture says we shall be finally DELIVERED from the bondage of corruption. But says Mr. Waller, the same term that expresses the duration of punishment, is applied to the duration of God; and our argument, therefore, dethrones God, and causes the happiness of the righteous to cease! The word is sometimes applied to objects of limited, and sometimes to objects of unlimited duration. This I have shown. So the word, "*never*;" and the phrase, "*forever and ever*." These terms are only variations of the same word—*aion*, and *aionios*, as affected by being associated with prepositions, or adjectives, etc.

Mr. Waller will *admit* that they are all *sometimes* used in a *limited sense*. This is all we claim. For all is admitted, if this be admitted. What then? Do you not claim that it *can not* mean endless, when applied to punishment? Not we. If the word be admitted to be once used to mean less than endless, it follows that the word translated "*eternal*," does not *necessarily* prove endless punishment. I say, *not NECESSARILY*. So much for the *words*.

Then we prove by *other* means, that punishment is *limited*;—as from the nature of God, etc. All we are bound to do, is to prove the fact that the words *sometimes are limited*; and this Mr. Waller will not venture to deny.

I trust I am understood. I only deny that the words must *NECESSARILY mean* ENDLESS. I suppose he will insist that they do. But apply the same argument to him; in this way. Suppose a JEW comes and says to Mr. Waller, Jesus Christ was an *impostor*; and I can prove it. How do you prove it? Why, in this way. God gave to Moses, our lawgiver, an "*EVERLASTING statute*." He said that the offerings by the Priests once a year, should continue forever. But *Jesus Christ put away* these statutes and offerings, *which God said shou'd last for-*

*ever*. He has abrogated the statutes, and set aside the priesthood of Aaron, and established a *new* priesthood, after the order of Melchizedec. He contradicts the promises of Almighty God. You must come back to the fold of Judaism. I offer you an opportunity to return to the Jewish religion. Regard the preaching of Jesus as that of an impostor.

What would Mr. Waller say to the Jew? What could he say, but what I or any body would say as to the words, "everlasting," etc? He may get over the difficulty as he best can. But he cannot; for I know not what he could say to an argument like that, except to adopt the argument I use here—that the meaning of the words is *limited*,—that it was the *design of God* that such things should *come to an end*. But we have the authority of God for the fact that it was to be *EVERLASTING*; and thus the Jew would say, you dethrone God, and destroy heaven!! It stops the happiness of the righteous; for the same word, "everlasting," is applied to *both*. What could Mr. Waller say to that? I will take the position of the Jew now, for argument's sake, and I would like to hear his answer. Come, Sir, what will you do with this argument? How will you show that Christ is not an arrant *impostor* in abrogating a priesthood that God said should be *everlasting*?

I have given reasons for the propriety of punishment in this life—remedial punishment.

Has Mr. Waller given reasons to show the propriety of endless punishment?

*Not one*. He represents that if it is good for man to be punished here, it may be so to all eternity. But there is no "afterwards," to endless misery, as there is to the punishments which God really inflicts. Therefore, it cannot be for their *good*. If it were *limited*, it would have a meaning; if *unlimited*, none. There is no propriety in arguing thus.

He next talks about relieving my agony, and my being mistaken in his views of punishment. Whether this be so or not, you all know whether I have made any mistake about the *common* opinion, as to endless punishment.

He next argues that punishment is *just*. Let him prove the justice of *ENDLESS misery*, and then he may say in regard to it, what he says about its goodness, etc. I admit the justness of the punishment of sin, because sin

is contrary to God's law; but *endless misery* is unjust—monstrously unjust. There is a great difference between “punishment being just,” and *endless torture* being just; a very great difference. We do not, cannot deserve *that*.

Universal salvation does not depend on the pardon of sin, in the sense he gave it, as Mr. Waller seems to intimate. It only teaches that men do not *deserve* a punishment so cruel! Perhaps in the first *sin*, a man is cut off. Does he for this deserve *endless* damnation? No! No man will say he does. Yet that is a consequence of the common doctrine.

Mr. Waller has again attempted to ridicule the idea of our being punished, and then forgiven. He compares it to a creditor forgiving a debt, after it is all paid. Apply this to *his own doctrine*: Jesus Christ suffered our punishment. The debt is paid. Yet we are made to pay it again! That is worse than punishing and forgiving; it is punishing *twice*, and not forgiving at all! But in reference to our views, I have shown that in the Bible the word “Forgiveness,” is not used in the legal sense, but as the *taking away* of our sins. Says John the Baptist, “Behold the Lamb of God, who *taketh away the sin* of the world.” This is forgiveness, in the Scripture signification of that word.

The common statement of the doctrine is that Christ took our punishment. Now where are we informed that he suffered *endless damnation*? which is said to be our punishment. Where is it? If he did take our punishment, why are we still to suffer it? We shall all *escape it*; so that *universal salvation* does not depend on this idea of the punishment first, and forgiveness after, of sins. In one case or the other, the doctrine is equally established.

But we are saved entirely by grace. What then becomes of all the argument for *works* and *rewards*?

MR. WALLER. I say there must be good deeds.

MR. PINGREE. Good deeds would make but little difference upon his theory. He said there were *none* that do good, and that sin does oppose the law of God, and Jesus Christ said “not one jot nor one tittle of the law should pass away.” All this is correct. It is what we say, and we say that all must be brought to obey the law of God. There will be universal salvation, because sin is opposed to the laws of God, which stand and triumph, and all will

be brought to OBEY, through the grace of God. Is there punishment for him who comes to God? Does he not say that God pardons all who come to him, if they take the proper course? Well, we prove that ALL will finally come to God, or to Christ, and so be saved.

Now he says that sin injures others, besides the sinner, and therefore ought to be punished. So say we. Therefore, also, ALL the sins of *all sinners* must be punished.

MR. WALLER. My position was that sin injured others, and therefore it was just to punish it.

MR. PINGREE. Then I say that if just, *all sinners are to be punished for EVERY SIN*, and all men sin. Therefore, all men are to be endlessly punished. This again is UNIVERSAL DAMNATION! But to punish *some*, and let others go free; is that just? But he has a way of escape for some. This is the difference.

He says sin is punished for an *example* to others: Not to others living here, certainly! Sodom and Gomorrah were overthrown for an "example" to them that should come after. But how can their future punishment *after the general Judgment*, be an example to those living here? The example as applied to future punishment comes too late, *everlastingly* too late. Who is influenced by that example here? Nobody sees it—it affords no example. But the punishment of Sodom, it is said, is put off till after the general judgment. Oh! the influence by the example is then to be felt in other worlds. Then human creatures,—God's children—are bound to fill Hell for the benefit of other beings!—to keep the angels, perhaps from sinning!—to keep saints from sinning *hereafter*!—Does that look like a Being of Justice, and Wisdom, and Goodness?

Suppose a State should not punish its criminals till the final winding up of its affairs, and after all its members had passed away. The example would come too late; would it not? So in this case. Endless misery hereafter affords no "example." It comes too late.

He says punishment is not arbitrary, but just; and the unavoidable result of sin. God *necessarily* punishes sin. Here again then is *universal damnation*; for *all do sin*. If punishment is *unavoidable*, then all must go to Hell forever, if that is the proper and necessary punishment.

That is what *we say*—that punishment is not arbitrary;

and yet God says he "will by *no means* clear the guilty." Hence punishment must be limited, and suffered; or else we have final, endless, universal damnation!

He says he has not denied free agency. He gives an illustration to show that he does believe in free agency. In reply, I ask, is the murderer *allowed* to *repent* in Hell? even though he *wants* to? Is he *willing* to be punished there? If willing to repent, it is most likely he would be willing while suffering. Is this allowed? I ask, will he be *allowed* to repent? Has he the *privilege* to *repent* and *love God* hereafter? *No!* says Partialism. This is worse than the penitentiary. For governors allow men to repent. But the penitentiary of which the Devil is sheriff, or turnkey, allows no *repentance*. They *must* sin on to all eternity! says Partialism, with all its boasted free agency.

He says the love of God was manifested in sending his Son Jesus. How many people did he love in giving his Son to die for them? I answer, *ALL*—he is impartial—he died for all. *No:* he died for a *paltry few!* say Mr. Waller and other Partialists. Look at the mass of mankind. What have they heard of the Gospel and of salvation? Nothing. What evidence have they of God's love? Pagans—blind idolators *cannot* choose the offered mercy of God; for it is *not offered* to them. Do they go to Hell? Can they help it? What though they cry to God for mercy—*CAN* they be saved? *No:* though they prostrate themselves on the earth, and cry to all eternity, they *CANNOT* be saved! Is there any *FREE AGENCY* there? Are *THEY free* to embrace God's terms, and be baptized, and saved? *ARE THEY FREE?* *They have no such freedom.* Mark it, forget it not; and let us hear no more about this free agency.

He says I don't know his views about vicarious atonement. I don't want to know them. It is enough to say that Christ suffered *in the room and stead* of man. I am taunted with *ignorance*; but if I know enough to see what concerns this discussion, it is all I want at present.

He says he belongs to the school of Jesus. Yet on the first day of the debate, when I referred to that school, he did not follow his Master's example: he appealed to the "*mass of mankind,*" to decide this question. Here is an inconsistency. My friend comes now to the school in which I have endeavored

vored. I hope in God we may both come to it! and there learn the true wisdom. CAN the Pagans come to Christ? that's the question now. In all past ages, how many millions of Pagans have lived! Can *they* come? are they FREE to come? No: if they are thus brought into this world by God, and driven through it into Hell, without the least *chance* of escaping it, God is not just. They have *no such opportunity*. They have *not* this freedom, according to Partialism. He now says expressly there must be a moral change, or the sinner in this world cannot be happy hereafter. What is the man about? I am perfectly astonished; after arguing for the HAPPINESS of the *wicked*, and the UNHAPPINESS of the *righteous*, as he has throughout this discussion. If sin makes men happy *here*, it may make them so to all eternity, and the doctrine of endless misery is a perfect humbug! Why *change*, if sufficiently happy *in sin*? Let him be happy still, and forever, even in Hell! He has taken a club to beat his own brains out! He now *virtually* admits that the sinful man will be eternally happy; and then he says he must experience a *moral change* before he can be happy in the next world; but that is what *we* say. He must be reconciled to God—raised in Christ; —ALL must experience this change; but *while wicked*, we suffer nothing but death, misery, damnation, and wretchedness.

[MR. WALLER'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.]

I shall have to trust a good deal to the common sense of the audience in this discussion. There are some things in the last speech that I presume you all will decide do not merit my attention, especially to the neglect of many important matters I have yet in reserve, some of which I shall be compelled to omit, for want of time. Especially must I trust to you the correction of his misrepresentations. What he told you I was about to say in the conclusion of my last speech, when I was stopped by the expiration of my time, was all imaginary. He has put words into my mouth, and seems more at his ease, in replying to what he would have me say, than to what I do say. I was about to say, when interrupted, that man could not be happy in the world to come without a change, wrought in grace through the righteousness of faith in this world; and he supposes that I was going to say, and argues as if I did say, they could not be happy in this life without a



moral change; and that having such a change they would be happy!

He wishes that Mr. Ballou were here to defend himself! I would have no objection—not the slightest. What I have said is stereotyped, *I neither seek nor decline controversy with a respectable individual.* If Mr. Pingree thinks that Universalism will fare better in other hands than his own, he can easily know where I am to be found. His wishes will be gratified.

It is a principle admitted by all expert Biblical critics, that the common sense interpretation of the Bible is the true sense—that the sense which is naturally and readily suggested to a plain, unsophisticated, yet strong minded and intelligent man, is generally the true sense. All writers say that this is the best rule of interpretation. Now apply this rule, at your leisure, to the 9th chapter of Hebrews, last two verses—“*And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him shall he appear a second time without sin unto salvation.*” Mr. Ballou’s interpretation of this passage has more good sense in it, than that of any other Universalist’s which has fallen under my observation. He says that the “Judgment” which follows death is the execution of the sentence, “Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” But Mr. Ballou cannot keep up with his followers. Mr. Pingree far outstrips him. He has become greater than his master. He follows the author of the “Pro and Con of Universalism.” He commends this book to you as the very best of productions. I recommend you to study the Bible, as decidedly preferable to the “Pro and Con of Universalism.”

MR. PINGREE. I said it was among the best books on Universalism.

MR. WALLER. I grant it teaches that doctrine much more clearly than the Bible, which does not teach it at all. Still I insist you had better study the Bible. But to Mr. Pingree’s interpretation of this passage, which he has borrowed of the “Pro and Con of Universalism.” The ‘men,’ says he, are the *High Priests*, who die by killing a sheep or a goat for the sacrifice! And after thus dying, or rather committing suicide by proxy, they put on the breastplate and go into the most holy place; and as this breast-

plate, among other words, had that of "*Judgment*" written upon it, the putting on of this breast-plate is the judgment mentioned by the Apostle!!! Then the passage means, according to this most lucid exposition, "And as it is appointed unto the *High Priests once to die, by killing a sheep or a goat, but after this the putting on of the breast-plate: so Christ was once offered,*" etc! I feel I should insult you to offer one word of comment upon such an interpretation. Suffice it to say, its far-fetched and extraordinary character shows conclusively that this text is a mountain in the way of Universalism—that its plain and obvious sense subverts the whole system. And when was this interpretation invented? Why since the year 1818! Ballou himself could not discover it. It is the work of desperation. Indeed, it is a virtual surrender, for when a man has to outrage common sense and every principle of interpretation to sustain him in an argument, it is because his affairs are in the worst possible condition, and he feels that only a death struggle can save him. Hence he makes one desperate leap, it is from truth into the dark abyss of absurdity! So the Jews in their madness threw themselves into their burning temple.

But Mr. Pingree seems to think, that after all, the passage did not prove any thing for me, inasmuch as it was not said, after death, the *damnation*, but the *Judgment*. I quoted it to prove the *judgment*. No one ever supposed that all would be *damned* after death, but that all would be *judged*. This the text proves, and it is all that I quoted it to prove. This is quite sufficient to subvert the very foundations of Universalism.

I should be glad if Mr. Pingree would more specifically give us his views respecting the reward of the righteous. He says that it is in this world; and that their sufferings are all for their good. But the wicked suffer for the same purpose. The declaration, that "these light afflictions which are for a moment, work for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," must, according to this theory, be applied to this life, aye, and this also applies to the wicked, since all their punishment is for their good; and since the gentleman insists that they suffer more than the righteous, of course more "exceeding and eternal" will be the weight of their glory!

Mr. Pingree complains that I brought the term *aionios*

too late into the discussion. Well, why did he not introduce it sooner. I brought it forward on yesterday, and this was the earliest possible period that I could. I have used all the dispatch in my power. I have never debated with any one before who has held out so many signals of distress as my present opponent. He has scarcely made a speech that he has not uttered some distressing complaint! I am sorry that he is so sensitive and feels so much pain. But my conscience tells me that the fault is not mine. I am satisfied that he has had, and still has ample time to meet this branch of the subject, if it can be met. The want of time is a poor excuse. He has as much time as myself. And it appears he did have time; for he attempted a reply. He admits that *aionios*, in the New Testament, always means eternal, except when applied to punishment! He does not pretend to deny but that it is translated eternal even in that connection, or that all scholars and translators understand it to mean eternal. If it does not mean eternal when applied to punishment, it devolves on him to show it. That it may be used sometimes in a limited sense, will not serve his purpose; he is to show that it must be used in such a sense when applied to punishment. Has he done this? Far from it; for he has attempted nothing of the kind. His utmost effort is to prove that as punishment is disciplinary, and as God is willing that all should be saved, therefore, punishment is not eternal; and the word *aionios* does not mean everlasting!—This is arguing in a circle. He proves that punishment is not eternal by Universalism; and then proves Universalism by the fact that punishment is not eternal! So the Papists prove the infallibility of their Church by tradition, and prove tradition by the infallibility of their Church. He has conceded that the common meaning of this word is endless. To deny this was more than even the impudent spirit of Universalism durst prompt him to do. The rule of interpretation which must apply in this case is, that the common meaning of a word is its meaning every where, unless the context shows that it must have another sense—the literal meaning of a word must never be departed from unless necessity compels. Has he brought the doctrine of punishment under these conditions? Has he showed from the context that *aionios* cannot have its literal and common meaning? He has attempted nothing

of the kind. He has gone off to other places and other usages. All that he has said avails nothing—is worse than chaff. It does not meet the case. I repeat, he must show the necessity for departing from the common meaning of this word when applied to punishment, this must be done by showing that punishment cannot be eternal; a work, which as far as I know, has not been undertaken by any one; for that, as well as anything else, may be eternal for ought we can show to the contrary. And if it may be eternal, then this word must have its usual and literal meaning.

This word may be applied to limited objects. Mr. Pingree has referred to instances where it is so applied. But this by no means proves that it is used in a limited sense. Adjectives qualify nouns, but nouns never qualify adjectives. When, for example, we say that a man is an *endless talker*, it is not the adjective *endless* which we limit or qualify; it means just as much here as in any other connection, but it is the noun *talker* that is affected: and thus the expression is considered hyperbolic. Thus too, when the lover speaks of the *angelic* beauty of his fair one: it is his object “to raise a mortal to the skies,” and not “to drag an angel down.” The adjective is not affected at all in its signification by such usage. The angels are not disparaged, but the lady is greatly flattered. This applies to *aiônios*: it may be used in reference to a limited object, but never in a limited sense. The Scriptures then literally assert, that the punishment of the wicked is eternal—is endless: Now Mr. Pingree must set aside the literal sense of the Bible, or his doctrine is ruined. He must show the language to be figurative or hyperbolic. This is what lies before him, and I trust he will meet it fairly, and if so, I know he must forever abandon the system he now defends. The Bible plainly and literally declares that punishment is *eternal*; this is conceded, it cannot be denied. My opponent has assumed to set aside the plain letter of revelation, and how? By showing an “evident reason or necessity” for deserting the literal meaning? He has done nothing of the kind—it is what he never can do. When he makes the effort, I will show by the same reason and necessity, that the happiness of the righteous, nor the throne of the Almighty, is eternal. I humbly conceive, as I have before intimated, that this settles the controversy.

There was another position taken by Mr. Pingree, which claims attention. I saw the same idea set forth in the "Star in the West," and will read it as presented in that paper. My opponent, who is assistant editor of that paper, quotes the following anecdote:

"UNIVERSALISM.—There was, sometime since, a man passing through the State of North Carolina, calling himself a preacher. On a certain night he preached a sermon at —; on which occasion, among his auditors there was a certain old German. After sermon, the German requested to speak to the preacher a few words in private. His reverence politely complying, when the old man addressed him as follows:

"Is de doctrine you breach here to night true?" "Certainly true;" replied his gravity. "Vel ten," rejoined the German, "pe sure you must keep it a secret from Chake Tavis." "Why so?" inquired the preacher. "Pecause," said the old man, "Chake Tavis has stole one-half of my smit tools already; and if he finds out dare ish no hell or punishment, pe sure he will come and steal te palance."

Upon this anecdote Mr. Pingree thus comments:—

"Now all that is necessary to be said in relation to this anecdote, is, that it is *admitted* that Schake stole *half* of the Dutchman's 'smit tools,' while a Partialist—believing, doubtless, with all of that class, that he could steal, and even murder, and repent, and go to heaven, escaping all punishment. And if Universalism had been taught him, he would not have stolen any more; but if not, he has probably stolen 'te palance' before this time. The anecdote only shows the *mistake* and *ignorance* of the German in relation to the legitimate influence of Universalism—hence his most foolish remark, now endorsed and retailed by the Editors of the 'Lutheran Observer,' and 'Baptist Banner.'

"Apropos to this, while dealing in anecdotes, I have heard one in substance as follows: A man was caught in the act of theft—stealing, I believe, a bundle of hay. The person who saw him, told him that he would pay for that at the day of judgment. 'Well,' observed the thief, 'if I can have as long credit as that, *I'll take another bundle!*'—probably believing he could comply with certain 'conditions' prescribed by a Partialist church, before death, and so not have to pay either at the day of judgment.

“If the Editor of the ‘Baptist Banner’ proposes to overthrow Universalism by means of anecdotes, will he have the kindness to copy this article into his paper?”

The point of these remarks is, that our doctrine tends to immorality, because we preach that sinners do not meet with full and adequate punishment for their sins in this world; but that they will, unless they repent, be punished in hell. Now these are strange conclusions. What if we do preach that sinners are not fully punished until eternity, does that destroy the hell of Universalism? Are we not told, that there is and that there can be no escape from a full and adequate punishment for sin? Did not the man who stole the smith’s tools, and the one who stole the bundle of hay experience all the fires of the Universalist’s hell? Most certainly, if there is any truth in the system; for it teaches that there can be no escape from them. How then could Mr. Pingree say in relation to one of these individuals, “If Universalism had been taught him, he would not have stolen any more?” What does it signify whether it was taught him or not? Would he be understood to mean that ignorance extinguishes the flames of his perdition? Or that a man might suffer full and adequate punishment for his crimes, and not experience pain? That while he is writhing in anguish, he will experience no pain, because he is taught that there is a terrible retribution in the world to come? This is to dispute all experience and to deride all facts.

“Who can hold a fire in his hand,  
By thinking on the frosty Caucasus?  
Or cloy the hungry edge of appetite;  
By bare imagination of a feast?  
Or wallow naked in December snow,  
By thinking on fantastic Summer’s heat?  
*O, no! the apprehension of the good,  
Gives but the greater feeling of the worse.”*

Philosophically speaking, then, our doctrine would but fan the fires of the Universalist hell. How then, I demand, if there is any virtue in their system, do we hinder its operation?

But let us suppose that Universalism had been taught the fellow who stole the hay, and let Mr. Pingree have been his teacher. “My dear fellow,” methinks I hear my bland and amiable friend say to him, “you are now suffering the

torments of hell. There is no hell in the next world,—no judgment seat there. You now endure the penalty for the crime you have committed in taking that hay; and if you take any more, you may at last become callous in conscience, and feel no compunction for any crime you may commit; and “this moral insensibility is itself a punishment—the greatest of punishments.” But all this suffering which you now, and will, experience for your sin, will work for you a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory!” Surely, such a speech, unless the man was dead to his own welfare, would induce him to steal—not another bundle—but a whole stack of hay! If telling a man that he will be punished in a coming day, tends to immorality, what must telling him that he will enjoy glory and happiness at that time, lead him to perform? Can folly itself subscribe to the position, that a belief in future punishment induces men to transgress, more than a belief in certain future happiness?

