

**CIHM  
Microfiche  
Series  
(Monographs)**

**ICMH  
Collection de  
microfiches  
(monographies)**



**Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques**

**© 1994**

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

- Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/  
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/  
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from:  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

- Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

- Additional comments:  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Wrinkled pages may film slightly out of focus.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
						✓					

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:

Metropolitan Toronto Reference Library  
Baldwin Room

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol  $\rightarrow$  (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol  $\nabla$  (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:

Metropolitan Toronto Reference Library  
Baldwin Room

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole  $\rightarrow$  signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole  $\nabla$  signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaires. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.



ORAL DEBATE

ON THE DOCTRINES OF

UNIVERSAL SALVATION

AND

ENDLESS PUNISHMENT,

HELD

IN CHESTNUT GROVE, TOWNSHIP OF PELHAM, C. W.,

ON JUNE 7TH AND 8TH, 1853.

BY

REV. G. P. HARRIS, METHODIST,

AND

REV. J. R. LAYELL, UNIVERSALIST.

REPORTED IN PHONETIC SHORT HAND


BY G. P. URE.

TORONTO:

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN,

2, ELGIN BUILDINGS, YONGE STREET,

1853.



ORAL DEBATE

ON THE DOCTRINES OF

UNIVERSAL SALVATION

AND

ENDLESS PUNISHMENT,

HELD

IN CHESTNUT GROVE, TOWNSHIP OF PELHAM, C. W.,

ON JUNE 7TH AND 8TH, 1853,

BETWEEN

REV. G. P. HARRIS, METHODIST,

AND

REV. J. R. LAVELL, UNIVERSALIST.

---

REPORTED IN PHONETIC SHORT-HAND

BY G. P. URE

---

TORONTO:

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN,  
2, ELGIN BUILDINGS, YONGE STREET,

1853.

P. 102  
235.2  
H13



## INTRODUCTION.

THE Debate, which it is the object of the following pages to lay before the public, came off on the 7th and 8th of June, in Chestnut Grove, Fonthill, Pelham, C.W. The weather on both days was very favourable; and the interest taken in the important subject for discussion, was indicated by the fact, that upwards of fifteen-hundred people from the surrounding country assembled in the finely-shaded, romantic spot, which had been chosen for the occasion, and had been temporarily seated for the accommodation. The disputants were the Rev. J. R. LAVELL, Pastor of the Universalist Church, Fonthill, and the Rev. G. P. HARRIS, Episcopal Methodist Church, and at present on the Barton Circuit. The questions for discussion were,—for the first day, *Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?*—Mr. Lavell the affirmative, Mr. Harris the negative; for the second day, *Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery for any part of the human family?*—Mr. Harris the affirmative, Mr. Lavell the negative. The speakers occupied a rustic platform, elevated about six feet from the sward, and each was furnished with a table and writing materials. The Moderators sat in the centre, in front of the platform. In the preliminary arrangements it was agreed, that the time for each speaker should be limited to fifteen minutes; that the debate should commence each morning at eight o'clock, and continue till six o'clock, P. M., with a short interval in the middle of the day for refreshment. The limitation in regard to time was carried out to the letter, so that frequently during the two days'

discussion the reader will find that the speaker stops short in the midst of some proposition without being allowed time to carry out his arguments to their legitimate extent. This abruptness of termination might have been obviated, had each speaker been allowed half an hour at a time,—but as the agreement had been made it was deemed advisable to act up to it. About nine o'clock on the morning of the 7th the arrangements were completed, the disputants having chosen for their respective Moderators, John H. Beraton, Esq., and George Bennett, Esq., and these again choosing Lewis Wilson, Esq., as their Umpire. The discussion was conducted in a calm, temperate manner, and was listened to throughout with the greatest attention and the deepest interest. No decision was asked of the audience as to which position had been most effectively supported; and when the debate was concluded they left for their respective homes, seemingly satisfied that their time had not been mis-spent.

G. P. U.

short in the  
carry out his  
termination  
wed half an  
was deemed  
orning of the  
aving chosen  
and George  
on, Esq., as  
a, temperate  
est attention  
audience as  
and when the  
es, seemingly

P. U.

## DEBATE.

Mr. LAVELL said,—

Messrs. Moderators, and Christian Friends,—We have assembled here this morning to discuss the most important question that can claim the attention of the human mind—a question which involves the ultimate destiny of millions of beings formed in the image of God. The question for discussion before us this day is,—*Do the Scriptures teach the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?* I affirm that they do. My opponent denies this opinion. In taking the affirmative of this question, I enter upon the work with great satisfaction and pleasure. I stand here as the advocate, and the only advocate in the western part of Canada, of this glorious, this soul-cheering truth. I stand here with great confidence that I shall succeed in proving it to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced mind present. Messrs. Moderators, I stand here to deceive no man. Not for if the Scriptures do not teach this great and glorious truth, that all mankind shall ultimately unite in triumphs of praise and glory to God and the Saviour, I will immediately abandon it; but if they do teach this soul-cheering doctrine, then all should know it, that they may lay hold of the sure and steadfast hope set before them in the Gospel, and rejoice in the fulness of its blessings. That I have the desires and prayers of all good hearts,—that I have the desire and prayer of my opponent,—that I may succeed in my undertaking, none will deny. For I do not believe that my opponent, or any individual upon God's footstool, desires and prays that the doctrine of endless and immortal suffering and misery may be true. No; none, save some dreadful fiend, can desire that God, who is the father of the spirits of all flesh;—that God, whose name and whose very nature is Love;—that God, who is Just, Good, Merciful, and Holy;—none, I say, but some dreadful, incarnate fiend, can desire that God will thrust down to the companionship of devils the creatures he has formed in his own image, there in immortal and endless agony to blaspheme the name of their Father, which is Love, to all eternity. My first argument is based upon the desire of God. God **DESIRES** *the final holiness and happiness of all mankind.* This my opponent

will not deny, as he granted it in a former discussion. No Methodist will do this, for every attribute of God proves such a desire. A holy God, a merciful being, can have no other desire. God is the Father of all. Can a perfect father have any other desire than that creatures formed in his own image shall become holy and happy? "God is Love," 1st John; iv., 8. Here the Apostle John gives us a full description of His holy nature. We do not read in the Scriptures that God is Justice; but we read that he is pure, unadulterated Love. If, then, God changes not—for he is without "variableness or shadow of turning,"—can a being, whose name, whose nature is Love, cherish any other desire than that the whole world whom he loves will become holy and happy? My argument is, that the desire of God will be satisfied, and that this monstrous doctrine of endless suffering is without foundation. I maintain that this desire will be satisfied, *without the possibility of failure*. Who will stand up in the presence of God, who is Infinite in Power, and say that God will have an *unsatisfied desire* to all eternity? Unsatisfied desire is a source of misery and wretchedness; and he who maintains that the desire of God will remain unsatisfied, takes the ground that the Lord will be unhappy. As God desires the happiness of all his creatures, he has provided means to accomplish that desire; and to deny this would be to deny the Scriptures. In the Scriptures we read, "He is of one mind, and who can turn him? and *what his soul desireth, even THAT HE DOETH*" Job xxiii., 13. It is admitted that God desires the final happiness of all men, and the Bible plainly asserts, What his soul desireth *that he doeth*. This plain affirmative text it is not in the power of any man to overthrow. I have now presented you with my first argument. I deem it proper to do this in the first place, and then make some remarks that I intended afterwards, in relation to the origin of this debate. You will all bear in mind that I am the challenged party; my opponent is the challenger. While delivering a discourse in the Baptist Church at Fonthill some few Sabbaths ago, my opponent rose after he had concluded his discourse on the subject of Baptism. He invited my attention, and challenged me to a public debate in this Township, at such time as we might decide upon. I accepted the challenge. I could not do otherwise. For as I am the only Universalist Minister in the Western part of Canada West, I felt bound, under these circumstances, to accept the challenge, and to defend the glorious doctrine of a World's Salvation, and to oppose the monstrous idea that God will consign to *ENDLESS SUFFERING* in eternity some of the creatures he has made in his own image. I could not have been induced, however, to accept it, unless we obtained a Reporter to give a faithful account of the discussion; for in the several discussions which I have had with Ministers both of the Methodist denomination and of other denominations, *invariably have sympathisers with my*

*opponents circulated falsehoods.* (Hear, hear.) I assert, they have circulated falsehoods, which can be easily proved, in relation to such debates; so that I am glad we have succeeded in obtaining the services of one who will give the discussion to the public as you yourselves hear it this day. I would also state, that owing to the manner in which my opponent acted in a former debate,—the unchristian manner, as I conceived,—I had another incentive to obtain a Reporter to note down this discussion, for I thought it would be the means of causing him to bridle his tongue, and treat his opponent in a Christian manner. But if he will not, then it will be down in black and white, for the public to see the influence and tendency of the monstrous idea, that God, whom we are bound to imitate in all things, designs the endless misery of creatures he has formed in his own image.

MODERATOR—The time is up.

Mr. HARRIS said:—

Moderators and Friends,—It may be as well that I should begin at the beginning, and notice first the circumstances connected with the challenge given in the Baptist Meeting House. On my arrival in this place to preach a sermon on Christian Baptism, I was informed by a number of my friends that after the discussion which took place between Mr. Lavell and myself, he had told the folks that “he had shut me up,” and that I could not prove the propositions that I undertook. This being the case, and Mr. Lavell being in the congregation, I said, I have some remarks to make. I am happy to see my friend Mr. Lavell present, as I understand by many in this place that he has told the people *here* that he “shut me up,” at our last discussion. I wish to give the gentleman the privilege of doing so down here, and to give his friends an opportunity to see how well he can do it. These were the remarks as near as I can possibly remember. I challenged the gentleman for five days’ discussion; but one of the propositions I was going to have brought forward—will be unnecessary now—that is, The existence of a personal devil, for he has already said that God will not send his creatures to be the companions of devils in an endless hell; so that part is settled. He accepted of my challenge before the congregation. But when we met he absolutely refused to discuss the subject for five days. He said he would discuss two days now, and two days by-and-by. I thought this would do me as well as five days at once, for I believe that when *this* debate closes, he will have the writings drawn for another discussion. These are all the remarks I would make in reference to my challenge. I am happy to hear my opponent in so strong language express the great importance of the question before us to-day. It is a matter of vast importance to

every human being, whether he or she shall throughout the unending ages of eternity spend their time in unceasing joys above, or in endless misery below. I rejoice equally with my opponent at the fact that the remarks which I shall make shall not only be heard by the folks present, but shall be read when I have ceased to live, when my tongue has ceased in death, and when my happy spirit has gone to regions of bliss; for I trust that by the grace of God, I shall speak on this subject as in the presence of God, and of the Holy Spirit that inspired holy men to write the Scriptures, and enabled me to lay hold of the hope set before me in the Gospel. Mr. Lavell has stated that he is the only advocate of this soul-cheering doctrine in the Western Province, and when I heard the remark I thought it a pity that they do not send out more advocates throughout the Province to spread so cheering, so delightful a doctrine, as he seems to think it is. Why not send out more, in obedience to Him who said, "Go ye forth and preach the Gospel to all the world"? He, and his denomination, do not carry the Gospel to one-tenth of the Province, nor to one-two-hundredth part of the Province. But my opponent has advanced one or two arguments, and these I shall now attend to. The first was, That an Infinite God, a God of Infinite Goodness, Justice, and Mercy, could not send the individuals whom he has created in his own image, to a place of endless punishment. Now, I will notice first, the Goodness of God, as it was the first thing he mentioned, and with reference to the Goodness of God I would say, "The Lord is good to all; and his tender mercies are over all his works." I would enquire at the mind of every intelligent creature here, does the Goodness of God make people happy now? Does the goodness of God make them religious now? Does it unite them to Christ now? If God is good, and good to all, so much the greater is the sin of those who sin against so good, so kind a being. And if the Goodness of God does not now make them happy, if it does not now make them religious, where is the evidence that God will make them happy through eternity. But if God is unchangeable, and if all men are not holy and happy now, and if he is good now and remains always the same, and all men are not holy and happy now, then it must be evident to every one that that God who cannot change, cannot in the nature of things make men holy and happy, unless there is a change in the individuals themselves to make them so. We come now to the Justice of God. It is impossible to arrive at what is right and what is wrong by referring simply to the attributes of God; for if the attributes of God were a certain guide for our religion, then these attributes would be all that is necessary. But, with regard to the Justice of God, if it has not allowed him to make all men holy and happy now, then it is clear the same God cannot deviate from his character and make them holy and happy hereafter. If the attributes of the Deity were alone sufficient to tell man what is right and what is wrong, no revelation would be needed. But who can

tell by the attributes of God whether there will be a resurrection? No one! Or that sin exists in the world? or that there is a heaven for all that are holy and happy? If the attributes of God were sufficient to settle this point what is the use of having a revelation. Socrates declared that a revelation was necessary to teach man the true religion. We have a revelation and it declares that God is Just, and moreover that God is the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus. But with regard to the Mercy of God, I do not regard Mercy as an attribute of Deity. We will look at it a moment. If man had never fallen from his holy and happy estate there would have been no room for the exercise of this attribute, and if all men were to become holy and happy there would be room for its exercise. The Mercy of God would thus only be exercised for some 6000 years, or only so long as the world remains in this miserable state, for it can only be extended to those who are sinful. My opponent has told us that it is the desire of God that all men should be holy and happy, and that God's desire must be satisfied. Is God miserable now? Is God unhappy now? Oh my God! what a doctrine. But if God desires that all men shall be happy, and some of them are not happy now, then God must be miserable according to my neighbour's faith. Who will witness the providence of God by day and by night, and come to the conclusion that that being who rules over all, is miserable. He was happy before the world was. He was happy before there was a creature on his footstool, and will be happy throughout the endless ages of eternity. We are told God desires men to be saved, I believe that; but he desires them to be saved from their sins. He desires their salvation only on Gospel terms, He that believeth shall be saved. John iii. 16, God so loveth the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. This is the condition upon which God will save men, and God desires them to be saved in this way and no other. He has sent out his ambassadors to proclaim the ministry of reconciliation, 2 Cor. v. 19, 20. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. God desires that this reconciliation be effected between him and his rebellious creatures. Now the pages of every newspaper convey the intelligence that there is drunkenness and crime, and debauchery, and sin, and misery reigning in every direction, and if this is the case, and if God is just now, we have no evidence that if they remain in this miserable state that God will be rendered unhappy because his desire has not been accomplished.

MODERATOR—The time is up.

Mr. LAVELL said:—Mr. Harris has made some remarks in relation to the origin of this debate. He says, “I was informed by a number of my friends that Mr. Lavell had told the folks here that he had shut me up in the last debate.” This is his own language, “and that he wished me to do the same thing here among his friends.” He says “he was informed by a number of *his* friends that I had circulated a report that I had shut him up”; allow me to say with all due deference to my clerical opponent, that I told no such thing; but that a certain individual from this region whom I knew was at the debate did come down here and state such a thing, and I can direct him to some of his Methodist brethren who will not give Mr. H. much credit for what he said on that occasion. I did not circulate such a report. He was informed of it by his friends. I do not doubt it. I have found within these few days that some of *his* friends have told things unqualifiedly false in regard to *this* debate, which I can easily prove. My opponent challenged me to five days’ discussion; but I chose to divide the time. He has also stated that I admitted the existence of a devil or of devils; certainly I do. I believe in devils—devils on two legs, to be plain. Because I mentioned that he believed God would send some of his creatures to suffer with devils to all eternity in an endless hell, he concludes I believe that there is some semi-omnipotent devil. I said this would be the case if his doctrine be true. I do not believe in a semi-omnipotent devil, for the very reason that the Bible is silent on it. Judas was called a devil; Peter was called Satan; and two Angels were called Satan. But as this is not the subject I will desist. He says, if my doctrines are so cheating and so delightful, why do we not send out more missionaries to the people? But if we could not send better missionaries to the heathen than his denomination has done, God save us from such an iniquity. They and the other *self-styled* Evangelists will send forth their missionaries in a ship, loaded with powder in the hold and cannon upon deck, and they will go to the heathen to preach the Gospel. And if they do not accept the Gospel they will receive the cannon and shot. This is the way the Evangelists send the Gospel to the heathen. I do believe in sending the Gospel to the heathen; but we have heathens enough at home amongst our Methodist brethren, and I would wish to preach to them as often as I can; for *they* do not believe in a God that will be *joy to all people*; but only to a part of their fellow-beings. This is not the true Gospel ministry. He stated that I said the Justice of God could not send his creatures to ENDLESS misery. I did say so, and will maintain it presently; but that was not my present position. An honorable debater will grapple with the ostensible meaning of his opponent’s propositions. My proposition is that God desires the happiness of all men, and that “what his soul *desireth that he doeth*.” He has not said a word upon that point. He has spoken of the Justice and Mercy of God,—but these were not embraced



in. my position. And then about the Goodness of God—though this was not my position—he says, does the Goodness of God make men righteous now? does it make men perfectly good now? No! I admit; but is that a reason that He never will. My friend has more to do than make bare assertions. God is unchangeable, he says, and all men are not holy and happy now; therefore, they never will be. And has it come to this? God is unchangeable, and all men are not holy and happy now; therefore, they never will be. To sustain himself, and to avoid the conclusion of my position, it is just saying in plain English that God's desires are not always accomplished. He has stated that God desires all men to be holy and happy now; but they do not become so; Therefore, they *will never be* holy and happy, notwithstanding *God desires it*. I maintain that this position is not sound. It overlooks the fact, that God was pleased to *create man subject to vanity*, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the *same in hope*. Because the creature itself also *shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God*, Rom. viii., 20, 21. My opponent overlooks the fact that man is created a progressive being, and capable of progress. It is great folly to insist that God's desires are frustrated because man at the commencement of his progress is not at the same point, at which he will be at the conclusion. It would be just as consistent to say that God's desire is not accomplished because the little child is not as fully developed as the man, or because a simple twig does not produce fruit as the mature tree. But the fact is the argument is very strong and conclusive, and the gentleman may make the most of it. It is so strong and conclusive that he makes a most desperate attempt to throw doubt upon the declaration of Job which I have quoted. For the Scriptures expressly declare, Job xxiii., 13, "He is of one mind, and who can turn him? *and what his soul desireth, even that he doeth.*" My opponent must either admit that God does what he desires, or deny his Bible. God desires all men to be saved, and he does what he desires; hence he will in *his own good time* save all men. Instead, however, of my opponent yielding the debate, he is laboring very hard to impress it upon the minds of the audience that the Scriptures utter a falsehood when they declare that God doeth what he desireth. But I leave this point, although he insists either that God cannot or will not do what he desires, he has admitted that God desires the final salvation of all, and the Bible declares that he can and will save them. My opponent stated that I said God would be unhappy through all eternity. I said no such thing. I said if God had an *unsatisfied* desire through all eternity, he certainly would be unhappy, for an unsatisfied desire is the most prolific source of unhappiness. He says also that my God is miserable. Is the man crazy to talk such nonsense as this? Or is my opponent in earnest? My God is not unhappy. But I do maintain that the God *he* worships, that

will send some of the noblest of his creation to roll in endless and immortal agony will be unhappy through all eternity, inasmuch as he has desired the ultimate holiness and happiness of all men, and yet that his desire will be left unsatisfied.

Mr. HARRIS.—My opponent stated that I had not touched the xxiii chapter of Job. It was not because I was unwilling to do so; but because I had not time to come to it. The words are, He is of one mind and whatsoever he desireth that he doeth. If he does all he desires, the Bible says in the second Psalm, I have set my King upon my holy hill of Zion, I will declare the decree. The Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost part of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise now therefore, O ye Kings; be instructed, ye Judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." This is the testimony of Scripture as to what God will do. The remarks I made upon the desire of God were these; I said that God certainly desires the happiness of man now as much as he would do at any future period, from the fact that my opponent stated that God was unchangeable. If God is unchangeable and desires the happiness of men now, and they are not happy, I ask my opponent to bring forward some evidence that God will ultimately make men holy and happy without any change in the Divine Being. If he could prove that the Divine Being would change, there would be some hope; but from the fact that God says himself—I am the Lord I change not—those individuals that are unhappy now cannot be made happy unless a change takes place in the individuals themselves. God is the same, and he is saying, Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him turn unto the Lord for he will have mercy upon him, and to our God for he will abundantly pardon. My opponent said he went to the heathen Methodists. As a Methodist, certainly I feel thankful that I have got so far off from the system of my friend as to be associated with the heathen. Better be a heathen in this respect than a Bible-reader and deny the holy revelation. My opponent says God is satisfied,—of course God must be satisfied, and whatsoever his soul desireth that he doeth. Then is God satisfied at present with the position of our world? Is God satisfied with the position of every man? What saith the scripture, Unto the Angel of the Church of the Laodiceans write:—These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true Witness, the beginning of the creation of God; I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot; I would thou wert

cold or hot. So then, because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth—Rev. 3 ch. 14, 15, 16 v. He would spue them out like water—like ditch water. God represents the Laodicean church as unfit to be tasted. Now did God desire them to be different from what they were? If so, they were not as God would have them. If God did not desire them to be better, if the apostle misrepresents the fact, then the case is altered. But if they were neither cold nor hot and if God desired them to be different from what they were, then they were not in a position to satisfy the desire of God. There is no way of framing an argument to get out of this solemn fact. My opponent went on to say that we loaded a ship part with powder and cannons, and then sent missionaries on board of her to go to the heathen, and if the heathen would not receive the gospel, we gave them cannon balls. Has he named one single instance where this occurred—not one. We go forward in obedience to the command, Go ye forth and preach the Gospel. Go, says the Saviour, and preach peace to them that are far off, and glad tidings of great joy to all people. And I say, yes, in the name of heaven go. It opens the door of salvation to the family of man; it offers them life and salvation, and it provides for all, who will comply with its requirements, eternal felicity and a home in glory. It is glad tidings of great joy. My opponent then went on to speak from the passage, Romans viii., 21—23, "Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God; For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together 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." These words were spoken of the Jews, they were the creation. Paul says, even we ourselves. This was the creation groaning until now. They waited for the redemption of the body. But the creature was made subject to vanity, and was in the bondage of corruption. But we are told the creature shall also be delivered from the bondage of this corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God. Jews as well as Gentiles were to be made happy and to rejoice. My opponent talked of a devil with two legs, however, as we have nothing to do to-day with the existence of the devil,——

Here the moderator interrupted the speaker, and stated that as the question for the day was, *Do the Scriptures teach the final holiness and happiness of all men*, it was the duty of the chairman to see that the speakers keep as nearly to the point as possible, and he trusted they would do so, and would not again wander so far from the subject of debate.

Mr. HARRIS resumed,—The great truth revealed in the Bible is that upon which we are to depend, as the light that shines in a dark

place, with regard to man's eternal destiny. The Scriptures of Divine Truth have been given us as the man of our counsel, and we are told that we do well to take heed to these truths, until the day dawn and the day star arise in our hearts. We have spoken of the desire of God. We have proved that God did desire that the Laodicean Church should be in a different position from what it was, and would now refer you to the circumstance of the Saviour when he looked down upon Jerusalem. His words were, *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen doth gather her chickens under her wings, and ye would not.* And in the eighth chapter of John, *Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life.* Here we see that their life depended upon their coming to the saviour. However, I perceive that my friend has got a license to say that Methodists will tell unqualified falsehoods without interruption; but when I come to touch upon that point—it is out of order. I really hope that men engaged on this occasion will act themselves like men bound to the judgment. God desires the happiness of all men; but he desires it upon Gospel terms. He desires their happiness, but he also desires their holiness. He “will have all men to be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth.” This is found in 1st Tim. i. 4. He did not quote that, because a part of that passage was against him.

Mr. LAVELL.—I may just look over my notes, to see if I have noted anything worthy of replying to. My opponent stated that he did not attend to the argument of the desire of God, because he had not time to do so. He has had time since then; and what has he done, in the name of common sense, to prove to this audience, that inasmuch as God desires the holiness and happiness of all mankind, and that whatsoever his soul desireth that he doeth,—what has he done to prove that this desire will be unsatisfied, or to weaken the position which I have assumed? The gentleman has gone to other parts of Holy Writ, and has picked up a verse here and a verse there, for the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of this audience. Why does he not meet me upon this position, and grapple with it like a man? For if God desires the final holiness and happiness of all men, it is as plainly stated that what God desireth that he doeth. There is no getting clear of it. He still retorts, with what I hold to be a stale objection, that because God's desires are not accomplished now, they never will be. I maintain that God's desires will be accomplished throughout the whole wide universe. Very well, let the gentleman stand up, as a minister, and say that the desires of God are defeated, in any one issue. Let us look at this old argument, God desires that all men should be happy now, but inasmuch as all men are not happy now, they never will be. Wonderful logic to use in reference to a perfect Deity!—It might do for an imperfect man;

ptures of Divine  
and we are told  
e day dawn and  
of the desire of  
odicean Church  
would now refer  
ked down upon  
alem, *thou* that  
unto thee, how  
n as a hen doth  
ot. And in the  
at ye may have  
coming to the  
a license to say  
at interruption ;  
order. I really  
selves like men  
all men ; but he  
ess, but he also  
aved, and come  
Tim. i. 4. He  
gainst him.

if I have noted  
at he did not at-  
d not time to do  
in the name of  
as God desires  
soever his soul  
this desire will  
assumed? The  
as picked up a  
ing dust in the  
n this position,  
e final holiness  
at God desireth  
l retorts, with  
desires are not  
at God's desires  
iverse. Very  
hat the desires  
old argument,  
inasmuch as  
erful logic to  
mperfect man ;

but not for a perfect God. How does my opponent know that God desires the perfect happiness of all men now? I deny this position. God made man subject to vanity. He is a progressive being; and to argue, that because the child is not a full-grown man in infancy, therefore God's desires are defeated, is not what I would expect. I trust we shall have something better than this before the day closes. He says men cannot be happy unless a change takes place in them. Now, I am just proving that God desires this change; and that it will undoubtedly take place. My opponent stated that I said the Methodists were heathens. I did not say any such thing. He may shake his head as much as he pleases. I said that instead of going with the Bible in their hands, they go forth with powder and cannon as well, and I said that it were far better, and we conceived it to be our duty to go as missionaries among his Methodist brethren, that there are plenty of heathen men amongst them. My opponent says I deny the Bible, as much as to say that I am an infidel. Messrs. Moderators, is it infidelity to advocate that God is Infinitely Just, that he is Infinitely Holy, Merciful, Good and Powerful? Is it infidelity to say that the Son of God was sent by this holy Being to save the whole world? Is it infidelity to say that the Lord "will see of the travail of his soul and will be satisfied?" Is it infidelity to say that all men will on Gospel grounds be made holy and happy? For I do not believe they will be saved on any other than Gospel grounds:—"for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. What is infidelity? It is unbelief. Now which is the greater infidel of the two? I believe that God is infinite in all his perfections, and that he will succeed in reconciling to himself all persons for whom he sent the Saviour. My opponent believes that the Saviour will be defeated; that a semi-omnipotent devil will go off with the palm of victory, and that the Saviour will go back and tell his father that he has only these few to give him, after all his sufferings, for the devil ran off with the rest. Which is infidelity? The passage quoted from Revelations is not at all to the point, and he may use such language as "dish water" and such stuff, but allow me to say that I have no wish to be contaminated with the filth indicated in such a course of expression. My opponent also stated, that they—the Methodists—did send to preach glad tidings of great joy which shall be to all people. I deny this. I admit that they are sent to preach glad tidings, but not of great joy, which joy shall be to all people. He believes in preaching glad tidings I admit; but not in preaching great joy in connection with it; for the joy that is distinct from the tidings he does not believe will be fulfilled. I quoted Romans he says to show that all men were not created miserable. I quoted it to rebut his assertion that man ought to be perfectly holy and happy at the commencement of his progress, and if not so, then he never will be. And I quoted it to show that God made man subject

to vanity. He handles the passage as though I was satisfied it told against my argument. I beg of him to read the passage as stated by the inspired penman "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body," that is, the Jews and the Gentiles. They shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption. So they will. Why did he not finish the passage? They shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption *into the glorious liberty of the children of God*. Now, I claim the argument in this part of the debate. My opponent has asserted that the passage includes both Jews and Gentiles, which I consider includes all mankind. But he does not stop there. He qualifies it like a good Universalist. He says they shall be raised from the dead and made holy. This, then, he has advanced in the debate, that the passage includes both Jew and Gentile, and that they shall be raised from the dead and made holy and happy. I beg his attention to the argument based on the desire of God, for I shall soon leave it as I have some fifty or sixty positions to bring forward. But if he cannot take this position from me, he cannot take any. He says all *should* become holy and happy. I perfectly agree with him. I believe they *will* be holy and happy. My argument based on the desire of God proves it, and this argument he has not yet touched. He has quoted a passage where the Saviour says, "how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. He quotes this to show that God's Will is defeated. I have not introduced the Will of God. But I will remind him that it is the Saviour's language, and he must bear in mind that I cannot allow him to assume that Jesus Christ is the very and Eternal God. I cannot allow him to assume the heathen notions of the Trinity. But I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and not the Deity himself. My opponent stated that I said the Methodists told unqualified falsehoods. I did not say any such thing. He said he was told that I said thus and so. I denied it. I said it was not the first time that some of his Methodist brethren had made false statements in regard to the debate, for I knew it to be done within the last few days.

