

tion. Some have foreseen this difficulty and have therefore tried to dodge the shock by referring the latter, not to the resurrection, but to the commencement of the church. This is more in conformity with their doctrine that Revelation was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, which, however, they deny the moment they refer to a single passage in it as proof of universal salvation. But such an interpretation of the passage under criticism not only takes it out of the hands of Universalism, because if it refer to the commencement of the church, it can have nothing to do with final happiness; but such an interpretation is contradictory to the text itself, for instead of all tears being wiped away then, it was the period of the greatest suffering in the cause of Christianity. Do you now say it is all a figure? Very likely, for Universalists will say or do anything to avoid "*cornerism*"; but it nevertheless seems passing strange that they should never be willing to admit Isa. 25:8 as figurative, and that they should always quote this text and use it in the literal sense till obliged to expose its figurative meaning, and with that exposure admit its non-assistance to their cause. But, say they, it must refer to the commencement of the church, for John says: "I *saw* the holy city." Very well, then it does not teach universal salvation, and it so happens that in the very proof-text (Rev. 5:13) which says that he heard every creature praising God, he also uses the past tense—*heard*—and of course, according to their own showing, has no reference to the future, but to the past. Then there is no Universalism in the book of Revelation.