I am not disposed to let the matter stop here. The argument of Mr. Pingree, is, in effect, that the punishment for sin contended for by Universalists, is wholly inadequate to prevent crime. These anecdotes, as embellished by himself, conclusively prove it. The two villains mentioned, feeling all the horrors of Universalist perdition, went on in crime. That hell necessarily burns in the bosom of every transgressor, Mr. Pingree being witness. These men felt its fires, but were undeterred. Of course Universalism could not restrain them; and Mr. Pingree proposes to stop their career, not by holding up more punishment, (which he admits too must exist to prevent crime,) but the everlasting happiness of heaven!!! Never was the human mind before insulted by the presentation of a system of ethics so monstrous and absurd!

Mr. Pingree, in the article read from the “Star in the West,” argues as if we removed the Universalist’s torments of hell, and yet he has more than once insisted in this debate, as fundamental to his system, that we might as well think of hurling the Almighty from his throne, as to endeavor to save the sinner from full and adequate punishment for his sins. Then his charge of immorality amounts to this: That we preach future punishment, and the sinner endures temporal punishment; when we ought to preach temporal punishment and future happiness!!

Such logic needs only to be mentioned, in order to be despised.

I will now return to the argument of my last speech. When I sat down, I was showing that punishment is not arbitrarily inflicted, nor is it for the gratification of any revengeful feelings, but is the inevitable result of sin, and inflicted from the necessity of the case.

God is under no obligation to save sinners. He might, without the violation of any principle of his nature, have left men without the hope of salvation. And had not Jesus come into the world, men must have remained lost and undone. His is the only name given under Heaven among men whereby we must be saved. Unless as urged before, it can be shown that we of right might demand the death of the Son of God for our salvation, then we might justly have been left in sin, to reap the bitter fruits consequent upon it. Our salvation being of pure grace, without the slightest worth or merit on our part, might in perfect righteousness, have been withheld.

Besides, men as sinners, are unfit for Heaven and do not want to go there, and it would be inflicting a punishment on them if sent there without a change of their moral being. I grant they do not want to be punished, and that they want to be happy, but they do not want to give up their sins, they do not want holiness without which none can see God, and none can be happy. His conduct proves that he does not want to go to Heaven, the holy habitation of God, of angels, and of the spirits of the just made perfect; and to take him there would be a violation of his will, and would make him miserable. He cannot enjoy the society of religious people here. Even the conversation of a pious mother, or father, or sister, or brother, or wife, is exceedingly disagreeable to him—he always shuns it—his affections are set upon the things of earth. He is earthly, sensual, devilish, in the temper and disposition of his mind. His whole moral being is opposed to God—he hates what God loves, and loves what God hates. A thorough, radical moral change must be effected in him then, or he cannot be happy in Heaven. If he cannot talk with pleasure about religion here for a few moments with his best friends and nearest relations, how could he relish an eternity of such conversation? And there he would find nothing to his taste—he would be consumed with desires



never to be satisfied—he would hunger and thirst after pleasure that he could never enjoy. Nothing that his heart delighted in, and every thing that his heart loathed, would be there.

God would be there. He would stand in his dread presence without a veil between, and his heart would be enmity against God. Jesus would be there, King of kings, and Lord of lords; and he would not have Christ Jesus to reign over him. Heaven is lighted with glory and truth; but the sinner loves darkness rather than light, because his deeds are evil. The delights of the blessed are righteousness and holiness: but he takes pleasure in unrighteousness, and rolls sin under his tongue as a sweet morsel. The law of God, which is holy, just and good, pertains there: but he is carnal, sold under sin. In a word, if taken to Heaven, the sinner would be denied every delight of his heart, in a place wholly unsuited to his taste, with no other society but such as he loaths, governed by one he hates, burthened by a law he despises, and far away from every object he esteems essential to his happiness. He would writhe in eternal torment, and Heaven would be Hell to him.

Now is God bound to change men—to give them new natures and new moral beings? Will Mr. Pingree venture upon a position so monstrous? Will he dare say that God is under obligations to make a man fit for Heaven, although he desires nothing of the sort? Unless he assumes this, let him cease to complain of the hardship of punishment: because the sinner could be placed no where in the universe where he could be happy. If left in sin, where he wants to be left, he is in misery: if taken to Heaven, where he does not want to be, I have demonstrated that he would be a wretched, miserable, desolate being. His punishment then arises in the nature of the case; it is an inevitable consequence of the course he has chosen. He plucks down ruin upon his own head.

Mr. Pingree mistook my positions respecting *Hades*! I deem it a waste of time to recapitulate them. Suffice it to say, that I showed that although *hades* did not necessarily imply torment, yet it was some times used in that sense; and that the parable of the rich man and Lazarus proved it beyond question. Mr. Pingree's efforts at ridicule on this parable, his facetious allusions to the water,

finger, Abraham's bosom, etc., recoiled upon himself. Before an audience accustomed to look upon the Bible respectfully, he should handle such subjects with some degree of delicacy. The Bible speaks of Jehovah himself as possessed of the parts of a man. The divine writers were obliged to use the language of earth to convey ideas of heaven. The word *paradise* means a *flower garden*, *heaven* means the air. This every scholar knows. The words house, city, temple, Canaan, etc., are used with reference to the abodes of the blessed. All his ridicule against this parable applies with equal force against God, and Heaven, or rather against the Bible. Admit that there is the weight of a feather in his criticisms, and the entire book of God must be discarded as worse than old wife's fables! Such matters are edged tools, and he ought to handle them carefully; unskilful use of them may injure Christianity itself, more than they will benefit his cause.

I now proceed to redeem my promise respecting the word *Gehenna*. If the real meaning of *paradise* is "flower garden," and of *heaven* is "air," so the primary meaning of *Gehenna* is the "Valley of the son of Hinnom, which is by the entry of the east gate" of Jerusalem. (Jer. xix. 2.) Here the Jews in the days of their degeneracy burnt incense unto false gods, and built also the high places of Baal, and burnt their sons and daughters in sacrifice to idols; and it is called Tophet because they beat drums and timbrels that the shrieks of the infants might not be heard by the parents: (Jer. vii. 31.) Josiah destroyed this horrible worship: (2 Kings, xxiii. 10.) Some writers say that, in after time, it was used as a receptacle of the carcasses of beasts which died in the city, which were burnt there. Now where on earth could a more appropriate type of Hell be found than this; and if a "flower garden" was selected as suitable to convey an idea of Heaven, surely this loathsome vale might convey a very appropriate idea of perdition. Certain it is that in the days of the Savior it was used by the Jews in the sense of what we now mean by *Hell*. If the gentleman denies this (as I presume he will not) I am prepared to show that it was used in that sense by all the Jews in the days of the Savior. The Jewish commentators, Josephus, and all biblical scholars of any note attest this fact. But I repeat, I

do not suppose it will be disputed. This being the meaning of the word in the days of the Savior, let us examine his usage of it, and see if he gave another sense to it.

Matt. v. 22: "But whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of Hell fire"—*Gehenna fire*. Now those to whom he spoke understood by *Gehenna fire* just what we mean by "Hell fire;" how then must they have understood him? Did he intend to mislead them? Did he use their own language? If not, what language did he use? There was no fire then kept in the vale of Hinnom. No one had a right to burn them there. For him to tell them that they were in danger of the fire in the valley of Hinnom, would have been ridiculous nonsense.

Matt. v. 29, 30: "If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee, for it is more profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into *Hell*. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee, for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into *Hell*"—*Gehenna*.

Mark ix. 43—48: "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into *Hell*, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into *Hell*, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out; it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into *Hell*, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched."

Matt. xviii. 9: "And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee; it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into *Hell fire*." In the verse above, the language is, "Be cast into *everlasting fire*."

Now what can the Savior mean by *Gehenna* and *Gehenna fire*, in these exhortations? Not literally the vale of Hinnom; for then there could be no meaning to his language. Not the destruction of Jerusalem as some Univers-

alists suppose, for then no one could have understood his meaning, for the word never was used in that *sense*. The truth is, the exhortation of the Savior corresponds with a saying of the Jews; "It is better for thee to be scorched with a little fire in this world, than to be burned with a devouring flame in the world to come."

Matt. x. 28: "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in *Hell*."

Luke xii. 4, 5: "And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom you shall fear: Fear him, which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into *Hell*; yea, I say unto you, Fear him."

These passages have made our Universalist friends travail in great pain. They are reduced to great extremities in their efforts to escape their plain and obvious sense. The author of the "Plain Guide to Universalism" tells us, that the passage in Luke does not say, God *will* destroy both soul and body in *Hell*, but it says he is *able* to do so. It describes his *ability*, not his *will*, nor his *purpose*." (page 92.) But not satisfied with this, and feeling his conscience still burthened, he tries another expedient, and labors on page 94 to show that the word SOUL (in the original *psuche*) means mere "animal life," and not the "immortal spirit." These are death struggles—the writhings of despair—the ravings of frenzy. They need not be answered. No: these passages prove beyond the power of escape, that the Universalist exposition of this word is the veriest abortion of nonsense. No one was ever destroyed, soul and body, in the valley of Hinnom. The Lord never destroyed the soul and body of Jew or any one else in it, at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, nor before or since. And no Jew was burnt there by the Romans when Jerusalem was destroyed. The language of our Lord in these passages comports precisely with the sense attached to Gehenna, by all the Jews of that day, viz: a state of torment in the world to come. This meaning gives point to his discourse, no other will. And if he was speaking in the language of men, and to be understood by the men to whom he spoke, he could not have used it in any other sense.

Matt. xxiii. 15: "And when he is made, ye make him

two fold more the child of *Hell* than yourselves." Verse 33: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of *Hell*?"

James iii. 6: "And it is set on fire of *Hell*."

I believe I have quoted all the passages where this word is used. Now, remember its meaning at that time was a state of future punishment; corresponding precisely to the common meaning attached now to the English word *Hell*. Do not these passages show that the Savior used it in its common acceptance? That was its literal and prevailing meaning in that day; and can the slightest reason be given why the Savior should have used it in any other sense, unless he designed to mislead? If he designed to teach temporal punishment merely, why take a word that the people were all in the habit of applying to eternal punishment? Was the language too barren to furnish a word suited to his purposes, that he must arrest one from its common, and force upon it an unusual sense? And if he intended to allude to the destruction of Jerusalem, why take this word that no man had ever used in that sense, and press it into service, when not one of his hearers, if all the faculties of their minds had been tortured, could have guessed at the idea he designed to convey? According to Universalism, the Delphic oracle never spoke more obscurely than did our Savior! And indeed if they can make it appear that he used it in a sense in which it was never used by any one except himself, then I may exercise my privilege of guessing as well as Universalists, and shall insist that not the destruction of Jerusalem was meant; but of the Bastille and of Moscow, and I can support my opinion by as sound criticism as the best of them. I challenge Mr. Pingree to put me to the proof.

But to sum up the matter. *Gehenna* denotes, in the New Testament, a place of punishment. That the Jews in the in the days of the Savior, used it in reference to future punishment, no man who has any reputation to lose as a scholar, will deny, or has ever denied. There is no evidence that the valley of Hinnom was used as a place of punishment in the times of the Savior and his Apostles. Our Savior mentions various persecutions which the disciples should undergo, but he makes no allusion to their being punished by the Jews in the valley of Hinnom. The Apostles never once allude to the fact that they had been

in danger, or that they apprehended the danger, of being punished in that place. The Jews never threatened them or their master with such a punishment.

There is no evidence that a perpetual fire was kept up in the valley of Hinnom, in the days of our Savior, as the Universalists affirm. No writer of that age, or near that age mentions any such thing. And those modern writers who conjectured such was the case, have relied upon Rabbi Kimchi, who flourished about the fourteenth century. Neither the Lord nor the Romans destroyed both soul and body of the Jews in this valley at the destruction of Jerusalem. No one at that time was burnt there. And neither Jews nor Romans were wont to burn criminals in the valley of Hinnom.

In a word, if Jesus meant to be understood by those to whom he spoke—if he used human language at all—he could not by Gehenna have meant the destruction of Jerusalem, as the author of the “Pro and Con of Universalism” affirms; for the word was never used by any one of the inhabitants of earth in that sense. But if he used it in its then commonly received sense (and we must believe he did, or else esteem him a deceiver,) then he meant by it all that we mean by the terrible word HELL! The alternative is then presented to you, either of rejecting Universalism, or else of discarding the Savior as a deceiver!

There is one other passage that deserves attention: 2. Peter, ii. 4: “God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to Hell, and delivered them unto chains of darkness, to be reserved unto Judgment.” Here the word *Hell* is translated from *Tartarus*. The author of the “Plain Guide to Universalism” very prudently forebore to make any comments on this word. And even the intrepid author of the “Pro and Con of Universalism” has quailed before this passage. He does not allude to it. Indeed none of the Universalist writers upon whose works I have been able to lay my hands, have ventured an explanation. The reason is obvious enough. If they know any thing at all, they must know that *Tartarus* can have reference to nothing else but future punishment. This is its usage in all writers who have occasion to employ it—whether saint or sage, poet, historian, or orator. Clearly then Peter teaches future punishment; for he used a word, that so far as known, is never employed in any other sense.

No marvel then that Jeremiah White, Chaplain to Oliver Cromwell; and one of the most able and learned of all the advocates of the "ultimate holiness and salvation of all men," felt compelled by facts too stubborn to bend, to utter this solemn warning to his brethren:—"LET HIM THAT DENIES HELL TAKE HEED LEST IT BE VERIFIED UPON HIMSELF, WE HAVE AS MUCH FOR HELL AS WE HAVE FOR HEAVEN!!" (*Restoration of all Things*, page 27.) I hope my friend will profit by the warning.

[MR. PINGREE'S TWELFTH SPEECH.]

RESPECTED FRIENDS:—I shall first examine, as far as I think it necessary, Mr. Waller's last speech of the forenoon. His first remark was upon Hebrews ix. 27, 28; and he laid down the maxim that, in interpreting Scripture, the common sense interpretation of the passage was usually, if not always, the right one.

I grant that the common sense interpretation is the right one. But we must arrive at the common sense view of a passage, frequently, by inquiring into the circumstances under which it was spoken, or written, and by true examination, gain a knowledge of the subject of it. We must look at the *context*, compare it with *parallel passages*, and learn something about the nature of the subject elsewhere. before we can be perfectly certain we have got the right meaning of the author. Now in reference to that passage, where the word "*creature*" is used, he pursued a different course from the one he now prescribes to me. Though he objects to my course, he did the same thing which he charges upon me. He was not willing to take the obvious meaning of the word *creature*. He must go to the context, and try to show a different meaning; although in this he did not succeed.

He attempts to ridicule my interpretation of Hebrew ix. 27, 28; and says the allusion to the breastplate of righteousness, etc., is all fancy and imagination. I appeal to you, after what has been said, if the institution of that rite, under the old dispensation, *was not typical* of the appearing of Christ, under the new.

As to the reward of the wicked and the righteous, did I say the wicked could "inherit the kingdom of God?" No; I have urged all the time, that they *cannot* enjoy, if they are not righteous, the peace and happiness which the good

man has. Here is the difference: One is *in* the kingdom of God; the other is *out of it*,—in darkness, wretchedness, misery, and death.

He represents me as complaining and being tormented about *aion*, etc. I have *not* complained, nor shown signs of being tormented. I have merely stated the matter of fact, that when I introduced passages bearing upon the question, he was not willing to attend to them, until I enforced them by comments and showed their bearing upon the subject. I merely said that I myself should follow his example; and I propose to do so, to some extent, at least. As to his illustration about the argument of the Roman Catholic, in a circle, it does not bear on the point. I have *not* argued in favor of Universalism from punishment not being endless, and then proved that punishment is not endless, from Universalism. I have argued in favor of universal salvation from the WORD OF GOD, and that punishment was not endless, from the *nature* and *object* of punishment.

He says the ordinary acceptance of Scripture is always right. He takes it for granted that the word rendered "eternal," means *endless*; which is the very point in dispute. The *context* and *subject* must show the meaning. In the 24th and 25th of Matthew, the context shows plainly that the punishment there spoken of, was in this life—at the coming of Jesus Christ in glory, within that generation. The context, I say, shows this. In 2 Thessalonians, the punishments were to be at the coming of Jesus Christ. I have shown the time to be in the *life time* of some then living. The Jews were in captivity for *seventy years*. This was said to be *everlasting*; and yet it was endured only seventy years! See 2 Kings xiii. 22, 23; Jeremiah xxix. 10—14; and xxiii. 39, 40. All these passages refer to the same matter; and illustrate 2 Thessalonians, as to the "presence of God," and the *limited* signification of "everlasting," when applied to punishment.

Now we have an *admission* from my friend here, that overthrows the doctrine of endless punishment forever! He has once for all surrendered the word everlasting, (*aionios*) as a positive proof of endless punishment. That is, he has admitted that though the word itself is not limited, in signification, yet it is *APPLIED to limited things*. This is all we ask. If it be *applied* so, no argument can



be founded on it, which is of any use to prove that punishment is endless. The argument derived from the force of that word is *lost*, by that admission, forever!

I have thought it would have been as well for Mr. Waller, considering the circumstances, occupying as he does a different position in *social life*, from myself, to have allowed *me* to show how well I might compliment the fair sex upon their "bright eyes," etc.; rather than do it himself. It may do for his *amusement*, and yours, my friends. For myself, I am here to discuss the great question of the *doom of the human soul*, and that for all eternity; and in answer to grave arguments, we have illustrations from the gentleman's fancy about the bright eyes of women! This is for your "amusement," I presume.

I thank him for his anecdote about the Dutchman. As he has *commenced* anecdote telling, you will allow me to relate another, which I heard to-day: A fellow stole a number of things, and he who lost them was in trouble, lest he should not be punished. Oh! said his friend, he will be punished *hereafter*. There is a *Hell* in store for him. Yes, says the man, but *curse* the follow! I'm afraid he'll *repent!* (Great laughter.) I ask pardon for exciting laughter—it is merely to show the spirit of the man; and the evil consequences of *putting far off* the evil day.

Just so in reference to this opinion, if carried out. Still he represents that they have superior claims to morality, because they have the advantage of all the Hell of this life, and another beyond, and endless. Yes; but they are *deluded* with the idea that sin is *pleasant* here. I want to disabuse them of that licentious notion. I want to drive that all away. I do not wish them to be deluded any longer; but to learn that "there is NO PEACE to the wicked."

We have an additional idea; that the sinner cannot be happy in religious company. Take the sinner with his evil inclinations into the world of glory, and he would be miserable there, says Mr. Waller. Admitted—while *unchanged* and *sinful*; but the sinner is to be *CHANGED*—*then* he can enjoy it; can he not? That is the point. We do not say the impenitent sinner could go to heaven and be happy. What we contend for, is the *ultimate* HOLINESS, (and happiness consequently) of all men: this is what we prove in this discussion.

But are we not taught by Mr. Waller, that in *this world*

the *wicked* are HAPPY? Why not let them all go to heaven? or let them be in Hell, with boon companions? On Mr. Waller's theory, they could be very happy. Besides, there is the best of *society* in Hell, according to Partialism, —some of the greatest men that ever lived; such as Cicero, Demosthenes, Homer, and Plato; and even our own Washington and Franklin! If there be no change after death, and sinners are so happy here, they would not ask to go to heaven: Hell would be heaven to them! Thus Mr. Waller himself overthrows the doctrine of endless misery. If there be a change after death, they are saved in heaven. If no change, they are happy in *Hell!* So either way, we are content. I think he must admit that the happy sinner here, will be a happy sinner hereafter; or else admit a *change after death*. One or the other he must do. I will now pass on.

He says the *place* of Hell is the least consideration in this controversy. It would look a little more *Orthodox*, if he were to give it not quite so small a place in his estimation. It occupies the *largest* "place" in most Partialist sermons.

He says I misrepresent his doctrine of *Hades*. He says he did not mean that *Hades* was a *PLACE of torment*, but the *state* in which the dead were put, after the separation of the soul from the body. I care not. He admits it is not a place of *endless damnation*; and I have *proved* that it shall be *destroyed*.

We next have *Tartarus* introduced, from the classics, to show a place where the wicked were tormented to eternity. In view of the facts admitted, *that* cannot be *endless*; because Death and *Hades*—and *Tartarus* is said to be in *Hades*—are to be cast into the lake of fire, and destroyed. Abraham's bosom is in *Hades* too! and that is cast into the lake of fire, also. I suppose, if all those criticisms are adopted by Mr. Waller. This lake of fire, I suppose, is *Gehenna*—the real, final Hell.

MR. WALLER. I do not admit that *Hades* includes punishment necessarily.

MR. PINGREE. Then all that parable about the Rich Man and Lazarus has nothing whatever to do with the discussion; for the argument was entirely founded on that idea.

MR. WALLER. Abraham's bosom is, accordnig to the

Jews, is in *Hades*. I was giving the different notions that prevailed. Josephus says that, the Jews believed in two departments for the dead. One was Abraham's bosom, and the other *Hades*, in a bad sense. *Hades* was a general term for the place of the dead.

MR. PINGREE. Well, let it pass. It is the same *Hades* in which the Rich Man was; the same *Hades* that delivered up its dead in Revelation; the same *Hades* that was cast into the lake of fire, and the same *Hades* that the Apostle says is to have *no victory*. That *Hades*, then, can be no evidence of ENDLESS punishment; although the whole force of Mr. Waller's argument was in the idea that Christ *adopted* the views of Hell, as expressed by Josephus.

*Gehenna* comes next. He says it was a term used by the Jews, to represent a place of future and endless torture; and that *therefore* Jesus Christ used it so. If so, I ask as I did before, what is there *new* in Christianity? This shows the knowledge we have of a future life to be derived from the Pagans. We are indebted to the Greeks and barbarians for our views of the immortal state. The Savior only *adopted* the terms and ideas he found in use, with the meaning of Jews and Pagans attached to them. So we derive our knowledge from the Jews and Pagans, after all, and not from God or from Jesus Christ!