Mr. HARRIS.—The first thing is the question—What had I done with the desire of God? I had attended to it fully and had proved pointedly and plainly that God desires individuals to be in a different position from what they now were in. That God desired the Laodicean Church to be either cold or hot. I wish the gentleman to attend particularly to that passage in the Revelations, because it is a passage in point. God desired the Laodicean Church to be either cold or hot, and because they were neither cold nor hot he would spue them out of his mouth. I stated that God desires the salvation of all men on gospel terms. He does not desire to take them to heaven in their sins, consequently he has provided the Great Salvation to qualify them for the

felicities of the inheritance of the saints, and has sent out the heralds of the cross to preach salvation in his blessed name. The exhortation is, Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect. My opponent brought forward the fact that a child is a child and not a man, and that a twig was not a tree, and he wanted to make out from that, that God desires the child to be a man, and the twig to be a tree. But the question is, Does God desire men and women to be sinners now? if so then God is well pleased with sin. But if God is not well pleased with men and women living in sin any longer, then it must be evident that God is opposed to it, and wishes these individuals to forsake their sins. His language is, "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let them turn unto the Lord for he will have mercy upon them, and to our God for he will abundantly pardon." This was the passage I quoted that the gentleman never attended to. God desires man to be happy now. We admit that; but we will not admit that God is willing that men should live in sin. The Lord says, Let the wicked return unto me. And again, I will that men repent everywhere, and come unto him with all their sins upon them, and turn from the error of their ways. Is this not an evidence that he wishes them to repent. "God desireth that all men should be finally holy and happy, and whatsoever he desireth that he doeth." If they are not holy and happy now, there is no evidence that God will change; because God is unchangeable; and if God is unchangeable, and if they are not holy and happy, let my opponent bring forward some evidence that they will be holy and happy hereafter. It will not do to say that a Holy Being will not suffer his creatures to be endlessly miserable. God did not send his Son into the world to make men happy, but to save them from their sins. If God gave his Son to die for them, was it not to make them happy now. It is admitted that some are happy now, because they are saved now. If men are saved they are saved here, and we have no evidence they can be saved in any other state. This we will not admit, because it is unsound and unchristian. He declares that the desire of God was realized in all worlds. How is it now? Is God satisfied with the condition of men at the present time? Then, if satisfied with them, why send preachers to try to make them better? If satisfied with them now, why does he still command them to repent, and turn from the error of their ways? If satisfied with them why tell them to change their course that they may live? How can he do it. It would be inconsistent to do so. Deity would be inconsistent with himself. My opponent next goes on to speak of those passages of Scripture where it is stated that God is Infinitely Just, Infinitely Holy, Infinitely Merciful, and so on, as if just because God is Infinitely Just and Merciful now, and will be to all eternity; man being miserable now, will afterwards be holy and happy, and never more rendered miserable.

There is a great amount of misery in this world. Hearts are broken, men and women are degraded, and live in sin and wretchedness. This being the case, God is *however* holy and happy, and how can men and women remain degraded and God remain holy and happy,—for it is evident that such is the case. I believe equally with my opponent that God's desires will be satisfied, and that whatsoever God desireth that he doeth. He desires that we may live a life of holiness in this world, and gave his Son to die, that *whosoever* believed in him might live, and he sent his glorious Gospel, to proclaim this truth in our hearing that we might be holy and happy. With regard to the remarks on infidelity, my opponent is desirous that you should believe that I am more an infidel than he is. Who is an infidel? The man who believes in God and who believes in Jesus Christ as the Saviour of all men. Is he an infidel who believes more than God has taught him? I profess to believe what God has taught. My opponent professes to believe more than God has taught, and he who professes to believe more than God has taught is an infidel. I believe that God has taught that "by grace are ye saved through faith." "That without faith it is impossible to please God." That he who cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of all them that diligently seek him. I have already remarked that God desires the salvation of all men upon Gospel terms, and these terms are repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. These are Gospel terms, and upon no other terms can God save any one, for he commands all men everywhere to repent. If God will save them without that repentance, then he will save them without that which is requisite, which in the nature of things he cannot do. He talks ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~matter~~. I am sorry that I introduced the phrase, but I did ~~so~~ ~~because~~ I thought it applicable. My opponent stated that the Methodist preachers did not preach glad tidings of great joy to all people, that they only preached it in part. But the Methodists believe and teach that Jesus Christ by the Grace of God hath tasted death for every man, and that he laid down his life to save sinners, and that *whosoever* shall comply with the conditions laid down in the Bible will be endlessly holy and happy. This is what the Methodists believe, and this is what they teach.—Then a passage from the Romans viii. 22. The whole creation groaneth and travaileth 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 said in reference to this passage, we will be delivered from the body of corruption. I say that the apostle Paul is demonstrating that the Gentiles will be raised as well as the Jews, and they will be made holy and happy, as well as the Jews, in a future state; that the salvation was not provided for Jews only, but for the Gentiles and Jews together, so that *whosoever will* may partake of the Grace of God free'y.



parts are broken, and weakness. This is how even men and women are happy,—for it is my opponent that I desireth that he should be in this world, that he might live, that he might be in our hearing, that he might make the remarks on the Gospel that I am now making. The man who is the Saviour of all men has taught him? My opponent professes to believe the Gospel, and desires to believe that God has taught men without faith it is not God that must believe, but men must diligently seek the salvation of all men towards God on Gospel terms, and demands all men to repentance, which is the Gospel. I also I thought it was the teachers did not only preached Jesus Christ by the word, but that he laid down his life for all to comply with the word, to be holy and happy. My opponent teach.—Then my opponent's definition of grace is, but ourselves, but ourselves groan for redemption, and delivered from sin, demonstrating that they will be saved; that the Gentiles and Jews are saved of God freely.

Some was made to our heathen notions of the Deity, and my opponent would not allow the passage from St. Matthew I quoted, "How often would I have gathered you together as a hen doth gather her chickens under her wings, but ye would not," to be taken into account in the debate because the Methodists have heathen notions of the Deity. I would only say we have no idols in our worship; we rest upon the infallible precepts of revelation. I have attended to the argument on the desire of God, and have shown God did desire, and that God had not his desire satisfied in the state of the Laodicean Church. Let my opponent say that God has his desire in the condition of all men, and every man and woman must arrive at the conclusion that there will never be any other state. But man we are told is in a progressive state.

Mr. LAVELL,—I will merely correct the gentleman, and not take up much more time with assertions that have no bearing upon the point. My opponent says, God desires individuals to be different from what they are now. So he does: he desires them to become holy and happy; but my opponent takes the ground, that this desire will be unsatisfied to all eternity. He said also, that God did not desire to save them in their sins, and wished to impress upon the audience the idea that I had said so. I believe no such thing. It is nonsense to talk of salvation *in sin*. It is salvation *from sin* that I believe in. "Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord." Does this prove that God's desire will be defeated? Does this prove that the holiness and happiness of all men will never take place? No such thing. Let the wicked man forsake his way, is what I would say to all. And I believe all will forsake their evil ways,—all will be saved on Gospel terms too. But my opponent states that if all men are not perfectly happy now, they never will be. How suicidal is such a belief of these self-styled evangelicals! The Bible says that no man is *perfectly* holy and happy now, nor can he be until he is raised from the dead. But according to my opponent's argument, if all men are not *perfectly holy now*, they never will be. Then, what surety has my opponent of the salvation of himself or of his brother evangelicals? No surety whatever. I rest my hope of immortal felicity on the sure and certain fact, that God *desires* my ultimate holiness and happiness, and that *what he desireth that he doeth*. My opponent has referred to the word *doeth* in this passage as if it were not the word; but the words are, "What his soul desireth that he doeth. No Universalist could frame it in stronger language than the inspired penman has done. My opponent takes the ground that Christ saves men in this world, but not in a future world. I do not imagine my opponent believes any such thing. How does he know

that Christ does not save men in a future world, seeing that he has power to reconcile all things, both in heaven and on the earth; seeing, too, that Christ's reign is still in existence, and that his rule and government will extend into a future world, and that his kingdom shall continue to exist until he shall have *subdued all things*? Then shall he himself also be subdued unto the Father, that God may be ALL IN ALL. My opponent says I stated that God's desires are satisfied in all worlds. I state so again; and in my proof text the inspired penman has stated so positively: "What God's soul desireth, that he doeth. This is my authority; and if the gentleman does not bow to that, he can bow to some other Gospel. My opponent says, "men and women are degraded now, and God is holy and happy now: may not men and women be degraded in a future state, and God be still holy and happy? Men and women may be sinners in a future life,"—I do not say they will,—but admit they may be; they may be degraded and tormented with suffering—for a year; for a thousand years; even for a million of years—that does not imply that they will be suffering throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity. There is, you will see, a vast difference between punishment that is limited and punishment that is ENDLESS. God, I am satisfied, will bring all men to holiness and happiness on Gospel terms. He will force no man, for all will be willing to come to him, which I shall prove by and by, in another position. My opponent believes that Christ tasted death for every man. So do I, and this is one of my reasons for being a Universalist. Make me believe that he tasted death for only a part of the human family, as the old blue Calvinists believe, and I should be a Calvinist; but because the Scriptures say Christ tasted death for every man, therefore I am a Universalist, soul and body one. My opponent again displays the eighth chapter of the Romans, and there, I maintain, there is much that he cannot get over. He does not seem to satisfy himself with his arguments on that passage. He does not assert from it that Jews and Gentiles will be holy and happy; and certainly they will, if the whole creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the Children of God. To get clear of that passage in the Romans, too, he has stated that the salvation is *provided* for the Gentiles. Did you not remark that expression—it is *provided* for them? Read the passage, and you will see the difficulty he was in. He wishes to draw back. He is afraid there will be too many saved, and therefore he says it is *provided* for you all. Is there any such word in the inspired language? It is, "the creature itself shall be delivered,"—not *may be* delivered, but *shall be* delivered,—"from the bondage of corruption"—not into an endless hell, but "into the glorious liberty of the Children of God." I have still to ask my opponent to stand up and say that God's desires will remain unsatisfied to all eternity. I am glad he does not. My posi-

tion is, that God desires the final salvation of all men. My opponent believes this. I maintain that God will accomplish this desire on Gospel terms—he will do it according to the means and terms he himself has laid down; and that it is said that the whole human family will be saved. I do not deny the salvation of men upon Gospel terms. My Bible says so, and the Bible is the pillar of my faith.

Mr. HARRIS,—The first thing my opponent noticed was, that God desires all men to be holy and happy now. But this I already met by that passage in Revelations, which refers to the Laodicean church. He will not venture to touch that passage. He keeps away from it because if he quotes it, it will strike a death-blow at his whole theory. I admire his cunning in keeping away from, because there is death in it as sure as in the Upas tree. But my opponent would not tell us where they were to be saved from sin—whether in this world or in the next. I believe that God is unchangeable, and believing that God is unchangeable, my argument is, as it was at first, that if God is unchangeable, and will remain so, individuals that will not change now so as to bring themselves into a state of reconciliation with God will remain unholy, and consequently unhappy. Man is happy only when in union with God. "I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing." It is only in union with God through Jesus-Christ that the soul of man is happy, and when the soul of man is happy in union with God through Christ Jesus, that man is saved on Gospel terms. My friend says, Whatsoever God desireth that he will do. What a man is doing now, and what he will do at a future period, are things entirely different. The words are, however, "Whatsoever his soul desireth, that he doeth," not, that he will do. And if God does whatsoever his soul desireth, he doeth it now. Let us look at the state of our world. Will we infer that God does not desire the salvation of all men? No; but he desires their salvation on Gospel terms. And he has laid down these terms—"Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him turn unto the Lord and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon. Would my opponent reverse the declaration, and say, "If the wicked does not forsake his way, the Lord will pardon him." If so, he will make out God to be partial. God provided a plan of salvation. He sent his Son into the world, not to condemn the world, but that whosoever believed on him might be saved. And Jesus, before he left the world, gave this commission to his Apostles: "Go unto all the world and preach the Gospel. He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." Now, unless salvation and damnation are one and the same thing, how can all be finally holy and happy?

If there is no difference between the terms, then we will all be saved together. But there is no evidence that God will accept in a future world those who reject his grace in this. Where is the evidence? It is not found either in reason or revelation. But my opponent believes that the Saviour's reign will be continued in a future world. He says man is a progressive being. I believe it; but we frequently find his progress to be from drunkenness to misery, from misery to the jail, and from the jail to the penitentiary, and still progressing until he gets up the steps of the gallows. Thus we find man is a progressive being more ways than one. But again, we are told that Christ will reign until all his enemies shall be put under his feet. He must reign and will continue to reign in a future world, and that we will reign with him. This I believe. My opponent next tells us he believes in a limited punishment; but he did not say how long. He did not tell us that he believed those who rejected the Gospel here would be a thousand or a hundred thousand years in hell, and that then the scorching fires of the infernal regions will purify their hearts and reconcile them to God. If this is the belief, then will the punishment that a man receives in a future state be greater than the pangs and the agony of Calvary, and than all the influences and operations of the Eternal Spirit. Then will man's misery in a future state be the means of his salvation; and he will not be saved on Gospel terms, but on the terms of a limited punishment! Where does the Gospel say so? I wish he would tell us what bounds he would put to that punishment. Is it one year? Is it ten years, or a thousand years? I did not know he would run into this; but he has run into it, and if a bad beginning do not make a bad end, just wait till the end of this debate and you will see a wonderful change. But all men, he says, are saved on Gospel terms. Why does he not name the terms? They are—"repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ," and if any man that is not saved on these terms is saved by his punishment, and if all that are thus saved get to heaven. When they get to glory they will say: What do we thank the Lord for? We have got to glory, but no thanks to him. And while the redeemed in glory will be singing, "Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation," they will be singing,

"Glory to the punishment we got going along,"

for that was our salvation, that was our saviour. My opponent next stated that he was a Universalist minister because he believes that Jesus "tasted death for every man." I believe this too. Christ has tasted death for every man. "He died that we might live." John iii., 16, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." But it is evident that there is a condition in the Gospel

e will all be saved  
 accept in a future  
 is the evidence?  
 But my opponent  
 in a future world.  
 but we frequently  
 from misery to the  
 progressing until  
 an is a progressive  
 d that Christ will  
 is feet. He must  
 , and that we will  
 next tells us he  
 ay how long. He  
 d the Gospel here  
 in hell, and that  
 purify their hearts  
 n will the punish-  
 an the pangs and  
 l operations of the  
 state be the means  
 terms, but on the  
 Gospel say so? I  
 that punishment.  
 ? I did not know  
 f a bad beginning-  
 is debate and you  
 ys, are saved on  
 s? They are—  
 us Christ," and if  
 y his punishment,  
 they get to glory  
 have got to glory,  
 in glory will be  
 food, out of every  
 will be singing,

" My opponent next  
 he believes that  
 too. Christ has  
 live." John iii.,  
 begotten Son that  
 have everlasting  
 in the Gospel

connected with this offer of salvation. It may be understood by every intelligent being what the condition is, "*Whosoever believeth in him.*" But the next point must be attended to. "The whole creation groaneth until now." The Apostle says, "We ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the redemption of our body." The bodies of men in the resurrection will be immortal bodies. Here, then, we are to be raised according to the great truth here declared, that those that are raised as Children of God then, will be raised holy and happy; the wicked will be raised under different circumstances. My opponent stated that I was afraid there would be too many saved. No, no; that is not so; but I am afraid there will be too many duped by false teachers. And if the Saviour said "Many shall seek to enter in but shall not be able," I am afraid the reason will be, not because the grace of God was not offered to them, but because they did not comply with the terms of they did not receive the blessed Gospel.

Mr. LAVELL—My opponent still makes a desperate effort to get clear of the great truth taught by the apostle in the 8th chapter of the Romans, "Ourselves also, which have the *first fruits* of the Spirit." My opponent says there is a distinction here. What distinction is there? If there is one stated, I should be glad to know it. The only distinction, if it may be called so, is that they the believers had the first fruits of that spirit which would be enjoyed by the whole creation when they "shall be" delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. The redemption of our body; is an expression of the Apostle Paul, and my friend states that this "*body*" meant the Jews and Gentiles. But here he gets out of the frying pan into the fire. For he says further that the *bodies* of men will be raised. Oh! friend Harris these two statements will not tally. My friend was right when he said "the redemption of our body meant Jews and Gentiles,"—and *that is* the whole creation that shall be delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God. But he sees the difficulty into which he got and wishes to draw back. He wishes you to take the ground that it means, the *bodies* of men will be raised. There is not one word about the *bodies* of men being raised. I deny that the same identical bodies of men will be raised. My friend also stated that there will be a wonderful change when this debate is over. I do hope so, and I really do begin to think that if the debate continues as it has hitherto, there will be certainly a wonderful change. But what side will the change be on. Those who have heard even the few speeches my friend has given, I will venture to say, that there is not an intelligent Methodist in the whole land but will say, that my friend has not taken the position out of my hand, and that I have proved that all men will ultimately be saved. He says there are conditions in the Gospel.

I have admitted it. He wishes to drive me into a position in which I do not wish to stand—that is,—that I believe that if mankind are not saved through gospel means, they will be saved through some other means. This is what he tries to make the audience believe. But I have stated over and over again that I believe all mankind will be saved on Gospel terms. These grounds, whatever they are, must be complied with, to enter that happy state. They will be complied with ultimately; but that the immortal state entirely depends upon any conditions with man, I deny distinctly, and demand the proof. I believe there are conditions attached to the *Gospel*; that men must comply with the conditions of that *Gospel*, and that no man can be saved unless all the conditions are complied with. But I have taken the position that God desires the ultimate holiness and happiness of all mankind, and that whatsoever he desireth that he doeth. One of his desires is the ultimate holiness and happiness of all men, and the inspired writer has stated in plain language, that “whosoever he desireth that he doeth.” My opponent says God desires the holiness and happiness of all men now. Has he offered one word of proof on this point? No. If God desired the perfect holiness and happiness of every human being now, I believe it would be done, for whatsoever God desireth that he doeth. God works by means. God has instituted certain means that will be *effectual* in the saving of the race, for he hath given all power—the fulness of power—to Christ, to save every individual that lives, or that shall ever live. Hence I believe that God desires the ultimate salvation of the race, and that what he desires that he doeth. To put the expression “What his soul desireth that he will do,” will make it no stronger for the Universalist. We do know that he desires all men to be ultimately holy and happy, and that the Scriptures affirm that whatsoever his soul desireth that he doeth. The objection raised is, that God desires the perfect holiness and happiness of all men now, and therefore if they are not happy now, they never will be. But of this I desired proof. I asked my opponent for proof that God desires this holiness and happiness of all men now, but he has not given it. He has neglected to pay any attention to the expression in Romans which I introduced,—the great fact that God *made man subject to vanity*,—but he runs to the conclusion of the verse. Why does he not reconcile this with his views; with the fact that man was made subject to vanity. My opponent stated that I believed in limited punishment in the future world. I stated no such thing. He will not take my words up as I express them, but will continually misrepresent me. I stated *this*, that the question of difference between us was not whether the sinner was punished in a future world or not. This is what I stated. A *limited* punishment, was not the question of difference between us; but the question of *endless* punishment. This is the position the gentleman will be under the necessity of proving to—

morrow. I believe that God will inflict a *just* punishment upon every individual that violates his laws, and that no one, even by repentance, can evade the just punishment of his *past* deeds. For I believe that repentance looks to the future and not to the past. For the past he must suffer, for God has distinctly stated that he will *by no means* clear the guilty. My friend has stated that the sinner must repent and be converted. No one objects to this. I believe in this as well as my friend does. He then, taking for granted that I believed in a future limited punishment, wished you to imagine that this punishment would be the means of man's salvation. I did not take this position:—but my time is up.

Mr. HARRIS,—The first passage to which I shall attend is the one in Romans already alluded to. I shall quote it as it is, Romans viii., 16: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we 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 the present time *are* not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us." Is this applicable to all men? I think not. My opponent wishes to make an impression in regard to that passage, God made man subject to vanity. God created man a moral agent. He created man a moral being, and as such he is both responsible and accountable. This will bear out what we said before, that is, that the Jews, who had the first fruits of the Spirit, groaned within themselves. We will have that to-morrow, and the gentleman will attempt to disprove the resurrection of the same body. But we have done with this passage in Romans. My opponent stated that the position taken up by his friend will not tally about the salvation of the Jews and Gentiles. His friend is willing to allow it to go before the world as it is. But my opponent is as ingenious and cunning as a fox that has been trapped and lost a limb. He will not come near that passage in the Revelations; as I told him, it was death to him on that point. There is not ingenuity or skill enough, however, in the gentleman to turn aside the sharp sword with the two edges, which makes him feel in the joints and marrow. My friend goes on to tell us, that all men will be saved on Gospel terms; but he never preaches these Gospel terms, repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. These are never preached in a Universalist Church. You might as soon expect to see a white blackbird, or a pious devil, as to hear a Universalist preach, "They that believe not shall be damned. No, never—never. I believe that all men that will be saved must be saved on Gospel terms. But except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye repent ye cannot be saved. Then there is the condition which God lays

down, but my friend will keep away from it. It is, Whosoever believeth in the Lord Jesus Christ hath everlasting life. My friend says the immortal state does not depend upon any condition; so that, you see, the gentleman encourages sin of every kind. He first teaches that all men will be holy and happy, and that happiness is not the reward of holiness,—what an encouragement to live in sin,—to say that salvation does not depend upon terms at all. But what does the Bible say? “Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.—Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, for they shall enter in through the gates of the city.” These are conditions, and they cannot be got by. My friend wishes to impress upon you the passage, “Whosoever God desireth that he doeth,”—not, that he will do. That puts it in the present tense,—“Whosoever his soul desireth that he doeth.” If God does all that he desires, and if individuals are not holy and happy now,—we reiterate the argument already advanced,—that the very same unchangeable God can remain unchangeably the same, and sinners remain sinners, and God have his desire. If he desires the salvation of men now, he desires it on Gospel terms, and on no other terms, and except a man be born again he cannot be saved. My friend then goes on to say that God works by means. He does not, however, wish to tell you what these means are. I shall tell you. I hinted at them before. He works by the preaching of the Gospel—by the influences of the Holy Spirit—by the preaching of his word among sinners. And how many ministers have to return home and say with the Prophet of old—Who hath believed our report? With this glorious Gospel of my friend’s, is it not wonderful that he does not make Universalists of us? But unless he can get an infidel to take shelter in a corner of his faith, he will exist alone in the belief of endless happiness, without complying with the conditions of the Gospel. He went on to say that God would have whatsoever his soul desireth, and he brought in the passage as from the New Testament, that it might look a little better. He then stated that he did not mention limited punishment. He said he did not believe that man would be endlessly punished; but as I have a mind for drawing inferences, I drew the inference, and it amounted to the same as if he had said it. I would have set it down that he was not one of these *hell redemptionists*, although he is placed in as much dilemma, for I asked him if he believed in the punishment working out the holiness of men, or if salvation proceeded from the Lord Jesus Christ. He believes in punishment, but it is not endless. However, it is as it is. My friend then went on to say that God would inflict a punishment upon every man, and that no man would escape punishment by repentance towards God. He says repentance has reference to the future, and not to the past. What saith the Scriptures?—“And that



It is, Whosoever  
 g life. My friend  
 condition; so that,  
 He first teaches  
 happiness is not  
 to live in sin,—  
 at all. But what  
 , and I will give  
 s commandments,  
 they shall enter  
 nditions, and they  
 n you the passage,  
 t he will do. That  
 ul desireth that he  
 ndividuals are not  
 ready advanced,—  
 unchangeably the  
 his desire. If he  
 Gospel terms, and  
 he cannot be saved.  
 means. He does  
 I shall tell you.  
 ig of the Gospel—  
 oling of his word  
 o return home and  
 our report? With  
 ul that he does not  
 t an infidel to take  
 e in the belief of  
 conditions of the  
 o whatsoever his  
 n the New Testa-  
 ted that he did not  
 believe that man  
 mind for drawing  
 the same as if he  
 s not one of these  
 much dilemma, for  
 ng out the holiness  
 Jesus Christ. He  
 ver, it is as it is.  
 ct a punishment  
 e punishment by  
 s reference to the  
 ures?—"And that

repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. Repentance has reference to the future! Did Judas repent for what he was going to do, when he took back the thirty pieces of silver, and then went and hanged himself. Did the Jews repent in reference to what they were about to do, when Peter cried out, "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain. Know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ. Now, when they heard this they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter, and to the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Here then, friends, we say that this is not a repentance with regard to the future, but it refers to the past, a godly sorrow for sin, which worketh repentance unto salvation not to be repented of. Jesus is exalted a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and remission of sins. My friend believes that if a man does repent he will be punished, even after having believed. But the Lord Jesus Christ is our righteousness. The Apostle Paul says: Being justified freely by His Grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God. To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. This is the point, and in his very soul it tells, and operates powerfully upon him.

Mr. LAVELL.—The gentlemen wound up with much declamation and bombast. He tells us that in his very soul the gentleman feels it. What do I feel. I feel that my opponent is in as bad a predicament as any man I have discussed with these seven or eight years. I have never discussed with a man in so forlorn a condition as the Rev. Mr. Harris is at this time. He will still misrepresent me. He talks of remission of sins, and forgiveness of sins, which I believe, but if he attempt to prove the remission or forgiveness of punishment, I must oppose it. I challenge him to prove before this audience that God forgives a man his *just punishment*, in the face of the declaration, that he will by NO MEANS clear the guilty. I did say that repentance looks to the future, and I still declare that it does, and he has not refuted. What is repentance? He said, godly sorrow. So it is, but it is not that kind of sorrow which we see during great protracted Church Meetings. We do not see it there. Godly sorrow for sin is repentance towards God, it is sorrow for the past. How is it sorrow for the past? The sinner has done wrong, he has been convicted of

that wrong, and hence repents. I do believe in the reform of the individual, and restraints which look to the future. But repentance does not look to the past, for a man is not forgiven his just punishment. He must suffer for his sins, and I maintain that this suffering is one of the means that has brought him to repentance. How was it in the case of the prodigal son. His words were, I will arise and go to my father. His repentance was thus brought round by punishment in the providence of God. Certainly for he repented and returned to his father's house. My opponent says—the gentleman does not preach the glorious gospel. I maintain that I do, and if he does not take my position out of my hands, the impression will be left upon the minds of the audience that I do preach the glorious Gospel. He then asks, Is it not wonderful that the gentleman cannot make Universalists of us? He has used some pretty hard language in relation to pious devils, in speaking of Universalists to-day. I say it is not at all wonderful when we consider the manner in which he conducts himself in this debate. It is useless to throw pearls before swine. No, friend, I cannot convert you to Universalism so long as you *will not* be convinced, let the arguments be ever so strong. He said also the expression was, that what God desireth that he doeth. Give me your attention. He said he “believed that God desired the ultimate holiness and happiness of all mankind, and he said that whatever God desireth that he doeth,—not will do.” Then he maintains that God's desire is defeated, for he believes God desires all men to be holy and happy *now*, but he is defeated in his desires. Now, either Mr. Harris has manifestly uttered that which is false, or all men are perfectly holy and happy *now*; yet he admits that God desires this state ultimately, and that what God desires he doeth. I have shewn that man is a *progressive* being: that the twig must be a twig before it is a large tree: that God made man subject to vanity; I have proved all this, and hence, as God desires the ultimate holiness and happiness of all mankind on Scripture grounds, I maintain that “whatsoever his soul desireth **THAT HE DOETH.**” I ended my last speech by saying some Universalists did believe in a limited punishment; but no Universalist believes that after he has suffered a just punishment for his sins that thereafter he can claim the mansions of everlasting bliss. After we have suffered for what we have done we have no claim upon the Deity whatever. I maintain that the *immortal* state of bliss is *not conditional* but *unconditional*, and I demanded the gentleman to prove the contrary, but I have not heard one word in support of it. No, the immortal state of bliss is the *gift* of God; it is not of works lest any man should boast. After we have suffered for what we have done, we have no claim upon the Deity. If we violate his laws, and must suffer. As in the physical world, if a man puts his finger into the fire he will be burned, and no repentance will undo that

suffering; so is it in the moral world of God. So he must look out in future, and not put his finger into the fire. So when he commits sin he must look out in the future and not suffer the consequences. This is the fruit of repentance. He undertook to do something with the eighth chapter of Romans, but strange to tell he came to the words "Man was created subject to vanity," says he, and then came out with the expression that, man is a moral agent—and we did not hear one word of the eighth chapter of Romans after that expression. He dares not grapple with me on that chapter. I admit man is a moral agent. But he must prove that man is able to defeat the desires of an infinitely holy God, and then I will admit my position to be false. I admit that man is a moral agent; but I believe that God, as a perfect being gave him this free agency, this moral agency, not to defeat his own will; by no means. It will all work harmoniously. I have stated that man as a moral agent will ultimately act harmoniously with the desires of God. His will and purpose will be effected ultimately. Talk of Universalists preaching Gospel Salvation on Gospel terms, my opponent said, "You might as well talk of a white blackbird or a pious devil." I will not say much in reply to this. But I will correct him by saying, we do preach Salvation on Gospel terms. I have said so a dozen times this morning already. I must take the ground that all mankind will be saved on Gospel terms, and on Gospel grounds, whatever the gentleman may say to the contrary.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, TWO O'CLOCK.

Mr. HARRIS.—The first thing that I wish to notice is the commencement of the last speech of my opponent. He stated that God forgave sins, but did not remit punishment. That is to say, salvation is not a preventive of damnation. A man may be saved, and when saved damned. To be forgiven, and then punished, is awful in the extreme. How do we understand the idea of forgiveness? Let my child offend against me and be forgiven. Well, he approaches me with tears in his eyes, and says, Dear father, can you forgive me? I would say, My child, I forgive you this time; I hope you will not offend so any more. But, according to this new theory, I then take the horsewhip, and apply it to the little fellow's back; but he cries out, Father, you told me you forgave me—that is not forgiveness surely, when you are punishing me so severely. Well, I should think that was not forgiveness. The Saviour tells us what forgiveness is. He says, A certain man had two debtors, the one owed him five hundred pence, and the other fifty; and when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me, therefore, which of them will love him most? Simon answered and said, I suppose that he to whom

he forgave most. And the Saviour said unto him, Thou hast rightly judged. My opponent's views altogether reverse the Saviour's ideas of forgiveness. The Lord in mercy save me from such forgiveness. My opponent believes that God forgives the sin, and yet afterward punishes the sinner all that his sins deserve. This he calls Gospel salvation. We don't want such forgiveness. He next refers to repentance as looking entirely to the future, and not to the past. He says the repentance of the Gospel is altogether different from that of the Methodists at their camp meetings and their great gatherings. The man is crazy. I think if he had been living in the days when the Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost, he would have been amongst the number then assembled that said, these men are full of now wine. But Peter knew well the gamut of the Holy Spirit's influences. He had learned the summary of the scheme of salvation. Peter standing up, with the seven, said, These are not drunken as you suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, And it shall come to pass in the last days (saith God), 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. It is not to be wondered at that the children of the same parent should act in the same way. For Christ said to these wicked Jews, ye are of your father the Devil, and the works of your father ye do. It is not to be wondered that they should mock, when the Spirit of the Eternal is poured out on men. And if the alarm goes abroad until their consciences are touched, and they are made to see their sin before God, and come and weep before the altar and seek the salvation of God; they are crazy, they have been at these disgraceful camp meetings. But my Saviour held a camp meeting of three days duration at one time, and he fed the hungry folks with loaves and fishes, and they blessed God and were thankful while they partook of the refreshment which the Saviour presented to them. But my opponent went to confirm what he first stated, that they must suffer every iota of their punishment else they wont be saved. But to him give all the prophets witness that thro his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive the remission of their sins. My opponent stated that repentance belongs to the future; and I denied, it and brought forward the case of Judas and the wicked Jews who had crucified the Lord of Glory. But when they were cut to the heart Peter did not say, they would all be punished, but repent and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. These were not Peter's words; but, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. My opponent stated that my arguments were calculated to prevent men from embracing Universalism, as they would not embrace Universalism so long as I acted as

I did. I bless God for it, I bless God that my arguments are calculated to do so, and I hope they will do so, so long as I breathe the air of Heaven. He then went on to say that God desired the final holiness and happiness of all men, but I said before that God desires their salvation on Gospel terms, and that he desires their salvation now. St. Paul says in 2 Cor. vi. 2, Behold now is thy accepted time; behold now is the day of salvation. This is time then, there is no future. To-day if you will hear his voice harden not your hearts; for some did harden their hearts when they heard the Word of God. In order to make this strong argument stronger, my opponent said, either Mr. Harris or the Apostle had told a falsehood. I do not wish to be understood as misconstruing the argument of the Apostle, but let God be true and every man a liar. My opponent then went on to say that every man should be punished, that every man deserves to be punished. Now, I would like to know how much punishment a lie deserves, I would like to know how much punishment an oath deserves. If my opponent knows let him speak out in the name of Universalism. Let him tell it right out. He next went on to say, that punishment led men to repentance. This from a Universalist is somewhat strange. It is coming from the wrong source. The wrong vein has been tapped. The Scriptures say that the Goodness of God leadeth men to repentance. The Gospel of the blessed Saviour was sent to men to lead them to repentance, and to turn them to God. My opponent illustrated his position by saying, if a child burn his finger he would bear his suffering physically. But does that prove that he could not do it again, is there anything like Godly sorrow in that. The man's common sense must be bewildered. In the name of common sense will men and women think this a godly sorrow. My opponent said I have not attended to the eighth chapter of the Romans. Well I have said enough on that chapter, and you will have the pleasure of reading it by and by. My opponent next referred to man being a moral agent, and next enquired whether man is an independent agent. I want to know whether man committed murder without God helping him. If so, he is independent. If moral he is accountable, and if not independent he is not accountable. A man shoots his fellow man, is it the man or the ball that is the moral agent. The man undoubtedly on account of his moral agency, is accountable to the God who created him. Man is a moral agent and is free to act as he thinks proper. There is a measure of restraining influence upon his actions. But if man acted under the sanction of Almighty God, when they commit wickedness God would be the author of their sin. But my friend keeps away from Revelation iiii. 15. I would thou wert cold or hot. So then, because thou art neither cold nor hot, I will spue the out of my mouth. The desire of God evidently was not fulfilled in the state of the Laodicean Church, and he knows that this passage will strike at the root of his argument.

Mr. LAVELL,—The only part of my friend's speech to which I need refer is the last few words he has uttered. He says I know that the desire of God was defeated in the case of the Laodicean Church. I know no such thing, and it is for him to prove that the desire of God was defeated in the case of the Laodiceans, and to prove it in the face of the inspired penman, who says whatsoever God desireth THAT HE DOETH. He says I dare not touch that passage in Revelations. Yes I dare, and will give him more than he can do presently on that very passage. It will come up at its proper time, when I shall call upon my friend to clear up the difficulty that will arise. He said, because I believe that God never forgives the just punishment for sin, that, therefore, salvation does not prevent damnation. He says, in that view, a man may be both saved and damned. Here is wonderful logic. He says I believe a man may be saved and then damned; I do not believe that a man who is made finally holy and happy will be damned. Nor do I believe that a man may be damned after the resurrection. Suppose I did, this would not affect the question. He must prove that a man must be *endlessly* damned. We shall hear more of this to-morrow. If the gentleman persists in taking the ground that damnation means endless misery, I can prove the eternal misery of Christ is as plain as Scripture language can make it. Let him try it to-morrow, if he dare. My friend brought up an illustration to show, I suppose that the idea that God forgives sins and not punishment is absurd. The illustration was that of the child who comes to its father in tears, and asks its father to forgive him; and then, after the father whips his child, he asks what kind of forgiveness is that? I would like to know where the gentleman learns so degrading ideas of punishment and forgiveness. Has he no more elevating ideas of it? I maintain that the child desired pardon and that punishment was one of the means of bringing the child to its father to get pardoned. I brought forward the case of the prodigal son, and showed that because he was punished, he was reduced to come back to his father's house. But was the father changed? Did he not love the son in his suffering condition? Certainly he did. For when the son was yet a *great way off*, the father ran and fell upon his neck and kissed him. The Scripture here is a perfect illustration of the government of the Almighty. "Will the gentleman tell us," says he, "how much punishment a man requires"; just as much as God thinks is necessary,—that is my answer. And all the punishment I say Amen to. But not endless punishment. He does not touch that. He talks about punishment no man denies; but endless punishment he will keep away from. Then in relation to camp meeting he says, The Saviour held a camp meeting in the wilderness of Judea. I deny that our Saviour held such ridiculous meetings as the camp meetings of the Methodists of our modern times, in the wilderness of Judea. My friend represented me as stating that his arguments would prevent men

speech to which I  
 He says I know that  
 Laodicean Church.  
 at the desire of God  
 prove it in the face  
 and desireth THAT HE  
 Revelations. Yes I  
 esently on that very  
 en I shall eul upon  
 He said, because  
 sment for sin, that,  
 He says, in that  
 re is wonderful logic.  
 a damned; I do not  
 ppy will be damned.  
 ter the resurrection.  
 He must prove that  
 ear more of this to-  
 round that damnation  
 misery of Christ is us-  
 ry it to-morrow, if he  
 suppose that the idea  
 rd. The illustration  
 ears, and asks its  
 whips his child, he  
 like to know where  
 ment and forgiveness.  
 that the child desired  
 of bringing the child  
 e case of the prodigal  
 was reduced to come  
 changed? Did he not  
 y he did. For when  
 and fell upon his neck  
 et illustration of the  
 much as God thinks is  
 hment I say Amen to  
 that. He talks about  
 shment he will keep  
 he says, The Saviour  
 ea. I deny that our  
 amp meetings of the  
 rness of Judea. My  
 ts would prevent men

from becoming Universalists. I did not say any such thing. He said also that I stated that God desires the Salvation of all men now. I stated no such thing. I said if God desired all men to become holy and happy now his desire would be fulfilled. He then quoted the passage, "Now is the accepted time, and now is the day of Salvation." What does he mean to insinuate by this, that this life is a probationary state and that if man is not saved here he never will be? Eighteen hundred years ago the words were expressed. Five hundred years ago the same expression was made,—now is the accepted time. The present day,—now is the accepted time. Yours hence it will be the same,—now is the accepted time; and so will it be until the kingdom of God is delivered up to the Father, and God will be ALL IN ALL. What is the meaning of the word "day" in that passage? I call upon my opponent to prove that it means twenty-four hours. The word "day" according to the definition is "a time," "a dispensation," "an era," and I maintain it means here the Gospel dispensation, or during the existence of the kingdom of Christ, and I maintain it will be so until God be all in all. But my friend would quote it to prove that if a man is not saved here that God will cast him into endless suffering and misery, and not even allow the poor sinner the privilege of repentance, no, not even if the poor fellow is rolling in misery. My God! has it come to this! that a Minister of the Gospel in the nineteenth century will maintain before this audience, that God will not grant the poor sinner who may be rolling in misery, the privilege to repent: no, not even if he begs that privilege. My opponent will labor hard to prove here that if a man do not repent in this life he will never have another opportunity. But he may labor till his head is grey, and will not be able to prove it. My opponent stated that I believed punishment leads men to repentance. I said that punishment was one of the means in the government of God that led to repentance; that is good Universalism. It is not the preaching of endless misery, but the *Goodness of God, that leads men to repentance.* I am glad my friend is progressing. He maintains that man is a moral agent; (so do I; but I do state that man is not an independent agent;) and therefore, says he, if man commits murder God does it. But I say that God's acts are infinite and the consequences of them infinite. But the actions of men are finite, and their consequences limited. This is the position I occupy, and to remove it my opponent ought to maintain that the consequence of men's sins are *infinite and endless.* I will proceed to my *Second* argument. I build this on the *fulfilment* of the Law of Love, every man being commanded to love God fully and supremely, and his neighbor as himself. This is shown in Matthew xxii, 36-40: "Master, which is the Great Commandment in the Law?" "Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,

and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment; and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets." Love to God and love to man is thus the substance of all the commandments God has laid upon man; and that this comprehends all the duties enjoined upon him is not only evident from the language of our Saviour, but from that of his Apostles also—Romans xiii., 9,—“If *there be* any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” James denominates it the Royal Law, James ii., 8,—“If ye fulfil the royal law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well. Romans xiii., 10,—“Love is the FULFILLING of the law.” Galatians v., 14,—“For all the law is fulfilled in one word, *even* in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.”

MR. HARRIS.—I am again under the necessity of calling the gentleman's attention to the passage in Revelations. Like the Levite who saw the poor wounded man and passed by on the other side, my friend has looked at the passage and passed by, leaving it standing in all its glory and beauty. In defence of the assertions made, that God does desire things, and things are not in the state that he wants them to be, I gave the evidence from Scripture, “I would ye were cold or hot, but because ye are neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth;” my friend next charges me with saying that man might be saved and damned. But my argument was this, “That salvation is no preventive of damnation, according to my friend's theory that individuals, when their sins are forgiven, are as much exposed to punishment as when their sins were not forgiven. And then to illustrate it, I showed that a father could not forgive his child, and then put all the punishment of the offence upon the child. My friend then made the assertion that he would prove that Jesus Christ, the Saviour of men was endlessly damned. But as that is to-morrow's point, I would advise him not to waste any of his heavenly ammunition until to-morrow, for he will need it all, and require to borrow too if it can be lent. He next brought forward the case of the prodigal son to prove that it was the misery of the prodigal son that brought him to repentance. The Scripture tells us that he said, “I will arise, and will go to my father, and will say to him, ‘I have sinned against Heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son.’” And we are told that when he was yet a great way off his father saw him and had compassion, and ran and fell on his neck, and kissed him. Would he have required compassion provided the punishment he had received was all that he deserved. No, because he would have had a right to his father's embrace without any compassion whatever. His father could not have required of him all the punishment he deserved, *that* was inflicted upon him at the time he



This is the first and it, Thou shalt love men, hang all the love upon man; and that is not only evident his Apostles also—ment, it is briefly love thy neighbor, James ii., 8,—“If thou shalt love thy neighbor, thou shalt love the law.” Love is the law, and the law is fulfilled in the love as thyself.”

calling the gentle—the Levite who saw the sin, my friend has been shining in all its glory that God does desire them to be, I gave them or hot, but because of my mouth,” my friend saved and damned. no preventive of individuals, when their sin is as when their sin. I showed that a punishment of the assertion that he was endlessly advise him not to do so, for he will need to be brought to the misery of the Scripture tells us, and will say to him, and am no more at when he was yet in sin, and ran and required compassion he deserved. No, embrace without any required of him all him at the time he

was in a foreign land. My opponent said this was a perfect illustration of the dealings of God. Let us look at it one moment. Here the prodigal is away in a foreign land. He is in misery, and repents of his sins and returns to God, according to the Scripture already quoted—“Let the wicked forsake his way, and let him return to the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him.” The prodigal came home; the father did not run after him. If the prodigal had remained where he was he might have perished, but when he came home he was received. While he was away his father did not bless him; but when he came home, his father received him and blessed him, and when sinners come home to their Heavenly Father from whom they have strayed, he receives them and blesses them. This is a perfect illustration of God’s dealing with sinners. “Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out.” Thank God for it. My friend said our Father will punish us as much as is necessary. How much is necessary? If my friend takes that position, he must deny that Scripture I have just quoted. It is not what he needs, but what he deserves, that God will give him. But there is a difference between God and my friend on this point. He says God will punish him all that is necessary, and then he says that the goodness of God leads men to repentance. The sufferings of the prodigal, he says, led him to return home, and thus it was not the goodness of God at all, but his own sufferings, that brought him home. He came then to the celebrated camp meetings, but he gave no evidence that souls did not get comfort there. I know that souls get comfort there. I know that the Saviour said, “Where two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. But when he came to that point—referring to the day of Pentecost, “These men are full of new wine,” the sword of the Spirit pierced his soul, and he passed over that passage. He will not touch it. I admire his ingenuity. He next touched upon the passage in 2nd Cor., vi., 2, “Now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation.” I believe exactly as my friend does on this passage; as a matter of course, it tells sinners, in the present tense, to forsake their sins. If I were to preach on this text to-morrow, I would say, “Now is the day of your salvation. The message of salvation is always given in the present tense. There is no to-morrow about it.” My friend next contended that men will have the privilege to repent in a future state, and wondered that I should deny this. What is repentance? It is a godly sorrow for sin. Well, will men have a godly sorrow for sin in a future state? This point, however, we will have up to-morrow, when I come to the question, “Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery for any portion of the human family?” so that I will not spend my arguments upon this till it comes up. However, I would be real glad if my friend would give us any passages of Scripture to prove that men repent in hell and turn to God. If he does, I will furnish arguments to meet

everything brought forward on this point. My friend went on to say that the consequences of men's crimes were not endless; that they were all finite; that whatever we did, had reference only to this world. I will quote the verse I quoted this morning: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." What we do now has reference to the future. "Be thou faithful unto death and thou shalt receive a crown of life." "I have fought the good fight, henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord the righteous Judge will give me at that day, and not to me only but unto all those who love his appearing." I have got my opponent to the second argument. We have squeezed out the second proof text. It is based on the Law of Love. If he cannot prove that every man loves the Lord with all his might, he will not have a single ray of hope concerning the final holiness and happiness of all men. But is not the contrary the fact—thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself—that is not fulfilled in our day. Do not some men take out license to sell liquor, and sell that liquor and demoralize the people, and fill our jails and penitentiaries with the victims of their cupidity? Does not every newspaper, does not every intelligent man declare that there are individuals living in a wretched and unholy state? Do not the Scriptures say the works of the flesh are these—adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings and such like; of the which I tell you now, as I have also told you in time past, that they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. There is a nail driven by that passage which will not be drawn out easily. There is a proof of love. Some men love their neighbors even unto death by depriving them of life. My friend quoted a passage in proof of the Law of Love: "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor"; but what does this prove? If it could prove that a man loves his neighbor as himself it might do something, but the wind has blown his arguments right back in his face, because they are not based on the truths of revelation.

Mr. LAVELL.—If declamation and bombast are to be considered evidence in this debate then the gentleman opposite will undoubtedly gain the victory. But as declamation and bombast are not to be received as evidence in this debate, I shall stand some chance at any rate. I shall finish my argument on the Love of God. I now maintain that the Law of Love will be eventually obeyed by all mankind; and in proof of this position I present you with the words of our Saviour, the object of whose mission was to bring about this Law. He says, in Matthew v., 17, 18,—“Think ye that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say

friend went on to say  
 endless; that they  
 e only to this world.  
 blessed are they that  
 to the tree of life,  
 What we do now  
 into death and thou  
 ht the good fight,  
 ceousness which the  
 and not to me only  
 ve got my opponent  
 e second proof text.  
 ve that every man  
 ave a single ray of  
 of all men. But is  
 eighbour as thyself  
 a take out license to  
 people, and fill our  
 upidity? Does not  
 eclare that there are  
 o not the Scriptures  
 eation, uncleanness,  
 riance, emulations,  
 rders, drunkenness,  
 now, as I have also  
 shall not inherit the  
 passage which will  
 love. Some men  
 them of life. My  
 ve: "Love worketh  
 If it could prove  
 do something, but  
 s face, because they

are to be considered  
 site will undoubtedly  
 are not to be received  
 nce at any rate. I  
 now maintain that  
 ankind; and in proof  
 r Saviour, the object  
 e says, in Matthew  
 roy the Law or the  
 l. For verily I say

unto you, till heaven or earth pass one jot or tittle shall in nowise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Here the Saviour declares that the Law of God shall be fulfilled in every jot and tittle. What is the fulfilment of a law? It is the bringing of men to an obedience to its demands. Thus I finish my argument drawn from the fulfilment of the Law of Love. My friend can make the most of it. He said that I maintained that the Prodigal suffered his punishment and could thus come back when he chose to his father's house. I maintained no such thing; but I maintain that the punishment was one of the means of bringing him back to his father's house. But he had no claims upon his father, because he had suffered the just punishment of his sin. I did maintain that his father's love was unchangeable when he was in sin, and I do maintain that no circumstance can take place in the character of a child that will warrant the father throwing off his obligations,—that will warrant the father to drive the son from his own roof: for the obligations are binding until death separates them. My friend put the question: "How many will come to the Saviour?" The fact is he forgot to tell us. "All that the Father giveth me," Jesus says, "shall come, and him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out." My friend said I would not tell how much punishment is necessary. Now, I would not tell because I could not. An all-seeing and perfect God only can tell how much punishment a human being requires. I said I was satisfied with the punishment our Heavenly Father would see fit to inflict upon his children, and I would rather take the most degraded man that should die in the depths of his iniquity and place him in the hands of God than in the hands of the best man that ever lived. God is unchangeable, and he is the father of sinners. I agreed with my friend that the Goodness of God leads men to repentance. Even, says he, the gentleman preaches the Goodness of God. I maintain that the Goodness of God gave the Prodigal his punishment; and also, that all the punishment man receives comes from the Goodness of God. When the physician comes to a sick man, he does not come to give him pain or to kill him, but to restore him to his wonted health. It is an evil to take medicine, unless taken to restore the health. My attention was next turned to the passage, "Now is the accepted time." There can be no difference between us here. I maintain that that time is during the Gospel dispensation, and that Kingdom and dispensation shall exist until God be all in all. My friend represented me as saying that men will not have the privilege of repenting in eternity. I stated that his doctrine of endless and immortal agony precluded the idea of repentance in a future state, for he declares, If man is not saved here he never will be; but my friend will be continually misrepresenting me here to-day. He was not going to spend his arguments; he thinks he has pierced my soul so often that he does not wish to spend his arguments. I should like to know how

many *arguments* he has spent to-day. He quoted a passage that reads: "Blessed are they that do his commandments." Who denies this? He said I had squeezed out another proof text. The fact is, I have laid out fifty to seventy positions to present in this debate. I have had the position based upon the *desire* of God, and the gentleman has not attempted to take it out of my hand. I have given him the second one, and I intend to give him more this afternoon. He stated in speaking of certain fruits of the flesh—in Galatians, I think it is—that they who do such things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. I believe this as he does. But he has not shown that they shall not ultimately be reconciled to God, and be made finally holy and happy. I do not believe any more than he does that when men do such things they shall inherit the Kingdom of God, not until the individuals doing such things have reformed and repent of such acts and become reconciled to God; and so will it continue as long as the Kingdom of God exists; and so will it exist until they shall all be reconciled to God the Father of all. My friend says if the gentleman proves that all do now love God, he will have stated something that has a bearing upon the proposition. If I could prove that all now love God, evidently, it would prove the position that reads thus: *Do the Scriptures teach that all men now are holy and happy?* But that is not the proposition. It is: *Do the Scriptures teach the final holiness and happiness of all men?* This is the proposition, and this I have proved from the Law of Love. I have clearly proved the final reconciliation of all men. I have presented the declaration of the Saviour, that "Not one jot or tittle of the Law shall pass until all be fulfilled." The whole sum and substance of which is to love God with all our heart and soul and strength, and to love our neighbor as ourselves.