All the remarks about the destruction of Jerusalem, can go for what they are worth. Universalists do not say those passages where *Gehenna* is found, refer to a literal burning in the valley of Hinnom. It is admitted by the Orthodox, that the *original* meaning of *Gehenna*, or Hell, was this valley of Hinnom. But they say it was *changed* afterwards to mean a future and endless Hell. Dr. G. Campbell and others distinctly admit this. Now the question comes up, *who changed* the meaning of the word? *who?* God? Jesus Christ? the Prophets? or Apostles? No: but *uninspired men*.

So with the English word HELL. Two or three hundred years ago, when the present translation of the Bible was made, it did *not* exclusively mean what we mean now by it. Professor Stuart will tell you so. Dr. Adam Clarke says so; and so Mr. Waller will admit. It is no news to him,—this fact respecting the word *Hell* in English.

He says the Jews used *Gehenna* to represent a place of endless punishment. The only authority for this, is in the

*Targums.* And HORNE, who is good authority in reference to these Jewish books, says:

“*The Targum of Onkelos:* ‘The generally received opinion is that Onkelos was a proselyte to Judaism, and a disciple of the celebrated Rabbi Hillel, who flourished about fifty years before the Christian era; and consequently that Onkelos was contemporary with our Savior; Bauer and Jahn, however, place him in the second century.’ *Intro.* ii. 159.

“*Targum of the Pseudo Jonathan:* ‘Learned men are unanimously of opinion that this Targum could not have been written before the seventh, or even the eighth century.’ *Ibid.* 159.

“*Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel:* Some suppose this Jonathan to have lived in the days of Christ, and Wolfius thinks he lived a short time before that period. ‘From the silence of Origen and Jerome concerning this Targum, of which they could not but have availed themselves if it had really existed in their time, and also from its being cited in the Talmud, both Bauer and Jahn date it much later than is generally admitted; the former indeed is of opinion that its true date cannot be ascertained; and the latter, from the inequalities of style and method observable in it, considers it as a compilation from the interpretations of several learned men, made about the close of the third or fourth century.’” *Ibid.* 160.

Then who would place much dependence on that testimony from the Targums? There is no evidence in the Bible. The Old Testament is silent as to it. If so, there is no evidence of that usage in the time of Christ.

While I am about it, I will read a quotation from MacKnight, on this point:

‘*Into the deep.* The word *abyssos* in this passage signifies the place where the wicked spirits are punished; as it does likewise Rev. xx. 3, where it is translated *the bottomless pit*; properly it denotes a place without bottom, or so deep that it cannot be fathomed. The Greeks described their Tartarus in this manner, and the Jews, when they wrote Greek, did not scruple to adopt their expressions, because they were universally understood. Besides the Hebrew language did not furnish proper words for these ideas, which was the reason that the first Christians also, when they had occasion to speak of the state of evil spir-

its, made use of terms purely Greek, such as *Hades*, *Tartaros*, &c.’” *Har. Evan.* sec. 32.

Thus it is seen that the Hebrew language did not present proper words, to express the future world of woe. Hence the Jews *borrowed* words from the *Pagans*, to represent that idea; and they borrowed the idea too!

What then is the fact about *Gehenna*? It is this: It is a phrase signifying, *originally*, the valley of Hinnom—this is admitted. But we say it was used *figuratively*, by Jesus Christ, to express the *temporal calamities* that were to befall the Jewish people;—not the mere burning of bodies in the valley. And for evidence of this, we quote the 19th of Jeremiah. I call your attention to the whole chapter, that you may examine it again at your leisure.

“Thus saith the Lord, go and get a potter’s earthen bottle, and take of the ancients of the people, and of the ancients of the priests; and go forth unto the valley of the son of Hinnom, which is by the entry of the east gate, and proclaim there the words that I shall tell thee. And say, hear ye the word of the Lord, O kings of Judah, and inhabitants of Jerusalem: Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Behold, I will bring evil upon this place, the which whosoever heareth, his ears shall tingle. Because they have forsaken me and have estranged this place, and have burned incense in it unto other gods, whom neither they nor their fathers have known, nor the kings of Judah, and have filled this place with the blood of innocents; they have built also the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt-offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind: therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that this place shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of Slaughter. And I will make void the counsel of Judah and Jerusalem in this place; and I will cause them to fall by the sword before their enemies, and by the hands of them that seek their lives; and their carcasses will I give to be meat for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth. And I will make this city desolate, and a hissing: every one that passeth thereby shall be astonished and hiss because of all the plagues thereof. And I will cause them to eat the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters, and they shall eat every one the flesh of his friend in the

seige and straitness wherewith their enemies, and they that seek their lives, shall straiten them. Then shalt thou break the bottle in the sight of the men that go with thee, and shalt say unto them, thus saith the Lord of hosts; Even so will I break this people and this city, as one breaketh a potter's vessel, that cannot be made whole again: and they shall bury them in Tophet, till there be no place to bury. Thus will I do unto this place, saith the Lord, and to the inhabitants thereof, and even make this city as Tophet: and the houses of Jerusalem, and the houses of the kings of Judah, shall be defiled as the place of Tophet, because of all the houses upon whose roofs they have burned incense unto all the host of heaven, and have poured out drink-offerings unto other gods. Then came Jeremiah from Tophet, whither the Lord had sent him to prophesy; and he stood in the court of the Lord's house; and said to all the people, thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Behold I will bring upon this city and upon all her towns all the evil that I have pronounced against it, because they have hardened their necks, that they might not hear my words." (Jer. 19th. chap.)

Here Jeremiah went to Tophet, and prophesied, and came up out of it again. Now, at the present time it is thought to represent the place of endless damnation. Yet Jeremiah went there and came back again!

Take another passage: Jer. vii. 29—34—to show the use of the phrase by the prophet, and then we shall have the Savior's language taken from the prophet, understood. "Cut off thy hair, O Jerusalem, and cast it away, and take up a lamentation on high places; for the Lord hath rejected and forsaken the generation of his wrath. For the children of Judah have done evil in my sight, saith the Lord: they have set their abominations in the house which is called by my name, to pollute it; and they have built the high places of Tophet; [then there men built HELL!] which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire, which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart. Therefore, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter; for they shall bury in Tophet till there is no place." Is this the place of endless damnation hereafter?

Isaiah xxx. 33: "For Tophet is ordained of old; yea for the king it is prepared; he hath made it deep and large, the pile thereof is *fire and much wood*; the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone doth kindle it."

Here we have a description of Tophet, and yet it cannot be pretended that it here means a place of future damnation. So much for the origin of Hell, as Tophet, and the valley of Hinnom. As to the word Gehenna, he refers to Balfour's 1st Inquiry, and you will see stated there the *facts*. Gehenna is generally claimed by the learned Orthodox, to be the only word meaning their Hell. *Sheol* and *Hades* are given up. But they say that Gehenna has an *emblamatical* or *symbolical* signification; and taints the Partialist's world of woe. This is Dr. Geo. Campbell's opinion. It is admitted by several Orthodox authors that Gehenna represents other things in the New Testament, besides the place of the damned in a future life. Some learned Orthodox writers say that *Sheol* and *Hades* NEVER were used to mean Hell, as now understood. In addressing the Gentiles, the word Gehenna was never used—never. It was only used in addressing the *Jews*; and they only could understand it, because it represented punishments relating to them. It is strange, unless it was only intended to apply to that people, that it was never addressed to the Gentiles. It is not found in all the apostolical preaching, as recorded in the Acts. If that be *the* word to express a future immortal state of punishment, it is strange they never used it in speaking to any but Jews.

Again, neither *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus*, or *Gehenna* is any where called *endless*, in Scripture. The future salvation is no where declared to be salvation from this sort of Hell. Salvation *now* is supposed to be from that; and therein the Church differs from Scripture. John the Apostle never used the word Gehenna. This is strange, if it was the express word for future punishment. I suppose the reason is, that those books were not addressed exclusively to the Jews. Luke does not use it in the Acts. This is strange, if it was the word for future punishment.

Paul never used it in all his sermons or Epistles. Yet he says he did not "fail to declare all the counsel of God." Hence Gehenna as an endless Hell, is not included in the counsel of God, as to the destiny of mankind in general. Is it not strange that Paul, the great preacher never

used Gehenna, THE word for future and endless punishment? His preaching was generally to the *Gentiles*, and this word concerned the *Jews* only. Peter never used it in his preaching, or in his Epistles. Jude never used it. These are curious facts, now urged on Mr. Waller's attention.

You will recollect, too, that there are four words rendered Hell; yet that these four words do not mean the same *thing*; and yet one word, Sheol, is rendered by three words, the Grave, Hell, and Pit, and the whole four words are supposed to mean the *one* HELL, by the mass of professed Christians. I say this is also a curious fact.

Again; I do not say it for the learned Orthodox, nor for Mr. Waller, but for the benefit of the audience generally; but it is a fact, that the learned Orthodox have two HELLS; the common people but ONE, and that is "Hell," as commonly understood by the word in preaching. If you ask, what is Hell? they reply *Hell is Hell*; and that's all they know about it. But the learned Orthodox, and Mr. Waller; believe in *two* Hells.

MR. WALLER. The gentleman is mistaken.

MR. PINGREE. I say the *learned* Orthodox *do*.

MR. WALLER. No, Sir.

MR. PINGREE. Why, first, there is Hades, immediately after death; and then there is the *second* Hell, which is Gehenna, after the resurrection, and it appears to me as if the admissions of Mr. Waller were nearly the same; because, has he not said that the Rich Man went to Hades, and is not that one Hell? and is it not said that Hades shall "deliver up the dead that are in it;" and after that, Hades (where the Rich Man was) was cast into the lake of fire; and is not that the second Hell? adopting here the common interpretation of the "lake of fire."

It is a fact worth remembering in this connection, (I mention it not for Mr. Waller's benefit; he is familiar with it, but for those who are listening to the discussion;) that it is asserted by Orthodox writers—Rev. Stephen Remington, of New York, Dr. Joel Hawes, a writer against Universalism, Dr. George Campbell—the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Greenfield, and others, that Tartarus or Gehenna is IN HADES. It is commonly believed, also, that the lake of fire in Revelations is in Hades, and is the same as Tartarus or Gehenna. See the



absurdity: here is *Tartarus* in *Hades*, and *Gehenna* in *Hades*, and *Hades* delivers up the dead, and is afterwards cast into the lake of fire, and the lake of fire is *Gehenna*. Therefore this Hell in Hell is cast into Hell; that is, it is cast into itself! I shall not dwell on this point. I do not charge Mr. Waller with holding these absurdities; because he now protests against it. Part or all of these notions are held, however, generally by the learned and other Orthodox.

Let us examine some passages, where the word *Gehenna* is found in the New Testament. We shall not apply to the Targums, whose date is not established. I know of no other means of determining its meaning, but the New Testament itself. It is true we may appeal to the Old Testament for *explanation*; because Jesus Christ was a Jew, and used the word in a similar sense to that of the Old Testament. Yet it is necessary to come to the New Testament itself, to learn how the Savior used it.

Take this passage, Matt. v. 21. "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of the judgment: But I say whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council, but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of *Hell fire*."

Here the original is *Gehenna*; and "Hell fire" is the *Gehenna* of fire. Mr. Waller quotes this passage, you will remember, and ridicules the idea that it had allusion to being burned in the valley of Hinnom. Yet I will give Orthodox authority who says it has that allusion. You can judge how much it is worth. It is Dr. Adam Clarke, the celebrated Methodist commentator on the Bible.

He says, "*Shall be in danger of the judgment; shall be liable to the judgment.* That is, to have the matter brought before a senate, composed of *twenty-three* magistrates, whose business it was to judge in cases of murder and other capital crimes. It punished criminals by *strangling, or beheading, &c.*

"*The council; the famous council, known among the Jews by the name of Sanhedrim. It was composed of seventy-two elders, six chosen out of each tribe. This grand Sanhedrim not only received appeals from the in-*

ferior Sanhedrim, or court of *twenty-three*, mentioned above; but could alone take cognizance, in the first instance, of the highest crimes, and alone inflict the punishment of stoning.

"*Shall be in danger of Hell fire; shall be liable to the Hell of fire.* Our Lord here alludes to the *valley of the son of Hinnom*. This place was near Jerusalem, and had been formerly used for those abominable sacrifices, in ~~which~~ the idolatrous Jews had caused their children to pass through the fire to Moloch. A particular place in this valley was called Tophet, from (ebrew) *tophet*, the *fire stove*, in which some suppose they burnt their children alive to the above idol. See 2d Kings xxiii. 10. 2d Chron. xxvii. 3. Jer. vii. 31, 32.

"Now proportioned to these *three* offences, were *three* different degrees of punishment, each exceeding the other in their different degrees of guilt. (1.) The *judgment*, the council of *twenty-three*, which could inflict the punishment of *strangling*. (2.) The *Sanhedrim*, or great council, which could inflict the punishment of *stoning*. And (3.) The being *burnt alive* in the valley of the son of Hinnom. This appears to be the meaning of our Lord." *C. m. in loc.*

Here a single remark: why does the Savior make this difference between sins, and say some shall be in danger of "the judgment," some of "the council," and some "of Hell fire?" Mr. Waller and the other Orthodox hold that ALL sinners are to go into Hell fire. Why the distinction between "the judgment," the "council," and "Hell fire?" Why subject one to the *judgment*, one to the *council*, and one to *Hell fire*? Either the Savior meant that some sins did not deserve Hell fire, or the passage does not refer to the judgment and punishment in a future life. If the word Hell fire *does* refer to a future punishment, then there are some sins which do not deserve it. Rev. Mr. Townsend has a similar remark in the Chronological Bible, edited by Rev. Mr. Coit; he says here are three gradations of crime, here spoken of, and three gradations of punishment. Alexander Campbell, one of the teachers in modern theology, and a great "reformer," expresses the same sentiment in his preface to the New Testament. We have the admission that *all three* relate to *temporal* punishment.

MR. TOWNSEND says:—"Here are three gradations of crimes mentioned by our Lord, and three degrees of punishment respectively annexed to each. The first is causeless anger, unaccompanied with any abusive expressions to aggravate it; the second may be supposed to arise from the same source, increased by an exclamation, which denotes the triumph of vanity, mixed with insult and contempt; the third seems naturally to rise one degree higher, and occasions the opprobrious epithet, "Thou fool."

The two former, we may observe, are threatened with the temporal punishment or animadversion of the Jewish tribunals, the council and the judgment, which were now deprived of the power of life and death, and could therefore take cognizance only of minor offences.

Now it is highly analogous to our Savior's reasoning to suppose, that the punishment annexed to the last crime would be of a temporal nature also; particularly as it can only be considered as an abuse of speech, like that of the preceding, though in a more aggravated form. On the contrary, to imagine that, for the distinction between 'Raca,' and 'thou fool,' our blessed Lord should instantly pass from such a sentence as the Jewish Sanhedrim could pronounce, to the awful doom of eternal punishment in hell-fire is what cannot be reconciled to any rational rule of faith, or known measure of justice. But a critical examination of the original text will remove this difficulty."

After giving the usual definition of the word *gehenna*, he continues:—"From the loathsome scene which this place exhibited, as well as from the fires which were kept constantly burning there, it was frequently used as the emblem or symbol of hell, and of hell-torments in a state of eternity. But our blessed Lord may well be supposed to use it *here* in its literal sense, without any reference to its metaphorical meaning; and this will serve to clear the text of its supposed difficulty." *Note in loc.*

Let us now examine another passage. Mark ix. 43-49: "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off, it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into Hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off, it is better for thee

to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into Hell, into the fire that is not quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out; it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into Hell-fire; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

Now observe the contrast there is between "life," and the "kingdom of God," and "Hell." The inquiry therefore is, where is the "life" of the Gospel? It is certainly in this state of existence. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation," says the Savior, "neither shall men say, Lo here! or lo there! but the kingdom of God is *within* you." Paul says "the kingdom of God is righteousness, and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit;" and it is again said, "Repent; for the kingdom of God is *at hand*." This means the kingdom that is within the hearts of men *here*. Does it mean that in this passage? or the future kingdom of immortal glory? Our Savior said it is better to enter into it, maimed, or halt, or blind, than to be cast whole into Hell fire. Do we go to *Heaven*, and enter the state of immortal glory, *maimed, or halt, or blind*? Surely not; but the kingdom is *on earth* that we can enter in that condition of body. Then if "life," here used as synonymous with the kingdom of Heaven, applies to *this state of existence*, Hell fire must also apply to it. Both those states here spoken of by our Savior, belong to the same state: they are directly contrasted.

But say you, "*the fire is not quenched*." Let me give an example of this same phrase found in Isaiah xxxiv. 9, 10: and then you can judge about its burning to all eternity, or belonging to the immortal state. It is applied to *Idumea*, and illustrates too, the "lake of fire," in Revelations: "And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; [*it is in this world*, because it is spoken of the land of *Idumea*,] the smoke thereof shall go up *for ever*: from generation to generation shall it lie waste; none shall pass through it **FOR EVER AND EVER**." Here are the strongest terms of unlimited duration about which so much has been said and written, applied to a *temporal* judgment upon the land of *Idumea*.

Again; Jeremiah xvii. 27, will show how the sacred writers are accustomed to speak of "fire" that should "not be quenched." "But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering into the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates *thereof*," [of what? *Hell? no: but of Jerusalem.*] "And it shall devour the palaces of JERUSALEM, and it shall not be quenched."

There is a difference between *quenching* a fire, and letting it *go out*, after it has consumed every thing in its way; it is not an *endless burning*. Here are two fires, then, which shall not be quenched; one was to burn up *Idumea*, and the other the gates and palaces of Jerusalem. Therefore when they propose to prove the eternity of Hell fire *hereafter*, they must take examples of other expressions, and not these.

Take another chapter. Isaiah lxvi. 24: "And they shall go forth, and look upon the *carcasses* of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, *neither shall their fire be quenched*; and they shall be an *abhorring* unto all flesh." Does that mean *endless* fire and worm? Yet it is declared to be unquenchable and undying. Where, then, is the proof of the eternity of hell fire—derived from the use of the same language in Mark? Especially in view of the context, and other passages in the same connections?

So much for the facts bearing upon this question. The Old Testament has the phrases, the sense of which is admitted by the Orthodox writers, and they are used in the passages which Jesus Christ uttered. That is all that is necessary to say at present.

As *Hades* and *Sheol* have been discussed, it is well enough now to present the real views of Universalists respecting them; not the caricatures of them presented by our enemies.

*Sheol* means, LITERALLY, the GRAVE, or the STATE of *all the dead*, good and bad; the place where Jacob went, and where Korah and his company went. David said, "The wicked shall be turned into Hell, and all the nations that forget God;" that is, into the grave, (*Sheol*), literally. It expresses *punishment*, when used literally, only when they suffer a *violent* and *premature* death; as when Moses said of Korah, Dathan, and Abtiam, and their families, "If

they should die the *common* death of all men," then the Lord had not sent him, but if the Lord should prepare "a *new thing*," as if the ground should open and swallow them up, then the people would know they had sinned against God; or again, where men are said to be turned into Hell, —expressing violence. But when in the state of the dead, they have no more misery, and no more happiness *there*. Solomon says there is *no knowledge*, or *wisdom*, or *device* in the grave, Heb. *Sheol*; Gr. *Hades*; *whither thou goest*." There is no more consciousness in the grave—*Sheol*—the *literal* Hell of the Old Testament.

Most words may be used in a *literal* or *figurative* signification. So *Sheol*. When a man is dead, all is darkness, silence, and gloom in the grave; and the word signifying the grave, was used to express *moral* darkness and misery in the *present* life. Now HELL, in its figurative signification is only the *Sheol* of the Old Testament, and which was used to represent misery in this life. "The *pa ns* of HELL got hold upon me," says David. Afterwards he speaks of having been delivered "from the *lowest* HELL." He used the word in its figurative sense. In the *literal* Hell of the Old Testament, there was no idea of misery. In the figurative sense it was expressive of misery on earth, in the present life; not in the future life. The same is true of the *Hades* of the New Testament. They are admitted to be alike in signification. This was the *Hades* into which Jesus Christ went, as said by Peter in Acts. In the passage, "O Death! where is thy sting; O *grave*, *Hades*, where is thy victory?" the word is used also in its *literal* sense, as when applied to Christ. In other passages, it has the figurative meaning; as in the damnation of Capernaum; "and thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to Heaven, shalt be brought down to Hell." That is, to misery and degradation in this life. The story of the rich man and Lazarus was a parable, intended to *represent* things on this earth, by figures taken from death and the grave. If it were used in its *literal* sense, there would be some mistake between the Wise Man and Jesus Christ. For the Wise Man says, "There is *no knowledge*, or *wisdom*, or *device*, in the grave (*Hades*) *whither thou goest*." But Jesus Christ says there is *torment* there. The argument is, then, that it was used in the parable of the Rich Man in its *figurative* sense, drawn from the darkness and gloom

thrown over death and the grave; here affording no proof of *post mortem* misery.

Those are our views. Through these you perceive, that neither of these words had application to misery in a future life; but applied altogether to misery in this life, by a figure drawn from death, and the grave. I request you to reflect on these views at your leisure, in connection particularly with what Mr. Waller may say in his next speech. I leave the matter with you, for the present.

[MR. WALLER'S TWELFTH REPLY.]

My remarks this evening will necessarily be desultory. Mr. Pingree and myself have agreed to make a speech each in the morning, by way of recapitulating the whole matter. Whatever new matter I may wish to introduce must be done now. I regret that the time agreed upon has not been sufficient to enable me to bring before you all that I wish or intended on this important question. I am forced for the want of time to omit many important matters. My business now will be chiefly to recur to some former positions, to notice objections, and further to confirm and support what I have already advanced. On many points of importance. I have felt that I have had no opponent. True, Mr. Pingree alluded to them sometimes by ridicule, and sometimes by an effort at argument; but all simply by way of producing mystification, rather than casting light.