Mr. HARRIS.—It appears to my friend that if declamation and bombast would carry the point it would soon be carried; but I would not say that there is something in this noise, other than the mere noise itself. My friend stated that the Law of Love will eventually be fulfilled; but he gave no evidence but that contained in the words, "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law until all be fulfilled." Every one acquainted with the Bible is acquainted with the Moral Law; then, there is the Ceremonial Law, and the Law of Love—three laws. Did Christ come to destroy the Law of Love? What is it? "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and mind and strength." The word "fulfil," means to accomplish. Did Christ come to accomplish the whole law of God? He loves sinners with a love of compassion, but not with the love of the Father. Every man that loves God, loves sinners; but we read that John was the beloved disciple, and that the Saviour loved John better than the rest of the disciples. But we have no evidence that this is the correct

a passage that reads :  
 Who denies this ? He  
 fact is, I have laid out  
 I have had the posi-  
 an has not attempted  
 second one, and I  
 ated in speaking of  
 is—that they who do  
 l. I believe this as  
 ll not ultimately be  
 d happy. I do not  
 do such things they  
 ividuals doing such  
 l become reconciled  
 he Kingdom of God  
 be reconciled to God  
 an proves that all do  
 has a bearing upon  
 ve God, evidently, it  
 scriptures teach that  
 the proposition. It  
 appiness of all men ?  
 m the Law of Love.  
 f all men. I have  
 Not one jot or tittle of  
 le sum and substance  
 ul and strength, and

if declamation and  
 arried ; but I would  
 than the mere noise  
 will eventually be  
 tained in the words,  
 the law until all be  
 is acquainted with  
 aw, and the Law of  
 the Law of Love ?  
 ith all thy heart and  
 to accomplish. Did  
 ? He loves sinners  
 the Father. Every  
 that John was the  
 better than the rest  
 this is the correc

meaning of the passage under consideration. "I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil." What law is here referred to? It was undoubtedly the Ceremonial Law. It should not pass away until all be fulfilled; the types and shadows referred to him, they centred in him, and they only had a bearing on the destinies of men as they referred directly to the great anti-type. "One jot or tittle of this law shall not pass until all be fulfilled." My friend then stated that one of the means made use of to bring the Prodigal home was his sufferings. If sufferings brought the Prodigal home, and if others are led to God another way, God's ways are not equal, and he deals with some men in a different way from what he does with others. He said the father loved the Prodigal son as much when away as when at home. He did not give any evidence of this. When the son came home the father had compassion upon him; but the passage does not say anything about him when absent. My friend then stated that no circumstance in a man's history that could transpire could lead his father to disown him. But it is evident that my friend is not reasoning right. He looks upon God as a father only, and not also as a moral governor. God has to sustain the relation of father and of moral governor of men, and we should keep in mind that God sustains these two relations. We see a child adopted into a family receive sometimes twice as much punishment as the child that belongs to that family. God is the father of the spirits of all flesh, and those that are comforted are united to him; he is the father of all, the creator, the redeemer and preserver of all men. "Ye have received the spirit of adoption whereby we cry Abba Father. The Spirit itself bearing witness with our spirits that we are the children of God. We come again to the passage: "Him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out." My friend said he could not tell how much punishment sinners deserved. How then can he tell it will not be endless punishment. Just as if he had said I don't know how far it is to such a place; but I know it is not so far as you have named. He knows they will not,—he knows they do not deserve endless punishment but he cannot tell how much they do deserve. Then the old passage in the Revelations, he keeps away from. But he went on to speak of God as the unchangeable friend and father of sinners, forgetting all the while what Christ said, John viii., 44: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar and the father of it." He next went on to say that many were punished all they deserved, and while he was speaking I thought in imagination, I saw a man entering into a tavern, and I saw that man drink of the liquid-fire until it produced delirium tremens, and I said to myself, is that what God punishes that man with? How can it be said that God punished him?

God did not give him the liquor. He has said "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink." The individuals that go on a drunken spree, are not punished by God. Men in such a case punish themselves. In order to prove his position he spoke of a physician who gave bad medicines; but Christ is the great physician, and he will give the good medicine. How they will feel in their inmost soul when they take his medicine! It is bitter medicine; but then he will give them the sweets of his grace. I stated that man will not have the privilege of repentance in a future state. If he will give any evidence of that, I am ready for him. My friend then quoted the passage—"Blessed are they that do his commandments." But I enquire: do all men do his commandments? He wants to make out that they will by and by; but the Bible says—"Evil men will wax worse and worse." They go from bad to worse in the degrees of sin. He then stated that he had brought forward between fifty and sixty arguments this morning. If so they were so weak that I really forget them. They really vanished with the breeze for I did not hear them. I hope my friend will bring forward stronger facts. He then talked about the fruits of the flesh; but I did not say anything about the *fruits of the flesh*. It was the *works of the flesh* I spoke of, and the *fruits of the spirit*. I stated, however, that I would admit the proposition if he proved that all men will finally love God with all their hearts and all their minds, and soul and strength; and I will never preach another sermon on endless misery.

Mr. LAVELL.—I conceive that I have proved this proposition already. It is the Law of Love which is the sum of the whole Law and the Prophets. The Saviour sums it all up, by saying, Not one jot or tittle of the law will pass until all be *fulfilled*. I am willing to let the argument rest upon that. My friend stated that the Saviour loved sinners; but not as he loved Saints. I warrant he will make a distinction here. I dare say he does not love a poor degraded sinner, as he loves my righteous and pious friend Mr. Harris. If he does not love the sinner truly and sincerely, then he is open to the charge in his own words, If ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? for sinners also love those that love them. No. The gentleman wants to make a distinction between the Love God has for sinners and Saints; but he dare not stand up here and say that really and actually God will hate the poor sinner and crush him to all eternity. He dare not do it. He represented me as saying that the suffering was one of the means that brought the prodigal to repentance, and impelled him to return home to his father's house; but he said I would not tell you the other means used. I have told it again and again. It was the *goodness of his father*, and I defied him to produce any other reason. So is it the goodness of God that leads men to repentance. He said, what proof have you that the father loved the son when he was absent?

Woe unto him that  
 that go on a drunken  
 a case punish them—  
 of a physician who  
 rsician, and he will  
 in their inmost soul  
 dicine; but then he  
 d that man will not  
 te. If he will give  
 friend then quoted  
 nmandments.” But  
 He wants to make  
 s—“ Evil men will  
 worse in the degrees  
 rward between fifty  
 hey were so weak  
 with the breeze for  
 ng forward stronger  
 h; but I did not say  
 e *works of the flesh*  
 ed, however, that I  
 all men will finally  
 minds, and soul and  
 n on endless misery.

ved this proposition  
 m of the whole Law  
 y saying, Not one jot  
 I am willing to let  
 at the Saviour loved  
 he will make a dis-  
 degraded sinner, as  
 ris. If he does not  
 en to the charge in  
 what thank have ye?  
 No. The gentleman  
 l has for sinners and  
 ut really and actually  
 l eternity. He dare  
 suffering was one of  
 , and impelled him  
 I would not tell you  
 again. It was the  
 ce any other reason.  
 pentance. He said,  
 when he was absent?

the best of all proofs; for when he saw him *yet a great way off*, he ran and fell on his neck and kissed him. He did not ask any questions about the reform then. He did as a father, as every true genuine parent would do under similar circumstances. My friend says, God is a governor, as well as a father. The character of Governor is included in the word father when applied to God, and I maintain that he governs all things, and that his government answers the end for which it was instituted, namely, The *good of every intelligent being* that lives upon this earth. All that the father giveth me shall come to me: and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out; John vi., 37. He says that God giveth him penitent sinners; but I maintain that “God giveth *all things* into the hands of his Son, and all that the father giveth him shall come to him.” We have but the barefaced assertion that God giveth the Saviour *only* penitent sinners. My friend asks me if I can tell how much punishment a sinner deserves, I cannot; but I know it cannot be endless, from the fact that *punishment* cannot be endless. If God inflict a punishment that would be endless, it would be downright cruelty. What would you think of a man beating his son and then throwing him over a precipice, and then going down and throwing him into a fire and roasting him to death? Would you call that punishment? No, every one would call it downright cruelty. The suffering, however, here ends. But God, it is said, whose name is Love, will take some of his children whom he has brought into the world without their consent, and consign them to endless and immortal agony, for the sins of this short life. The very idea of the thing is absurd. The very mention of it is sufficient to show its *falsehood*. But to proceed. My Third argument is drawn from the *parental* character of God. God is the father of all men. Malachi ii., 10: Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us. Acts xvii., 26: And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation. That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us. For in him we live and move and have our being; as certain, also, of your poets have said, ‘For we his offspring are.’ For as much then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold or silver or stone, graven by art and man’s device.” Ephesians iv., 6: One God and Father of all, who is *above all*, and *through all*, and *in you all*. 1. Corinthians viii., 6: But to us *there is but one God*, the Father, of whom *are* all things, and *are* in him. Ephesians iii., 14, 15: For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; of whom *the whole family in heaven and earth is named*. Hebrews xii., 9: Shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits and live? Matthew vi., 9: Our Father which art in heaven,

hallowed be thy name. The parental relation is a tie of nature, and hence is indissoluble and indestructible. It is impressed on the mind of every individual that he is a child of God, that God is his parent; and that God recognizes men in disobedience, as still his children, is plainly stated in Scripture. "My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him. For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth."—Hebrews xii., 5, 6. For what does God chasten, rebuke and scourge his children? Is it not for their disobedience and sin? Still he calls them his children. Again, A voice was heard upon high places, weeping and supplications of the children of Israel; for they have perverted their way, and they have forgotten the Lord their God. Return, ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings. Behold, we come unto thee; for thou art the Lord our God."—Jeremiah iii., 21, 22. Notwithstanding they had forgotten God, and plunged into wickedness, still he calls them his children. St. Paul said to the idolatrous Athenians, "God hath made of one blood all nations of men." The affection of our heavenly father is of such a nature as that of a good earthly parent: but infinitely stronger and more enduring. Oh! yes, it is infinitely stronger. "What man is there of you, whom, if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish will he give him a serpent? If ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father who is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?"—Matthew vii., 9, 10, 11. Here it is proved that our heavenly Father entertains the same feelings of love towards all his offspring that the earthly parent does to his own children; but to a still greater degree: for the words are, "How much more shall your heavenly Father?" Again: "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee."—Isaiah xlix., 15. The affection of our heavenly Father is far more enduring than that of a mother for her babe. What would a good father not do even for a sinful child? He would do all for him that he possibly could. He would still love him, and make him a good child if he could. Yet we are told that our heavenly Father—whose nature is love, and whose love is infinitely stronger than that of an earthly parent—would rather consign his own offspring to a place of *endless*, and consequently unjust and unmerciful punishment, to blaspheme his name (which is Love) throughout the endless ages of eternity. But the stamp of *falsehood* is put upon such an idea, in these passages which I have quoted from the Bible, and many others which I would quote did time permit.

Mr. HARRIS—In the first place, my friend stated that the law would be fulfilled, and that all men would love God; yet we lack the



evidence, we have only the bare assertion. He then stated that God did love sinners. But it is one thing for God to love sinners, and another thing for sinners to love God. I admit that God loves sinners. But I contend at the same time that sinners hate God. In order to illustrate his position, my friend said—"If you love them that love you what reward have you? Do not sinners even do the same?" I may have compassion upon a poor miserable drunkard, but I am not for that reason to associate with him, and make a bosom friend of him. God loves sinners with compassion. He is represented as calling upon sinners constantly to come to him, and he will lead them to His grace and to His love. My friend next stated that it was the goodness of the prodigal's father that led him home. But he wanted a crust, and that brought him home. It was the want of bread that brought him to himself,—“How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger.” It was bread that he was dying for. My friend next said that the father saw him a great way off, and had compassion on him. But did the father love him with the love of compassion, and with the love of a father, until he saw him? I speak after the manner of men.—My friend then admitted that God sustained the character of a governor as well as a father, and that as a moral governor he is bound to do right. “Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?” “To them,” saith the Apostle in his epistle to the Romans, “to them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, eternal life; But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath. Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first and also of the Gentile. But glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile; For there is no respect of persons with God.”—Romans. ii., 7, 11. My friend next went on to speak of endless misery, and stated that God brought men into existence without their consent, and therefore to consign them to endless misery would be entirely unjust. Let him say that God could in the nature of things bring into existence human beings, and make them moral and accountable agents, without a liability to sin, then this being the case those that are condemned and those that are saved, are so by the will of God. Some bad parents have good children, and it is wrong to look upon that part of the creation that shall be finally lost, without looking at creation as a whole. Then we may ask,—Is it right and just for God to create such a race of beings at all, when he well knows that some of them will be miserable. The fact is there will be a vast multitude saved. All infants will be saved, and all pious adults will be saved. Would it be right for God to withhold existence from those that are saved. We see in the arrangement no cruelty at all. God placed man here, and I

placed before him life and death,—“I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, *that* I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore, choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live.—Deuteronomy xxx, 19. Man is here expected to choose life and to glorify the God of his existence. But we come to the third argument. If I mistake not, Malachi ii, 10. was my friend's first quotation,—“Have we not all one Father.” The prophet is here speaking of God as the Creator of all men. He went on to the circumstance recorded in the seventeenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Then he quoted a passage in the Ephesians, and read from Matthew vi., 9, where Christ teaches his disciples to say their prayers,—“After this manner pray ye,” and so on. He wants to make out that the Devil's children pray the same kind of prayers. He next quoted Hebrew xii., 9,—“Shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live.” The children of God do sometimes receive punishment. They receive it to lead them nearer to God. God doth not willingly afflict the children of men; but sometimes he afflicts them for their benefit, “for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.” My friend next quoted Jeremiah iii., 21, 22: “They have perverted their way, and they have forgotten the Lord their God. Return ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings.” This is first rate, that is the very thing we preach. My friend then went on to say that the affection of our heavenly Father is infinitely stronger than the affection of earthly parents. What does our Savior say?—“While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name; those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scripture might be fulfilled.” These were given to the Saviour and they rejoiced because they were made happy in his love.

Mr. LAVELL,—Those whom thou hast given me I have kept. He had lost none but the son of perdition. My friend *assumes* that the word *lost* here, means that the son of perdition was lost to all eternity. I demand proof of this. I cannot take his bare assertion for that. Dr. Adam Clarke his own commentator when speaking on this very subject says, “I contend that there is no evidence of the final damnation of Judas, in the Sacred text.” My friend knows this as well as I do. He quoted a passage that speaks of looking for glory, honour, and immortality,—when he quotes it correctly I will attend to him. No doubt my friend thinks more good than evil will result from the government of God. I believe in this and more. I believe that evil will be *completely overcome* with good. He believes also that all infants and idiots are saved. He has touched a question that will trouble him to-morrow. He need not be alarmed, I will not trouble him about that now. We will see by and by on what grounds

n and earth to record  
e and death, blessing  
ou and thy seed may  
ected to choose life  
ve come to the third  
was my friend's first  
The prophet is here  
He went on to the  
er of the Acts of the  
sians, and read from  
to say their prayers,  
wants to make out  
prayers. He next  
her be in subjection  
of God do sometimes  
hem nearer to God.  
; but sometimes he  
loveth he chasteneth  
y friend next quoted  
their way, and they  
backsliding children,  
ate, that is the very  
that the affection of  
affection of earthly  
was with them in  
ou gavest me I have  
perdition; and that  
to the Saviour and  
love.

no I have kept. He  
d *assumes* that the  
lost to all eternity.  
ertion for that. Dr.  
on this very subject  
final damnation of  
his as well as I do.  
glory, honour, and  
attend to him. No  
ll result from the  
e. I believe that  
He believes also  
ned a question that  
hamed, I will not  
y on what grounds

it is he believes that. We will see whether he believes that any individual can be made endlessly holy and happy, by complying with certain conditions *in this life*. If this is the *only* time and ground on which a man may hope for salvation—then “Good bye” to all infants, and idiots and heathens. If he does not take this ground, he banishes the idea that any conditions are absolutely necessary on the part of man to enter the state of immortal bliss. If my immortal happiness depend upon anything I could or can do, I despair of ever getting there. And if that state depend upon anything on my part, I would far rather not run the risk of gaining that state,—for the chances are ten thousand millions against one—I would far rather that my God would have sent me into this world an idiot than that I should run the awful risk of being consigned to *ENDLESS* and *IMMORTAL AGONY*. For what is it to be an idiot for three score years and ten, compared with the suffering that must be endured through the ceaseless ages of eternity. God, my friend says, offers the sinner “life and death,” so he does; but not *endless life* and *endless death*. But this does not meet the difficulty. If he had proved,—God offers the sinner *endless life* and *endless death* he would take the position out of my hands. My Fourth argument is drawn from the *LOVE* of God. We have known and believed, the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love; dwelleth in God, and God in him. 1st John iv., 16; St. Paul denominates him the God of Love. The God of Love and peace shall be with you: 2 Cor. xiii., 11. God is Love itself. By this we must understand that all the moral perfections of his character are only so many modifications of this attribute, hence we cannot conceive of any justice in God that has not love as its principal feature—for *God is Love*.—John iii., 16 17: God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. Rom. v., 8: God commendeth his love towards us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Eph. ii., 4: God, who is *rich in mercy* for his great love wherewith he loved us. God loves all men. He loves them when they are sinners, even while dead in sin. This is the true love of an affectionate father for ungrateful disobedient children. And the Creator will cherish this feeling throughout all time for he is unchangeable in love. Mal. iii., 6: I am the Lord I change not. I conclude, therefore, that God whose nature is love would not usher beings into existence if he had not destined them for holiness and happiness. My Fifth argument I base upon the *FOREKNOWLEDGE* of God. I maintain that God is most perfect in wisdom. If we can conceive of anything in the Universe that will be new to an all perfect God; if you see anything in the world that he did not foresee, then he is not infinite in wisdom, and is not a perfect Deity. But the Scriptures


settle this conclusively. Acts xv., 18: Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world. Job xxxvii., 16: Dost thou know the balancings of the clouds, the wondrous works of him who is perfect in knowledge. Job xxiv., 1: Seeing times are not hidden from the Almighty. Isaiah xli., 10: I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me. *Declaring the end from the beginning and from ancient times the things that are not yet done saying, My counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure.*" There can be no such thing as a succession of periods with God. Isaiah lvii., 15: Thus saith the high and lofty one, that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the hearts of the contrite ones. All that is future now is present with him. With God all things are an eternal Now. Nothing can take place that he did not foresee,—that he did not foreknow. I conclude, therefore, that a God infinite in Wisdom, Holiness, Justice, Goodness, Truth, Mercy and Power could not, would not, have created his universal offspring with foreknowing that their existence would result in a condition of holiness and happiness. I do maintain, therefore, from the known character of God that whatever fate awaits the human family was distinctly known to God, and no christian dare affirm that God created them without some end in view. Or dare any christian say that God can mistake, or can increase in knowledge. God is perfect in all his attributes, and could not, and would not usher a single being into existence, knowing that that existence would result in endless, unmerciful, immortal suffering. The justice of God would have cried out, forbear. The mercy of God would have cried forbear. The goodness of God would have cried forbear. The Love of God would have cried forbear; rather let him remain in nouentity than call him to such a doom. I perceived that my friend in attempting to reply to my argument based on the paternity of God, flounders considerably, and I can perceive no argument in his speech against the position I have taken. He knows that the moment he mentions the word Father, that it gives the lie to such a monstrous idea as endless and immortal suffering. He knows that endearing appellation is more applicable to the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind.

Mr. HARRIS.—The first argument of my friend is that in Isaiah xlix., 16: "Can a woman forget her sucking child that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee." How encouraging this is to every child of God. God is addressing his children, and he says: "I will not forget thee. Behold I have engraven thee upon the palms of my hands." How consoling is that promise to the children of God. But Dr. Adam

unto God are all his  
xxvii, 16: Dost thou  
works of him who is  
mos are not hidden  
, and there is none  
claring the end from  
ny pleasure." There  
th God. Isaiah lvii,  
toth eternity, whose  
, with him also that  
pirit of the humble,  
All that is future now  
e an eternal Now.  
,—that he did not  
finite in Wisdom,  
ver could not, would  
eknowing that their  
nd happiness. I do  
f God that whatever  
own to God, and po  
t some end in view.  
e, or can increase in  
, and could not, and  
e, knowing that that  
immortal suffering.  
The mercy of God  
d have cried forbear-  
r let him remain in  
red that my friend in  
e paternity of God,  
ument in his speech  
that the moment he  
eh a monstrous idea  
ndearing appellation  
iness and happiness

nd is that in Isaiah  
that she should not  
they may forget, yet  
s to every child of  
: "I will not forget  
lms of my hands."  
od. But Dr. Adam

Clarke is introduced with reference to the situation of Judas Iscariot. I dare say he would answer were I to introduce Dr. Adam Clarke against him. But look at the circumstances of the case. We are told that Judas went and hanged himself. We are told that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him. Judas was a wicked man and he died in his sins and perhaps his punishment was his hanging, or his hanging was his punishment, so that it went both ways. So if Judas's punishment was endured here, it was inflicted by himself. My friend then referred to infants and idiots being saved; I would only say they are saved as passive agents. John i., 29: "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." 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"; so that infants and idiots are safe in the hands of Almighty God. It is a mercy they are saved in this way. My friend stated that if the doctrine of endless misery were true, he would prefer liberty to accountability. It were well for him if he had been. He might then have been saved. What a pity it is he was not born an idiot. If he had had his choice he would rather have been so. What is that but saying to this audience that he is sorry he is not a fool. He is sorry he is accountable. Is he not afraid of the punishment that awaits him in consequence of his accountability. If idiots and infants are saved, and if accountable beings are saved, why is he sorry that he was not born an idiot. These are things that come right home to him. My friend then stated that if I would prove that the passage which I quoted,—“I set before you life and death, blessing and cursing,”—meant endless life and endless death, he would be prepared to make a reply. John v., 40: “Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life.” This is not natural life, but spiritual life. Ephesians ii., 1: “You hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins.” My friend's next argument is founded on the Love of God. 1 John iv., 16: “God is love: and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him.” But does God dwell in all men? Our Saviour says—John xiv., 23: “If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.” God dwells in the believing heart. 2 Corinthians xiii., 11: “The God of love and peace shall be with you.” My friend then went on to say that God is unchangeable, but if the present love does not produce present salvation, will endless love produce endless salvation. Does the present love of God make all men holy and happy? If it does not where is the evidence that the endless and unchangeable love of God will make them endlessly holy and happy. John iii., 36: “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth in him.” Romans v., 9: “Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.” This was written



of believers; I will read it again: "Much more then, being now justified by blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." Thank God for this passage. Not only so, but we joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ. This is the passage. Again: Epesians ii., 4: "God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ; by grace ye are saved; (by grace ye are saved;)" not, ye will be saved, but "Ye are saved; and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places, in Christ Jesus." This is the text. It comes right to the point: believers sitting together in heavenly places, in Christ Jesus. Malachi iii., 6: "I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." Because God remained to be a father unto them, and because he did not change, they were not consumed. What a good thing it is to have a good father. My friend's fifth argument is founded on the Foreknowledge of God. God knew all things as they are, and his perfect knowledge will lead him to see things as they are. Solomon says—Eccles. vii., 29: "God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." But my opponent takes another view of the matter. He says, the mercy of God and the justice of God, had they foreseen man's disregard of the offers of salvation, would have cried out, "Leave him alone in a state of non-existence. But God brings them into this world, and invites all men to become happy, and consequently holy, and after he has done all this, he is forced to cry out, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life."—Acts xv., 18. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world. Job xxxvii., 16: "He is perfect in knowledge with all things, and he knows that every sinner may be saved if he only comes to Jesus. John xxiv. 1: "Times are not hidden from the Almighty." God looks upon the children of men; God sees all the children of men; but is that proof that they will be all finally holy and happy? I think not.

Mr. LAVELL—I will proceed to my Sixth argument. I build it on the Justice of God. God is just. Deut. xxxii., 4: "A God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he." Psalm cxviii., 9: "With righteousness shall he judge the world, and the people with equity." Prov. xvi., 4: "The Lord hath made all things for himself." Rev. v., 3: "Just and true are all thy ways, thou King of Saints." Job iv., 17: "Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his Maker?" Justice is a fundamental principle in the Divine Government. Psalm lxxxix., 14: "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne; mercy and truth shall go before thy face." What does Justice require? First, I answer, it demands that the guilty be punished according to their deeds; second, it demands the obedience of all men. Infinite Justice demands universal right. The

more then, being now  
through him." Thank  
God through our Lord  
Hebrews ii., 4: "God,  
th he loved us, even  
together with Christ;  
d;)" not, ye will be  
up together, and made  
us." This is the text.  
together in heavenly  
of the Lord, I change  
med." Because God  
he did not change,  
it is to have a good  
the Foreknowledge of  
perfect knowledge will  
says—Eccles. vii., 29:  
ought out many inven  
the matter. He says,  
they foreseen man's  
cried out, "Leave him  
s them into this world.  
requently holy, and after  
Ye will not come unto  
nown unto God are all  
xxxvii., 16: "He is  
ows that every sinner  
xxiv. 1: "Times are  
in the children of men;  
of that they will be all

argument. I build it on  
1., 4: "A God of truth  
alm xviii., 9: "With  
people with equity."  
s for himself." Rev.  
King of Saints." Job  
God? shall a man be  
mental principle in the  
ice and judgment are  
ll go before thy face."  
it demands that the  
econd, it demands the  
universal right. The

question arises, Will the claims of Divine Justice ever be satisfied? or, Does Infinite Justice lead to forgiveness and to obedience? I maintain that it does. Psalm lxii., 12: "Unto Thee, O Lord, *belongeth* mercy; for Thou renderest to every man according to his work." Here we are informed that Justice and Mercy are united in the government of God. But endless misery is not according to deeds, inasmuch as it is ENDLESS. Therefore it is opposed to the Justice of God, it is unmerciful. And be assured, there is no Justice, either in earth or heaven, which does not exhibit God as a God of Mercy. Again, Exodus xxxiv., 6, 7: "The Lord, the Lord God merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty." Isaiah xi., 2: "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him; the spirit of wisdom and understanding; the spirit of counsel and might; the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord." St. Paul says, 1st Cor., ii., 7: "We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory;" Isaiah xlv., 21: "Am not I the Lord? and *there is* no God else besides me; a Just God and a Saviour, there is none besides me." I conclude, therefore, that the Justice of God will be satisfied with nothing short of the infliction of punishment according to deeds—the righteous punishment of all mankind. My Seventh argument I base on the Mercy of God. Psalm lxii., 12: "Unto Thee, O Lord, *belongeth* Mercy." Psalm lvii., 10: "Thy Mercy is great unto the heavens." 1st Chron., xxi., 13: "Let me fall now into the hand of the Lord; for very great are his mercies." Psalm ciii., 8: "The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in Mercy." Eph. ii., 4: "God, who is rich in Mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us." Psalm cxlv., 8: "The Lord is gracious and full of compassion; slow to anger, and of great Mercy." Micah vii., 18: "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? he retaineth not his anger for ever, because he DELIGHTETH in Mercy." It is the nature of Mercy to pity and to relieve the sufferer; it desires the happiness of all, and never can be satisfied with the endless misery of any human creature. And we are thus drawn to the conclusion that Infinite Mercy will be satisfied, and consequently that all men will become holy and happy. The man has never existed who could harmonize the Infinite Mercy of God with the doctrine of ENDLESS suffering. The very nature of that doctrine puts the stamp of falsehood upon such an unmerciful, such an unjust sentiment. In replying to my argument founded on the paternal character of God, my friend said God addressed those that love him. But I brought forward several passages to prove that God loved some that were sinners, and that those that were sinners



he denominated his children. My friend believes that the man who lives by faith is a child of God; but in another, and a different sense from that, I maintain that God is the father of the Spirits of all flesh. The believer is a child of God by adoption through faith: but, beyond all doubt, God is the Father of the Spirits of all flesh, and this character he must sustain throughout eternity. All mankind will be children of God in a still higher sense than by faith. My friend alluded to my remarks in reference to Judas. He said Judas went out and hanged himself. We know that Judas died under peculiar circumstances, but whether he hanged himself, or whether his bowels burst out with grief, we cannot say. But I maintain that the repentance of Judas when he threw down the thirty pieces of silver was thorough and sincere, and that you will not find an instance of more sincere repentance in the Scriptures. Where will you find a person having \$500 that will come forward as boldly and manfully as Judas did, and repent of the course he had pursued and throw down the money. Such instances are rare. You will not find them among those who go to those crazy "protracted meetings," and "get religion," as it is called. They get religion, but keep fast hold of the money they may have wringed their neighbour out of. I do not believe in such repentance. Throw down the money, and repent and sin no more; this is godly sorrow. This is true repentance. The salvation of infants and idiots troubles my friend mightily. He says they are passive agents; so they are. He then quotes the passage where it is stated that Christ is the propitiation for our sins and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world. He says, infants and idiots are included here. Yes; the world is included: My friend falls short of the amount. I did say that I would prefer being sent into this world an idiot. I do say from my heart that it would have been better to have been sent into this world an idiot, than to run the risk of being lost according to my friend's view of the matter, for there are 100,000 chances against me. My friend quoted the passage, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." But does that prove that they never will come to him? that they never will have life?—certainly not. He says, before my argument drawn from the love of God avail anything, I must prove that the love of God dwells in all men now. He quoted the passage, "He that hath the Son hath life, he that hath not the Son hath not life." I believe it." But the wrath of God *abideth* on him: not, will abide upon him to all eternity. This passage is of no avail to him. He says it is a glorious thing to have a good father, I believe so. But do you call that a good father, that would consign nine-tenths of the human family to ENDLESS misery and ruin. No, I would call him a *fiend*. He is not the father spoken of in our good old Bible.

Mr. HARRIS.—Isaiah xli, 9 is the text I left off at—"Remember the former things of old; for I am God, and there is none else; I am God,

believes that the man  
 another, and a different  
 father of the Spirits  
 adoption through faith :  
 Spirits of all flesh, and  
 ity. All mankind will  
 n by faith. My friend  
 He said Judas went out  
 under peculiar circum-  
 her his bowels burst out  
 the repentance of Judas  
 ver was thorough and  
 of more sincere repent-  
 person having \$500 that  
 das did, and repent of  
 money. Such instances  
 who go to those crazy  
 it is called. They get  
 may have wronged their  
 entance. Throw down  
 is godly sorrow. This  
 and idiots troubles my  
 ents ; so they are. He  
 Christ is the propitiation  
 sins of the whole world.  
 Yes; the world is in-  
 I did say that I would  
 I do say from my  
 seen sent into this world  
 oording to my friend's  
 moes against me. My  
 unto me that ye might  
 ver will come to him ?  
 . He says, before my  
 anything, I must prove  
 He quoted the passage,  
 t the Son hath not life."  
 n him: not, will abide  
 avail to him. He says  
 eve so. But do you call  
 s of the human family  
 him a fiend. He is not  
 off at—"Remember the  
 none else ; I am God,

and there is none like me. Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times, *the things* that are not yet done, saying My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." God is here referring to his counsel in reference to the destruction of the Jews by Cyrus, King of Babylon, and any one who reads the chapter will come to this conclusion. Isaiah lvii, 15-16: "Thus saith the high and lofty one that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." That verse I believe, we all might read with profit. But my friend has brought in the power of God as another argument in favour of the final holiness and happiness of all men. But what God has power to do, and what God will do are two things entirely different. What has God's power to do with man as a moral agent. God has physical and moral power; he has various attributes and these attributes cannot, in the nature of things, clash with each other. This brought us to what my friend called his sixth argument, the justice of God. But in the way he uses the word of God, by giving a small portion here and there he may prove almost anything; while taken in connexion with the passages where they occur, they give an entirely different meaning. Prov. xv., 3—"The eyes of the Lord are in every place beholding the evil and the good." Is it not wonderful that he would direct my attention to such passages to prove his position? Proverbs xvi., 4—"The Lord hath made all things for himself, yea even the wicked for the day of evil." If they had been all good of course there would have been none for the day of evil. Job iv, 17—"Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his maker." Here two questions are asked; but does that prove the final holiness and happiness of all men? Well! well! Psalm lxii, 12—"Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy; for, thou renderest to every man according to his works." Of course he will; but does that prove the final holiness and happiness of all men? Surprising surprising! Exodus xxxiv, 6, 7—"The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and in truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the childrens' children unto the third and to the fourth generation." Drunken parents have sometimes children that are idiots, and thus the sins of the fathers, in a temporal point of view, are visited upon their children unto the third and fourth generation in several instances. Sometimes the children, unto the third and fourth generation, have to grapple with poverty in consequence of their parents drinking and squandering all their property. But does that prove the final holiness and happiness of all men? No! not by a great majority. 2 Corinthians ii., 7:

"Ye ought rather, to forgive him and comfort him, lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow." This was a letter Paul wrote to his brethren in Corinth, telling them to take a man back to the church who had repented of his sins. Isaiah xlv., 2: "Am not I the Lord? and there is no God else besides me: a just God and a Saviour: there is none besides me." Does this prove the final holiness and happiness of all men? No! the very reverse. These are the arguments my friend has drawn from the Justice of God. You will see how far they bear upon the point at issue. We have next, Psalm lxii., 12: "Unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy, for thou renderest to every man according to his work." I am astonished that my friend does not bring forward something tangible to prove his proposition. Psalm lviii., 10: "Thy mercy is great unto the heavens, and thy truth unto the cloudes." 1 Chron. xxi., 13: "David said unto God, I am in a great strait; let me fall now into the hand of the Lord; for very great are his mercies; but let me not fall into the hand of man." Well now, does this prove the final holiness and happiness of all men? The Lord is merciful and gracious and full of compassion.

Mr. LAVELL.—Well, my friend has gone through with his lesson just as a school boy does. He quoted one passage, (but I do not know what he has done)—Isaiah xlv., 2,—where the Prophet speaks of God as a just God and Saviour. He does not show that God is unjust. He does not show that it is inconsistent with God's character to be just. If he were to prove that God was a God of justice, and that this justice never would be satisfied with anything short of the future holiness and happiness of all men, if I opposed that doctrine I would feel bound to meet my friend upon that ground alone—but he presents nothing here against the final holiness and happiness of all men. I pretend to have brought that passage forward as one of my proof texts for the justice of God, I draw my argument from the fact that God is just and that His justice will never be satisfied with anything short of the final holiness and happiness of all men; so that you see I have nothing to reply to. I do not bring forward the power of God as an argument for the final holiness and happiness of all men. I incorporate that attribute with some of the positions I have taken. I now proceed to my Eighth argument, which is founded on the PLEASURE of God: It is the pleasure of God that all men become holy and happy. This we learn from the language of the Apostle Paul—Eph. i., 9, 10: "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself. That in the dispensation of the 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." Here St. Paul declares it was in accordance with God's will and pleasure to purpose in the fulness of times to gather all things in Christ. Again: Col. i., 19, 20,

comfort him, lest per-  
overmuch sorrow."  
writh, telling them to  
of his sins. Isaiah  
od else besides me: a  
e." Does this prove  
No! the very reverse.  
om the Justice of God.  
ssue. We have next,  
eth mercy, for thou  
I am astonished that  
angible to prove his  
eat unto the heavens,  
3: "David said unto  
the hand of the Lord;  
fall into the hand of  
iness and happiness  
nd full of compassion.

rough with his lesson  
e, (but I do not know  
e Prophet speaks of  
ow that God is unjust.  
a character to be just.  
, and that this justice  
e future holiness and  
I would feel bound to  
resents nothing here  
n. I pretend to have  
texts for the justice of  
just and that his jus-  
the final holiness and  
ing to reply to. I do  
it for the final holiness  
bute with some of the  
th argument, which  
easure of God that all  
om the language of  
e known unto us the  
sure, which he hath  
f the fulness of times,  
ist, both which are, in  
Here St. Paul declares  
re to purpose in the  
gain: Col. i., 19, 20,

"It pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell, and having made peace by 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." Will God's pleasure eventually be accomplished? I maintain it will. Isaiah lv. 10, 11: "As the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven and returneth not thither but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void; but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." Psalm cxxxv., 6: " whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did he in heaven and in earth and in the seas, and all deep places." Isaiah liii., 10: "It pleased the Lord to bruise him." He hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands. Isaiah xlvii., 10: "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." Here God declares in emphatic language that he will do all his pleasure. My Ninth argument is based on the WILL of God. God wills the salvation of all men. Eph. ii., 9, 10: "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself, That in the dispensation of the fulness of time, he might gather together in one all things in Christ." 1 Tim., iii. 4: "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth." This plain language of Scripture decides the question better than all the creeds and confessions of faith formed by erring men. They may contradict this plain testimony of the Bible; but intelligent men, who have more confidence in the Bible than in mere human creeds, will believe that God will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. Will God's Will be ultimately accomplished? What creature dare affirm that the Will of God will be defeated. If God is a perfect being, then his will that all men shall be saved must be done in due time. One of these positions must be taken,—Either, first, God can save all men, but will not, which is an impeachment of his infinite Goodness; or, second, He would save all men, but cannot, which is an impeachment of his infinite Power; or, third, God will and can save all men, which last position accords to him infinite goodness, infinite power, and infinite wisdom, and makes him a PERFECT GOD. But the Scriptures place this matter beyond a doubt, and distinctly state that this will eventually be accomplished. John vi., 38: I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." John iv., 34: "Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish

his work." To finish his work, which is the salvation of the whole world. Christ is a complete Saviour, and will accomplish the Father's will, and finish his work. How can Christ finish his Father's work, if he does not accomplish his will. "Dan. iv., 35: "He doeth his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What dost thou?" Again, Eph. i., 11: "Being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will," not after the will of man, but after the counsel of his own will. This language is decisive. Here, then, we have established, that God wills the salvation of all men. If my opponent takes the ground that God's will ever will be defeated, he virtually assumes that God is imperfect, and hence not God at all. But my friend believes that God is perfect, and works all things after the counsel of his will; therefore all men must be saved. And my arguments from the Scriptures affirm that they will. Job xxiii., 13: "He is of one mind and who can turn him? and what his soul desireth, even that he doeth." Turn which way you will, there is a difficulty to all who believe in the unmerciful doctrine of endless suffering. Or will the gentleman say that man is absolutely a free agent, and can resist the will of the Almighty? I believe man to be a free agent, but not an absolute one, and not free to defeat the will of the Almighty being, who gave him this agency, for this would be placing the creature above the Creator. I hold that God's will is superior to man's will. Romans ix., 15, 16: "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy." James i., 18: "Of his own will begat he us, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures." Phil. ii., 13: "It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." Ezekiel xxxvi., 26, 27: "A new heart will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them." I introduce these passages merely to show that man's will cannot withstand or defeat the will of God.

Mr. HARRIS.—Psalm ciii. 8. The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy." God is merciful; but I deny that mercy is an attribute of God, for the reasons I assigned in the early part of this discussion. Micah vii. 18. Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? he retaineth not his anger for ever because he delighteth in mercy. I believe that with all my heart and always will. My friend said, infinite mercy was inconsistent with endless suffering.

vation of the whole  
 accomplish the Father's  
 in his Father's work,  
 5: "He doeth his will  
 of the earth, and  
 dost thou?" Again,  
 the purpose of him  
 own will," not after  
 will. This language  
 that God wills the  
 the ground that God's  
 that God is imperfect,  
 is that God is perfect,  
 will; therefore all men  
 Scriptures affirm that  
 and who can turn him?  
 "Turn which way  
 lieve in the numer-  
 gentleman say that  
 will of the Almighty?  
 lute one, and not free  
 ave him this agency,  
 Creator. I hold that  
 ix., 15, 16: "I will  
 will have compassion  
 is not of him that  
 at showeth mercy."  
 we should be a kind  
 "It is God which  
 pleasure." Ezekiel  
 and a new spirit will I  
 art out of your flesh,  
 put my spirit within  
 d ye shall keep my  
 pages merely to show  
 LL of God.

merciful and gracious,  
 merciful; but I deny  
 assigned in the early  
 God like, unto thee,  
 gression of the rem-  
 for ever because he  
 heart and always will.  
 th endless suffering.

God is merciful and men suffer at present, and if a man suffer for a day, or a week, or a year, or two years, can God not be the same merciful God that he is now and allow them to continue in suffering endlessly. Judas, my friend says, gave genuine proof of repentance because he brought back the thirty pieces of silver—which many who make a profession of religion and attend these crazy meetings—would not have done. But Judas did not believe in Jesus and he went and hanged himself with a halter. My friend called upon me to prove endless misery. That I will attend to to-morrow, I trust. His arguments in the next place are founded on the Justice of God. He went on to prove that God will be just. This I admitted—his eighth argument was founded on the Pleasure of God. Eph. i. 10, 11, Being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will. Col. i. 19, 20, It pleased 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 there be things in earth or things in heaven, and you that were sometimes 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 and unreprouvable in his sight. If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel." Here is the condition of the salvation—"if ye continue in the faith grounded and settled," but I pass on to notice the Pleasure of God. Isa. lv. 11, So shall my word be that goeth out of my mouth, it shall not return unto me void; but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." This proves to us that the Word of the Lord will be successful. Jesus has seen of the travail of his soul and is satisfied with the salvation of man. Thousands have turned to God by means of the preaching of the Word, and still it will be successful in turning sinners to God. The next passage is Psalm cx. 6. Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did he in heaven, and in earth, in the seas and all deep places. Isa. liii. 10. He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong." Isa. xli. 10. Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure. I told my friend that the counsel of God was to take the Jews into captivity by Cyrus, King of Babylon. My friend's next argument is on the Will of God, Eph. i. 9, 14. 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. In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things

after the counsel of his own will, that we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ. In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." 1 Tim. ii. 4. Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." Here it is declared that God will have all men to come to the knowledge of the truth, and he will then save them. Do all men come to the knowledge of the truth? Is not the will of God frustrated even in this way? It is undoubtedly, and if Universalism is the truth, how is it that we do not come to the knowledge of it, for not one in a thousand believes in Universalism. It is the will of God that all men be saved; but God is willing to save them only on Gospel terms. The Saviour says, Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life. God invites them to be saved by his Grace and accepts of them through the merits of his son, and invites them to share his glory in the spirit land.

Mr. LAVELL.—The gentleman stated, in reply to my argument drawn from the mercy of God, that infinite mercy allows men to suffer here; then—says my friend—they may suffer to all eternity. I contend that the argument is unsound inasmuch as suffering in this life is limited and not endless, therefore there is no comparison whatever between them. If infinite mercy allowed men to suffer endlessly here, then we might conclude that they might do so in a future world. My friend says, how do you know that Judas repented? I know from the best evidence we can have,—he threw down the thirty pieces of silver, he returned the ill-gotten gain, and he went out and then hanged himself, or his bowels burst asunder,—brought on, no doubt, by the awful act of which he had been guilty. But admitting that he did not repent, it would not prove that Judas is endlessly suffering at this time. There is no evidence of the endless damnation of Judas, and Dr. Adam Clarke states, that there is no evidence of the final condemnation of Judas in the sacred text. I call upon my friend to shew [that his passages do speak of a punishment that is endless in its nature. Why does he bring them up then, if not to defeat my proposition? Then his criticism of my argument, drawn from the Will of God, is really amusing. He says, "do all men come to the knowledge of the truth now? and because they do not, therefore God's Will is frustrated." Yes! a Christian Minister of the 19th Century has the effrontery to stand up here and assert in plain language that the Will of God is frustrated. I leave this to go to the public as it is. But the moment he takes the ground that the Will of God is accomplished, that moment my proposition is proved. He contradicts also the language of inspiration, for the several passages

I have quoted from the Bible, show that the Will of God shall be accomplished, that there is no power in heaven or in the earth that can defeat it. He makes an offset with a quotation from the Saviour, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." But this has no bearing whatever upon the Will of God. He has also the presumption to stand up here and assert that the Mercy of God is not an attribute. He denies that the Mercy of God is an attribute. I would ask him how he knows that the Goodness of God is an attribute? How he knows that the Justice of God is an attribute, or the Power of God is an attribute? Just in the same way that he discovers this in the Scriptures, in the same way will he discover that Mercy is an attribute. If Mercy is not, Goodness is not, and Power is not. My Tenth argument is drawn from the Purposes of God. Ephesians i, 9, 10—"Having made known unto us the mystery of his Will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself. That in the dispensation of the fulness of time, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him." This is one of the most glorious promises the Scriptures contain, and one whose sense is so brilliant that it has cost the so called orthodox commentators, more labour to smother and blot out its genuine meaning, than all the passages in the Bible. Ephesians iii, 9, 10—"To make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ, to the intent that now, unto the principalities, and powers, and heavenly places, might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God. According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." 2nd Timothy i, 9—"Who hath saved us, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace," &c., &c. We are informed in positive language that the Father sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world. 1, John iv, 14—"And we have seen, and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." Look at this passage fairly and see whether it is not a triumphant proof of the proposition. If the Bible did not say that God sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world, then Universalism would not be a Bible truth. Shall, then, this great purpose of God be accomplished. Isaiah xiv, 24—"The Lord of Hosts hath sworn, saying, surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass, and as I have purposed, so shall it stand." Yet, although God hath purposed and willed and desired the Salvation of all men, some who impudently arrogate to themselves the title of Evangelicals, stoutly deny that God hath ever purposed, or willed any such thing, or that his will and purpose ever can be accomplished. Which shall be believed? Those who hurl the doctrine of endless suffering at their neighbours? or the Eternal God who hath said "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." Isaiah xlv, 10. Jeremiah li, 29—"Every purpose of the



Lord shall be performed against Babylon." This proves that if God purposed to save all, his purpose would be accomplished. The gentleman has passed over my argument, based on the Foreknowledge of God. This he will not, he dare not touch. He merely admitted that God does know all things, and that is all I can glean from what he asserts. I stated that God knew all things. He knew what would be the character of every child he created. He saw the end from the beginning, and if the end of that child were to result in endless and immortal agony, I said his attributes would cry forbear, and would say rather let the child remain in nonentity, than create him for such a doom. But the passages my friend has avoided, and so will every man who endeavors to maintain the idea of endless and interminable misery.

Mr. HARRIS.—John vi., 38: "For I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." It was the will of God that Christ should die for all, for without the shedding of blood there could be no remission of sin. John iv., 34: "Jesus said unto them, My meat is to do the Will of him that sent me." Jesus made an atonement for sinners. He came into the world to save sinners, and he said that it was his meat and drink to do the will of God. 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?" This refers to the King of Babylon, at the time he was taken from his throne on account of his great sin. He beautifully says, No man has a right to enquire of God why he does so. If he brought down the King of Babylon from his throne on account of his sins, is that an evidence that he will lift up every poor sinner to the realms of bliss? Certainly not? Eph. i., 2: "Being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own Will." This verse is brought up again; but does it say they ever will be brought to a knowledge of the truth. "God is willing to save all men. This is life eternal to know Thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. I John v., 10: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son." Job xxiii., 13: "He is in one mind, and who can turn him? and what his soul desireth, even that he doeth." Did God desire the Laodicean church to be in a different state? Yet they would not change their position, and as moral agents God dealt with them. My friend says, man is a moral agent; if so, he is accountable,—he is rewardable and punishable. Rev. xvii., 7, is another proof-text brought forward by my friend, but it has nothing to do with the subject; also, Rom. ix., 15, 16. "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So

then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy." God is a God of compassion, and he will have compassion upon every soul of man that will turn unto him. He is bound to have compassion upon every one that turneth unto him. James i., 18, is another proof text,—“Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures.” That is, we are begotten by the word of truth, through the bonds of the Gospel, and are made Christ’s by receiving the knowledge of the truth. Again—Phil. ii., 13: “For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his pleasure.” That is, God worketh in him and makes him a christian.” Ezekiel xxxvi., 26, 27: “I will put my Spirit within you and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.” My friend said that I assigned no reason for considering Mercy not an attribute of Deity. I already stated that mercy could not have been exercised had man never become a fallen being. We will suppose the mercy of God to have existed from all eternity. There never then was room for the exercise of mercy until man fell; and since, according to my friend’s theory, all men are to be finally saved, that attribute will remain dormant; for Mercy can only be exercised toward those that are fallen beings. We have evidence sufficient that Justice and Goodness and Truth are attributes. Then as to Judas Iscariot, we want the evidence of his faith as well as of his repentance. If he had proved this he had done something; but Dr. Adam Clarke is called upon because the Bible would not prove it. Then the passage, “God will have all men to be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth.” Yes, God is willing to save all men. “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the Prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not.” Jesus would have gathered them together, but they would not; consequently they remained in sin, in ignorance and misery. We come now to the Tenth argument—the Purpose of God—and Eph. i., 9, is brought up again. The purpose of God that he should gather together all things in Christ; but how? He was to gather them by the Gospel net. “The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind; which, when it was full, they drew to the shore: and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels but cast the bad away.”—Mat. xiii., 47. Then comes the passage he quoted three times to make it stronger, for three is a perfect number, I suppose,—Eph. iii., 9,—1 John iv., 8. My friend says the devil’s works are to be destroyed, but when I bring forward a passage like this,—Prov. xxix.—which says, “He that hardeneth his neck shall be destroyed,” he says that this is not a final destruction, but salvation,—that in one instance it means salvation, in the other annihilation. Then 1 Cor.

xv. : this is the chapter that will come into play to-morrow, in regard to the resurrection of the just and the unjust.

Mr. LAVELL.—My friend has again quoted that passage in Revelations—"I would that ye were either cold or hot." This I know he would bring up. He brought it forward as a set off against the Will of God. The passage does not say God *wills* this to take place, and that if it does not take place his will is defeated; but it says, "I would that ye were cold or hot"; not, "I *will* that ye are so." This word *will* must be got into the passage before it meets the difficulty. Then as to the passage in Mat., xxiii., 27: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together"; not, "I *will* gather thee," or it would have been done. But moreover this is the saying of the Saviour, and I cannot allow my opponent to assume that doctrine of the Trinity—three Gods and yet but one God: I cannot allow him to assume this: While the Bible speaks of gathering all things both in heaven and in earth in Christ, my friend says it means gathering them as moral agents. I have no objection. All men must be saved on Gospel grounds. I have already admitted that no man can be saved on any other than on Gospel grounds. Now for my Eleventh argument, which I draw from Mat. xxii., 23 to 32. Jesus here teaches the doctrine of the resurrection, and concludes with the words, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. Luke xx., 36: "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. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him." Our Saviour did not simply answer the question of the Sadducees. He taught, 1st, The Resurrection from the dead; 2nd, That those who were raised should not die any more; 3rd, That they should be equal to the Angels; and, 4th, That they should *all live unto God*. We are also instructed by this that carnality shall not exist in the resurrection state. There is no way of escaping this conclusion unless by taking it for granted that the Angels in heaven sin and suffer. I would call the attention of my friend to the words, "They who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead." It is acknowledged in the Scriptures that all the world shall be raised. St. Paul declared, "That as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Acts xxiv., 15: "And have *hope* toward God, which they themselves allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Paul, being a Christian, did not hope that any would be raised unjust; for that would have been an unchristian hope. Nor does my friend hope that any will be raised unjust, and if his hope is as extensive as Paul's, he must hope that there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust.

y to-morrow, in regard

that passage in Revé-  
not." This I knew he  
against the Will of God.  
silence, and that if it does  
"I would that ye were  
his word will must be  
culity. Then as to the  
Jerusalem, how often  
not, "I will gather  
over this is the saying  
to assume that doctrine  
I cannot allow him to  
bring all things both in  
means gathering them  
men must be saved on  
no man can be saved on  
My Eleventh argument,  
Jesus here teaches the  
in the words, "I am the  
God of Jacob." God  
Luke xx., 36: "Neither  
to the angels; and are  
resurrection. For he is  
live unto him." Our  
of the Sadducees. He  
2nd, That those who  
that they should be equal  
ive unto God. We are  
exist in the resurrection  
usion unless by taking  
suffer. I would call  
who shall be accounted  
on from the dead." It  
world shall be raised.  
even so in Christ shall  
ave hope toward God,  
be a resurrection of the  
ing a Christian, did not  
at would have been an  
hat any will be raised,  
al's, he must hope that  
the just AND the unjust.

He must admit this to prove his endless punishment theory, for there could be no endless punishment without a resurrection; so that the fact is triumphantly established. ~~It is to obtain that word~~ and the resurrection of the dead, — ~~these are accounted worthy~~, this proof text triumphantly sustains ~~the proposition~~. Why did our Saviour say so if he did not wish us to believe it. He says, "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the Angels of God in heaven;" and again, "All shall live unto him." My Twelfth argument I take from Psalm lxxxvi. 9: "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name." My Thirteenth argument I take from Psalm xxii., 27, 28: "All the ends of the world shall remember, and return unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee. For the Kingdom is the Lord's, and he is the Governor among the nations." Here it is stated as plain as language can make it, that all the kindreds of the nations shall come and worship before God. My Fifteenth argument is taken from Psalm cxlv., 10: "All thy works shall praise thee, O Lord; and thy saints shall bless thee." If all God's works shall praise him, then all intelligent beings shall praise him. Will it be to the praise of God that innumerable millions of his rational offspring will be plunged in sin? Will the blaspheming shrieks and the endless moans of condemned spirits in hell praise the Lord? How is it possible that the so-called Ministers of the Gospel can be in so deep ignorance and blindness? How can people entertain an idea so monstrous? Every unprejudiced man must say that all mankind must be brought to love and praise and adore God for ever. My Sixteenth argument is based on Isaiah xxv., 6, 8: "And in this mountain shall the Lord of Hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it." All persons shall enjoy the great feast in the presence of God their Father.