And once more I will call your attention to the **JUDGMENT DAY**. The position of Universalists on this subject is that the **JUDGMENT** is in this world, and is constantly going on; and some say that the time specifically called the *Judgment day* is the Gospel day; others, that it means the day of Jerusalem's destruction. If I understand Mr. Pingree, he takes the first two positions. Now, I have granted that there is a judgment in the earth, that "judgment has come upon all men unto condemnation." That "he that believeth not is condemned already." I have granted, and proved too, that the "believer was justified from all things," that we are "justified by faith." But still this does not dispense with the doctrine of a *Judgment day*; when Christ shall judge the *quick* and the *dead*, and the fact that *after death* there is a judgment. These positions of mine have not been met. I have already amply sus-

tained my doctrine from the Scriptures, and will only refer to one or two passages heretofore adduced. Now how does Mr. Pingree dispose of the passage in Heb. ix. 27: "As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment?" He admits the common sense reading of the passage is against him, and admits as a general principle, that the Bible ought to be interpreted on common sense principles; but then he says that I have departed from those principles, and therefore he may! Well, suppose I am guilty as charged, does he mean that my guilt is his innocence? Does he condemn what I practice, and then do the same thing? aye, make what he calls *sins* in me, *virtues* in himself? If my memory serves, he has not, since this debate commenced, plead me as an excuse for himself, without first condemning in me the very things that he adopts! But I wholly deny that I am guilty of the charge. Nothing that I have said or done furnishes the slightest palliation, not to say justification of the monstrous nonsense perpetrated in the Universalist exposition of this passage! I will not insult your good sense by following him in his tortuous exposition, as he called it, of the context. I plant myself upon the plain and obvious meaning of the text, and defy the gates of Hell to move me. The gentleman's exposition only proves that his system will not let him believe what God says—leads him to contradict what God affirms? What has he said? . Why, that it is *not* appointed unto men once to die; for according to his own showing, it was not appointed unto the High priest to die, but only to kill *beasts!!* This mode of interpretation would turn the whole Bible into nonsense, and I could prove just as easily, that in the beginning God *did not* create the Heaven and the Earth: that Jesus was *not* born in Bethlehem of Judea, that he *never* was in the world: that he did *not* die: was *not* buried: did *not* rise again; for these things are not more explicitly declared in the Scriptures, than that it is "appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." To enter upon a defence of this passage, against the objections brought, is but to vindicate the Bible against the charge of being written in a manner which places it beyond the possibility of being interpreted by man! that it is worse than Jewish fables, and less intelligible than the books of the Sybils.

But a judgment after death is supported by other pas-



ages. Jesus shall "Judge the quick and *the dead* at his appearing and kingdom." John, in prophetic vision, saw "the DEAD, small and great, standing before the judgment seat of Christ." Again, the Savior said, "The queen of the South shall rise [exordiomai, "*come out*"] in the judgment with the men of this generation, and condemn them. The men of Ninevah shall rise [anastesontia] in the judgment with the men of this generation, and shall condemn it." Here the Son of God declares, the queen of the South and the men then living shall *come out* together: and the Ninevites and the men of that generation shall be raised together, in the judgment. What language can be more plain and unequivocal? And yet Universalism contradicts all this, and says there is no judgment after death!

The fact then that there is a judgment of men before death, does not militate against the position that there is a judgment after death. As well might it be argued that because men live in time, they will not live in eternity: because the saints love God here, they will not love him hereafter: or because we have magistrates' courts, that therefore we have no courts of appeals!

Mr. Pingree stated an objection to my reasoning on the propriety of the judgment day, and says, suppose Tom Paine had become a Christian before he died, how would he be treated in the judgment? would he not be condemned for what his infidel writings had done? And so with other cases. Supposing I could not answer this objection, it argues nothing against the fact asserted in the Scriptures, that there is a judgment day. There are many facts, in and out of the Scriptures, that I am wholly incompetent to explain. I am surrounded with mystery. But this matter, I am happy to say, is easily disposed of. The gentleman argues with me as if I were a Universalist. He forgets that I subscribe to the doctrine of the *pardon* or *forgiveness* of sins, in the *human* acceptation of that term. If we forgive men their trespasses, even so will our heavenly Father forgive us our trespasses. Yea, if a brother offends seventy times in a day, and seventy times in a day, returns and says, I repent, we are bound to forgive him. And God remembers the sins and the iniquities of the penitent no more. Had Tom Paine repented of his sins and believed in Jesus, his iniquities

would have been pardoned, and his sins covered. As a believer he would have had his past offences remitted, and been taken into the family of Heaven. been justified, become a new creature in Christ Jesus. Of course what God forgives and forgets, he will not bring into judgment. Besides the very fact of his repenting and believing in Jesus, would be passing sentence of condemnation upon his former sentiments and practice; and then no one could urge those as his sentiments which he himself had condemned. The public renunciation of his sentiments would have done more to discredit them, than all that the ablest writers have urged in their refutation. They would at once have gone out of use and sunk into oblivion. It is easy to see that in this way he might have done more for the cause of Christianity, than he has ever done against it; he might have forever staid the influence of his works which no one else could do, and even turn them to favor the cause they now injure.

I might instance many men eminent in piety and usefulness, who were once infidels, but no man now knows them as infidels. All the impression they make upon the world is in favor of religion. They have ceased from their labors, and their works do follow them. They turned many to righteousness, and shall shine as stars forever in the coronal of the Redeemer. Such is the doctrine of the Bible; and thus dissolves this objection at the touch of truth.

As I am on the subject of repentance, I trust I will be pardoned for condescending to notice an anecdote related by Mr. Pingree, which, with the utmost deference, I beg leave to say, appeared rather *low* for such an occasion and such a subject. The substance of it, I think, was this: A man had some goods stolen, and upon being told that the thief would be punished hereafter, exclaimed, "Oh, curse the fellow, I'm afraid he'll repent." Now Mr. Pingree would have told him there was no possibility of his escaping a just recompense for his crime, that he would certainly and assuredly meet full and adequate punishment! It is strange that he should insist that our doctrine encourages immorality simply because it teaches that future punishment *may be* escaped, when he himself not only teaches that it may be escaped, but is here to *prove* that there is no such punishment at all! So his own as-

ecodote makes himself ridiculous, and demonstrates the immoral tendency of his doctrine! Is it not most astonishing too, that future punishment furnishes no terrors to evil doers, when he and his brethern have been constantly declaring by mouth and pen, ever since the year eighteen hundred and eighteen, that many individuals have been made tenants of mad-houses in consequence of this terrible doctrine! But enough: the Universalist who would *curse* a man for repenting of his sins, has a spirit, if not so grovelling as a thief's, yet much more savage and fiendish.

Once more respecting *Gehenna and Tartarus*. He says that Dr. M'Knight admits that the Hebrew had no word meaning *hell*. Neither had it any word meaning *heaven*. Mr. Pingree says the word originally meant the valley of Hinnom, and told us as if it were quite a discovery, that Jeremiah went into *Tophet!* And what does that prove? By the same school-boy logic, I can prove the gentleman himself has been in *heaven*; for no doubt he has been in a *flower garden*, and I have seen him myself in the *air!* He admits that *Gehenna* meant *hell* in the days of the Savior, but affirmed with great earnestness, that God had not given it that meaning; but uninspired men! No matter that was the *meaning* of the word in that day. That is enough, and settles the question. We are not asking *how* words came to have their meaning, but what *is* their meaning. I am not aware that there is a word in the Bible that owes its meaning to inspiration. Certain it is, the Greek language in which the New Testament was written, was the language of *Pagans*? Did Mr. Pingree know this? If he did, it is strange he did not tremble while indulging his sneers on the uninspired meaning of *Gehenna* among the Jews. Even the awful name of *God* himself, in the original of the New Testament, had its meaning from uninspired men—from Pagans! And, I repeat, the same is true of every word in the New Testament, so far as I know or believe. Then, by the same rule he rejects the meaning of *Gehenna* among the Jews, in the days of the Savior, he rejects every word of the New Testament; which is a step further than the most daring infidel has gone!

But he says the Jews got their notions of future punishment from the Pagans! Well, suppose they did; the Sa-

rior endorsed them as true. Now is it not passing strange, that Jesus in reproofing the Jews for their errors and traditions, if he knew they held this error, so monstrous in the eyes of Mr. Pingree, that he never once reproofed them for it—never once intimated that it was wrong? He could reprove them for tithing anise, mint, and cummin; for their foolish washings; and their superstitious observance of days; and yet wholly neglect to utter one syllable of warning against this terrible heresy! Yea, he rebuked them for the things they had received by the tradition of their elders; but never uttered a word against this tradition of the Pagans! Now, who can believe this?

But it is enough, that he concedes that the Jews, in the days of the Savior, used *Gehenna* in the sense that we attach to *hell*. Now, would Jesus, in talking to them, speak in their own, or in an unknown, tongue? If in their own tongue, then he meant by *Gehenna* what they did. If he spoke to them in an unknown tongue, in the name of all that's curious, I demand what tongue was it? And is it not a most astonishing miracle that they should have understood him at all?

But the gentleman seemed to think it strange that the Apostle did not use this word when preaching or writing to the Gentiles. It is enough that they preached the doctrine. They told them that the impenitent should be "punished with everlasting destruction from the glory of God." They reasoned with them of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come." They called upon them to repent in view of that day in which God should "judge the world by that man whom he had ordained." They told them that God would render "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every *soul* of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first and also of the Gentile." They were told that God spared not the angels that fell, "but cast them down to *Tartarus*." But I need not multiply passages. Mr. Pingree tells us that the Jews got their notions of hell from the *Pagans*; of course, then he admits that the Pagans believed the doctrine of future punishment. Why then did not the Apostles preach against it? Had they been Universalists, would they have not done so? Did you ever hear a Universalist preach; or did you ever read any thing from him half as long as an apostolic epistle, that did not have something to say for

his doctrine; and that expressed too in such plain language that no one could misunderstand the subject. And yet the Apostles went out preaching among *Partialists*, to use my friends favorite term; and far from condemning the doctrine, used words and phrases that the most learned and acute—indeed *every body* for seventeen centuries supposed decidedly to approve it! How will Universalists explain this matter? Will they charge the Apostles with being unfaithful; or else unskillful?

But Mr. Pingree says, that according to the notion of the Pagans, *Tartarus* was a department in *Hades*; and the Jews taught that *Gehenna* was a department in *Hades*; and he has proved that *Hades* will be destroyed, and of course, *Tartarus* or *Gehenna*! Now I am not sure whether he designed this for argument or wit. In either case it is entirely harmless, except so far as it concerns himself. The word *Hades*, as I proved, was a word of varied usage, and of course, its signification had to be determined most generally by its context. I showed that it was used in the sense of the grave; and in that sense it is to be destroyed. In the sense of the receptacle of the soul separate from the body, it will cease upon the resurrection; but in the sense of a state of punishment, it is not to be destroyed. Now, it was used in these several senses by Jews and Pagans, and it is so used in the New Testament; but Jews, nor Pagans, nor the New Testament intimate that it shall cease as a state of punishment. Mr. Pingree ought either to have shown that it was not used in these several ways, or else ought not to have attempted this instance of wit or argument, whichever he may please to term it: for until he does this, such remarks bear all the lineaments of great ignorance of the subject.

But the Orthodox taught two hells; *hades* was hell, and the lake of fire and brimstone was *hell*; and yet *hades* was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone! Hell cast into hell!! Or *hades* cast into *tartarus*, which is a department of *hades*! The greater cast into the less—the whole into the part!! The remarks just made apply to these specimens of wit. *Hades* in the passage alluded to is evidently used in the sense of the receptacle of departed souls in a state of punishment, if the gentleman must insist that such are our views; and the souls at the day of judgment are

brought out of this state and united with the body, and then cast into Tartarus, Gehenna, or lake of fire and brimstone. It was the *inhabitants* of hades, and not *hades* itself, that were cast into the lake of fire and brimstone; just as the *inhabitants*, and not Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about the Jordan, were baptised of John in Jordan. This the passage shows. "And the sea gave up the dead; and death and hades delivered up THE DEAD which were in them, and they [the dead that were in them] were judged every man according to their works; and death and hades [the dead which were in them] were cast into the lake of fire." Now the passage shows, not that death and hades, but those that were in them, were delivered up, were judged every man according to their works, and were cast into the lake of fire. So this most remarkable exhibition made by the gentleman in his desperate effort at witicism, was a most ridiculous want of skill in an interpretation not above the capacity of a Sunday school scholar!

He told us that the punishments in Matt. v. 22, were temporal. I cannot see how this can be. Now what court in Judea had a right to inflict temporal punishment on a man for being angry with his brother? And what law, human or divine, authorized the council to inflict temporal punishment on a man for saying "raca," to his brother? And who was like to burn a man in the valley of Hinnom, for saying "thou fool?" Such an interpretation makes nonsense of the passage. But let the punishments be spiritual, pertaining to that kingdom which is not of this world, and the explanation is easy and natural.

He asked if men entered into heaven maimed? or blind? etc., and inferred hence that these passages did not teach a danger of being cast into *Gehenna*, in the Jewish sense of that term. This is sheer quibbling. I hope Mr. Pingree will pardon my calling things by their right names. The same mode of illustrating spiritual truths pertains throughout the Bible. The Almighty is said to repent, to be angry, to be pleased, as if affected with the feelings of a man. Whoever from hence inferred that the Bible taught that there was no God?—or that he was altogether such a being as ourselves? But Mr. Pingree's mode of interpreting Scripture would result in this. Therefore it is improper and absurd. The meaning of our Savior is, as every

one will see in an instant, that we must discard whatever is dear to us, if it leads us to sin; for it is better to give them up, than by committing sin, to be cast into hell.

Well, he has abandoned the idea of *quenching* the fire which shall never be quenched; and of *killing* the worms that never die. Ho now contends that the fire goes out; and the worm that *dieth* not, nevertheless *does die!* He may pursue unmolested all such wonderful achievements in logic!

*Hades*, in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, he says, is used in a *figurative sense!* Did he imagine this? Or was it communicated to him in a dream? Certain it is that it was suggested to him by the ghost of his system. If he had not felt himself reduced to the last extremity, he never would have taken the desperate position that the Savior based this parable on the phantom of *Hades*. I venture to say if this parable is based upon the figure of a thing that has no existence, that it has not its fellow in the whole world of parables! And then it assumed this peculiar and unique shape for the especial accommodation of Mr. Pingree's system!

But I perceive I have bestowed as much attention to this branch of the subject as my time will allow. I must proceed to other matters. I will take occasion to say, however, before I proceed, that Mr. Pingree, in asserting that "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power," and similar passages, related to temporal punishments, or punishments in this life, brought no other authority to his support than his own! As ponderous as I am disposed to regard his word on ordinary occasions, he must pardon me, if, on a subject so grave as this, I cannot receive it, being alone. Mere assertions will not suffice. He must bring proofs. He must use arguments.

Mr. Pingree told you that in admitting that *aionios*, though signifying *endless*, was applied to things of a *limited* nature, I surrendered the whole matter in dispute! The surrender is on *his* part! He has surrendered to me the literal meaning of the word—he grants that to be *eternal*—*endless*. He does not dispute my position that it retains its literal meaning when applied to limited objects; and has virtually surrendered that in all such cases it retains its ordinary meaning; and that the *object*, not *aionios*, is ef-

fect, making the phrase hyperbolic. Then he *surrenders* the point, that when it is applied to punishment it means endless or eternal, and that the Scriptures *literally* teach *endless* punishment, *endless* destruction, etc., etc. This appears to me to be surrendering the whole controversy. True, he has a salvo. He endeavors to make it appear that in all such cases, we must understand the language as hyperbolic, for he says that punishment is *limited*. Aye, but has he proved this? Can he prove it? The very assertion is begging the question, is taking for granted the very thing in controversy. But is *eternal life* limited? If not, neither is the punishment of the wicked, for we have *these use antithetically*.

Matt. xxv. 46: "And these shall go away into *everlasting* punishment; but the righteous into life *eternal*." The words "everlasting" and "eternal" are translated from the same word, *aionios*. According to the law of *antithesis*, "everlasting punishment" is the very opposite of "life eternal," if the latter is *endless*, so is the former. This is necessarily so, unless we charge the Spirit of God with being incapable of communicating ideas intelligibly. Such would be the rule for interpreting it, if found in any correct writer. It is of universal application. I defy an exception in the writings of any author of repute. An exception would be a violation of the laws of language. If then the life of the righteous is endless, so is the punishment of the wicked. Jesus himself has placed them antithetically. So then "endless punishment" is no hyperbole. It is just as true as *endless life*. He that cannot lie, has asserted the one in the same terms and in the same connection, as he has asserted the other.

I will quote one or two other instances of antithesis.

Rom. v. 21: "That as sin hath reigned unto *death*, even so might grace reign, through righteousness, unto *eternal life*, by Jesus Christ our Lord." Here *death* and *eternal life* are opposite. Then sin reigned unto *eternal death*.

Again, Rom. vi. 23: "The wages of sin is *death*, but the gift of God is *eternal life*, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Here is the antithesis again. So the meaning is, "The wages of sin is *eternal death*; for if man was not entirely deprived of 'eternal life,' how could it be the 'gift of God.' And if entirely deprived of 'eternal life,' of course he was in *eternal death*. I might pursue this



subject much further, but time presses. Enough has been said, I trust, to show conclusively that the Scriptures mean what they say, when they declare that the wicked "shall go away into *everlasting* punishment."

A kind of *Jerusalem mania* infects the Universalists, and the contagion seems to have extended to Mr. Pingree! Every calamity and every punishment, almost, mentioned in the Bible, they apply to that ill-fated city and its devoted inhabitants! They are consumed in Gehenna fire and everlasting fire! On them feast the worms that never die! They are raised out of their moral graves to shame and everlasting contempt? It was that city that went to everlasting punishment! Paul mentions its overthrow in his epistle to the Thessalonians, when he speaks of the day of the Lord as not being at hand, and that before it came, the man of sin and son of perdition must be revealed, and then Jerusalem should be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. When the Apostle charged Timothy before the Lord Jesus Christ, "who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom," he alluded to his coming to destroy Jerusalem! When we are told that Jesus shall "come a second time without sin unto salvation;" we are to understand he comes to destroy Jerusalem, and to send the disciples to Pella. When James speaks of the tongues being "set on fire of *Gehenna*," he means the fires of the valley of Hinnom in which the Jews were not burned on the destruction of their city. When Peter says, "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 the perdition of ungodly men," that great event is alluded to. And Enoch, also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these things, saying "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him"!!! The poor Jews, were the dead, small and great, which John saw standing before God! "And the sea gave up the dead [Jews] which were in it, and Death and Hades delivered up the dead [Jews] which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works"!!!

But it would take me several days to quote all the passages which they refer to this one event.

But not the least singular manifestation of this mania is their treatment of Matt. xxv. I am aware that they attempt from Matt. xxiv. 24: "This generation shall not pass away until all these things be fulfilled," and the parallel passage in Luke, to show that all the Savior said on that occasion was fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem. Now I might show that the word *generation* may mean a *race* or *lineage*, and therefore might apply to the Jews, who, though scattered all over the world, are still most wonderfully, and doubtless for some wise purpose, preserved a distinct people. I might, I say, show that this verse is clearly susceptible of such an interpretation, and thus subvert the last hope of the Universalists from it; but it is unnecessary. I shall commence 47 verses in advance of this; and where of course it can have no necessary bearing, and give you a specimen of Universalist exposition, taking for granted, as they do, that this xxiv. 34: furnishes the key to the whole discourse of the Savior on this occasion. Matt. xxv. 31—34: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory [to the destruction of Jerusalem,] and all the holy angels [Pagan Roman soldiers,] with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. [this is a hyperbole.] And before him shall be gathered all nations, [this was neglected,] and he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats, [this was not done,] and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left, [which was not done.] Then shall the King say to those on his right hand [to his disciples who were *not* on his right hand,] come ye, blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." [run over to the town of Pella which was built a great while since the foundation of the world!]

Verse 41: "Then shall he say, also, unto them on his left hand, [to the Jews,] depart. ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared by the devil and his angels." [go into Jerusalem, and you will be destroyed by the Romans; the "devil and his angels" are mere retorical flourishes!]

Verse 46: "And these [Jews] shall go away into everlasting punishment, [shall be killed by the Romans and go to Heaven;] but the righteous into life eternal" [into

the town of Pella, to suffer poverty and persecution, many years after those Jews killed by the Romans have gone to the abodes of the blessed.] Let this suffice. You can pursue this course at your leisure, with other passages similarly perverted by the Universalists. Their system stultifies the whole Bible; makes it more absurd than the ravings of the Pythia—a complete nose of wax to be turned any way. It makes us build for eternity upon vapor! The truth is, the passages I have been quoting just as well refer to the day upon which our Declaration of Independence was declared, as to the destruction of Jerusalem.

I deem it unnecessary to detain in order to expose further Mr. Pingree's misapplications of the Scriptures. I have in many instances thought it would be an abuse of your intelligence to notice them. I noted two instances especially, in his last speech. His quotations from 2 Kings, and Jeremiah, which he said alluded to the seventy years captivity of the Jews. If you think it worth while to examine for yourselves, you will see at once the passages have no such meaning. The name of his mistakes in this way, since the commencement of this discussion, is Legion. I charge him with no design in the matter. His system has put out his eyes. But I have thought it unwise to neglect weightier matters to expose his comments on quotations of Scripture. If I have erred it has been a defect in judgment.

Mr. Pingree insists upon the necessity of a moral change after death, and even asserted that I had conceded the necessity! This is a most flagrant mistake. I have made no such concession, and hold no such doctrine. I subscribe implicitly to the declarations of the Scriptures. That every one who is a disciple of Christ, *has the Spirit of Christ*, and with *his mind serves the law of God*. Will Mr. Pingree himself say that such a one must be changed, so as *not* to have the Spirit of Christ, and *not* with his mind serve the law of God, or they are unfit for Heaven? He must take this ground, or his assertion that a Christian must experience a moral change after death is as empty as a vacuum. I know and lament the divisions among christians; but this is an error of judgment, it arises from education, from wrong teaching. But their hearts are

cast in the same mould. Their heads may not be alike, but the same law is written upon their hearts. They have the same spirit, the Spirit of Christ, or they are none of his. But the gentleman wholly mistakes the matter, if he supposes that because they differ, they hate one another. No; he that hates his brother is no Christian, but is a murderer, and has not eternal life abiding in him. Love is the fulfilling of the law, and the Spirit of Christ is love, and the man who serves the law with his mind and has the Spirit of Christ, (and without these he is no Christian,) must love his brethren; aye, his enemies. Mr. Pingree, I am persuaded, does not believe that I have any hatred to *him*, as widely as we differ. I entertain none but the kindest feelings toward him. Our intercourse, since the commencement of this discussion, is enough to convince him of this. And I believe he reciprocates those feelings. I am sure he does if his conduct has truly represented his feelings. There needs no moral change after death, then, in order to the amicable association of Christians in that glorious world; but only better instruction—the complete triumph of that love that now prevails in their hearts.