Mr. HARIS.—I was quoting from 1 John iv., 14: "We have seen, and do testify) that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." I have already said that men will be saved on Gospel terms, and that these terms are repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Isaiah xiv., 24: "The Lord of Hosts hath sworn, saying Surely as I have thought so shall it come to pass: and as I have purposed, so shall it stand." That passage refers to the Assyrian yoke which was upon the Jews, and which was to be broken. It is astonishing that there is nothing tangible brought forward—nothing to touch the point. When individuals are to be brought from a state of

slavery, that does not prove the final holiness and happiness of all men. Isaiah xlvi., 10: "Declaring the end from the beginning and from ancient times *the things* that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." Here Cyrus is again brought forward to prove that the Jews were to be taken into captivity by the heathen. Jer. li., 29: "Every purpose of the Lord shall be performed against Babylon; to make the land of Babylon a desolation without inhabitant." What has that to do with the final holiness and happiness of all men? Oh, my God, if this is the only proof of the final holiness and happiness of all men, what is to become of them? and if my friend had any better, I have no doubt he would bring it forward. He stated that I would not touch upon the foreknowledge of God; but that has got nothing to do with moral agency. God says, "He that believeth will be saved, and he that believeth not will be damned." But the foreknowledge of God will have nothing to do with moral agents. Individuals that are moral agents do as they think fit. God says to men, "Do not do that," yet they do it. The passage in reference to the Laodicean church; I contend, proves that they were spewed out; let my friend bring evidence that they will be taken in again. Where is the evidence? No, friends, there is no evidence. "But because they are neither cold nor hot I will spew them out of my mouth, saith the Lord." Then comes in the woman with the seven husbands. We have got at last to this fine woman. The Sadducees came to entangle the Saviour, and enquired of him concerning the resurrection, and having related the circumstances as given in the passage, they put the question, "Whose wife shall she be?" Then came the remarks of our Saviour, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures: for in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. In order to show what is meant by worthiness, I would refer to Rev. iii., 4: "Thou hast a few names even in Sardis which have not defiled their garments, and they shall walk with me in white: for they are worthy." Luke xxi., 36: "Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man." They shall be watching and praying always, and if they watched and prayed always they would be accounted worthy. But to show you what kind of characters would be in that world, he brings forward Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush." Why does he not bring on the wretched king Ahab, or the wicked king Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin, for an example. If all men would be accounted worthy to obtain that world, it would be superfluous to say that those that watch and pray always shall be accounted worthy. There are some, we have reason to believe, that will not be accounted worthy. Those that do not watch and pray: Those that do not turn to God. He says these

and happiness of all men  
beginning and from  
me, saying, My counsel  
Here Cyrus is again  
be taken into captivity  
of the Lord shall be  
of Babylon a desolation  
in the final holiness and  
is the only proof of the  
to become of them?  
doubt he would bring it  
in the foreknowledge of  
al agency. God says,  
believeth not will be  
have nothing to do with  
as do as they think fit  
do it. The passage in  
proves that they were  
they will be taken in  
there is no evidence. But  
them out of my mouth,  
with the seven husbands.  
success came to entangle  
resurrection, and having  
age, they put the ques-  
tion the remarks of our  
for in the resurrection  
out are as the angels of  
beant by worthiness, I  
names even in Sardis  
they shall walk with me  
: "Watch ye therefore,  
thy to escape all these  
ore the Son of man."  
and if they watched and  
thy. But to show you  
dead, he brings forward  
dead are raised, even  
bring on the wretched  
no made Israel to sin,  
ated worthy to obtain  
that those that wash  
There are some, we  
and worthy. Those that  
o God. He says there

will be no guarantee for those who do not watch and pray. I believe it. Neither will there be any more death, nor sorrow, nor crying. Neither shall there be any more pain. Like poor Lazarus they shall be taken to Abraham's bosom. We come to the Twelfth argument. Psalm lxxxvi, 9:—"All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name." That the Gospel shall be universally preached, and they shall worship before the Lord. But does that say that every individual shall be holy and happy. Do we not read that there went out into the wilderness unto John, Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the regions round about Jordan. And were baptised of him in Jordan, confessing their sins; and these very persons afterwards crucified our Lord. The Word of God will prevail. It is for ever sure, and Christ will be glorified. The Thirteenth argument is drawn from Psalm xxii, 27, 28: All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee. For the kingdom is the Lord's, and he is the Governor among the nations." That is—Individuals are to worship God, and the glory of the Lord is to be revealed among the people. Psalm cxiv, 10: "All thy works shall praise thee, O Lord; and thy saints shall bless thee." My friend wants to know how individuals that are endlessly miserable shall praise God. We are told in Scripture that the very wrath of man shall praise him, and the remainder of wrath shall he restrain; Psalm lxxvi, 10. Will you recollect the circumstance in the Revelations, the judgment of the mother of harlots: "Salvation and glory, and honour and power, unto the Lord our God. For true and righteous are his judgments, for he hath judged the great harlot who did corrupt the earth with her fornications, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand." In the fifteenth chapter of Exodus we are told that Moses and the Israelites sang glory and praise unto God when their enemies were drowned in the sea. And, as I before quoted, the Bible says, "The Lord maketh the wrath of man to praise him, and the remainder of wrath will he restrain." Now for the proof text: "All they that shall be accounted worthy shall obtain the resurrection." If my friend would prove that all men shall be worthy to obtain that resurrection, and shall be raised to immortal life and to the felicity of the children of God, he would do something to sustain his proposition. He will do a good deal, for I think he would prove that all men will be finally holy and happy. But as yet we lack evidence that all men will be holy and happy. If the gentleman has got better evidence let him bring it forward, in the name of the God that he professes to serve, that we may hear and attend to it.

Mr. LAYELL.—My friend has just said that if I prove that all would be accounted worthy to obtain the resurrection, I would do some-

thing to maintain the final holiness and happiness of mankind. I have already stated that in the resurrection they are as the angels of God in heaven, I contend that this proves it in clear language, and to show my confidence in the proofs I have adduced I will allow them to go to the public as they are. However in the first part of his last speech, my friend says they that shall be accounted worthy shall obtain the resurrection of the dead. This is not a scripture doctrine. Paul had a hope of both just and unjust, and for this hope he was called in question by the Pharisees and partialists of his day. My friend stated that the point turned upon the words "are accounted worthy." So it does. If all men are not accounted worthy then they will not be equal to the angels, but, if all men are accounted worthy they will be equal to the angels of God, for all will live with him. My Seventeenth proof text I draw from 1 Cor. xv.—the whole of the chapter. It appears from this chapter that some of the Corinthians denied the doctrine of the resurrection altogether, and the Apostle goes into a lengthened account of its effects upon all. First, in reference to its extent,—As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. Second, as to its effects. Those who are raised shall be raised in Christ. In 2 Cor. v. 17, we have an illustration of the phrase "in Christ." Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature, old things are passed away; behold all things are become new. Paul declares that as we have borne the image of the earthly so shall we also bear the image of the heavenly. Third, it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. Fourth, We shall all be changed. What is to become of the partialist's phrase? So much for the extent and effects of the resurrection. It is universal. It is glorious. It is sublime. It is holy. I will notice now some of the results and triumphs of the Saviour's reign and Kingdom. 1st. He is to conquer death. Death is swallowed up in victory. 2nd. He is to put down all rule and authority—that is, all opposing rule and authority whatever, not excepting the devil whatever he may be, 1 John iii. 8. For this purpose the son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. Heb. ii. 14. That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil. 3rd. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. Death being the last enemy shall be destroyed. What will hinder the final holiness and happiness of all mankind, if all his enemies are destroyed. 4th. All things shall be subdued unto him. And after all shall have been subjected unto Christ, then Christ is to become subjected to God. The very word "subject" obviates the popular cavil, that some are subdued one way and some another. The 26th verse, Dr. Clarke says in his commentaries, is on the side of Universal salvation. The last enemy, death, can only be destroyed by a general resurrection, so that if there be no general resurrection, death must retain his empire, therefore the fact that in the resurrection there will be no more death, death is swal-

of mankind. I have as the angels of God in language, and to show will allow them to go to part of his last speech, worthy shall obtain the doctrine. Paul had a he was called in ques-

My friend stated that united worthy." So it they will not be equal thy they will be equal My Seventeenth proof chapter. It appears the doctrine of the a lengthened account second, as to its effects.

In 2 Cor. v. 17, we Therefore, if any man passed away; behold as we have borne the age of the heavenly ver. Fourth, We shall st's phrase? So much It is universal. It is ice now some of the Kingdom. 1st. He is ctory. 2nd. He is to sing rule and authority may be, 1 John iii. 8. that he might destroy ough death he might is, the devil. 3rd. h. Death being the ler the final holiness are destroyed. 4th. or all shall have been bjected to God. The hat some are subdued Dr. Clarke says in his on. The last enemy, ction, so that if there empire, therefore the death, death is swal-

lowed up in victory. Hence the Apostle says, O, death where 'is thy sting." All are to bear the image of the heavenly. All who died in Adam are made alive in Christ, for none in the resurrection state are raised out of Christ. But all who go down to the grave in Adam the earthly man, shall come up and be made alive in Christ, the Lord from heaven. All are to be raised in *power*, and *glory*, and in *incorruption*. In the proof texts I have advanced, there is the most perfect harmony, and though the heavens and earth may pass away, not one jot or tittle of God's word shall pass away until all be fulfilled. Until the ransomed world shall unite in a general ascription of praise, "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, shall be heard saying, blessing and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."—Rev. v. 13. Thus have I gone through with Seventeen arguments out of a great number that I have still on hand, and which I will introduce to-morrow on the negative side of the question. One of these you are aware I had up the whole of the morning, and the sixteen have all been introduced this afternoon, and it is for this audience, it is for those who shall read this debate to decide within their own minds whether there is sufficient evidence to prove, that God will in his own good time, on gospel grounds, bring all men finally to holiness and bliss. I consider that the arguments I have presented are conclusive and irrefutable, and I rejoice that I have had the opportunity of standing here to day to advocate a doctrine that is pleasing to the hearts of all good men; that is pleasing to the heart of my opponent; a doctrine which tells that you, that I, that my opponent, that the Moderators, that all, shall unite ultimately in ascriptions of praise to God, that all shall be reconciled to God, that all shall be saved from sin, and ignorance, and death. The heart glows with ardour in advocating such a glorious sentiment. If my physical strength could hold out, I would stand here for days, and for weeks advocating this glorious doctrine of the fulness of the blessings of the gospel. But how is it with my friend, arguing against his own best feelings, arguing against the best feelings and desires of the human race, against the desire of God and of the angels, that all men will ultimately be gathered together into one fold, so that there will be but one fold and one shepherd. Here I rest my argument for to-day. To-morrow my friend will have the labouring oar, and will attempt to prove the doctrine of endless misery. I shall have great pleasure in following him closely and in taking the whole of his arguments out of his hands.

Mr. Harris.—I will examine a few of the passages my friend has introduced. Isaiah xxv, 6-8—"And in this mountain shall the Lord of Hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things," &c., as already quoted. Here God will take away the rebuke of his people: but it



seems a strange conclusion for my friend to draw from this passage, that all men will be finally holy and happy, inasmuch as the 10th verse of the same chapter states that Moab shall be trodden down under him. Heb. xi, 13: "These all died in faith, not having received the promise, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them." We read also in the 35th verse, that others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection. Revelations xx. 6, "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection." I come now to the Seventeenth argument—but by the way, my friend left out his Fourteenth argument. 1st Corinthians xv.; My friend gave you a large portion of that chapter as an argument, and then went on to talk of my good Methodist brother, Dr. Adam Clarke, believing in the general resurrection. I am not surprised at that; Paul believed in it, too. He says there will be a resurrection of the just and of the unjust, so that some will be raised just and others unjust in a future state. Yes! he said all Christ's enemies are to be subdued under him—he must reign until he hath put all his enemies under his feet. Would you have a great deal of friendship for me if I had you down under my feet and was trampling upon you? Yet it is said that Jesus shall have all his enemies under his feet. There is to be no more death. All will then have passed from time into eternity. There will be no more physical death; for then shall be brought to pass the saying, "Death is swallowed up in victory;" therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast and immoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord; forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord. Heb. ii, 14—"That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the Devil." That is, Jesus Christ came to destroy death. He will swallow it up in victory—that is, there will be no more of this natural death. In order to destroy death he had to die. In order to save men he had to enter into the grave, for he died for our offences, and he rose again for our justification. The resurrection of Christ, then, is the pledge of our resurrection. St. Paul tells us that when all 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. Revelations v, 13—"Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever." No doubt all the works of God praise him; but that does not say that all men will be finally holy and happy. If he had proved that every creature that was in the earth, and under the earth, and shall ever be in the earth, was singing the song of the redeemed, he would have done something; but, so far, he has entirely failed. The proposition is not proved, and he cannot prove it. My friend told you very feelingly that the hearts of all men desired the that this doctrine was true, and

he got warm in its defence and felt that he would be glad if you were all happy. Be not deceived: God will thoroughly purge his floor, and will gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn with fire unquenchable. I tell you friends that this doctrine is not cheering to the hearts of all good men. It casts a gloom on the face of God's children. They know and feel that those who preach that doctrine are in error. They know that souls are left in ruin by this deluding doctrine. I will admit that my friend has brought forward his Sixteen arguments, the strongest of which was founded upon the woman with seven husbands, and on the desire of God. I have shown that God did desire certain things that were not effected. He said to the Laodicean Church, I would you were either cold or hot, but because ye are neither cold nor hot I will spew thee out of my mouth. Then, friends, look at the Bible itself. Is it not strange that this great and glorious doctrine that my friend has been talking about does not stand upon the face of revelation plain and clear? Is it not astonishing that it takes the wisdom of a man of talent and skill to make it appear in any shape? And even having made a variety of efforts, the proposition still is not proved, and it cannot be proved, for it is not in the Word of God. If all men were to be finally holy and happy, it would show upon the page of inspiration as clear as the sun in the firmament. I have brought forward arguments unanswerable that all will not be holy and happy. They must come and worship before God; they must bend the knee, and bend the spirit before God. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again he cannot enter the Kingdom of God." The conditions upon which salvation is suspended, are belief in God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. He that believeth hath the evidence of his adoption. The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we 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. Before you, my friends, lie the arguments for the final holiness and happiness of all men. They will, by-and-bye, be scattered over the country, so that many who have not heard us to-day may be enabled to peruse them. I thank you for attending here to-day. I thank you for the patience with which you have waited to the close of this day's debate, and the attention with which you have listened to it. I pray the God of all Grace that his blessing may accompany what has been said, if in accordance with his will; and may make a suitable impression upon each of our hearts. I beg of you to attend again to-morrow, when I shall endeavor to take the lead in the argument, and in the name of God I shall endeavor to bring before you the truths of God with regard to the endless misery of the ungodly; and if I fail to convince you of the clear scriptural character of this doctrine, I will never preach another sermon on that subject.—Meantime farewell.

WEDNESDAY MORNING.

Mr. [Name] introducing the important proposition which  
 upon the [Name] [Name]'s debate, I wish to lay down some rules  
 which shall be governed in its discussion. In the first place,  
 words will be introduced to-day, the meaning of which can only be  
 properly understood by the connexion in which they stand; and I  
 would here remark that words are properly divided into three classes,  
 Univocal, Equivocal, and Synonymous. Univocal words stand alone.  
 They have got but one meaning, and they express that meaning fully  
 themselves. Equivocal words have a variety of meanings, and can  
 only be properly understood by the connexion in which they are found.  
 Synonymous words may be applied differently as, wave—billow; dwell-  
 ing—habitation, &c. The proposition for to-day you are aware is—“Do  
 the Scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery to any portion of the  
 human family.” I proceed in the first place to notice that there will be in  
 the future a resurrection of the bodies of all the children of man, and  
 in order to prove this my appeal of course shall be to the Law and to  
 the Testimony. The first passage of Scripture which I shall introduce  
 to prove the resurrection, you will find in the prophecies of Daniel  
 xii. 2. “Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall  
 awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting  
 contempt.” And to show this resurrection shall be at a period when  
 the Saints shall rejoice endlessly, the Prophet goes on to state that  
 “They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament;  
 and they that win many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and  
 ever. Here it is plainly stated, there is to be a resurrection of two  
 classes;—some to shame and everlasting contempt, others to everlast-  
 ing life. In the Gospel according to St. John, v. 28, 29, it is written:  
 “Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are  
 in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that  
 have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done  
 evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.” Here is a resurrection spoken  
 of, and mark my friends of, all that are in their graves. An excep-  
 tion. It is not stated that the hour is past; but the hour is coming  
 —speaking in the future tense—when 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. The next passage I shall introduce is Job xviii. 26:  
 “And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh  
 shall I see God.” Then the resurrection of the body is from a  
 corruptible state. Luke xx. 37: “Now that the dead are raised,

Even Moses showed at the bush, when he calloth the Lord the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Abraham and Isaac and Jacob had been dead hundreds of years: Abraham about 430 years, at the time that God appeared to Moses in the burning bush. John xi., 23, 24: "Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him; I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." At the last day Lazarus was expected to rise. Martha was a believer in the resurrection of the dead. Acts iv., 1, 2: "And as they spake unto the people, the priests, and the captains of the temple, and the Sadducees, came upon them. Being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead." Here we have the resurrection of the dead spoken of, and this grieved the Sadducees, and led them to lay hands upon the disciples. Acts xxiv., 15: "And have hope towards God which they themselves also allow that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Both classes you see are to be raised—just as well as unjust. Acts xxvi., 6, 7, 8. "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers. Unto which promise our twelve Tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come; for which hope's sake, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?" Acts xxiii., 6: "When Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and Brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." Here a resurrection of the dead is again spoken of. Heb. vi., 2: "Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." Here the resurrection of the dead is spoken of in connection with the judgment. 2 Tim. ii., 18, 19: "Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already, and overthrow the faith of some." Here the resurrection of the dead is spoken of as being in the future, and it was regarded by the Apostle as an error in his day to say that the resurrection had taken place. 1 Cor. xv., 21: "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; but every man in his own order, Christ the first-fruit: afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming."

Mr. LAVELL.—The question before us to-day for debate is, *Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery for any portion of the human family?* My friend declares that they do, and I shall maintain that they do not; so that you see the position of parties to-day is changed. My opponent takes the affirmative. He leads in the investigation to-day. After laboring to show you that in a world over

which a perfect Deity reigns, the best state of things that men or angels could wish for, or God design or desire, or Christ accomplish, can never take place, he now comes forward to maintain the worst state of things that man can fear, or that demons could desire, will ultimately transpire, and endure as long as the Throne of the Eternal shall stand. I say the worst state of things. In the name of Heaven! what could possibly be worse than that even one soul should fall into ENDLESS sin and woe, to writhe in agony, to shriek and groan in dark despair, and blaspheme the name of its creator through the endless cycles of eternity. But when he contends, as he will, not that one soul shall be lost, but that MILLIONS of souls shall receive this doom, I feel authorized to declare that he will maintain the worst state of things which it is possible to conceive. Can it be possible that my opponent, and the believers in the monstrous doctrine of endless misery, have ever attempted to realize the awful, the revolting nature of that doctrine, or considered the dark, unholy imputations it casts on the character of the upholder of the Universe? Endless misery I think of it for a moment. Days, months, years will pass away; ages on ages will roll over the heads of the sinners in hell; this multiplied by every grain of sand that lines the ocean shore: this again multiplied by every star that gilds the vault of heaven: this again multiplied by every blade of grass that beautifies our earth; and all this multiplied, twice ten thousand millions of times into itself, you would not even then begin to form an idea of the doctrine of endless, unceasing, interminable misery. It surely cannot be that my opponent and his brethren have ever endeavored to realize the consequences of such a doctrine. My opponent will labor to prove that there are thousands of parents who have lost children that arrived at years of discretion, and will never meet them more. He will seek to convince you that your dearly loved ones have gone to buffet the waves of Almighty, Infinite, wrath, and fight with incarnate fiends for ever. He will strive to make children believe that they have beloved parents in an endless hell; that the father and mother who watched over them in their infant years, and who trained them with care and affection, and whom they followed to the grave, and that grave they have watered with their tears, are now shrieking in ENDLESS despair and anguish; that they are calling on God for even the slightest display of MERCY and JUSTICE, and the smallest mitigation of their torture; but alas! they are calling in vain. The only answer to their cries for pity from Him who made them will be, my opponent contends, infinite frowns of hatred and vengeance. My opponent will labour to prove that vast numbers of parents who may be so fortunate as to arrive in Heaven will be childless there, and that thousands of children there will be orphans;—that when the redeemed in Heaven shall strike their golden harps to praise of the Majesty of Heaven, the sweet melody of their song shall be combined with sorrow at the absence of the dearest

objects of their affection, who may be rolling in the billows of infinite wrath. O, my God! what a doctrine. What an idea to be contended for under the light of that glorious sun, now shedding his lustre around us, and whose sweet and blessed beams, falling alike on the evil and the good, attest the impartial love of the Father of us all. What a work to be engaged in, in the 19th century, and that too by a professed Christian Minister of the Gospel of Christ, which bringeth glad tidings of *great joy* which shall be to *all people*. It is my duty, and most pleasing to my soul it is, to contend against this monstrous sentiment with the little ability I possess. I shall endeavor to show that this doctrine is dishonorable to God, disgraceful to Christ,—and that it is opposed to Scripture, and abhorrent to the best feelings of the human heart; and that there is impressed upon its very frontlet all the marks and features of a monstrous **FALSEHOOD**. I maintain that my opponent has, in the first place, the *improbable* side of the question. It requires not only a little logic, but a vast amount of testimony to prove that such a question is probable, a weight of convincing evidence to make it approach anything like to certainty. A trifling amount of evidence will not sustain my friend in defence of such a monstrous doctrine. The evidence that the community, that mankind have a right to demand for this doctrine, and the arguments in support of such a sentiment must be drawn clearly, directly and legitimately from the source of all truth, the character and attributes of God. It will require, moreover, that the arguments in defence of a doctrine of this nature, so destructive of the best desires of mankind, be so clear, direct and conclusive, that not a doubt shall be left upon the mind of any human being. If such evidence is not adduced, then the doctrine of endless misery must be abandoned for ever. My friend has quoted a number of passages to prove a resurrection from the dead, and only one to prove the resurrection of the same identical body of flesh and blood. I believe in the resurrection from the dead, and I would therefore save his time by requesting him not to produce passages to prove what I do not deny.

Mr. HARRIS.—My opponent reminds me of the course pursued by a young lawyer in the city of Dublin, who was employed to conduct a case. Before he made his appearance in court he wrote out his speech, and when about half through delivering it the Judge requested him to stop as he was not speaking to the point, but the gentleman replied "I have written my speech and am determined to deliver it." I will now continue the proof of the resurrection from the dead. When that point is established I will give evidence as high as heaven, as deep as hell, and as strong as the word of eternal truth, which is built on an immovable basis, that there will be in the future world, persons that will suffer in endless misery. I will now return to Corinthians. The 23rd verse says, "In his own order, Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. Thus we see that Christ rose from the dead, and rose

with the same identical body, he had when he died, he showed to the disciples the wounds in his hands and in his side. He said to Thomas, reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless but believing." Christ was the first-fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection from the dead. 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. 1 Thess., iv, 16. 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. Here the dead in Christ and they that are Christ's are both spoken of by the Apostle, and when this resurrection takes place, "Then cometh the end when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." Now all enemies—this is spoken in the plural number—All the enemies are to be put under his feet, before death is destroyed, consequently it will be, before the everlasting punishment and endless misery of the finally impenitent takes place. I shall now turn to the examination of another passage of Scripture to prove that it is the resurrection of the same body which will take place. 1st John iii, 2. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." Here the saints are to be like Christ. Again, Phill. iii, 20, 21: "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ. Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body. According to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." Here then the bodies of the saints are to be raised,—the bodies,—and then changed after being raised, and made like unto Christ's glorious body. It would not be a resurrection at all if not the same body; it would be a new creation. It must be a resurrection of the same identical body, if a resurrection at all. Rom, vi, 8. Now, if we be dead with Christ we believe that we shall also live with him. Rom. viii, 23. 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. Mark the words—*Our Body*,—The same body of course, for he had not any other body, and he was then speaking in the present tense—waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of *our body*. 1 Cor. 6, 14. And God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his own power. Here the resurrection of Christ is spoken of. His body was the same in which he suffered and died. The Apostle goes on to reason on the matter, and says, and will also raise up our body by his own

pow  
Jesu  
I ha  
out  
recti  
just  
quot  
Rev.  
death  
wero  
holl  
to be  
reflec  
their  
water  
God,  
deeds  
then,  
dead  
dead  
to the  
I will  
Whist  
"1.  
are de  
not re  
does n  
not sh  
region  
pointe  
agreea  
"2.  
able fi  
prepar  
senten  
those t  
idols a  
himself  
the cau  
never f  
same pl  
"3.  
there  
through  
do not  
are led  
region  
world,  
no pier  
fathers  
they wa  
this reg

power. 2nd Cor., iv., 14: "Knowing that he who raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you." I have now gone through a variety of passages of Scripture that point out as plainly as language can point out, that there will be a resurrection from the dead of the bodies of all men;—a resurrection of the just and unjust;—a resurrection of the evil and the good. I will now quote but one more passage on the resurrection part of the debate,—Rev. xx., 13: "The sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged, every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire." Here, then, we are told there is to be a resurrection of all that are in the sea. How wonderful to reflect that those who have been buried in the great waters, where their bodies have been devoured by fish, or decomposed in the waters of the great deep, shall yet be raised by the mighty power of God, and shall stand at the bar of God, and give an account of the deeds done here in the body. We can have no hesitation in saying, then, that this resurrection must be general. The sea gave up the dead that were in it; and death and hell (or Hades) delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged, every man according to their works. Concerning Hades, to which I have just now referred, I will give you the opinion of the Jews, as given by Josephus. See Whiston's Josephus (Bohn's edition), vol. ii., page 561:—

"1. Now as to Hades, wherein the souls of the righteous and unrighteous are detained, it is necessary to speak of it. Hades is a place in the world not regularly finished, a subterraneous region, where the light of this world does not shine; from which circumstance, that in this region the light does not shine, it cannot be but there must be in it perpetual darkness. This region is allotted as a place of custody for souls, in which angels are appointed as guardians to them, who distribute to them temporary punishment agreeable to every one's behavior and manners.

"2. In this region there is a certain place set apart as a lake of unquenchable fire, whereinto we suppose no one hath hitherto been cast, but it is prepared for a day afore-determined by God, in which one righteous sentence shall deservedly be passed upon all men: when the unjust and those that have been disobedient to God; and have given honour to such idols as have been the vain operations of the hands of men, as to God himself, shall be adjudged to this everlasting punishment, as having been the causes of desilement; while the just shall obtain an incorruptible and never fading kingdom. These are now confined in Hades, but not in the same place where the unjust are confined.

"3. For there is one descent in this region, at whose gate we believe there stands an Arch-angel with a host; which gate when those pass through that are conducted down by the angels appointed over souls, they do not go the same way, but the just are guided to the right hand, and are led with hymns sung by the angels appointed over that place, under a region of light, in which the just have dwelt from the beginning of the world, \* \* \* with whom there is no place of toil, no burning heat, no piercing cold; nor are any briars there; but the countenance of the fathers and of the just, which they see always, smiles upon them; while they wait for the rest and eternal new life in heaven, which is to succeed this region. This place we call the bosom of Abraham.



"4. But as to the unjust, they are dragged by force to the left hand by the angels allotted for punishment, no longer going with a good will, but are prisoners driven by violence; to whom are sent the angels appointed over them, to reproach them, and threaten them with their terrible looks, and to thrust them still downward."