In proving that the punishment inflicted on sinners in eternity, is founded in justice and righteousness, and, therefore, in strict conformity to the love and mercy of God—that it is not arbitrarily inflicted, or inflicted from revengeful feelings, but the nature and necessity of things, I have completely answered and annihilated all that Mr. Pingree has said, by way of *ad captandum vulgus*, respecting the misery the righteous must experience in beholding the condemnation and sufferings of their friends and relatives. The objection supposes an impossibility; that the saints in light will have hearts opposed to the law of God, and to God's justice, holiness and love; hearts revolting at what is done in accordance with law, opposing what is just, and righteous, and necessary! This cannot be. Such emotions can prevail in no heavenly bosom. No heart can there revolt at a thing, when the righteous law of God approves it well. But the objection is founded in another mistake: that we take our natural feelings to Heaven, when the Savior tells us that we do not; but are as the *Angels of God*. This whole objection then is

founded in gross error; and Mr. Pingree's pathetic declamation on it is less than nothing, and perhaps was indulged in because he had nothing better to say.

Mr. Pingree's efforts in the way of pathetic, struck me as a most singular failure. He said that our doctrine made Washington, and other great and good men, the companions of the wicked in Hell! Mr. Pingree is the very first man that I ever heard say Washington was not a Christian! The charge is a slander upon his name! He was not only Nature's nobleman, but a Christian, "the noblest style of man!" Would the gentleman take the finest chaplet from the fame of this great man? And it is a most unwarrantable misrepresentation of our views to say that we teach the damnation of *good* men. We do no such thing, as every Universalist knows.

Oh! but says Mr. Pingree, your doctrine was held by the Pagans! Yes, and it was held, and is held by all the eminently good and learned in the present and all past ages. The fact that many, or even all the heathens hold the doctrine, is no proof of its having originated among them. As well might it be said, that we are indebted to them for the doctrine of Heaven and of the Soul's immortality. The ancient heathen philosophers tell us that the doctrine came down from the most primitive antiquity, and is "older than philosophy." They say it did not originate with them. And I now defy the gentleman to point to the age this side of Adam when it did begin. If it came from the heathen, let him tell when, and who first taught it. But he ought to be careful in making reflections of this sort. He ought to have inquired into the paternity of his own doctrine. Mr. Ballou was the first who, admitting the Bible, proclaimed that there was no punishment after death. But the very first propagator of the sentiment of no future punishment was a PAGAN!

[MR. PINGREE'S LAST SPEECH.]

RESPECTED FRIENDS:—This morning, as we have arranged, each of us has the privilege of discussing the question for an hour, according to the rule which is to govern us; and that is, that we are not to introduce new matter, but each is to have the privilege of replying to the last speech, or to any one made during the discussion. My present object will be to review as summarily as pos-

sible, Mr. Waller's last speech of yesterday afternoon, and after that to recapitulate the prominent points brought up in this discussion, and the arguments adduced on both sides to sustain those positions.

He told you that you would be *astonished* with what ease he could dissipate the mists I had thrown about the subject; and no doubt when you saw how it was done, you *were* both astonished and surprised! I was. I was almost alarmed and terrified at the first setting forth of such a tremendous threat. He then proceeded to observe that he had a word to say about the judgment after death, and quoted again the passage in Heb. ix. 27, 28: making the declaration that it refers to a judgment after death, in which *all the actions* done on earth are decided upon.

I have already said repeatedly, that neither Mr. Waller nor the Orthodox Church *believes that*, that *all men* will be judged for *all* their acts done in this life. He believes, and they believe, as I have shown, that a murderer or a liar, or any other sinner, may sin till nigh death, and then repent, and die, and *not* be punished for his sins. So the upright man, who has done good all his life, may commit *one sin*, die thus suddenly, and go to Hell, and not be rewarded for the good he has done. The fate of both is determined to all eternity, by the state of mind and heart in which they are at the *moment of death*. If a man *dies* a sinner, he remains so to all eternity. If he dies a saint, he remains so to all eternity. I say this is the common opinion

I called Mr. Waller's attention to the context of this passage in Hebrews. I did this to show the subject of the chapter, and the Apostle's argument, and thus throw light on it, by reading the preceding language, beginning at the 16th verse: "For where a testament is, there must also be the *death* of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are *dead*; otherwise it is of no force at all while the testator liveth. Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without *blood*; ["blood" is used for *death*, observe.] For when Moses had spoken every precept to the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves, and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people: Saying, *this is the blood* of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you." [Ridicule was attempted to be made

of the idea of a man's offering "the blood of others," instead of his own death; yet the Apostle takes that law as given by Moses, as an illustration of Christ's death.] "It was therefore necessary [mark!] that the *patterns* of things in the Heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with *better* sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the *figures* of the *true*; but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us. Nor yet that he shall offer himself often, as the high priest entereth the holy place every year with the *blood of others.*" [This explains the passage, "once to die." The high priest was once to die, that is, once every year, figuratively, by a typical death, as it were by proxy; not by himself, but "*by the blood of others,*" not his own blood.] For then must he [Christ] often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now *once* in the *end of the world*, [understand that,] hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after that the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him, shall he appear the second time without sin unto SALVATION."

It is plainly a comparison or contrast between the first offerings of the Jews, and the offering of Jesus Christ. He alludes to them in contrast throughout the chapter. Christ was to appear a second time unto salvation to those that looked for him; for it was for pronouncing a *blessing*, and not a *cursing*, that the priest appeared, when he came out of the holy of holies. But if this "judgment" refers to a *future life*, the passage is then a proof of UNIVERSAL SALVATION, as before shown; though I deny that he has demonstrated that it has relation to the immortal state. It would be strange indeed, if Paul now should leave the subject of the sacrifices made by the High Priest, abruptly, at this point, and the offering of Jesus Christ, and talk about the natural death of all men, and the General Judgment, to be followed by endless damnation! He did not do it. The passage belongs to his subject, and he is showing still the same general reasoning. There is *no intimation* of any *punishment*, either, to follow the judgment, as exhibited in this place; it was a judgment of *justification*—of "SALVATION." Mark that!

We have the passage quoted, "I came not to judge the world," etc. Admitted in relation to his first, his personal coming; but *his second coming was* to judge the world. This we have established by proof that has not been set aside.

We have also, passages referring to the "*day* of judgment." That the "*day*" here, does not refer to a future life, I have established by abundant proof. When is this "*day*?" If it is to take place after the literal heavens pass away, it is not "*the last day*." It is rather the *first* day of Eternity; because it is placed, according to the common opinion, *after* the heavens and the earth have passed away. We have Scripture examples of this use of the word "*day*," as found here. Says one, "*now* is THE DAY of salvation." It is not a day in Eternity. It sometimes refers to the *whole period* of the Gospel Dispensation; and "*DAY*" is used in the same sense, as applied to the general judgment by Jesus Christ. It is a *progressive* judgment, going on continually, through the period in which Christ is now ruling, reigning, and judging the world, in his "*kingdom*," and by his Gospel.

He quoted a passage in Peter, where he quotes the prophet Joel, in which he speaks of the "*last days*." But Peter says *those* were the "*last days*." He referred to the last days of the Old Dispensation. John says, in relation to his time, "*There are*, that is, *now*, many antichrists, whereby we know that *IT, THIS*, is the *last time*." It relates not to Eternity.

He quotes the declaration, that for "every idle word we shall have to give an account." Does that not take place here? Mr. Waller does *not* BELIEVE that for *every* idle word, men will be punished. Peter denied his Master. Was he to be punished for it? Mr. Waller would say, *No*. We say that men *are* judged; but during the progress of the Kingdom of Christ. Christ is the Judge of the "*living and the dead*," says Mr. Waller. But what says Paul in the text, to Timothy? 2d Tim. iv. 1: He says it is to be "*at Christ's appearing and KINGDOM*;" *not* in the immortal life; but during the reign of Jesus Christ, to commence at his "*coming*," and the establishment of his "*kingdom*."

Matt. xxiv. and xxv. He says Universalists apply this to the "*destruction of Jerusalem*." I protest against this



representation of our views. This coming in power and glory, and the judgment *embraces* the destruction of Jerusalem; but not *all those things* were to be fulfilled at that time; it was a *progressive matter commencing then*. I have not said anything about the "destruction of Jerusalem." All he said about the Christians retreating to Pella, amounts to nothing. *That was not* the reward. The reward is "the Kingdom of God;" and that is *within* MEN; it consists of "righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." It is a perversion to represent Universalists as believing that Pella was the Kingdom of God. He knows better.

He says that the passage, "this generation shall not pass," etc., applies to the *race* of the Jews being kept distinct from other nations. Then where is the *point* of the Savior's idea, if that is the meaning of "generation"? What means the illustration of "the fig tree"? "While the branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is NIGH. So ye," he says, "when ye shall see all these things, know that it is NEAR, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled;" (that is, thousands, and perhaps tens of thousands of years! according to Mr. Waller and others; yet it all bears upon the period *nigh at hand*, yea, even at the *doors*!) Mr. Waller therefore denies the ordinary meaning of the words, "this generation," to be the average period of human life.

MR. WALLER. No, Sir.

MR. PINGREE. If he does *not*, I do not see the force of his last argument about the "ordinary meaning" of words. In the first chapter of Matthew, it says, "All the *generations* from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David until the captivity are fourteen generations, and from the captivity to Christ, are fourteen generations." Does the fourteen generations here mean fourteen distinct *races of men*? But the period of time is given; so that it cannot be so. But if there is no force in *that* argument, the 16th of Matthew will settle the question as to what our Savior did mean; for he there says, in allusion to the same event, (verse 22,) "Verily I say unto you, there be *some standing here* which shall *not taste of death*, till they see the *Son of man coming in his kingdom*." The same idea is expressed in both texts, but in different words. In one place he says, "This *generation* shall not pass till all those things be accomplished;" and in the

other, "there be some standing here that shall *not taste of death* till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom;" that is, *shall not die*. It is certain, therefore, if Jesus Christ spoke the truth, that the second coming of Christ is PAST; as he positively said it should be in the life time of some then living. Was all that language, "pray ye that your flight be not in the *winter* or on the *sabbath day*," etc., used in reference to the *general judgment*?! Was it to be after the literal heavens and the earth had passed away, and we were in the immortal world?!

All that paraphrase about the Roman Emperor, and the Roman army, I will not reply to. I have advanced *no such sentiments*—Christ sits upon the throne of his kingdom, and rules over his kingdom by the Gospel, now, and has for eighteen hundred years.

*Everlasting*, as used in this place. Mr. Waller says that the word rendered "everlasting," is applied antithetically to future "life," and to future "*punishment*"; and challenges the production of any case where a sentiment is *antithetically* expressed, and where the same word qualifying the objects means one thing in one branch of the antithesis, and a different thing in another branch. All this is unnecessary—I *admit* that the terms mean the same thing in both members of the antithesis. I have denied the position that either of them applies to a future state; and have asserted and proved that "everlasting punishment," and "everlasting life," when used in the same expression, both apply to this state of existence. Do I therefore deny the doctrine of a future life? No; it is incorrect in him to say so. Christ says, that at the *resurrection*, we shall be "as the angels of God in heaven." The doctrine of the RESURRECTION establishes the idea of the future, *immortal* life. Then the 5th of John has been introduced: our Savior's words are, "he that heareth my word and believeth in him that sent me HATH—that is, *now—everlasting life*;" and he defines what it is; to "know God and Jesus Christ." This they *had*—that was this "everlasting life," enjoyed *here*.

Mr. Waller says that those who fell away from grace, can *never* be renewed. Yet they had enjoyed the "everlasting life," according to the above passage. Therefore it is enjoyed in this world, and may be *lost* again, according to that passage. It is the enjoyment of "the kingdom of

God," in this life. I do NOT *deny* immortal life. But I assert that the phrase, "*everlasting* life," as *frequently* found in the New Testament, has application to the spiritual life of the Christian in this world, *also*; although I do not affirm it to have that meaning, *exclusively*. In 5th Romans, it is said, that as by the disobedience of one man "*many*," or *THE* many have sinned, so by the obedience of one shall "*many*," the *same* many, be made righteous. Here is an antithesis. Take all his doctrine in relation to antitheses, which is correct, and see the result. How many are made sinners by Adam? ALL men. So upon the other side of the antithesis, "*ALL MEN*" who had endured the judgment of condemnation in Adam, shall be made righteous in Christ, and "*JUSTIFIED*," verse 18. Therefore it follows that all will be saved; does it not? There are two verses containing antitheses in this chapter; and both of them positively prove the doctrine of Universal Salvation, according to the gentleman's own mode of interpretation, which, *in principle*, is correct.

Thus I have taken up his gauntlet, and first shown that the text quoted by him does not apply to the immortal state, and then thrown it down to him on the 5th of Romans.

As to "*everlasting*" being applied to "*limited* objects;" I have preferred not to deny what Mr. Waller calls the ordinary meaning of the word, but granting it, he *admits* that it may be applied to *limited* objects. If so, I say the word *in itself* does not necessarily prove the *endless* duration of the object to which it is applied; and therefore can never prove the endlessness of punishment. His admission destroys all the force of his argument.

We hear again the old remark, that sin done here, influences men after the death of the sinner; and yet he *admits*, that after repentance, previous sin is not judged, or punished. Therefore, as shown before, the remark passes for nothing; it has no force at all.

In regard to the agreement of mind among Christians. He agrees very well, to be sure! with all other sects, and with mine; for he will not admit them nor us to the Lord's Supper! Now if the Church of Christ be thus divided here, and we undergo no moral change after death, how can they commune together with the Lord in heaven? That has not been answered. I put the question again.

There is no concert among the professors of Christianity. Perhaps Mr. Waller may be more benevolent than others; but you all do know that the professed Christian Church is a scene of *strife of mind with mind*. They do not dwell together in peace: they cannot after death, unless morally changed in heart and mind.

The anecdote of John Newton—with his mother's influence—was all well enough, but the prayers of his mother did not affect him till he was in middle life. Now as an illustration of what I have before said, suppose this poor woman had sinned before death; according to the Orthodox views, she would have gone to Judgment as a sinner, and consequently to *Hell*, notwithstanding all her previous good works! This would be a necessary consequence of the state of mind in which she died, and not according to her general works on the earth.

We have quoted here the passage, "avenge not yourselves; vengeance is mine, saith the Lord." Here is the difficulty of this passage, according to the Orthodox doctrine: a man may *not* be avenged. He may *escape all punishment*, by repentance. That was the difficulty with regard to the man that stole the hay; who said, if he was not to pay for it till the judgment, he would take another bundle! Hence Mr. Waller himself does *not* believe that declaration.

*Gehenna and Tartarus in Hades.* We have here the denial of Mr. Waller as to that. Mr. Greenfield has been repeated to us as Orthodox authority on this point. What he says has been understood.

MR. WALLER rose to explain. I stated that with learned men, when they spoke of *Hades* as a place of punishment, might speak of *Tartarus* or *Gehenna* as a part of it. Where he states that I said they *were* in Hades, I said only they *might* be.

MR. PINGREE. Let that pass. According to the learned of the Orthodox, there are *two* Hells. I have proved this on the authority of Greenfield, Kenrick, George Campbell, and others, that *Tartarus* and *Gehenna* are departments *in Hades*. Greenfield says that *Tartarus* was supposed to be the place of punishment in *Hades*, and makes it equivalent to *Gehenna*. You may recollect my remarks us to the doom of *Hades*, proving that it shall be *destroyed*, with the Hells *within* it!

As to "human language," words changing their meanings, the New Testament being written in a Pagan language, there is no difference between us. But the question between us, is, Did the Sacred Writers use Pagan words in a Pagan sense?

How are the words, *Hades* and *Tartarus* borrowed from the Pagan notion? They had *Tartarus*, and *Elysium*, or *Paradise*, or *Abraham's bosom*. If the Sacred Writers used these words with the acceptation common to Pagans, the Gospel reveals *nothing new* as to the future place of punishment. It simply adopts the Pagan notions. If they did not adopt the Pagan notions, by employing Pagan language, then Mr. Waller's argument and affected ridicule as to my views of human language, all go for nothing. Christianity is Paganism; or else Mr. Waller's labor is all lost. That is all I propose to say in reference to this last speech of Waller.

I will now proceed briefly to recapitulate the arguments throughout this discussion. I have about one hour, but I may not occupy the whole of my time.

After some preliminary remarks upon the origin of this discussion, and defining the terms of the proposition, I proceeded to draw my first argument in favor of the proposition that *the Scriptures teach the ultimate holiness and happiness of all men, from the nature of GOD, his character, attributes, and relationship to men*. I showed he was "the FATHER of our spirits;" that, as John says, "God is LOVE;" that God, as David says, "is GOOD unto ALL;" and, as the Savior says, is "KIND even to the evil and unthankful:" that though he *punishes*, it is for our *good*! That he is a Being of Goodness and Love, and that his unfailing goodness is over all his works FOREVER; that this forbids the idea of *perpetual* perdition and torture being the lot of any of God's creatures.

The *reply* to this was, that if God punishes sin in this life, he will punish it *hereafter*. In answer, it was shown that there is a great difference between *temporal* punishments, inflicted for the *benefit* of the sufferer, and ENDLESS TORMENTS, resulting in no good. Parents, to be sure, should punish their children; but for their benefit. If a parent should take his own child and torture him *through life*, it would be monstrous! The first is according to Universalism; the last is according to Partialism.

My second argument was from Romans viii. 21. "Because the creature itself, [that is the human CREATION] shall be *delivered* from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God;" in connection with what Paul says to the Hebrews, "destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them, who through fear of death have all their life time been subject to bondage."

To this second argument, Mr. Waller has replied the first passage, is confined to *the saints*; but if so, it must be confined to the *Roman* saints, whom he was addressing, and not the *saints now*—Mr. Waller and others! But this has no force, because the Apostle afterwards *distinguishes* between the "creation" and the saints;—"and not they *only* but *we* also," embracing ALL, saints and sinners. So the argument remains firm, and has not been, and cannot be wrested out of the hands of the Universalists. The passage in Hebrews, has not been noticed at all.

My third argument was from Romans v. The Apostle argues, that because all have sinned, it is necessary that a *Savior* should come; and concludes that they all should become righteous, be justified, live, and be saved. The argument is this: as "many" as have sinned, will "be made righteous;" and so be saved, be they *more or less*. If there are any that are not to be saved, they are those that have not sinned. But all have sinned, and the same all are to enjoy this blessing; that is, according to the force of antithesis in the Apostle's argument.

My fourth argument was from Col. i. 20: the *reconciliation* of all to God. He says it applies only to the SAINTS; because addressed to the Church of Colossos. If restricted at all, then it must be restricted to the *Colossian* saints. But Christ was to reconcile ALL—"the WORLD," to God; and even the saints were sinners, *before* they were reconciled. If all are reconciled, then all shall be saved. This is the doctrine of universal salvation. God will not *damn* those who are reconciled to him, but will save them. It is his purpose thus to save them; and his purposes are not to be frustrated. The promise is of reconciliation, and consequently, of salvation to all men—to the WORLD.

5. The fifth argument was drawn from 1 Tim. ii. 4, and iv. 10: where it is said to be God's WILL that all men

should be saved; and that God "is the Savior of all men, especially of those that believe."

There are two sorts of salvation; that of the immortal state, which is a common gift to ALL, and that which is specially enjoyed by believers in this life. Says Paul "We are saved, now, by hope." "He that believeth not is condemned, or damned, *already*," says the Savior. Beyond them both, is the *ultimate* salvation of all men. They "shall be DELIVERED from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God;" and shall be "as the angels of God in Heaven," clothed upon with immortality, incorruption, and glory.

The only reply to this was that *men sin now*, and therefore they cannot all be saved. Partialists differ among themselves as to the doctrine of endless damnation. We say that *here* men are "made subject to vanity;" but that "grace shall much more abound than the offence;" and that, *finally*, all will be saved. Some of the Orthodox say that God will have *some* to be saved, and will be able to accomplish his will with regard to these; (this is the Calvinist.) Others say that God would *like* to have all saved, but *cannot effect it*; (this is the Arminian.) Therefore God, in this latter case, must possess, if unchangeable, an *eternally ungratified desire!*

My sixth argument was founded upon the doctrine of the *resurrection*, as declared by the Savior to the Sadducees, in Matt. xxii., and Luke xx.; and by Paul to the Corinthians, in the 15th chapter of the 1st Epistle. Paul says, "as ALL die in Adam, so shall ALL be made alive in Christ." But "*how?*" the question is asked; "and *with what body* shall they rise?" He then proceeds to say that they shall rise with an incorruptible body, immortal, in power and GLORY. The Savior says they shall "be as the ANGELS OF GOD IN HEAVEN." Mr. Waller asserts that all these declarations relate to the Christians alone; and quotes St. Paul's language, "we," and "us," etc., in connection, to prove it. But this argument has no bearing on *general doctrines*, like that of the resurrection, as before declared; because, if restricted in that manner, it would by the same logic apply to the Corinthians *only*, whom he was addressing. Neither Mr. Waller nor any of us here present could derive any benefit from it. We should have no hope of the resurrection, upon such a rule of construc-

tion. Then the argument is absurd, in restricting it to the Christians whom he was addressing; because the other passage, "WE shall all appear before the *Judgment seat* of Christ," would by the same rule be restricted to those whom he addressed—the *saints*,—and not apply to the whole world. But that passage has been quoted as a proof that *all the world* shall be JUDGED. Again, the passage, "How shall WE escape, if WE neglect so great salvation?" and so all those passages quoted. Mankind in general have nothing to do with them, if Mr. Waller's rule be adopted; only the saints, living at that time.

Then there was an argument attempted to be founded on the use of the Greek particle *ek*, in the language of the Savior to the Sadducees; as if that *restricted* the number to be raised and made "as the Angels of God." I showed you Paul's declaration, "as in Adam ALL die, even so in Christ shall ALL be made alive." Christ himself says, "ALL live unto" God, in relation to this resurrection to a glorious condition. I showed that this particle *ek* could not stand between us and Heaven. I showed the plain declarations of our Savior, and showed that they referred to *all men*, to all who die, whether more or less.