Mr. LAVELL.—My opponent has taken the position that words are either univocal, equivocal, or synonymous:—Very true; he admits this rule. It is a grand admission; and I feel confident that before this day's debate is closed, the gentleman, if he is anxious to succeed in proving the doctrine of endless misery, will regret having made this the rule of his course in this discussion. Equivocal words will be the words that will trouble my friend. He says he will commence by proving the resurrection of the same identical body, and then he quotes Daniel xii. 2; but in the quotation of this verse he has been guilty of a trick that is dishonourable. It is dishonourable in any Christian minister to handle the Word of God deceitfully. He takes the passage of Scripture from its connexion. Look at it. Look at the reason of the conjunction *and* here. Read the 11th chapter, and it will help to explain the meaning of the passage he has quoted. It will tell you that it was to be at a time of great trouble, referred to in the 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew; the destruction of the Jewish Temple; the abrogation of the old dispensation, and the establishment of a new one: "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* shall thy people be delivered, every one *that shall be found written in the book.* 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." There is not one word, however, in the quotation to prove the subject he quoted it for—the resurrection of *the same identical body.* If my friend avers that this passage refers to the resurrection to an immortal state of existence, I demand proof. I deny that it has such a reference; and I appeal to the Moderators, that no debater has a right to quote a passage of Scripture, and let it pass without showing its bearing upon the question in debate: I also aver that if he pursues this course, and quotes passage after passage without showing their import—for I believe all the passages in the Bible—if he pursues this course, I am not bound by the rules of controversy to pay the slightest attention to them. I make this statement at the commencement of this day's debate, wishing all present to know,—both learned and ignorant,—that I have taken a position which I am justified in taking; and I appeal to every man of talent in this country to say if I am not right in the position which I now take, so that if I do not notice some of the passages which my friend introduces, the reason will be explained in this statement I have now made. He has quoted a passage

from A  
my fle  
the sa  
before  
from  
try to  
tence,  
gener  
endle  
worm  
mean  
this li  
that t  
resurr  
have  
resurr  
the r  
the r  
the p  
purpo  
the d  
He d  
stamp  
inthis  
"Th  
that  
sown  
says  
hono  
disho  
it is  
shall  
—the  
to the  
up r  
up th  
the e  
This  
ing  
deny  
word  
frien  
to m

hook

from Job. He says that, "Though worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." He brought this up to prove a resurrection of the *same identical body*. But does that prove the proposition in debate, before us this day. Bear this in mind. He will go on by degrees from the resurrection of the same identical body, and no doubt he will try to get sin into the future world; sin, in that state of existence, where mankind are to be punished both before and after the general resurrection; this established, he will from that prove endless misery. But he will fall infinitely short of it. "Though worms destroy this body," &c.,—I would like to know what my friend means by the word "destroy" here. Persons have been destroyed in this life, and yet they have not been annihilated. My friend assumes that the expression, "In my flesh shall I see God," applies to the resurrection state, while I contend that in that very book of Job, we have very strong evidence that Job had very little knowledge of a resurrection state. My friend has quoted from 1 Cor. xv., to prove the resurrection of the dead, and he says he will undertake to prove the resurrection of the *same identical body*, and with the exception of the passage in Job, he has brought forward all his proofs for the former purpose. There is proof abundant produced of the resurrection from the dead but not proof of the resurrection of the very identical body. He dare not assert there is, because he knows the passages quoted put the stamp of falsehood upon such an assertion. The fifteenth chapter of Corinthians says nothing at all about the same identical body. Paul says, "Thou sowest not that body which shall be." My friend says, "Yes, that identical body"; which are we to believe? Paul says, "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption." And if my friend says some are raised to misery, Paul says "it is sown in dishonour," and if *endless misery* were true, it would be raised in dishonour; but "it is raised in glory." "It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall ALL be made alive. The one is earthly, belonging to the earth,—the other is heavenly, spiritual and glorious. Mankind go down to the grave in Adam. Do they come up in Adam? No, they come up in Christ. Here is much for my friend. I am glad he brings up this passage, for I intended to do so. This passage winds up with the expression—that God may be ALL in ALL,—a glorious declaration. This is one of the best passages in the Bible to prove the final ingathering of the whole human race. The passage quoted from John v, I deny refers to the resurrection, but to this mortal state. He left out the words,—*the time is coming and now is*, not the time will be, as my friend would have us believe. The Saviour says *marvel not at this*, to make it more impressive upon his hearers.

Mr. HARRIS.—I am glad that I have drawn out Leviathan with a hook so as to have an opportunity to say something. I quoted from

Daniel xii., but my friend says that I have taken the passage from its connexion. He wishes to confine it to the destruction of the Jewish people. But any person that will read the last verse of the 11th chapter must be aware that the things prophesied of here had not taken place at the time when Daniel wrote, and did not take place for centuries after the commencement of the Christian era. The last verse of the 11th chapter, it is very generally believed, refers directly to Napoleon Bonaparte. He shall come to his end and none shall help him. Napoleon came to his end in 1821, if I mistake not, and he was then in solitude with none to help him. At that time, says the prophet, shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people, and then 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. Then the prophet goes on to say, "some shall awake to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt, and they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." The idea is carried not only to the resurrection of the immortal state, but to two classes of men that shall rise, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. I do say that this refers directly to the resurrection of the body and to the immortal state which shall commence after the resurrection of that body—some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. My friend wishes to refer this to the overthrow of the Jews, an event which took place in the year 70 of the-Christian era. But this refers to a resurrection to everlasting life, and to everlasting shame and contempt and not to the destruction of the Jewish polity. But my friend wishes to draw away your minds from this to the doctrine of endless punishment which I shall attend to in its proper time, and by the grace of the God I serve I shall do, it; and before the sun which now shines so resplendently above us hath found a lodging place behind the western hills, my efforts to prove the doctrine of endless misery to a part of the human race, will tell on every mind and on every conscience that will attend to what I shall say. My friend went on to say that I quoted passages of scripture, but did not attend to their connexion. I have commented on every passage brought forward by me since the discussion commenced, if I mistake not. We come again to Job xix., 24: And though after my skin worms destroy this body yet in my flesh shall I see God. My friend declared that Job knew little or nothing about a future state. But he said more; he said Job had reference to the things that transpired in his own day. But if he had quoted the passage I adduced, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth," he would have changed his opinion. O! yes, O! yes, that tells, In my flesh shall I see God. The time is named—It is the latter day, he shall stand upon the earth.

Job's fa  
ing, he  
friend b  
shall no  
itself.  
very thi  
up, and  
body th  
change  
body, a  
things u  
would  
body w  
and wh  
it is sov  
in glori  
very bo  
dust of  
shall be  
shall b  
some a  
contem  
future  
proves  
death,  
in the  
come  
and th  
it spiri  
it has  
chapters  
and no  
and th  
should  
the ho  
God, r  
the p  
in the  
show  
said,  
swall  
is thy  
he sh  
have  
reign,

Job's faith took hold upon the future, and though sinking under suffering, he had a lively faith in reference to the resurrection. Here my friend brings some passages from 1 Cor. 15, to show that the same body shall not be raised—"If it is raised a Spiritual body;" "it," the very thing itself. "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." The very thing itself that is sown is raised. The thing put down is brought up, and this being the case we have proved the fact that the same body that is sown shall be raised again, Phill. iii., 21, "Who shall change this vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." The gentleman keeps away from this text. He would pull that leaf out of my book. Here then we notice that the body will be raised and will be fashioned like to his own glorious body, and when the Apostle is referring to the resurrection in Cor. 15, he says it is sown in dishonour; but though sown in dishonour it will be raised in glory, it is sown in weakness, but it shall be raised in power. The very body will be raised, because it is stated that they that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake. But every man in his own order. There shall be different grades or different descriptions; that is the wicked shall be in their own order, and the righteous shall be in theirs. If some are to be raised to immortal life and some to shame and everlasting contempt, all will be raised, for there will be no incorruption in a future state. My friend glanced at John v., 28, 29: "He says it proves a spiritual resurrection if so they must be raised from spiritual death, these are the words." Marvel not at this for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation? Is it spiritual death to be raised to resurrection of damnation. But that it has no reference to a spiritual resurrection, the 25th verse of the same chapter shows very plainly. The Saviour says—"The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live." The Jews were astonished why Jesus should address them as he was doing, and he turned to them and said, the hour is coming, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. He speaks of the future, not in the past or present time; they that hear shall live. The time is in the future: All that are in their graves shall hear his voice. To show that this word grave refers to the depository of the dead, it is said, after the resurrection shall come to pass the saying, Death is swallowed up in victory: O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? My friend referred to God's being all in all, "when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet." But my friend

dare not tell you who these enemies are. He will not come out plainly and say who they are. But he must reign till his enemies are put under his feet, 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. Jesus himself said. All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth, And lo I am with you always even unto the end of the world;—and to believe a finite being capable of all power in heaven and in earth would be a far greater difficulty than to believe that Jesus Christ is the true and eternal God. My friend has said that if I prove punishment after death, and after the resurrection, I shall have done something to prove my position. I shall prove punishment in a future state, I shall prove it in eternity, and I shall prove that that punishment shall be endless, and enduring as the God who created man in his own image and likeness.

MR. LAVELL.—I once knew an old gentleman, a Methodist, a good man and an honor to the denomination, who said to me, “I must confess, Mr. Lavell, if your doctrine is not true, I feel as if it *ought* to be,”—and it is just the way with every good-hearted individual that lives. They feel if it is not true, it ought to be. This same person made this remark—after a certain individual, a Methodist Minister not of his denomination, not of the Episcopal Methodists, had lectured against Universalism—he remarked if he only deliver another course of lectures here against this doctrine, he will make more Universalists than Mr. Lavell would make were he to preach here ten years. And allow me here to say to my friend Mr. Harris, for it is put down in black and white, I venture to say that his speeches will make more Universalists than if he had been labouring to preach the doctrine. Now, my friends, I wish you to read them calmly and without prejudice. It is one of the greatest, the most fortunate of circumstances that ever happened to us that we managed to obtain an efficient Reporter. My friend said that the last part of the 11th chapter of Daniel referred to Napoleon. *Suppose* it does, what of it? My friend seems greatly at a loss for some proof of the premises. He said by the Grace of his God, he would do so and so,—“By the Grace of my God,—of the God I serve I will prove the doctrine of endless misery.” There is not a doubt that by the Grace of the God he serves, who is worse than an incarnate devil, he will prove the doctrine of endless misery;—fit work indeed for such a couple. But by the God whom I serve—by the God that we read of in the Bible—by the God that is the author of the Sun that now shines upon us in all his lustre and shines upon all alike—by the God whose impartiality is manifested throughout all the natural world, he will most signally fail. After my friend had uttered these wonderful expressions which he thinks I suppose are pretty conclusive testimony he says O yes! O yes! that tells.—It was a wonder we did not all rise

and cle  
We con  
body.”  
of it.  
Paul a  
Next t  
come.  
that sh  
grain;  
seed it  
as an  
of fleg  
birds.  
and an  
star di  
—“so  
raised  
is sow  
it is ri  
that is  
the tv  
body  
of him  
shall  
it, it  
a spi  
hear  
and  
a re  
that  
no e  
a spi  
spea  
pow  
thes  
Dea  
pea  
wh  
that  
som  
feet  
at t  
hin  
tion  
the

and clear out being so frightened. What wonderful argument is here. We come to 1 Cor. xv. "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." But did he show to us what this refers to. No not one word of it. He dare not do it. Mark the preceding part of the chapter. Paul says,—But some men will say, how are the dead raised up. Next *with what body do they come*, with what body do the dead come. Paul then goes on to say,—“Thou fool, *thou sowest not that body that shall be*, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed its own body.” Now you know that Paul states immediately after as an illustration, “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.” Mark, too, they are all glorious: “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 in glory.” Now mark the *fact* that Paul gives —“so also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body:” hence, it is not the same identical body that is raised at the resurrection. I call the gentleman’s attention to the two questions of Paul. How are the dead raised up? With what body do they come? and if he sticks to this I will make a Universalist of him. The passage he quoted which speaks of the Saviour,—“Who shall change our vile body,” shows very evidently that if he changes it, it is not the same body I am sure. He admits that Christ speaks of a spiritual resurrection in the quotation from John. “The dead shall hear his voice and they that hear shall live.” “The time is coming and now is,” &c. Then he goes on to say, that the Saviour speaks of a resurrection to an immortal state of existence. I demand proof that the Saviour so suddenly changes the subject here. He gives us no evidence of it. There is not one word of a change. He speaks of a spiritual resurrection in this life by faith; for the resurrection he here speaks of is conditional, while the one to immortal life is through the power of God, and unconditional. My friend says I dare not tell who these enemies are that are mentioned in 1 Cor. xv.; I dare—they are, Death, Sin, Ignorance and Error,—all that is opposed to the mild and peaceful reign of Jesus Christ. Death is to be the *last* enemy; and when all are subdued then shall Christ himself be subject unto God that God may be *all in all*. Does my friend mean that there shall be some of mankind upon whose necks our Saviour shall stand with his feet, and shall trample them in the dust, and that this shall take place at the resurrection of the dead? If he does, I demand proof of it. Let him prove it from that chapter which gives the most elaborate description of the resurrection of the dead in the whole Bible. Let him prove that part of mankind will be enemies to Christ forever. He said I dare

not state who are the enemies mentioned in that connexion—I have stated who they are. But my friend said this in order to throw dust in the eyes of the audience. It was his duty to prove that men will be enemies, but it is all barefaced assertion on his part. He said Christ has all power in heaven and in earth. So he has: and for this very reason I believe he will succeed. If Christ obtained the power from some semi-infinite being, then the devil might go off with the palm of victory, having robbed the Saviour of nine-tenths of the human family, and take them to howl with grim devils to all eternity. But as the Saviour receives all power from God, an infinitely perfect being, we are bound to believe that he will succeed in his mission,—we are bound to believe that the devil and all his works will be destroyed. I repeat then, that if my friend does prove punishment after death, he falls far short of proving the affirmative of the question? Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of ENDLESS punishment?

Mr. HARRIS.—The first thing I will notice is the remark of this good Methodist. He was good in my friend's estimation for saying if all men are not saved, they ought to be. His goodness then consisted in his having an opinion different from what is taught in revelation. Then he referred to the preaching of a certain Methodist making Universalists, I did not know but it was my opponent's brother that was making so many.

Mr. LAVELL.—Moderator,—I rise to a point of order. He has mentioned my brother who is a Methodist Minister, and has attempted to cast a slur upon him. What has this to do with the question?

Mr. HARRIS.—Well I will say this good man, this Methodist, thought that if the preacher continued to lecture against Universalism, he would make a great many Universalists. Then my friend turned round to me and said what a most fortunate thing it was for him that we obtained an efficient Reporter, so that all this discussion might be published to the world, as it would bring men from Methodism to Universalism, thus saying that I encouraged Universalism.

Mr. LAVELL.—I rise to a point of order. I did not say that Mr. Harris encouraged Universalism; but that his expressions were calculated to do so.

Mr. HARRIS.—I do not wish to be thus interrupted, and I trust the Moderator will give me my full time.

The MODERATOR, requested that the discussion might proceed without any personal allusions whatever, as it only would tend to create unhappy feelings.

Mr. LAVELL said he would waive the question as the remarks were all noted down.

Mr. HARRIS resumed,—My friend referred to the expression I used,—My God whom I serve, by his grace I would prove endless misery before the sun went down. This being the case, my friend said “the God whom I serve was worse than an incarnate devil.” I was astonished at that expression; however, I let it go. He next came to the twelfth chapter of Daniel, and the gentleman admitted all I said. This being the case, he has given up the argument of the author having any reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, inasmuch as Napoleon died at St. Helena in 1821. “At that time shall Michael stand up, the great Prince which standeth for the children of my 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. 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.” I call upon the gentleman to say who this refers to, is not to the resurrection of the dead at the end of time. My friend next came to the words, “It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body;” and he wishes to make out from this that the particle it refer, to the seed sown; and then he referred to the words, “It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory,”—the very thing I was contending for. But it is not the same body, says my friend, but a spiritual body—the very thing I contend for—the very same body, but changed. The Apostle says, “We shall not all sleep, but we shall be changed.” I ask any man of common sense, Will the bodies of those who live upon the earth when Christ shall come to judge the world not be the same bodies in which they were living? Will they not be the same bodies with which they lived, with the exception of the change which shall take place upon them? Of course they will. I will refer you as proof of this to the circumstance of the Transfiguration. There appeared Moses and Elias talking with Jesus. They had their resurrection bodies, and they spoke of the deceased Jesus was to accomplish at Jerusalem. My friend directed your attention to John v., 28, 29. He says this refers to a conditional resurrection. But I think it is evident that the condition refers not to the resurrection, but to the future bliss or misery of the persons raised,—according to their conduct here,—they that have done good, to the resurrection of life; they that have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation. They shall all come forth, but their future state depends upon their present conduct. My friend refers to sin being destroyed, to sin and ignorance and error and everything that opposes Christ being destroyed. This is the very thing. And what if the gentleman shall prove punishment in a future



world? says he. In the name of common sense, what will be punished if there be no sin? We want to go right along. It is now admitted that there will be a resurrection. He admitted that that passage in Daniel refers to the resurrection from the dead,—he could not do otherwise; and then that the verse proceeding refers to Napoleon Bonaparte, who fought against the British on the field of Waterloo, and was afterward carried captive, and died in exile. I have said done with the resurrection; it is sustained, and cannot be controverted. In the next place I shall proceed to prove a Judgment, and that that judgment will take place after the resurrection. Acts xvii., 31: "He hath appointed a day in the which he shall judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; *whereof* he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." That judgment, we see, will take place at a particular time appointed. Now the evidence of a future judgment, in the opinion of Paul, depended upon the resurrection of Christ, and here he states positively and in plain terms that God hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised Christ from the dead. That this cannot refer to the destruction of Jerusalem is evident. The Apostle Paul was addressing the philosophic Greeks at Athens, and this is an evidence that the passage had nothing to do with Jerusalem or the Jewish State. And to show what world is to be judged, Paul says, He hath commanded all men everywhere to repent. It is the world "everywhere,"—the entire universal world, all men everywhere,—Because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; *whereof* he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. 2d Peter, ii., 9: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished,"—not that he knows how to reserve the unjust that are punished; but he reserves the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished. Then they are to be punished after the day of judgment. O! solemn fact, that when he shall judge the world in righteousness, he has reserved the unjust to be punished in that day. John xii., 48: "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the words that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." Now we are placing the judgment in the proper place; after the resurrection. All men shall be brought before the eyes of a congregated world, for all men shall stand before the Judge of all the earth. Then Christ says, "The word that I have spoken shall judge him at the last day." 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." Sodom and Gomorrah had been burned to ashes centuries before, but the Sodomites are to be assembled at the day of judgment; and Jesus said

it would be more tolerable even for them than for that city that heard the Saviour's preaching, and yet denounced his miracles and remained impenitent,—more tolerable, more easy at the day of judgment than for that city. O, Fearful Day! Day of Judgment! Day of wonders! In Revelations vi., 17, it is said: "The great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand." O! that day of wrath!—that great day, that day of wrath!

Mr. LAVELL.—My opponent will be continually misrepresenting me. He said that I admitted the last verse of the 11th chapter of Daniel referred to Napoleon. I admit no such thing; but I denied it, and demanded *proof* that it refers to Napoleon. My opponent has undertaken to prove the resurrection from the dead, of all men, and has thus laboured to prove what nobody denies. But he stated also that I undertook to prove this. No Sirs! I am not bound to prove anything here to-day. I am not called upon to prove anything. Persons acquainted with the rules of debate will know that I have the *negative* and my opponent the *affirmative* in this day's discussion. He attempted to erect the building, and it is my duty to show that his material is not sufficient to do it. My opponent stated that 1st Cor. 15 taught that the same body would be raised; but it would be a spiritual body. Well, really, if the spiritual body in the spiritual state be the *same body* it is strange to me. We have here something new under the sun. But he has not dared to touch the question I propounded. How are the DEAD raised up? and with what BODY do THEY come? He stated that the resurrection spoken of in John v, 29 is not a conditional resurrection. Let us read it,—"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."—Now mark, they that have done good. Here is a conditional resurrection: It is predicated of works,—They that have done good. Now I maintain that the resurrection to immortal life is by the *power of God*,—it is unconditional, so that the gentleman's argument fails here. He however, made some little ado about the word "graves." If you refer to Ezekiel xxxvii, 12 you will find the word "graves" used in a spiritual sense, and all confined to this life. "I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into 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, and ye shall live; and I shall place you in your own land." This is sufficient to show that it does not follow that the word "graves" has any reference to the resurrection state whatever. Dr. Lightfoot a celebrated divine of the Church of England remarks on John v, 28.

"These words might also be applied to a spiritual resurrection, as were the former, (and so, coming out of graves meaneth, Ezekiel xxvii, 12) the words of the verse following being only translated and glossed thus: 'And they shall come, 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.'

Here is the assertion of a divine of the Church of England, a learned one too, and admitted to be so,—also a believer in the doctrine of endless misery—not a Universalist. My friend said I also admitted the passage in the 12 chapter of Daniel referred to the immortal resurrection. I do no such thing, and demand proof of it, as he has the labouring oar to-day, his assertion is good for nothing, unless he prove it. My friend has quoted several passages to prove a final judgment. One in Acts xvii., 31: "Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world," &c. I ask my friend what he means by the word "day" in this passage. If he says it means a period of 24 hours, I demand proof of it. If he believes that it means an age, a dispensation, I admit it, and this will agree with the great truth aught in the Scriptures, that the judgment commenced 18 centuries ago, when the Gospel Kingdom was established, and will continue to exist until Christ has done reigning and ruling over mankind, and shall deliver up the kingdom to God that he may be all in all. If my friend assumes that to judge means to gather all mankind together in a body, and God literally sit in a chair or throne, then I demand proof of it. "The Lord knoweth how to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." Does my friend mean to say that there will be a general judgment after all upon the earth have died? If so, I demand proof. He knows as well as I do, that plain statement of the Saviour—"Now is the Judgment of this world—not will be in eternity." Then again, "The same shall judge him in the last day." This expression is used by the sacred writers frequently. If my friend says it means a day for final judgment, then I demand proof of it. Proof is what is required here to-day. Mere assertions will not do. In reference to Matthew x., 15: I shall present you the evidence of a believer in the doctrine of endless misery, the celebrated orthodox commentator, Dr. Hammond, a man whose learning is beyond doubt. In regard to the words it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah. Dr. Hammond says:—

"I assure you the punishment or destruction that will light upon that city will be such, that the destruction of Sodom shall appear to have been more tolerable than that."

Bishop Pearce, another learned commentator, says:

"The sense of this verse seems to be this, That which formerly befel Sodom and Gomorrah, was more tolerable, than what should befall this city. That the day of judgment here mentioned is to be thus understood, appears from what is said concerning Capernaum in Chap. xii, 28, compared with verses 22, 24 of the same chapter."

Testa

calam  
those  
same  
had J

I

day of  
state  
that p  
judgm  
destr

I

Wetst

New

this v

"

shall  
to ha  
punish  
these.

T

those

Unive

the qu

ations

party

M

by my

parte.

Napol

an a

showe

Destr

chapt

the e

shall

even

every

that s

life ar

the w

write

text o

Gilbert Wakefield, who published a translation of the New Testament in 1800, says of this passage:

"All that our Saviour intends to say is, that when the temporal calamities of that place come upon it, they will be more severe than even those of Sodom and Gomorrah. See this phrase, employed in precisely the same meaning by the LXX in Proverbs 6, 34. Our Saviour, I apprehend, had Jerusalem principally in view in this declaration."

Dr. Clarke again, by the way, thus comments on this passage:

"In the day of judgment, or punishment: Perhaps not meaning the day of general judgment, nor the day of the destruction of the Jewish state by the Romans; but a day in which God should send punishment on that particular city, or on that person, for their crimes. So the day of judgment of Sodom and Gomorrah, was the time in which the Lord destroyed them by fire and brimstone, from the Lord out of Heaven."

I shall only trouble you with another quotation. One from Wetstein, a celebrated critic, who published a commentary on the New Testament in 2 vols., folio, at Amsterdam in 1751. He says on this verse:—

"Whosoever shall witness the calamities which the contumacious Jews shall endure on account of their rejection of the Gospel, shall judge them to have suffered more severely than the inhabitants of Sodom, and the punishment of the latter to have been more mild, when compared with these."

Thus have I given you the opinions of men who stand high among those who believe in the doctrine of endless misery. It is not Universalist testimony at all, but from gentlemen of his own side of the question. I sometimes think too that ministers of various denominations know the meaning of such passages; but the influence of their party compels them to appear ignorant of them.