My seventh argument was that we find in the Bible, that *all the enemies* of man shall finally be *destroyed*, even to "THE LAST," which is death, for Jesus is to "take away the SIN OF THE WORLD;" the DEVIL and all his WORKS, and HELL, and finally DEATH itself, are to be destroyed. To this there was no reply. The argument stands unrefuted, irrefutable. All men will finally be forever *free* from all enemies,—sin, misery, death, hell,—every one; and consequently all *saved*, all *happy*. We need fear no enemy beyond death, for Paul calls that "THE LAST!"

These are the seven principal arguments that I have presented in favor of the proposition in controversy. They may be called seven pillars of the temple of universal salvation. I have incidentally adduced others, which are as follows, and may be numbered as the others.

8. The promise of God to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that he would BLESS in their seed—Jesus Christ—"all the nations, and kindreds, and families of the earth." Peter says that this promise is to be performed by turning them away from their *iniquities*. And this promise has been confirmed by the solemn OATH of Almighty God himself; it



cannot fail. The blessing was shown as above, to be *salvation* a deliverance from sin. To this there was no reply.

9. There is a promise of the *SUBJECTION* of all things to Christ, in xv. Corinthians, at the time of the resurrection; and that then Christ would surrender his authority to God, that God may be "ALL IN ALL." To this we have had no distinct reply.

10. The *purpose* of God is expressed in Paul's letter to the Ephesians to *gather together ALL* in ONE unto Christ, Eph. i. 10: "That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth; even in him. I do not recollect having any reply to this.

11. Next I presented the last verse of Romans xi. "For of him, and through him," that is to God, "are ALL THINGS, to whom be glory forever, Amen." Here the doctrine is not expressed by the *word*, "salvation," or holiness, but that all shall return to God. Consequently, all shall be happy; or else those who are *with God* must be miserable.

12. Then Christ says, "If I be lifted up, I will *draw all men* unto me;" and those that come, shall not be cast out. That is universal salvation.

13. Again; "Every knee shall bow, and every tongue *confess* that Jesus is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. ii. 9, 10. This cannot be, until all are purified, become holy and happy. Then they will make the joyful confession, and God will be glorified.

14. The next argument is founded on the declaration of Peter in Acts iii., "Of the *restitution of all things* spoken of by God's holy prophets."

15. Then Jesus Christ says, "Not one jot nor one tittle shall pass from the law; till all be fulfilled;" that is, till all men are brought to love God and each other; for "Love is the fulfilling of the law;" and then "God," who is LOVE, "will be ALL IN ALL!"

16. My next argument was that the happiness of the *saved*, requires the salvation of *all men*. Now if the common doctrine be true, that there is no change after death, and the good are made miserable by the sufferings of others *here*, they will experience great suffering in knowing or witnessing the torments of the damned hereafter. If they experience no moral change, they will, while in Heaven, be made miserable, by the groans and cries of despair of

the damned, crying from Hell for help and mercy. They never can be happy, while this lasts, though they be right by the throne of God; if there is no moral change after death. Thus the happiness of the saved, requires the salvation of all.

This is the fair, and beautiful, and most glorious TEMPLE of universal salvation, whose foundations are in Scripture, fact, and reason; whose builder is the Holy God, the Author of our great salvation, who will effect the ultimate holiness and happiness of all his creatures. All sin will pass away, and all temptation. All will be pure, holy, and happy, and saved in the immortal state. These promises are the joy of those here who hold this faith. It leads them to adore the goodness of the Creator, and to love one another as brethren. Hearer! will you not enter into this heavenly temple, and rejoice even now, in all its light, and life, and glory?

Opposed to this is the system of ENDLESS DAMNATION—of endless sin and rebellion against God, with cursings and blasphemies of millions without number, of wretches enduring “Hell horrors” to all eternity. It is not true, says this system, that God and the Savior will destroy the Devil; but that he is, and will ever remain within the government of God, as an enemy—an arch-adversary, who will claim the largest and most powerful kingdom, and hold it to all eternity; in spite of God and the Savior; in spite of the Holy Spirit and all the powers of Heaven; having, in short, absolute spiritual sway over by far the greatest part of God’s moral universe. The powers of evil, says this system, have been in successful rebellion against the powers of good, and will be forever able to maintain their ascendancy; so that the creatures of God’s hand, whom he loves and wills to save, are by violence *snatched from Him*, and made devils of, to curse and blaspheme his holy name, and yell in the tortures of Hell, to all eternity; being wholly in the power of the devil.

And this system is for the *glory of God*; is it?! It was for his glory, that this kingdom of endless pain, despair, and blasphemy was permitted, and the monarchy of the universe divided with the enemy! But sin is said to be contrary to the will of God: and yet it is said he will *perpetuate* it, to all eternity! This is one of the horrible absurdities of Partialism. No, it is Universalism that glori-

fies God, representing all his will to be accomplished; while Partialism glorifies the Devil!!

I am now prepared to recapitulate Mr. Waller's principal arguments, and my replies to them. There were various remarks made, which I look upon as being the— (I hardly know how to term it.) Though such remarks and insinuations make but little impression; yet they evince an *affected* superiority in those who hold the Partialist system, and particularly my friend, Mr. Waller, over Universalists, and especially over his present opponent. He has been insinuating continually about "a little learning being a dangerous thing;" and that I have but little, while he by implication, has "*drank deep* of the Pierian spring," etc.; also that while "in deep water, little boats must keep near shore;" and declaring that I know nothing of the doctrine he holds, and that I have not read enough, etc.; and expressing how he has been *disappointed* in the ability of his antagonist, and all that; and about Quixotic adventures, etc. These are the only things I have found unpleasant during the discussion. I have made no *pretensions* to learning or great talents, here or elsewhere. I would rather the discussion had gone forth without these things, and let all judge of the ability of the arguments, by the arguments themselves, and not by the great display of learning by the speakers. Mr. Waller is doubt a great scholar, and a worthy opponent of the doctrine of universal salvation. *Thus* will I speak of *him*.

The first argument he made was in the assertion that the "MASS of well regulated minds," in all ages and countries, have been believers in eternal punishment; and that those who believed in universal salvation were few and inconsiderable. You will recollect the reply I made to this argument. The mass of mankind may be mistaken. Majorities are not always right; but on the contrary are generally *wrong* in matters of religious belief. The same reasoning would extinguish light in the world always, and on all subjects; and stop all PROGRESS. Moreover, in the proposition before us, the *appeal* is NOT to the *mass of men's* OPINIONS, but to the SCRIPTURES.

He next said our doctrine was of modern origin; but I proved that the doctrine of the ultimate salvation of all mankind was believed from the earliest ages of the church, by Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Gregory Nazianzen,

and others, until it was condemned by the 5th Council as heretical; and not till then was the doctrine of strictly ENDLESS damnation settled to be the dogma of the Church as such. He said that MODERN Universalism, as he calls it, was a new thing; that Hosea Ballou was the author of it, and that it originated in the year 1818. But I showed that it was advocated a long time before the life-time of Mr. Ballou. A book was written two hundred years ago, by one Richardson, in which he denied all future punishment, on Scripture grounds.

He next argued upon the *cruelty* of universal salvation, in making men suffer all they deserved for their sins; and said that we admitted of no pardoning mercy in the Savior. He dwelt upon the "demon cruelty," and the "malignity" of Universalism. It is incomprehensible to us where the "demon cruelty" of the doctrine of universal salvation lies. But for present purposes, it is sufficient to say that while it teaches that God inflicts certain and inevitable punishment upon sin here, for the *benefit* of the sinner, it teaches also that all mankind are to be *delivered* from the bondage of vanity and sin, and made holy and happy hereafter. My friend, Mr. Waller, thinks there is "demon cruelty" in this; while a doctrine which teaches that the greater part of God's creatures are brought into the world to be driven through it in a state of suffering and sin, and thence into a world of endless torment, while a few only are selected as the subjects of God's favor, has no cruelty in it, but is the perfection of benevolence and goodness!!

Then he maintained that Christ suffered as a SUBSTITUTE for all men; notwithstanding which the greater part are yet to suffer the sentence of endless torment in their own proper persons! Thus a DOUBLE damnation is inflicted: first upon the SUBSTITUTE, and then upon the sinner HIMSELF. As if the judge in a civil court, should accept a substitute and hang him, and then hang the criminal too! This is not common cruelty, but a DOUBLE cruelty!! or JUSTICE, as it is called!

Remarks were made with regard to forgiveness, the putting away of sins, remitting claims after they were paid, and punishing first fully, then forgiving the sinner, etc. But I *proved* from the Bible, that the sinner could be first punished sufficiently, and then be forgiven, as was the case with the man in Corinth; as to whom the Apostle declares

that having been "sufficiently" punished, he must now be *forgiven*. The ridicule of Mr. Waller falls therefore upon the Bible, and not upon Universalists.

He charged upon us that we denied the use of words in their common sense. This was explained by the force of the words in Scripture applicable to punishment and forgiveness. Sin is really referred to by the Scriptures as a *disease*, to be *cleansed, purified, and purged away* by punishment and the presentation of powerful motives. They do not put away deserved punishment. God says, "I will by *no means* clear the guilty;" and "the wicked shall *not* be unpunished." Yet here Mr. Waller says God *will* clear the guilty, and under some circumstances, let him go unpunished, which is a flat contradiction of God's Word.

He referred to the words of Christ, respecting the sin against the Holy Spirit, as a proof that there was one sin, at least, which would NEVER be pardoned, to all eternity. The declaration of our Savior is, that *all manner* of sin shall be *forgiven* unto men, but that this sin shall not be forgiven "neither in this world, nor in the *world to come*." Is not this a plain intimation that *some sins may* be forgiven in the future life? Thus his view of the passage, referring it to the future life, demonstrably establishes the Romish *Purgatory!* But the "world to come"—THEN "to come," was the AGE to come.

Next come his "Twelve Facts" and Twelve Assumptions." It is not necessary for me to notice these at this time.

He next contrasts Jesus Christ's Sermon on the Mount, with the alleged language which he says Universalists would use; substituting the *wicked* for the *righteous*, and the *unbeliever* for the *believer*, as our doctrine. This has been sufficiently denied, that we save the wicked and unbeliever, *as such*. We say they will all be made **RIGHTEOUS**, and then *thus* they are saved, of course. All this paraphrasing of that language, in the meaning he attaches to it, passes for nothing. It is entirely aside of the question, and is a miserable misrepresentation of our views.

He quotes the passage that "no murderer hath eternal life," etc. But I showed that he believes *some* murderers *will* be saved; and the same of other sinners. So these passages should not be brought to bear on the condition of men in a future life. They are not believed by Mr. Wal-

ler himself, in that sense, so as to exclude every murderer. If so, then these passages are no proof of the endless perdition of any human soul.

He then objects to the doctrine of present punishment, Sin does not punish itself in this life, he say.

MR. WALLER. I did not say that sin did not punish itself in this life. I said there was not a perfect retribution in this life.

MR. PINGREE. The very expressions he has referred to, as proof of punishment hereafter, show that the punishment was in *this life*: that it is confined to the present state of existence.

Although it may be asserted that punishment was not all inflicted at some *particular period of time*; yet this is no evidence of its not being fully inflicted, finally, in this life.

I referred also to the passage in Hebrews: "Every transgression RECEIVED [the time was then past,] a JUST [not a partial] recompense of reward." Then again, the punishment of the wicked is said, in some places, to be *already accomplished*. As where a Sacred Writer says, "The punishment of my people IS ACCOMPLISHED;" referring to *time then past*. If the punishment was NOT perfectly accomplished, the fault was in the government of God, or else the Sacred Writers uttered an untruth.

Proverbs xi. 31: "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed *in the earth*: much more the wicked and the sinner." This passage has been said to be quoted by Peter, as follows: 1 Peter iv. 18: "And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" and this was quoted as a proof of endless punishment hereafter. But I showed that Peter establishes our principle; for he says in the verse immediately preceding, (1 Peter iv. 17,) "For the time IS COME—*then come*—that judgment must begin at the house of God." The time had *then come*, he says. The punishment, therefore, of the "ungodly and the sinner," in the verse following, is NOT in the future life: it had commenced then. In either case, then, it teaches *present* rewards and punishments; while the future life is the *gift* of God, and not a reward;—whether we read it according to the version in the Old Testament, or in the New.

Mr. Waller has referred to the passage that speaks of "the *sorer* punishment" of men under the Gospel dispen-

sation. I showed that this was in "the *great tribulation*—such as never was before," spoken of by Christ. But what is the Gospel for? "Is the law against the promises? God forbid!" says an Apostle. Men were judged by the law, during the present life. But the Gospel goes *beyond* that—the Gospel as given to Abraham. It goes to "BLESS ALL NATIONS." They shall be "judged by the law;" yet all shall be blessed at a future time. I demand the place where punishment was said to be ENDLESS, according to "the law." I call his attention to the fact that they were to be "judged by the *law*." And it would be unjust and monstrous, to inflict ENDLESS TORTURE, when that law does not call for it.

Again; it is said, "They that sin *without* law, shall *perish* without law." According to that idea, if there be no moral change after death, all Pagans are inevitably *lost*; if "perdition," in this place, is endless damnation. They are all sinful; they are idolaters, and depraved. They will therefore be damned endlessly. So idiots are said to be depraved. So all the saints who do not die in a right condition of heart. For they say the condition of heart at death determines the immortal destiny. It has been admitted that infants are saved. How saved, if there is no change after death? If it were so, a good mother must *destroy* her infants, if she wishes them not to be damned endlessly; because if they grow up, they must sin, and perhaps be damned!

Mr. Waller said as to the change after death, spoken of in the Bible, it was only a change of *body*—of the flesh. All have this change then. The wicked put off the flesh as well as the righteous. Do they not put off its sinful *influences* also? The same argument will apply to both. They will be relieved from temptation, "the flesh, and the Devil," and all the causes which interfere between the spirit and holiness, and purity, and heaven. It is enough of a change for that purpose, to change the body, according to Mr. Waller's admission.

Next was introduced the doctrine of the *coming of Jesus Christ*. I showed from Scripture, that his first coming was to proclaim his Gospel, and suffer and die, and rise again for the good of man. His "second" appearance was in power and glory to *fully establish* his kingdom, and was to have been in that "generation"—within the life-

time of some whom he addressed. James said "It draweth nigh," in his time. To John it was said, "I come *quickly*." Paul says, that some were living who would see it; there was to be "a falling away first;" but the mystery of iniquity had *already* begun to work. If I understand the passages correctly, all corroborate each other; and there is no contradiction. Both say it was not then far off; and "the mystery of iniquity" I account for by the early corruptions of Christ's Gospel, which began to appear in the Church, through pagan philosophy, and which led to the grand error of endless damnation, and all its train of errors.

We come now to speak of the *doctrine of Judgment*. Universalists say that the judgment under Christ commenced when the kingdom of God was established on earth, at his second coming; and that men are judged all the time during their life-time, under his reign, and "according to their *works*." While the contrary doctrine is that their fate depends upon the state of mind they are in at the moment of *death*; which contradicts the doctrine that men are judged "according to their *works*." There is to be a coming of Christ at the resurrection. It is a personal coming; at *that* time there is not said to be any judgment; but all men are to be raised to glory. The judgment is to *terminate* in the universal salvation of men, at the time God has determined to raise the dead. No judgment *after* that; it *ceases* then.

**PUNISHMENT:** Mr. Waller says it is just in God to punish *before* the general judgment. He says the object of the delay is that the sins committed may work all the evil they can, before the final trial. But yet he admits that those who have sinned most, and whose works remain doing evil on earth, may have repented before death, and they will *not* be judged for their works, after all. So those who have done *well*—as Newton's mother, for instance, but die in their sins, will not be rewarded for their good works. This admission *sets aside* all that argument for men being punished before they are finally judged. Mr. Waller says Tom Paine used this argument. What if he did? I do not recollect ever seeing it in his works. He may have used the same idea; but was it necessary for him to insinuate that I *borrowed* it from Tom Paine? Mr. Waller presents nothing new. Suppose I say to him, you



"borrow" from such and such a writer. I care not what source the argument comes from, if it is a good one, and irrefutable.

We next noticed the passages in Daniel, John, and 22d of Revelations. He says they relate to the "just dead, and unjust dead." I showed that the *dead* have no character at all; that in the grave there is "no wisdom, no knowledge, and no device," and that they "know not *anything*; nor have any more *reward*."

Paul "HOPEd," *desired*, expected the resurrection of the dead, *just and unjust*. Could he HOPE the resurrection of men to endless sinning, blasphemy, and damnation?! If so, he would be worse than Tertullian, who said "how I shall *laugh!* how rejoice! how exult! to see the tortures and agony of the damned!" He HOPEd for it, because he looked for them to rise in glory, sinless and pure. Those passages in John v. and Daniel xii., I showed had marks of the time at which what was predicted was to happen; a time *short* of the general resurrection; and referring to the scattering of the holy people—and the troubles—"the tribulation," to come upon men, in this life. In the 5th of John it is said "the time *now is*"—*then WAS*—when "the *dead* should hear the voice of the Son of God." It referred not to the resurrection of the literally dead; but those in ignorance, darkness, or sin.

On the use of the word, "GRAVES," in this place, it is metaphorical. Persons are said to be in their "graves" who were in *captivity*, and still living. That word does not establish the application of these threatenings to the literally dead. Besides, the literally dead are in *Hades*, another word from the one here rendered "graves."

The argument from the use of the word "*fire*," as representing punishment, I showed that those expressions apply to *this life*, and not to the immortal state. Sodom and Gomorrah were burned by fire; yet that did not relate to eternity. The use of the word *fire* does not, can not prove endless punishment in a future life by fire; even though it is called "everlasting fire." We are said to be "*purged*" by fire. It is applied to things saved; as things are purified by fire.

His readings of Scripture, substituting the *love* of God for the *anger* of God—the *fierce love* of God for the *fierce wrath* of God, and calling a fierce fire a fierce blessing, etc.

falls harmless upon my position. It is only a ridiculing of the Scriptures; for they teach that we are "saved so as by FIRE;" Mr. Waller's attempt to ridicule the idea, to the contrary, notwithstanding.

Next we have the sufferings of the righteous in this life. He speaks of the oppressor and the oppressed meeting in heaven; and attacks Universalism on that account. I showed that on his theory, there was more chance for the oppressor going to heaven, than the oppressed. The one has wealth, education, society, and is in the way of possessing every advantage to enlighten his mind and learn the truth, unto repentance, while the other is often poor, ignorant, neglected, down-trodden, and in the way of becoming vicious; so that the former may go to heaven, and the latter to Hell, on his theory. After oppressing and persecuting his victim on earth, and perhaps being the means of driving him to Hell, the oppressor may, after death, have the pleasure of *exulting* and *gloating* over the poor wretches' sufferings in ETERNAL TORTURE!!

The reply is of no consequence, about bringing the holy and wicked together, hereafter. I show it to be the *glory* of the Gospel to bring those who hate, to love; so that, finally, there will be *none wicked*. This, I repeat, is the glory of Christianity, to accomplish this; and yet Mr. Waller attempts to ridicule the idea!

That Hell or *Hades* is a place of punishment, he says is proved by the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus; and he says that no other parable can be found based on fiction or falsehood.

MR. WALLER. I said that our Savior would not use a parable based on that which *could not exist*.

MR. PINGREE. The argument supposes that *Hades* embraced Tartarus; and that Tartarus was a place of future punishment, and was used by the Savior in the same sense as used by the Jews at that time; for the argument is founded on this assertion. Christ is made therefore to adopt only the Pagan *Hades*, if used as they used it;—the Jews having learned it from them, and if not, there is no force in the argument.

*Sheol* and *Hades* mean *literally* only the state of the dead, good and bad. It is the state of unconsciousness and sleep, and the associations of darkness and gloom are always connected with the grave. When used *figuratively*,

it means *moral* darkness and degradation and gloom; and in that sense is applied to the condition of those men who are in this life punished for their sins; as David says: "The pains of Hell gat hold upon me—I found *trouble and sorrow*." This was Hell to him, but endured *here*, and not in the immortal state. When used *literally*, it does not represent suffering;—only when used *figuratively*, relative to this life; the figure is drawn from death and the grave.

As to *Gehenna*, it relates to the temporal calamities of the Jewish people,—not particularly to being buried alive in the valley of Hinnom—but to great tribulations and calamities to be endured *in this life*, as shown by an appeal to the language of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Savior himself. Neither word, then,—*Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus*, or *Gehenna*,—refers to what is to be after the resurrection in a future state. Each word, so far as *punishment* is expressed by it, is confined to this life.

Next we have a discussion on the words "everlasting," "forever," "eternal," etc. Granting all that he asks, for argument's sake, I showed that these words were often applied to things of *limited* duration. And Mr. Waller admits this. If not, he would be compelled to be a *Jew*, and offer sacrifices, as under the old "*statute*," said to be "*everlasting*;" or else, he would contradict and *dethrone God*, by his being a Christian, according to what he has said of Universalist views. What then is my argument? That *everlasting* does *never* mean *eternal*? not that. I do not say that it CANNOT; but I say it is *not necessarily so*, from *these words being applied to it, which we know are applied to things not endless*; and then from *other sources* I prove that punishment is not endless.

"Fire unquenchable." Mr. Waller says we contradict Scripture by saying it may be quenched. The worm that never dies, we say does die, etc. I showed that we have both these terms applied in Scripture to things *began and ended* in this life. Fire, which was called "unquenchable," has gone out long ago. Apply the same argument to the passage in 34th of Isaiah, and last chapter of Isaiah. So the fire in 25th of Matthew; where it is said to be with "the Devil." There is an illustration of this in 1 Cor. v. in the case of the incestuous man who was delivered over to Satan, and received *sufficient punishment*; and yet that

was in the *present life*. So that form of expression does not refer to a future life. Besides, these things are connected with the coming of Jesus Christ, which was to be within that generation, the life-time of those then living.

On the sufferings of Jesus Christ, he charges me with being ignorant of the Orthodox doctrine of atonement. I say if Christ suffered *in the stead* of sinners, then all are to be saved, unless monstrous injustice is done. That is *universal salvation*; or else God desires a *double vengeance!* Jesus Christ suffering our punishment first, then we suffer it *over again* afterward!—double damnation!!

We next hear about the unequal distribution of rewards and punishments in this life. Here I quoted Ezekiel, who said they *were* equal, in opposition to the doctrine of the gentleman, and the wicked people living in Ezekiel's time.

*When and where* are all men to enjoy this universal salvation? Mr. Waller asks. The Bible does not tell, precisely; neither does my proposition require me to tell.—Salvation is the "*ultimate*" condition of all men.

One thought more on this subject. If there is no change after death, will not the wicked be *happy* in Hell? for Mr. Waller has said they are happy *here*. There they will have their boon companions, continue sinful, and so be happy even in Hell; that is, if the wicked man is happy here, as Mr. Waller has asserted, and there is no moral change after death. In this case even, we have UNIVERSAL HAPPINESS, if not universal *salvation*.

Allow me to return my sincere thanks to the audience, for the good order and feeling which they have manifested during this discussion. We have not had to witness strife among our hearers, but there has been a good tone of feeling throughout.

I thank the Moderators for their presence and attention, though they have not been called on for a decision of any point, during the discussion.

I tender my thanks.

[MR. WALLER'S LAST REPLY.]

We have now arrived at the conclusion of the whole matter. Let us review the grounds passed over, and calmly survey the condition of things. We are now in possession of the whole strength of Universalism.. All that was possible for him to present, Mr. Pingree has presented.

He has not been straitened for time, and has had a patient hearing. And in justice to him and with perfect candor, I must be permitted to say, that he has fully sustained the character given of him to me by his brethren, as being one of the ablest advocates and defenders of their cause. Others perhaps might have been found, who would have been more adventurous—have entered upon the defence of matters which he has declined to defend. But his extreme caution has been his strength. While he has adroitly endeavoured to conceal the deformed features of his system, he has, with admirable tact and ability, presented whatever might appear pleasing and plausible about it. He has spoken for triumph; and if *he* has failed in his efforts to persuade you to embrace his sentiments, I believe no one else need attempt it. If Universalism has fallen it has been of its own weight, and because it cannot be sustained, however well defended. I have read much in its favor, and I know that Mr. Pingree has laid before you all that has any real claims to strength or ingenuity in the whole scheme. You then are in possession of Universalism with its reasons. Let us briefly examine it.

It is a remarkable fact, that while Mr. Pingree stood pledged before you, to prove from the Scriptures "the ultimate holiness and salvation of all men," he has not adduced the first passage that expressly sustained his proposition; or either part of it. He said that all men would ultimately be holy; but he cited no passage of the Bible which asserted it distinctly. He said that all men would be ultimately saved; but found no text that said so too! He made no attempt to sustain himself in this way, and was forced by the dire necessities of his cause, to make good his proposition, as well as he could, by *inference!* In a matter so weighty, involving the tremendous concerns of the soul in eternity, *inference*, to say the least of it, is a dangerous and hazardous mode of arriving at conclusions. These *inferences* were at first seven, he called them *seven pillars*, corresponding, as he assured us, to seven pillars in some temple of wisdom! He afterwards added another, and these were all, as he assured us. In his summary, however, this morning, he enumerated *fourteen!* But he made this number by *splitting* the original pillars! They are all comprehended, in fact, in his first *inferences*. We now call your attention to them in order:

1st. He **INFERRED** the ultimate holiness and salvation of all men, in the first place, from the nature and character of God, and his relations to men; He was good, his nature was love, and he was the father of our spirits.

I showed, in reply, that this proved too much for Universalism, which, in logic, is the same as proving nothing at all. For, according to Universalism, God decreed all the sin and misery of this life, and decreed it too, in love and for the good of mankind. It asserts also that God is unchangable; and consequently the same love and goodness would perpetuate sin and misery, world without end, unless God annulled his decree and changed his plan of benevolence, which is all one as to assert that his character has changed! So that Universalism, instead of the ultimate holiness and salvation of all men, proves the very reverse! We proved also, that punishment was founded in justice and righteousness, and of course in love. So that instead of the nature and character of God and his relations to men subverting the doctrine of future punishment, it was established by them.

It was further showed, that while Universalism asserted that God was love, and that he was merciful and kind, for the sake of an argument; yet it did not hold really any such sentiment; but on the contrary taught that there was **no forgiveness** with God, as that word is understood in the language of men—that he would not *forgive* men their trespasses—that he visited on every man full and adequate punishment for every transgression! That though sinners should repent, and the Son of God intercede, yet God would sternly exact the utmost farthing for their sins.

And thus this pillar of Universalism was demolished! And thus ended his first speech and his first argument; his time not being filled out!

2nd. His second **INFERENCE** was from Romans viii. 18—21. But as he utterly failed to show from the passage that the earnest expectation of *all men* waited for the manifestation of the sons of God; as he did not attempt to prove, and as it was utterly impossible to prove, had the attempt been made, that infants, idiots, infidels, atheists, pagans, etc., etc. have any expectations on the subject, or waited for any such manifestation, this whole inference, “like the baseless fabric of a vision,” vanished into air—thin air.

3d. His third INFERENCE was founded on Romans v. 12, etc. But when I inquired and pressed him to give an explicit answer—*whether he believed in the fall of man? that sin had come upon all men in consequence of Adam's transgression? and whether he did not believe that men now possessed the same character as when created?* he gave no response. The inquiry remains unanswered; leaving the impression that he does not believe the doctrine of the fall of man. Indeed; on his second proposition, he frequently and emphatically quoted, "*The creature was made subject to vanity,*" apparently to prove that man was created as he now is. How then could the declaration, "as by the offence of one Judgment came upon all men unto condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life"—prove Mr. Pingree's doctrine, when he does not believe that all are in condemnation by the offence of one, and when he utterly repudiates the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ? And especially too, since it is declared in the same connection, that this gift of God is "THROUGH RIGHTEOUSNESS, [not through sin,] unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord?" This inference then utterly failed him!

4th. This INFERENCE was drawn from 2 Cor. v. 19: "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself." But I showed that the school of Universalism of which Mr. Pingree was a disciple, taught that "all the evils from which Christ came to save men were in this life;" that he "came into the world to save men from the evil thereof," and therefore, this text, to suit his purpose, must prove that all men are reconciled to God in this life! which is alike abhorrent to reason, to revelation, and to common sense. But granting his system contended that this reconciliation was brought about in the life to come, I demanded whether it was effected by means of the gospel, or by some other means? To this inquiry he admitted he could give no answer, and insisted he was not bound to give any! So his own inference, by his own confession, drifted him into an ocean without a bottom, and without a shore; on which he was tempest-tossed, in the gloom and darkness of profound ignorance, without a rudder or a compass! It was further shown from the context, that the work of reconciliation was committed to the disciples; for the remainder of the verse says, "and hath committed unto us

the word of reconciliation." And we demanded to be informed whether, after death, this word was still in the hands of the disciples? Or whether the work of reconciliation took place there without faith? And if so, how? And if *by faith*, how could they believe in him of whom they had not heard? And if they heard, how could they hear without a preacher? And who preached to them there? To these questions, Mr. Pingree absolutely refused to reply; admitting again that his system led him wholly beyond the light of revelation, far into the regions of chaos and night! And thus this inferential pillar of Universalism was lost in the thick clouds of darkness, utterly beyond the ken of the mind's eye!

5th. His fifth INFERENCE was drawn from 1. Tim., ii. 4: "Who will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth." He alleged that God's will must be done—that he would do all his pleasure, and none could hinder him. This, I also demonstrated, proved too much. For Mr. Pingree had no right to INFER that this "will" extended only to another life. That it was true of this world. Besides, Universalism affirmed that Christ came to save men from this present evil world. That, therefore, this text proved, according to Universalism, that all men are saved here! that all men have the knowledge of the truth here!!

Besides; it is the will of God that no man should blaspheme; for he has said to every one, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," therefore, according to Mr. Pingree's reasoning on the will of God, no man can take the name of the Lord in vain. It is God's will that no one should worship idols, for he wrote with his own hand, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" *ergo*, says Mr. Pingree, there are no idolaters! His will is that none should lie; for he has said, "Thou shalt not bear false witness;" therefore none do lie! It is the will of the Lord, that none should murder, for he has said "thou shalt not kill;" therefore no man ever took the life of his fellow man! His will is that all men should love Him supremely, and each other as themselves; and therefore all do love him supremely and their neighbors as themselves!!

Verily, Universalism is a most splendid scheme—in theory. For it not only proposes to save all men hereafter,



but makes them as pure as the law of God in this world! demonstrates that no one of the innumerable millions of men who have inhabited the earth ever committed a sin; and shows that it is utterly impossible for sin to be committed by any of the millions who may flourish hereafter! Aye, proves that there never was such a thing as sin!—that it is a sheer chimera!! The radical defect in the scheme is, that it is ALL THEORY!—it is all shadowy vapor, as impalpable to the touch of common sense as the ghosts of Fingal! IT IS A MONSTROUS FALSEHOOD!—an *ignis fatuus* of Hell, dancing in the quagmires of murky imaginations to delude men of their souls!

Under this inference he quoted also 1 Tim. iv. 10: He “is the Savior of all men, but especially of those that believe.” I showed from one of his own writers, that this *special* or greater salvation was confined to this life; and therefore, the *general* or less salvation cannot extend to the life to come. Through Jesus are received all the blessings of life, and of these all men partake. This is the common salvation.

6th. He next INFERRED his doctrine, because as he said, the enemies of all men were to be destroyed. And his arguments under this head were most unique. Because the Apostle declared that temporal *death*, the last enemy of the Christian, should be destroyed, Mr. Pingree came to the strange and illogical conclusion, that there was no second death!—no destruction of both soul and body in hell!—no everlasting punishment!—no casting of the wicked into the lake of fire which is the second death!! His premises and conclusions were the poles asunder.

His effort at the destruction of the Devil was also a singular affair! He quoted a passage on the destruction of the *works* of the devil, and then in the true warrior pomp, he rose in all the grandeur of conquest, “his arm refulgent with the stroke of satan’s death, and bade the congregation hail! for lo! the devil prostrate in the dust! and man again is free!” It was really an achievement in the moral—not sublime, but *ridiculous*, beyond all language, and which defies all description. It reminded me of the old nursery ballad:—

“Some say the Devil’s dead  
And buried in a Pumpkin.”

In sober seriousness, I thought his rencounter with the

prince of darkness a very doughty affair; as purely fanciful as the renowned adventures of La Mancha's "Knight of the woeful countenance." It was all smoke, depend upon it, and this pillar of his system, the mere vapor of smoke!

7th. His next INFERENCE was founded upon 1 Cor. 15: This I showed could prove nothing for him, although he was pleased to call it, the "main pillar" of Universalism, —because the apostle was proving the resurrection of the *saints*, and therefore, not "the ultimate holiness and salvation of all men." We proved that the dead in Christ (and the apostle in this chapter was treating of such—of those who "were Christ's," and not of those who were not Christ's) should be raised before the wicked;—that those who should be accounted worthy to obtain Heaven, should be raised "out of" [*ek*] or "from among" the dead. That while the righteous should be raised to glory, the wicked should be raised to shame and everlasting contempt —that the righteous should come forth to the resurrection of life, and the wicked to the resurrection of damnation.

Instead of replying to the arguments and criticisms I advanced on the Savior's reply to the Saducees respecting the resurrection *from* [*ek—out of*] the dead, Mr. Pingree attempted to be facetious on my making so much, as he was pleased to say, of the *little word ek!* True, the word is short, *very short*, but is, nevertheless, a lever of sufficient length, aye, and of strength too, to overturn the whole system of Universalism. I grant this may be owing to the *emptiness* and want of gravity on the part of the system. That I leave Mr. Pingree philosophically to account for to his own satisfaction and at his earliest leisure. If our criticism be incorrect, then it follows, that when Lazarus arose, all the dead arose; and that when Christ arose, all the dead arose again; for both Lazarus and the Savior, the Scriptures tell us, arose *from* [*ek*] the dead. And if all the dead rose these several times, then Peter on the day of pentecost, though full of the Holy Ghost, committed an egregious blunder, in saying that "David is not ascended into the heavens! (Acts ii. 34.) The truth is, there was not a shadow of an attempt to overthrow this position. It stands as firm as the foundations of earth, and defies all assault.

But I proved conclusively that the xv. of 1 Corinthians

was inadequate to his doctrine, and utterly unappropriate to a cause like his. He asserted a moral change in the resurrection, this chapter proves only a physical change. His cause demands a change of soul after death; this chapter proves only a change of body! To urge a *moral* from a *physical* change, is about such an enterprize in ratiocination, as to urge that the sun, moon, and stars "adamantine spheres are wheeled through the void immense," by the ten commandments!

These seven INFERENCES, he called the SEVEN PILLARS of Universalism, and when he had finished them, he said, *his work was done!* He accomplished this in two days,—in just half the time he himself proposed to discuss the subject! But it was a *light* work, and no marvel then that it was so soon accomplished. And such pillars, forsooth! They remind one of the notion ascribed to some ancient geographers: That the world stands on the back of an elephant, and the elephant stands on *nothing!* Such pillars as these are insufficient to support a gossamer temple!—to uphold "trifles light as air!" And yet these are the pillars upon which he invites you to rest the mighty concerns of your immortal spirits! Beware! oh, beware! they will, *they must* give way; and let your souls fall into bottomless perdition!

8th. But Mr. Pingree himself seemed to distrust the ability of these pillars to sustain his temple, and accordingly on yesterday made another INFERENCE. It was the same distrust, I suppose, that induced him this morning to divide his pillars so as to make *fourteen*, concluding perhaps, that *numerical* would answer as a substitute for *intrinsic* strength. His eighth INFERENCE, as well as I could comprehend it, was something like this: The Savior said that not one jot or tittle of the law should fail, but that all should be fulfilled; and therefore all men must be conformed to the law. But he strangely forgot that the law had its penal sanctions: "The soul that sins shall die." And is it written, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." A law is alike fulfilled when its requisitions are observed, or its penalties enforced against its violators. Mr. Pingree must have forgotten this, or surely he never would have ventured upon an *inference* so preposterous. Besides, as I have already shown, this position of Mr. Pingree's bears

just as strongly upon this world as the next; and proves really that the law has never been violated at all! So he must try his hand again. He seems to forget that his system has two ends—that while he is taking care of one, the other is running away with him.

I have thus given, I think, a fair account of all the main propositions which Mr. Pingree thought essential to his system. It is for you to determine upon their weight. There were other minor points made, not necessary to be touched upon in a recapitulation, and all involved in the major ones already noticed. I have grappled with the pillars of his edifice, knowing that in the ruin of these, the whole edifice must fall to the earth!

I will very briefly glance at the arguments adduced in this discussion against Universalism. The proposition in debate covers the whole ground of controversy between Universalists and the rest of the Christian world, of course it may be attacked from many points. I regret that the time allotted to this discussion did not permit me to go so fully into the subject as I wished, and as I came prepared to do. I have not presented more than half the matter I had prepared; but I trust I have presented enough for the occasion. In truth, my business here was properly not to assail but to defend; and having shown that Mr. Pingree had not *inferred* his doctrine from the Bible, my work was done. He had failed to make good his proposition. But I not only did this, I carried the war also into the enemies territories, and assailed the monster Universalism on the throne of his dominions.

I stated it as a fact, and it was admitted, that Universalism as held by Mr. Pingree owed its origin to Hosea Ballou, in 1818. True, Mr. Pingree asserted that some one before that time had published a book setting forth the same doctrine, and promised to produce it, but failed to do so. The book would be a literary curiosity, and ought to be procured and placed in some museum. It was also urged as a fact and admitted to be so, that all Christians, of every creed and country, learned and unlearned, from the days of the Apostles to the nineteenth century, with perfect and uninterrupted unanimity, had pronounced the sentence of condemnation on Universalism. And it was urged, that if they were mistaken on so important and fundamental a doctrine, then it must be because it was

not revealed in the Bible: Or else how could it escape the diligent research and critical investigation of all the learned and good during the lapse of so many ages? But Mr. Pingree undertook to show that Universalism might be in the Bible notwithstanding! Yes, it *might be there*, just as infidelity and atheism might be there! and who can tell, if Mr. Ballou shall succeed in proving that all Christians, embracing the ripest scholars and profoundest thinkers that ever adorned the world, were incompetent to understand the language of the Bible in relation to the soul's destiny, but that some bolder adventurer than he may arise and claim that all Christians have been mistaken respecting the Lord God and our Savior? and affirm that the Scriptures teach that there is no God, and that Jesus Christ did not come into the world to save sinners? And why not? If Christians have all been mistaken on the one point, why not on the other? And if Universalism be a truth which for ages was rejected by all the lovers of the Bible, with perfect unanimity, the same cannot be alleged of any other truth revealed of God, no matter how inconsiderable. If error has prevailed and been predominant in past ages of the church, there was no truth rejected but has had its advocates, if not its martyrs, save this one of Universalism, admitting its truth! In this respect it stands alone; and pleads its truth by admitting that all the lovers of truth for seventeen centuries conspired its destruction!

It was also admitted that in our definitions of the word *hell, eternal punishment, and judgment*, in short, of all the words pertaining to this controversy, that we were sustained by all the Apostolic Fathers, by the entire church of the second century, by the Greeks in whose language the New Testament was written, and by all scholars, critics, commentators, and translators of any note in all ages of the church. Now are not the decisions of such men, on points too which it is not possible they could misunderstand, enough to crush forever the wild and visionary speculations of Universalism—that cannot boast one scholar or critic of eminence?

Our doctrine does not depend upon *inference*; but upon passages of Scripture, as plain and as positive as those which assert the existence of God and the creation of the world. Do we believe in a state of punishment after

death? The Scriptures say, "The rich man died and was buried, and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment." Do we believe that men will be raised out of their graves, part to happiness and part to misery! It is written, "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." Do we hold that the wicked will be eternally punished? It is declared in the Bible, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment"—the wicked "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Do we teach a Judgment after death? The Scriptures say, "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the Judgment." These and many other passages on each of these points, in their plain and obvious sense, and in the very strongest terms, assert our doctrine. And Mr. Pingree, like all his brethren, has called all his ingenuity and tact into requisition to evade the meaning that naturally suggests itself to the mind of every reader! He has been arguing to show that while the Bible says one thing, it means another!—and in the face of the positive declaration of the word of God, says that the rich man was not in torment after death!—that the wicked *do not* come forth to the resurrection of damnation!—they *do not* go into everlasting punishment! That there is *no* Judgment after death! In these and many other instances, you heard him flatly contradict the Scriptures and charge God with falsehood!—saying "peace! peace!" to those for whom God declared there was no peace, and promising life and light to those whom, God affirmed should not see life, and that for them was reserved the blackness of darkness forever!

It is because the Bible speaks thus plainly on these subjects, that all Christians were perfectly united upon them, for so many ages. To the learned and the unlearned, through common sense principles of interpretation, the Bible spoke the same things, because it could not speak any thing else. If the Bible be interpreted according to its plain letter—if it means what it says, our doctrine is established beyond controversy, and Universalism subverted beyond recovery!

We proved that all punishment was not disciplinary—

not inflicted for the individual good of the sinner. That this doctrine, so vital to Universalism, was contrary to reason, and contradictory to the plain declarations of Holy Writ. It is unnecessary to refer to Mr. Pingree's efforts at reply on this point. You cannot have forgotten them.

We next proved that this life was not a state of perfect retribution. Eight or more propositions were presented in proof of this position; which received scarcely a passing notice. They remain unanswered; a tolerably clear indication that, in the opinion of my opponent, they were unanswerable!

Our next position was, that *there is a future state of rewards and punishments*. We presented six propositions; the principle answer to which was a complaint that we quoted too many passages of Scripture!

We then showed that the future estates of men would be eternal. We argued that the eternal punishment of the wicked necessarily followed from the arguments of the Universalists themselves—that it was taught in the same terms as the existence of God, and the duration of the happiness of the righteous—in the very strongest terms it was possible to employ; and I requested Mr. Pingree to state, if stronger words to express endless duration, than those employed, were to be found in the Greek language. He did not pretend that there were. It is confessed then, and true, if Mr. Pingree is capable of defending his cause, that the endless duration of future punishment is expressed in the very strongest terms the Greek language could furnish; and the Greek is the most copious language ever spoken. It was also conceded that the literal and common meaning of *aionios* was endless; and that, therefore, when connected with punishment, unless it was shown to be used in a figurative and uncommon sense, it taught that punishment was endless. Thus making it manifest again that Universalism, to be true, had to prove that the letter of the Bible was not true, in a case like this!

But Mr. Pingree made a concession this morning that settles this controversy. This was the admission, (it was made in reference to Matt. xxv. 46:) "We admit that *everlasting* punishment is expressed by the same word as *life eternal*; and that one is just as long as the other!" He seems to speak for himself and brethren—that this

was the doctrine of Universalism—that the terms are the same, and the *eternal* punishment of the wicked is just as long as the *eternal* life of the righteous! Well, I invite Mr. Pingree's attention to just one passage in the New Testament. I hope he will open his ears and listen attentively; for I now expect to convert him. Indeed, I insist he must be converted; for I intend to show that this *eternal life* extends beyond this world. It is John xii. 25: "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this *world*"—[it is *kosmos* in Greek, Mr. Pingree, and cannot mean "age," or "state," or any thing of the sort, but simply what we vulgarly term the "world," or "the earth,"]—"he that hateth his life in this *world* shall keep unto LIFE ETERNAL." Here then is promised, after the life of this world is lost, *the life eternal*.

MR. PINGREE. I did *not* assert that "eternal life" was *always* confined to this world. I was speaking of Matt. xxv. 46: where it means *spiritual* life—the life enjoyed through the Gospel. Though I do not deny that it is sometimes applied to the immortal state.

MR. WALLER. You certainly contended that the term *everlasting*, applied to the life of the righteous and to the punishment of the wicked, meant the same thing in each case—that "one was just as long as the other."

MR. PINGREE. Not in the passage you just read; but in the text *then* under consideration.

MR. WALLER. You did not say in what passage; your remark was a general one. Nor am I willing to admit that the phrase "eternal life" changes its meanings, as often as the chameleon its color, for the especial benefit of our Universalist friends. To say that "*eternal life*" means *spiritual* life, is an assumption without a shadow of foundation. Universalists pretend to predicate this definition on the passages which declare that the believer "*hath everlasting life*." Well, believers *have* immortal souls. And if one is limited to this life, why not the other? If the "*everlasting life*" terminates at the grave, why not the "*immortal soul*?" This *everlasting life*, like the soul, commences in this world, and extends through eternity. The word *aiônios* expresses duration, and does not mean *spiritual*. For such a definition it has only the declaration wrung from Universalism by the anguish of its death struggles! Take home with you, then, the fact forced



From the unwilling lips of Mr. Pingree, THAT THE PUNISHMENT OF THE WICKED IS AS ENDURING AS THE EVERLASTING LIFE OF THE RIGHTEOUS!!! I knew that this admission would have to come. I have been trying to get it from him for several days. He has struggled against it as long as he could, and only brought it out in the last extremity. But it has come, and settles the controversy forever. With this concession, Universalism sinks lower than Hades!

I also disproved the Universalist system by showing that there was after death a "JUDGMENT"—a day when all must stand before the "judgment seat of Christ." The proofs on this point were many—expressed in language so plain that he who runs may read. Mr. Pingree made a faint effort to show that the passages adduced applied mainly to the destruction of Jerusalem. As a specimen of the straits to which he felt himself reduced, I need only to refer you to what he said in his comments on the xxiv. and xxv. chapters of Matt. I first understood him to apply every thing in these chapters to the destruction of Jerusalem. This morning, however, he tells us, that he did not say they were all fulfilled at that time—they only commenced then, and have been fulfilling ever since. And then turned right round, and demonstrated to *his* entire satisfaction, that the generation of men then living did not pass away until "ALL THESE THINGS were fulfilled!!" You all observed the contradiction! And how, I demand, could all these things have been fulfilled in the life time of the then generation of men, as Mr. Pingree and all Universalists affirm, and yet it should be true that some of them are now being fulfilled, and others remain still to be fulfilled?

MR. PINGREE arose to explain: I said that what Jesus Christ said in reference to judgment, etc., were fulfilled in that generation: but that his coming to reign in his kingdom, to judge the world, etc., though it *begun* then, progressed after the destruction of Jerusalem, and continues now. I thought I explained my position clearly.

MR. WALLER. I do not see that the gentleman is at all benefited by his explanation. How can he except such things as suit his convenience, after asserting that "ALL these things" were fulfilled in that generation? it still presents a palpable contradiction. It needs no comment. It is to be expected, that when men try to wrest the Scrip-

tures from their true meaning to suit some darling story, they will become involved in contradiction.

I also objected to Universalism, or to the "Ultimate holiness and salvation of all men," from the use of the terms *Gehenna* and *Tartarus* in the Scriptures; showing that these words were understood, by the people to whom Jesus and his Apostles preached to mean a state of everlasting punishment for the wicked in a state of future life. That while Jesus knew the Jews of his day attached to *Gehenna* that meaning which now in the English language is attached to the word *Hell*; and while he knew they held to the endless punishment of the wicked; yet he did not reprove them for it; which, if it was an error, is most unaccountable, seeing that he faithfully and frequently chided them for their errors and heresies. Nay, he not only did not charge them with error in this matter, but spoke to them as if it were true; asking them, "how could they escape the damnation of *Gehenna*?" and warning them to fear him, who after he hath killed, had power "to destroy both soul and body in *Gehenna*," etc. etc. He used the word precisely as if the then Jewish definition of it was the true one. There is not a syllable in all the New Testament remotely charging the Jews with being wrong on this subject. Can we believe that the blessed Savior would have connived at an error so fatal to the truth and to the best interests of men, as the Universalists declare the belief of future punishments to be? Why should Jesus be so silent and they so clamorous upon the doctrine; seeing that he as well as they were surrounded by *Partialists*?

The apostles too pursued the same course with the Jews. They went among the Gentiles, who also believed that the wicked would be punished after death—that for the abandoned and the abominable were reserved the unquenchable fires of the fearful *Tartarus*: and while the apostles reprovèd them for their errors, they never intimated that they erred upon this all important subject. On the contrary, they preached to them precisely as if it was true; and in terms and phrases which, if interpreted literally, could mean only that men were punished in the lake of fire. If they meant what they said, the Gentiles to whom they preached, must have believed that they taught a punishment for the ungodly and unbelieving in a future state.

Had they been Universalists, as honest men, could they have acted thus? Would they have concealed the truth from the nations? Would they have suffered the heathen to believe such a monstrous falsehood, and utter no word of warning or reproof? The course of Mr. Pingree, and of all Universalists, who make this the burden of their every discourse, answers no! NO! They would from the house tops have proclaimed against it. If there is any virtue, if any consolation—if *any truth* in Universalism; and especially if it abounds in all these things, as Mr. Pingree and his brethren tell us it does, how could the apostles hold their peace on the subject? How dare they refrain from deluging the souls of their hearers with this flood of celestial light? But they concealed their light. They put it under a bushel! I insist upon it, if Universalism be true, the conduct of the apostles is not only unaccountable, but wholly inexcusable. They did not discharge the trust committed to their hands. But as we cannot believe this, it follows that Universalism is the most improbable of all falsehoods.

But Mr. Pingree urges again, because it is indispensable to his system, that Christians cannot commune together in this world, and therefore cannot hereafter, unless changed after death. Now, I had supposed that all Christians, acquainted with one another, did commune together. They are brethren, animated by the same spirit, sustained by the same faith, cheered by the same hope, and journeying the same road to the same sweet and glorious home. And if Christians, they have the spirit of Christ, and love one another; and if this be not communion—if this be not the golden chain that shall bind together the souls of the redeemed in the regions of the blessed, I confess I am in midnight darkness upon the subject. Each Christian feels in relation to all he knows to be Christians, no matter what their stations in life; or color, or creed, or country, a sympathy and relationship, higher and holier than any natural tie; and there is among all Christians, acquainted with each other, a mingling of hearts and sympathies, at once sweet and hallowed, that afford a rich foretaste of the heavenly union of all the sanctified, in glory. Christians do cherish feelings of communion with each other.

MR. PINGREE. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

MR. WALLER. Well, perhaps there are some who do

not. But they are in a state of back-sliding. They have lost their first love. They are not in the enjoyment of religion. The love of the Savior is not shed abroad in their hearts. They have not the spirit of Christ. But God will not let them die in this way. He will reclaim them. But the gentleman means, I know, that we do not all sit down at the Lord's table together. But that is no evidence of a want of communion—it is *not communion with each other at all*. The supper was never instituted for any such purpose. It was designed to show forth the Lord's death until he comes a second time without sin unto salvation. If Christians were to commune together in this way only, there would, indeed, be very little Christian communion in this world. There sits the venerable father Scott, and I see many others of my brethren here, belonging to the same denomination with myself, with whom I never sat at the Lord's table. Is it, therefore, to be concluded that we have never communed as Christians together? With many of them I have held sweet communion. I solemnly declare that I know not the lover of my blessed Savior upon earth for whom I have not Christian fellowship, and would not hold Christian communion; that same communion, only less in degree, that I hope to hold with him in heaven. I trust I have said enough upon this subject. If Mr. Pingree or any other gentleman of standing among his brethren has any thing to say against the Baptists not inviting to the Lord's table, those whom the Lord himself has not invited, at a suitable time, and on a proper occasion, he will not find me wanting in all proper attentions to him. But this is not a subject to justify the introduction of such matters.

Mr. Pingree further urged, in his last speech, that unless a moral change was effected after death admitting our doctrine to be true, the saved would sympathize so keenly with the lost, as to be miserable, instead of being happy, in heaven: And in favor of his own doctrine, drew the conclusion, that in order to secure the happiness of the righteous, it was requisite that all men should be saved. I answered this objection last evening, I believe. The mistake of Mr. Pingree owes itself to his not drawing the proper distinction between *moral* relations and *natural* relations. The Christian is not of those who walk after the flesh, but of those who walk after

the spirit. He will be delivered from the body of this death. His mind that now serves the law of God will then be emancipated from its thralldom of flesh. The mind will then be free from the ties of natural affections, and the attachments formed here based upon those affections merely, will all be cast off when this corruptible shall put on incorruption. All his natural relations are destroyed in death; and his moral relations only survive. His natural sympathies and his flesh are left in the grave. But all of this I demonstrated on yesterday; let us, therefore, return to the work of recapitulation.

I showed that the Universalists had false notions of the true end and aim of punishment, and that especially they were mistaken in their views of what we taught upon this subject. On this branch of the subject, we proved that to punish the violator of a law established for the good of society, was right and just; and not to punish was a flagrant outrage upon the well being and rights of the unoffending and the virtuous—was to favor the bad at the expense of the good. This is the principle upon which all human governments are based. God has given his intelligent creatures a law—it is designed for the good of the whole. He that violates that law inflicts a wrong upon all intelligent creatures; and if he is not punished for his course, then his welfare is more regarded than theirs: and others are encouraged to trespass, and thus the whole social system of the moral Universe is endangered. It is just and right then that the transgressor should be punished. But even Universalism admits that punishment is right; but they say it should not continue forever. But who made them the judge? They admit that all are saved by grace, and that no one can be saved in any other way. Well, who has a right to demand grace? Is God bound to be gracious to sinners? If not, he is not bound to save them. Consequently might, in righteousness and justice, leave them forever unsaved—*lost*. And this is all we contend for. Besides, we proved that the sinner did not want to be saved—that he loved darkness rather than light—that he would not come unto Jesus that he might have life. Is Universalism itself impudent enough to urge that God should save those who will not be saved?—who spurn the mercy of God?—and will not that Christ Jesus should reign over them? And that because we teach that God will not force men to be

saved, that therefore we teach that he is unmerciful and does not love his creatures? If he were to force his will, man would cease to be a free moral agent; and consequently as incapable of virtue or vice as a stock or a stone.

It is clear then that the everlasting destruction of the ungodly from the presence of God and the glory of his power is founded in justice and righteousness—is the necessary result of the nature of things: for unless it could be shown that the sinner's moral being could be changed after death, where the gospel is not, then it is in vain to urge his salvation. God extends no grace to the sinner in the next world: he makes no proclamation of peace and pardon there: and if grace be withheld and the door of mercy closed, how can the sinner there be saved? You remember that Mr. Pingree acknowledged that here his system led him into utter darkness—that it furnished no solution of such inquiries. I marvel at the temerity which ventures beyond the light of revelation, and defies the horrors of a gloom more dreary than the night of the grave!

I expressed my apprehensions that Universalism tended to immorality. I mean nothing disrespectful to the members of that persuasion. I prefer no charge against them. Far from it. I have but very few acquaintances among them, and I take great pleasure in testifying to the moral worth of those few. But men do not always practice according to their doctrine. To the system then, and not to the professors, my remarks must be understood as applying. I may pursue this to its legitimate consequences without at all impugning the conduct or motives of its advocates.

The *future* is the polar star of our being—the mainspring of human action. “Man never *is*, but *to be* blessed.” It is in reference to the happiness that mankind think they discern in the distance, that men toil and labor for worldly gain. For this they fell the forest, till the ground, make farms, build cities, construct highways, dig canals, launch the steamer, and spread the canvass to every breeze! It is this that stimulates them to brave any danger, to encounter any difficulty, to forego ease, and comfort, and quietude—they see in the future more than a recompense for every sacrifice and more than a solace for every sorrow. They are cheered in the night of their toil by the flash of celestial light which darts through the portals of

their blissful home; and occasionally they inhale a breeze, fragrant from the spice fields of the land of their delight. Take this prospect from the vision—*destroy the hope set before them*—and at once you remove the motive of their exertion and enterprize, and they sink into inaction and despair. It is not the pleasure of labor, but its *promises* of good, that stimulate to industry. These principles apply to the great subject of religion. Admit there is no hereafter, and then says the Apostle, there is no sense in being religious. “Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.” He clearly did not agree with the Universalists that the benefits of religion were confined exclusively to this life. For were this the case, says he, “we are of all men most miserable.” It was the *future* that gave to religion its consolations. And although persecuted and hated of all men—exposed to every peril and every privation, he esteemed these but light afflictions which were for a moment and which would work for him a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. “For in this we groan, *earnestly desiring* to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven.” It is the *lively* HOPE of “an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away” in reserve for him, that cheers the Christian in his dreary pilgrimage through life. It is the bright and glorious future that is set before him in the Gospel, that makes him count his life as nothing and leads him to forsake houses, and lands, and wife, and children, and every earthly blessing for the religion of Jesus.

Universalism destroys this hope of the Christian, by declaring that God will not render eternal life in the future to those who, by patient continuing in well doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality.” The hope of heaven, on the principles of that system, furnishes no motive to Christian action and can pour no oil of consolation into the stricken heart of the pious man when persecuted for righteousness’ sake. Nay, why should he suffer for religion?—why endure the hatred of the world and the frown of relations?—why embrace a martyr’s stake, seeing there is no martyr’s crown? What does the man gain who is burned for his religion, any more than he who is hung for his crimes, seeing they both go to enjoy eternal life? Has our religion any consolations arising from a hope of heaven? Does it impart sweet comfort in the sick and dying,

hour, because of the hope that soon, free from all sorrow and pain, we shall enter upon the fruition of unfading happiness? If so, Universalism is a fraud and a falsehood, for it tells us that our religion has nothing to do with a future life—that its ends and hopes are confined to this evanescent world!

But it not only robs the Christian of his hope and tears from him all motive of running with patience the race that is set before him in view of the crown laid up in heaven for all that love our Lord Jesus, but it ministers an opiate to the conscience of ungodly men. It tells them, it is true, that they will suffer full and adequate punishment for all their sins, but that they will suffer it in this life. And what of that? Have they not just as much to encourage them under their sufferings for sin, as Christians have under their sufferings for righteousness' sake? And what are all the sufferings of this life? They will soon be over. And then these sufferings work for the sinner a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory!! Surely, then the drunkard, the liar, and all the abominable and unclean, may run with patience their race! They are on their journey home! They will get to heaven before many a Christian; for many of them will not live out half their days! And then if they should become weary of life;—if “the stings and arrows of outrageous fortune,” and “the heart-ache, and the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to;” and if

—“The whips and scorns of time,  
The oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely,  
The pangs of despised love, the law's delay,  
The insolence of office, and the spurns”

which he must take from the unworthy, become insupportable, why he “might his quietus make with a bare bodkin!” He might “shuffle off this mortal coil” by means of a dose of laudanum, by a bullet in his brains, or a dagger in his heart!” And surely “it is nobler in the mind to suffer” such wrongs and miseries, when we can so easily “take arms against a sea of troubles, and by opposing, end them,” and die and enjoy ineffable happiness and glory, world without end! And surely if Destructionism says to the sinner, “Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die,” Universalism may echo the sentiment, and “roll the rapturous hosannah round” the world of sinners,—“Eat and drink, for to-morrow you die, and go to heaven!” If Universal-



ism be true, then verily Christianity is a most miserable farce!

And what advantage hath a Universalist? and what profit is there in Universalism? *None whatever.* Grant that men are in sin and misery:—does not Universalism say they were ordained of God for the good of man? And will its ministers frustrate the purposes of the Most High, and urge an exterminating warfare upon his schemes of benevolence? “Woe unto the man that striveth with his Maker!” They should let the sinner alone! He is walking in the paths that God has ordained for him; and they must be paths of pleasantness and peace, for infinite Wisdom devised them for his good! And suppose that “*Partialism*” is an error and a sin, tending to make men miserable. Universalism assures us that it exists by the fiat of God. It is his pleasure that it should exist; and he will do all his pleasure. Besides it can do no harm: for, supposing that men suffer from it, it is for their good! Men only suffer for their good!! All punishment is disciplinary; and any miseries men may experience from “*Partialism*,” are but for a moment, and work for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory! And admitting Universalism to be true, man can gain nothing by embracing it, and lose nothing by opposing it. In either case, he but fulfils his destiny, and does what has been done for his good! The Universalist preacher, in calling upon men to change their sentiments and embrace his system, abuses man and insults God!—abuses man in asking him to do what he cannot, more than a log or a stump; and insults God by presuming to subvert his benevolent operations in behalf of his creatures! The brain of madness never projected a scheme more extravagantly foolish than that of Universalism!

But if it should turn out, that it is not only a system of folly, but of egregious falsehood, how fearfully dangerous is it!—a moral simoon, poisoned and heated by hell, blowing in terrible tempest over the soul! Every consideration then warns you against its embrace. If true, it can speak no promise; and if false, it utters the thunders of perdition!

If there is no punishment hereafter, and all are happy when they die, the murderer and the assassin are philanthropists!—they are doing the greatest amount of good

possible to their fellow-men—taking them from misery and sending them to heaven! War too is the greatest of blessings to mankind! And all the conquerors that ambition ever begat, “from Macedonia’s madman to the Sweed,” who have polluted the earth with the blood of innocence, and washed it with the tears of the bereaved and the widowed, were engaged in the benevolent work of making immortal souls, heirs of glory! And the Savior then mistook the most efficient way of establishing his kingdom. Instead of sending out his Apostles alone and unprotected in the world, to preach the Gospel, he should have sent them out at the head of formidable armies, to kill and to destroy mankind, and thus “compel them to come” into heaven!

But Mr. Pingree made an effort this morning to offset this, by showing that our doctrine was as bad as his, for we held to the salvation of infants; then, said he, it is a good work to kill them, and thus save them from the evil of the world! But the cases are not analagous. The law of God forbids their murder; and he that should do the deed is liable to eternal damnation; for no murderer shall inherit the kingdom of God. Not so, however, on the other hand: the murderer does not endanger his soul; and even granting he should be punished here; it would only be for his good, and secure to him the greater glory hereafter!

But there was an INFERENCE in Mr. Pingree’s last speech that I have almost forgot to notice. Because it is written, *That in Abraham’s seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed*, therefore, the gentleman argues, *all men will be saved*. The conclusions do not necessarily follow upon the premises. If he will take the trouble to study carefully the 3rd chapter of Galatians, he will find that these blessings come upon men through faith. By the “seed” of Abraham, our blessed Savior is meant. Through him, all our temporal blessings come. In this sense, all nations have been blessed in him. But doubtless, in the text referred to, spiritual blessings are meant. These have come to many nations. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is the richest boon of heaven. Our nation is blessed in its possession; and how many blessings it has diffused among the nations of the civilized world! And I am persuaded the promise will be strictly fulfilled. The prophecies certainly teach, in the plainest language possible, that the heath-

en are to be given to the Savior for an inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession. The stone, in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, which was cast out of the mountain without hands, became a mountain, and filled the whole earth, and this stone was the kingdom which the Lord God should set up. And it is declared also by Daniel the prophet, that "the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High." The Scriptures abound with glowing descriptions of a period of rest and prosperity to the people of God, when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ—when Jesus shall reign king of nations as he is now king of saints.

The Jews, before the coming of Messiah, understood a millenium of rest, when triumphant over all their enemies, the people of God should prevail over all the earth a thousand years, to be taught in the writings of their prophets. Christians generally, in every age since the Savior, have so understood the Bible. It is evident, to say the least, that it is far more reasonable to *infer* that it is in some such way the nations are to be blessed in the seed of Abraham, than to *infer* from the passage alluded to *Universalism*, with all its long train of absurdities and contradictions.

There is another idea connected with this matter which I will throw out merely as a speculation; it is: *That more will be saved than lost*. This has nothing to do with our controversy with Universalism, as God might, without wrong to any, have permitted all to be lost: still it may be interesting as a *truth*. Already, we know, there is a great company in heaven which no man can number; and what a host shall still be saved, when that glorious period shall be realized, so long the burden of every prayer, when God's will shall be done in earth as it is done in heaven. The duration of that period of course is a matter of conjecture. Some suppose it will continue 360,000, and I see no reason why this should not be so. But be this as it may, I hesitate not to say, that the amount of happiness will be much greater than if man had not fallen. Every soul redeemed enjoys an affinity of bliss above what he could have enjoyed, had he forever remained in the primeval abode of man. Take then into the account, the happiness

of all the redeemed, how incalculable the increase of happiness beyond what it could have been had man remained as he was created! God has overruled evil for good.

I deem it unnecessary to notice any other particulars brought up by Mr. Pingree in his last speech. I am not aware that either then or in any former speech, he advanced any thing of importance which I have not attended to. If so, the omission has been without design; and must now remain without an answer, as time admonishes me to draw to a conclusion.

My friends! perhaps I address you for the last time. In a few hours, I leave this place, it may be forever. But just recovering from a severe and protracted illness, my health still unsettled, and my constitution greatly impaired, I can make no calculations relating to the events of this life. Since I was last in this place, I have been called upon to look death in the face; for some time not knowing what hour I should be summoned to the eternal world. I think I then experienced some of the sweets of religion, and especially the value of its consolations on a sick bed, in prospect of the grave. How empty *then* the world and all its pleasures! And how precious *then* the glorious hope, that when heart and flesh shall fail, heaven, happiness, eternal joys shall be ours! How pleasant to feel *then*, when kindred and friends must forsake us, that Jesus will take us, and in his own everlasting arms, bear us safely over the dark, cold waves of death, to glory and to God! This Savior I confidently hold up, as able to save to the uttermost all who will come unto God through him. Believe on him and you shall have everlasting life. And there is no other name but his, given under heaven or among men whereby we must be saved. Lean on his strong arm for salvation, and though called to pass through the valley of the shadow of death, you need fear no evil. But I am not informed of any promise of salvation to those out of Jesus Christ; and at this, perhaps the last time you will ever hear my voice, I warn you solemnly not to trust the tremendous concerns of your souls to another.

I thank you all for the kind, courteous, and respectful attention you have given this discussion. I thank you, citizens of Warsaw, for the many instances of kindness, attention, and hospitality which I have received at your

hands. May heaven's choicest blessings be yours. I am happy to believe that no unkind feelings have sprung up from this debate, but that the speakers and their respective brethren, will part as they met—*friends*. And to you, Messrs. Moderators, I render my most heart-felt acknowledgments for the patience and impartiality with which you have presided over our discussion. Be assured for this you will ever have my most grateful recollections. And in taking this my public leave of Mr. Pingree, permit me to assure him, though we widely differ on one of the most vitally important doctrines of the Bible, that I entertain for him personally no other than the kindest feelings. And humbly pray through Jesus Christ, that when all our differences of opinion shall be sunk in the grave, we shall meet and mingle in a better and a brighter world.