Mr. HARRIS.—The first thing to which I refer, is the denial by my friend that the passage in Daniel referred to Napoleon Bonaparte. The remarks he made were these, "Whether it refers to Napoleon Bonaparte or not, it makes no difference." I consider this an admission. I say it does make a good difference, as it shows the circumstances referred to did not take place at the Destruction of Jerusalem. I refer the first verse of the twelfth chapter to the future state, to the resurrection which takes place at the end of time. "At that time shall Michael stand up, and shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time: and that time the people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to everlasting contempt." Then I quoted on this point the words, Rev. xx., 15: "Every one whose name was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." The next text of Scripture referred to was John v., 28, 29. I stated that the

twenty-fifth verse referred to spiritual resurrection, from the fact that the Saviour said, "The hour is coming" (the present tense) "and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. In the twenty-eighth verse he said, "The hour is coming when all that are in the graves shall hear his voice." And to prove that the word "grave" had reference to the repository of the dead, I quoted from I Cor. : "O death where is thy sting, O grave where is thy victory." My friend referred to Ezekiel xxxvii., 12, to show that the Jews being brought out of captivity represented a resurrection, and he wished to show that the word "grave" in the gospel of John had a similar meaning. It is evident that the Jews that were taken out of their captivity were not buried in their graves, but were morally degraded; but in John v., 26, it is said, "The hour is coming when they that are in the grave shall hear his voice." Then indeed, if they had been brought into God's favor would rise to spiritual life, they that had done evil to spiritual damnation, or a greater damnation than they had before. I am willing to let this go to the public as I have advanced it. In referring to Acts xvii., 31, my friend asked if the word "day" was to be understood as meaning a period of twenty-four hours, or whether I would not confess that it referred to an age or dispensation. I stated that it refers to the last day, when all the transactions of men will be brought before the All-Searching eye of a Holy God; and in order to prove this position, I quoted the words, "The same shall judge *him at the last day.*" There is to be a judgment in future, and we are plainly told that, "A day is appointed in the which God shall judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained." But my friend wished me to prove a judgment after the resurrection, and he would yield the point. This I will do, and then I expect him upon the honor of a man to renounce Universalism entirely. Rev. xx., 12, 13: "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 delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works." Then as regards the second death, "Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." If there is a spark of honour and honesty in my friend, he will now get up and tell the congregation that he will yield the point, and will forever yield it. I will pause to see if there is any honor left.—No!—I still pause for a reply.—None. Now my friends, you observe this passage tells the fact, and tells it as it is. The Evangelist says, "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God. In the eleventh verse he tells us "The heavens and the earth had fled away from the presence of him that sat

on th  
Thom  
heav  
God  
O, w  
of th  
forw  
that  
of en  
lation  
of m  
a—  
may  
clou  
Matt  
shall  
been  
until  
land  
refer  
men  
whic  
agai  
the h  
unto  
O S  
and  
Sv  
refer  
dest  
Awi  
who  
four  
16.—  
Chr  
  
tion  
indi  
as s  
not.  
refer  
com  
ture  
rea

on the great White Throne, and there was no place for them." Then the books were opened. "There was no place for the heavens and earth, and now the dead, small and great, stand before God: and they are to be judged every man according to his works." O, what a solemn truth! O, what a great truth! and it takes hold of the children of men that are here present. My friend brought forward a great number of commentators, but he seemed to forget that the proposition was, "*Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery.*" I will only say in reply to the great accumulation of wisdom that he set before us, "If ye receive the witness of men the witness of God is greater, and I would sooner have a—"thus saith the Lord" to establish any point, than all that may be written by men upon the subject. I am not afraid of such a cloud of witnesses. I will refer to the suffering of Sodom and Gomorrah. Matt. xi, 23, 24 "And thou Capernaum which art exalted unto heaven shall be brought down to hell; for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." This certainly refers to the future,—to the day of judgment when the privileges of men would be tested. 2d Peter ii, 3, 7: "The heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." O, yes! the heavens which are now, by the same word are kept in store reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. O SOLEMN FACT! In connexion with the destruction of the heavens and the earth will be the punishment of the ungodly. O, AWFUL SUFFERING! AWFUL SUFFERING, will then take place. Job xxi, 30 refers also to this judgment. "The wicked is reserved to the day of destruction, they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath." O AWFUL, AWFUL! Rev. vi, 17. "For the great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand." Whether that day be a period of twenty-four hours is of no moment. It will be the last day in time. Rom. ii, 16.—"The day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel:

Mr. LAYELL.—My opponent will again misrepresent me in relation to Napoleon. He seems to work hard to get Napoleon to be the individual referred to. My opponent represented me in his last speech as stating that it *made no difference* whether it refers to Napoleon or not. I said no such thing. What I said was, that I denied that it refers to Napoleon, and demanded proof, and it has not been forthcoming. He seems to have a peculiar liking for going all over the Scriptures and confounding passages. He quotes a passage from one book, reads it, and then declaims upon it a little, and then tells you that it



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)



1.5

1.6

1.8

2.0

2.2

2.5

2.8

3.2

3.6

4.0

4.5

5.0

5.6

6.3

7.1

8.0

9.0

10

11.2

12.5

14.3

16



**APPLIED IMAGE Inc**

1653 East Main Street  
Rochester, New York 14609 USA  
(716) 482-0300 - Phone  
(716) 298-9999 - Fax



means so and so without giving one word of evidence. Then he will go to another book and quote a passage, and put these two together and claim that he has made out his point. Really this is a wonderful course of procedure. I maintain that every honorable debater will take a passage of Scripture in the book to which it belongs, and consider it there in its connexion, the time when it was spoken, and the person to whom it refers, and the person by whom the language was addressed. But my opponent does not pursue this course. He has made a great ado about the expression, "was cast into a lake of fire?" I would ask my opponent—*where* is this lake of fire? He said it was in the future world; but he did not prove it; no Sirs; and he cannot prove it. He knows as well as I do that there are passages in the Old Testament that speak of fire and brimstone and all in this life; but when he shall attempt to prove that this lake of fire is in the future world, I shall produce passages to show that it is in this world. I leave my friend to do this, however, as it is his duty to lead, and if he do I shall attend to it. My opponent represented me as saying that I admitted the judgment was after the resurrection, and he then called upon me to yield the point. I dare say it would be exceedingly gratifying to him if I would yield the point, and save him the up-hill work of proving such a monstrous idea. But I am sorry I cannot gratify him, for I must continue to oppose such a monstrous doctrine, so long as God gives me health and strength. Then my friend would pause a moment to see if I would yield. Really he is acting the part of a gentleman. What a pity I did not yield, the man was so polite, and so accommodating too; but for reasons that I presented before, I cannot yield. Let him prove his point fairly and honourably, and I will preach the doctrine of endless damnation from one end of the world to the other. I am open to conviction. Does any man or woman suppose that I, an individual of some thirty years of age, having arrived at years of discretion, and having a little knowledge of human nature and read a little; does any one suppose that I would stand up here and advocate a doctrine that is opposed to the doctrines laid down in the Word of God?—that I would dare hazard my soul's salvation in advocating a doctrine that is false? You know I would not. If I believed the doctrine of endless misery, I would advocate it and confess it before the world. Let my friend convince me that it is a doctrine of the Bible, and I will yield the point like a man. I will not fight against him, and against Scripture. Rather let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, and let me sink into the silent grave, than that I should be the means of deluding my fellow creatures, or of leading them down to a pit of endless despair. My friend in quoting passages from the Book of Revelations, forgets the great fact that John was commanded not to seal the sayings of this book; again, towards the close, Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me. And again, seal

not the sayings of the book, for the *time is at hand*. Yes, it was at hand, eighteen centuries ago. Daniel was commanded to seal the saying of his book for the time was not at hand; the circumstances spoken of in the book were not to transpire for 500 years afterwards, and yet 1800 years are passed away, and John was commanded not to seal the book for the time was at hand. I deny that the expression "lake of fire and brimstone refers to a future world. I deny that the expression second death refers to a future world. We say persons in this world are dead; but not endlessly so. Persons die a spiritual death here, and they are brought to life in Christ. They are quickened together in Christ. What kind of death is that second death; is it annihilation? is it endless misery or what is it? He has made a great ado about the last day. This he advanced several times, and considered it conclusive evidence that it was after death, in a future world. But as he has given no evidence of this idea, it has no bearing upon the point. He will still insist that I have the affirmative to day; that I have to prove so and so. I am not to prove anything to-day. It is my business to follow him, and show that his evidence is insufficient to prove his proposition. He said I quoted from commentators, certain evidence in relation to a passage from Matthew, but he will bear in mind that they are his own commentators,—men who believed in the doctrine of endless misery, and who plainly state the true meaning of the passage which Universalists admit, and the same explanation which Universalists adopt. The gentleman finds fault with this. If he is ashamed of such company, I cannot help it; they are all on his side of the question; they are not Universalists. I consider that Universalist testimony is not worth a straw in this debate, and therefore I do not present it at all. But if the Bible says thus and so, then that is sufficient evidence. If my friend brings a Universalist commentator that maintains the doctrine of endless misery from any of the passages he has introduced for that purpose, then that is sufficient evidence. If I bring forward a commentator who believes in endless misery, who maintains that a passage or quotation means different from what my friend believes, that is sufficient evidence in the debate. Still the word of God is the book of appeal for all, and that is the best Universalist book in existence.

Mr. HARRIS.—Friends, you are aware my opponent stated that if I would prove a judgment after the resurrection, he would yield the point. I accordingly went on to prove that the heavens and the earth would flee away;—but I will read the passage as it is; and will ring it in his ears and will keep it before his eyes, and before the minds of this audience; because no man that lives and breathes can take that passage out of my hands. Rev. xx, 11—"And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat upon 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 book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of these things which were written in the book according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged, every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire." I would now simply state that the gentleman did not kindle his fire in time, because I have taken away the heavens and the earth. The material heavens and earth are gone, and he could not build a fire upon it, because he has no place to build upon. I have shown that the heavens and the earth fled away, for there was no place for them. I have got him a lake of fire burning with brimstone, into which are to be cast whosoever has not his name written in the book of life,—and this is the second death. The gentleman wants to know what is meant by the second death. I will say, men die naturally when they cease to exist in the world, and men are spiritually dead when they do not enjoy the love of God in their souls. I will prove the second death from Ezekiel xviii, 26—"When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die." If that is not the second death it is a wonder to me. First he dies in his iniquity, and then he dies for it. Here is the second death. And every one that was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire. *There is unquestionable testimony. It is the testimony of God. It is the truth of the GREAT I AM.* My friend assures us that if he believed in the doctrine of endless misery he would preach it to the end of the world; and if he would be more devoted to the doctrine of endless misery, it is because he thinks it contains tidings of great joy to men, and that they ought to hear it that they may turn to God and live. He appeared very sorry about the doctrine of endless misery. He was terribly annoyed about his own soul—that is what his sorrow was about. My friend referred to the opening of the Book of Revelations. He said the book was to be sealed. But it is said, blessed is he that readeth and he that keepeth the prophecies of this book. He went on to say that it was stated,—“Behold I come quickly.” He wished you to understand that on the 10th of September, in the year 70, the Revelations were written, or in the year 96, 26 years after the destruction of Jerusalem, according to Archbishop Usher’s Chronology, and that then it was sealed. He wished you distinctly to understand that it was not his business to prove anything, that was my duty. I think I am proving that very clearly, and it is his business to follow me to show that the evidence I bring forward is not sufficient proof. I adduced Rev. xx, 12-14, Let him take this out of my hands, and show that it does not mean such things as I stated. I know he will not do it. Let him prove there is a hell

upon this earth. I know he will not do it. He asks me if I was ashamed of the commentators that he had brought forward. I am not ashamed of them; but I still say, If ye receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater. The proposition is,—*Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery to any portion of the human family.* I will now proceed to the doctrine of the judgment; and if I am to take the lead, I may lead my friend into deep water. In Jude, 6th verse, it is stated:—“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.” Here also, friends, is an account of the Sodomites, and of the destruction of the city of Sodom. “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.” It is declared they are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. They went after strange flesh, and gave themselves over to fornication, and are consequently set forth as an example. Here, friends, is something that is *awful*, something that is *wonderful*, brought to bear upon the point. Luke xi, 31—“The Queen of the South shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and condemn them; for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh shall rise up in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it, for they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here.” The Ninevites had lived and died 800 years before the Christian era; yet we are told that they will rise up with the men of this generation and shall condemn them. The Queen of the South shall be at the judgment, and the men of Nineveh shall be at the judgment, and no wonder. The resurrection is general, and all Adam’s sons and Eve’s daughters, to the end of time, shall be assembled there. 2nd Timothy iv. 1, will tell us when the judgment will take place. “I charge thee therefore, before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing in his Kingdom. Yes! that is the time, when the quick and the dead shall be judged. According to the idea advanced by my friend here, this is only the judgment of this world. He would have all men to be judged here. But the Bible tells us, He will judge the quick and the dead at his appearing in his Kingdom. 1st Peter iv, 5—“Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead.” Here, friends, we have an account given us that Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead, and it is said also that he is ready. For time with God is not like time with men. The Lord is always ready to attend to the affairs of all men, and ready to hear us when we pray unto him. These passages point out a true day, and give us to understand that the quick and the dead shall be

judged at that time. Oh, solemn fact! revealed in the Bible for all Adam's race. The gentleman stated that if I proved my proposition he would be obliged to go and preach the doctrine of endless misery, too. I am satisfied we will have an addition of efficient preachers, for of course he will come with us.

Mr. LAVELL.—My friend has again stated my readiness to preach the doctrine of endless misery, if I am convinced of its correctness, and consequently there would be an addition to the number. I would just make a remark in relation to one point in the belief of the Methodists, that commends itself to the heart of every good man. It is this,—that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of the whole world; or, in other words, came to save all the world; while Calvinists pretend only to save a party. Methodists say Christ died for all. The Calvinists believe he died to save a part; Methodists, that he died to save all. Here then put them both together and we get Universalism, the very thing, so that our orthodox gentlemen have Universalism between them. But I am willing to let Calvinists and Methodists fight it out between them, until they come into the knowledge of the whole truth. My friend quoted a passage in Ezekiel, which he says proves the second death. I deny that it proves the second death mentioned in the Revelations, and demand proof of it. He says in that quotation, it states he dies in his iniquity, and dies for his iniquity. What kind of death, I ask, did he die in his iniquity? Then let him tell us, what kind of death he died for it. But, he has not offered one word of proof that this means endless misery in a future state of existence. My friend stated that if I believed in endless misery I would preach it. I said, if I believed in the doctrine of endless misery I would prove that belief by preaching it. But how my friend would desire to leave out that word "Endless" out of this day's debate. It is the *duration* of punishment, he has to prove here to-day. He has not replied to the saying of John, in relation to the time being at hand when these things written shall be fulfilled. My friend says, they were written after the destruction of Jerusalem. I deny that position. I can name as many commentators who contend that it could not have been written *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, and I contend that there is strong internal evidence of its having been written before the destruction of Jerusalem; for it expressly speaks of the Temple which was standing. My friend is desirous that I should take the 20th chapter of Revelations out of his hands. I believe the 20th chapter of Revelations. But does it say that this lake of fire is in the future world, and that it consists in endless misery? Not a word of it. I asked my friend what kind of death it was that this lake of fire meant; but I have received no answer. In this very chapter we read in the 9th verse, that "fire came down

from God out of heaven and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the *beast* and the false prophets are, and shall be tormented *day and night* for ever and ever. I wish to know if there are days and nights in eternity? Here is a difficulty my friend has to get over; and there is more in this chapter which I shall treat him to by and by, as soon as he disposes of what I have given him to do. He said Christ shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing in his kingdom. Yes, I believe that, but his Kingdom commenced eighteen centuries ago. And it is plainly said that he shall judge the quick and the dead at his "appearing"—not in the future world, but—in his Kingdom, and this I maintain is all the judgment stated here, and it will continue to exist, and Christ will continue to rule and reign until all are subdued unto him, and *God be all in all*. My friend quoted a passage from Jude, about being set forth for an example. In the first place, before trusting him to the opinions of some of his brother-commentators, I would state that my friend *assumes* that when it is said "they are suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," that the word "eternal" here means endless, a position which I deny and demand him to prove. We shall have more of this by and by. On the words eternal and everlasting, will hang the point we shall to-day contend for. Dr. Whitby, in his paraphrase and commentary on the New Testament, 2 vols., folio, London, 1827, says—"That this is spoken not of the cities themselves, but of the inhabitants which dwelt in them—i. e., of them who had given themselves over to fornication, and gone after strange flesh,—is evident; but yet I conceive they are said to suffer the vengeance of eternal fire, not because their souls are at present punished in hell fire, but because they, and their cities, perished from that fire of heaven which brought a perpetual and irreparable destruction on them and their cities." In relation to the lake of fire and the second death, I will treat my friend to the opinion of Dr. Hammond. He says—

"They that hold out to the end, that persevere in despite of all these temptations, shall continue a prosperous, flourishing Church,—shall not have their candle-stick removed from them, as they shall that, by the sharpness of persecutions, are scandalized and fall off from Christ."

In his remarks on the passage in Revelations, where the word "hell" is used, my friend *insinuated* that that hell was in the future world, and a place of endless punishment. He then asserted, "let the gentleman show if he can that there is a hell on this earth." I will inform my friend that this can be done. I will inform him of a hell the Psalmist was in, not only so, but the lowest hell, and all in this life. Yet God brought him out of it, and the Psalmist was all the time in this life. I cannot see for the life of me, what my opponent is about. There are several passages in the Bible that I know my opponent believes teach unequivocally the doctrine in dispute, and I am

exceedingly anxious that he would bring up these passages and let us give them all the investigation and time that we can. But I fear he will put them off in this debate as he did the last. Matt., 25th chapter, he, coward-like, put off to the last speech in the last debate he was engaged in. I am anxious to meet the strongest proofs he can bring forward from the word of God.

Mr. HARRIS,—The first remark that I would attend to is that in regard to Calvinists and Methodists. They would make good Universalists,—that is, if mixed up together they would arrive at the conclusion that all would be saved; for, says my friend, the Calvinists believe that Christ died for the elect, and the Methodists believe that Christ died for all,—consequently, as the Methodists believe that Christ died for all, and the Calvinists that all he died for will be saved, they would make together a beautiful flock of Universalists. This would all be right; but we have not arrived at that point yet. My friend referred to Ezekiel xviii., 26, and wished to know what was the cause of the second death. I take it for granted that he died in his sin; but I do not know whether it was in a drunken fit, or of some disease brought on by some bad habits. After he was dead, he died for his iniquity, and this is what I call the second death. My attention was invited to the twentieth chapter of Revelation, to show that the circumstances connected with the judgment were not in that place. But I admired his ingenuity in keeping away from the eleventh verse; he quoted the eighth verse and then the ninth verse, but the tenth verse says: "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." What circumstance in the history of man,—what circumstance in man's entire history accords with this in the world: "They were cast into a lake of fire to be tormented day and night for ever and ever." The expression "day and night for ever and ever," is applied to convey an idea of continual time, or never-ending existence, and some read "the forover of the forevers." My friend stated that I was cowardly, and dare not come to the 25th chapter of Matthew. I will come to that immediately, in the afternoon; but I was reserving "it till then;—I want to have the whole of this subject cleared up, and then I will join the Universalists forthwith." I will first, however, refer to 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 quick and dead, and he is appointed to judge the world in righteousness." Daniel vii., 9, 10: I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the 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; thousands thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him. The judgment was set, and the books were opened." Daniel does not say when the thrones were cast down. They are not yet cast down. There is still the throne of England, and the Pope of Rome, and Louis Napoleon, and the Emperor of Russia, and various kings still on their thrones. But he says, "I beheld till the thrones were cast down;" then he represents the Ancient of Days coming in the clouds of heaven. Another passage which refers right to the point is to be found in 2nd Thessalonians i., 7, 8, 9: And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels. In flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." That this cannot refer to the destruction of Jerusalem is evident, from the fact that Thessalonica was a European State, nearly a thousand miles from Jerusalem. The gentleman dare not deny this position, for it would go out to the world that he was ignorant of the geography of the globe. Yet it is here declared that the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven. But lest they should make a mistake and think that he would come very soon, the Apostle tells them not to mistake about this matter. In the second chapter, second and third verses, he says: "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." This has reference direct to Latianus, the first Pope, who ascended the throne in 606. He was the man of sin, the son of perdition, to whom the passage refers, that is in the temple of God, and exalts himself above all that is called God, by pretending to forgive sins, and by the sale of indulgences, and trading in the souls of men. We give this strong passage, then, as a proof that the Lord Jesus Christ shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, and that they who obey not the gospel of Christ shall be punished with everlasting destruction, at the time when he shall come to be glorified in his saints. Daniel said, "They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars for ever and ever;" here it is said, at that time when he shall come to be glorified in his saints. The next passage in reference to the final judgment is Heb ix., 27: "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." The Apostle is speaking of death, and he says, "after this the judgment." 2nd Peter, iii., 7: "But the heavens and earth that now are by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day



of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." Jude 14, 15: "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 convince all that are ungodly of the ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.

Mr. LAVELL.—It seems that my statement, that Calvinism and Methodism united would make Universalism, has pothered my friend a little; but the more he examines it the more will he be confirmed in the idea, that what I have said is true. In relation to the passage in Ezekiel, he said it did not refer to spiritual death dying in sin; but he did not give one word of proof for it. He says it means natural death, and then the death he dies afterwards must be a second death, and all done by bare faced assumption. He has not offered one word of proof. I ask him to prove what the second death and the lake of fire—for they are both one thing in the Revelations—mean. I ask him to prove that they refer to the future and immortal life, but he has not offered one word, nor can he. But he goes to Ezekiel and says here is the same second death mentioned, and assumes that the first death is a death in time, and the other *endless* death. *O tempore, O mores!* Is this the logic of my friend? Now Sir, prove to me that the second death and lake of fire and brimstone is in the future world. This is what I ask for, &c., it matters not what you think Ezekiel means. This is what I ask you to prove. My friend has been dabbling in the Revelation, all the morning, a book universally acknowledged to be highly figurative. But it matters not whether the book is highly figurative, or whether it is literal; right or wrong, he is bound to grasp a passage some where that would seem to help him in this debate. He has assumed that the passages he has quoted are literal, this I deny. But let him prove to me that the second death, and lake of fire is in the immortal world, and he will have proved his proposition. My friend said the expression "day and night for ever and ever," in the Revelations, was to give us some idea of unending time. This is at least something new under the sun. It is too much to say, that the expression day and night, gives an idea of time that is unending. The expression is day and night, but then he concludes that because the words for ever and ever are attached to it, therefore it refers to eternity. I deny that the word "for ever" means a duration without end,—and demand proof of it; and I shall give you plenty of evidence this afternoon, that the word "for ever" does not necessarily of itself mean unending time, and that the word "eternal" in scripture does not necessarily of itself mean endless. My friend said that because the thrones are to be cast down, and as the throne of England exists, and the wretched Louis Napoleon exists, and the Pope, and so on exist, that this

has not yet come to pass. But I deny that this refers to the throne of England, or any throne that now exists; and I demand evidence of it. My friend quoted a passage from 2d Thessalonians i., 7, 8, 8. I ask ~~who~~ troubled the Thessalonians? and for proof that it was the Jews, that troubled them, it is said in 1 Thess. ii. 15, Who both killeth the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, and have persecuted us: and they please not God, and are contrary to all men. Again in Acts xvii. 5-7, Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction? Those who troubled the Thessalonians shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. Does my friend understand that any portion of mankind can be driven from the presence of God? No, he cannot prove it. Psalm cxxxix., 7: "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there. If I make my bed in hell, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." What does my friend mean then by being banished from the presence of the Lord? It means the special presence of the Lord, which was especially in the temple of Judea, as every Bible reader knows; and hence the whole has reference to the Jews. He says—How could the Jews be banished when they were so far from Jerusalem? I maintain that the punishment inflicted at the breaking up of the old dispensation and establishment of the new was inflicted upon all Jews under heaven. They were all included. However, the quotations from the Acts and in the Thessalonians incontestibly prove that it was the Jews that were to be banished. Then the expression,—“Everlasting destruction.” I wish to know what my friend means by destruction?—if he means by it endless misery? for this I contend is one of his equivocal words. He quoted a passage from Hebrews, to prove a judgment after death. Heb. ix., 27—“And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment,” I ask my friend what the word “as” refers to? I ask, if, as an honest man, he will not say that it refers to the death of the Jewish High Priests. As it is appointed unto these men—the Jewish High Priests—once to die, but after this—the death of the Jewish High Priests—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.” From this it is evident that it has no reference whatever to the death of all men. It would be nonsense to say that Christ was once offered in the same way as all men.

Mr. HARRIS.—My friend said he would not help me out of the difficulties into which I had placed myself. I am satisfied, if I seek his help he would relieve me for he is a man of tender compassion: My

friend referred to the passage I had quoted from Ezekiel. He said I had made no remark in reference to the second death. I made remarks like this, and I now make them again—That any man who commits iniquity is spiritually dead. Well then he dieth in his iniquity,—dieth in them. This is the natural death that a man dies while he is a sinner, because every man that is spiritually dead is a sinner, and a sinner is spiritually dead. Thus he dieth for the iniquity he hath done—this is the second death. My friend stated that I did not prove that the lake of fire was out of this world, and then went on to prove that the Psalmist was in the lowest hell. But I had taken away the ground upon which he calculated on building his fire. I brought in Scripture testimony which said, "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 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 death and hell 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." Now I will quote the opinion of the Jews on that subject, which which will be found in Josephus's Discourse to the Greeks concerning Hades, sec 6, pp. 562, 2nd Book:—

"For all men, the just as well as the unjust shall be brought before God the Word: for to him hath the Father committed all judgment, and he in order to fulfil the will of his Father, shall come as Judge, whom we call Christ. For Primos and Rhadamanthus are not the judges as you Greeks do suppose, but he whom God and the Father hath glorified, CONCERNING WHOM WE HAVE ELSEWHERE GIVEN A MORE PARTICULAR ACCOUNT FOR THE SAKE OF THOSE WHO SEEK AFTER TRUTH. This person exercising the righteous judgment of the Father towards all men, hath prepared a just sentence for every one according to his works, at whose judgment seat when all men, and angels, and demons shall stand, they will send forth one voice and say, JUST IS THY JUDGMENT, the rejoinder to which will bring a just sentence upon both parties, by giving justly to those who have done well an everlasting fruition: but allotting to the lovers of wicked works eternal punishment. To these belong the unquenchable fire, and that without end, and a certain fiery worm never dying, and not destroying the body but continuing its emption out of the body with never ceasing grief, neither will sleep give ease to these men, nor will the night afford them any comfort; death will not free them from their punishment, nor will the interceding prayers of their kindred profit them; for the just are no longer seen by them, nor are they thought worthy of remembrance."

Here is an account given by Josephus, of the condition of those we refer to as cast into the lake of fire. O! Awful thought! I have proved beyond all contradiction, at least successful contradiction, that the lake of fire spoken of in Rev. xx. 15, has reference to the future world; it has reference to what takes place after the heavens and earth are fled away, and no place is found for them. My friend spoke with reference to the Sodomites, and quoted from a commentator on my side of the question. He said it was not the cities that were set forth as an exam

ple, but the souls of those individuals that were punished. But he said these could not be set forth as an example, because we could not see them. Why can the Jews be set forth as an example, just because we read an account of the circumstances concerning them, and of course we do this by reading an account of the different transactions in the world. Where evil is set forth in the world, it is that we may see it, and by reading these works from time to time, convey information to those individuals who do not enjoy the privilege of seeing and discerning for themselves. My friend next referred to the casting down of the throne of England, remarking on the verses quoted from Daniel; but I referred to the circumstance that the thrones were not yet cast down, and that the passage in Daniel stated distinctly, that the prophet "beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit, and thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened." Then came the passage from the Thessalonians, and he proved that the Jews troubled the Thessalonians. I am willing to admit it. But the point on which I wished to insist was, that they should be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints and to be admired in all that love him. That fixed the time. Then we came to the point—"everlasting does not necessarily mean endless." It is true there are places in the Bible where it does not mean endless; but as we are going to attend to the meaning of terms in the afternoon, I will pass over this at present. My friend says the Jews were banished from the glorious presence of God at Jerusalem. They were banished from his special presence. "I admit the Jews were driven away. But my opponent considered that they could not be banished from God's presence, whether they went to heaven or to hell. They could not be banished from His presence. But to be banished from God's presence, is to be excluded from the felicities of the Upper world, and to be excluded from the joys that are unending. Then came Heb. ix., 27: "As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment," my friend wished to refer this verse to the Jewish High Priests. But as it is appointed unto men to die, this does not say any thing about High Priests. Paul elsewhere says: "Death hath passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," and after they have died, they will be brought to judgment. This is no doubt the plain meaning of the passage under consideration. He said, the High Priest died figuratively; but is a figurative death a death at all. He said the High Priests died figuratively once every year—in that case there would have been a great many figurative deaths—and I am not aware how many figurative deaths would make a literal one. The sentence—"Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," fell from the lips of the immutable Jehovah, when man violated the law the Creator had given him. With these words I close this forenoon's discussion.

## WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

Mr. LAVELL,—I have called upon my opponent several times during this debate for proof that the lake of fire and brimstone, which is the second death, is in the immortal state of existence, but he has presented none as yet. That the Bible speaks of a lake of fire and brimstone, that it speaks of a second death, must be admitted by all who read the Word of God; but that this lake of fire and brimstone, the second death, is in the immortal state of existence, cannot be admitted for one moment without proof. It nowhere says that it is the immortal state of existence to which he referred it. If it did, I should not hesitate one moment to bow assent, and yield the point; therefore I am ready to hear proof that this circumstance refers to the immortal world. My opponent quoted Josephus, with the object of proving endless misery, I suppose, as the expression eternal misery occurs there. But if he is acquainted with the Greek, as I believe he is, and would refer to the original of Josephus, he will find that the word used there is not *αἰώνον*, the word rendered "everlasting" in our Bible; but that it is another word, which properly signifies endless; the Greek word there is *αἰδιος* or *αδιαλειπτος*. Here, then, is a position that sweeps aside the quotation from Josephus. If the word *αἰδιος* were applied to destruction or misery in the Bible, I should yield the point in a moment. But as it is the word *αἰώνον*, which word was used by the Jews in the Old Testament Scriptures, I cannot allow that the word means duration without end, or that the word of itself will settle that point. I admit that Josephus and Philo believed in the doctrine of endless misery. I admit that the Pharisees believed in endless misery, but the Sadducees denied it. But where did the Jews obtain evidence of it? He says from the Scriptures. I demand proof on this point. There is not a commentator will stand up and risk his reputation in asserting that the Old Testament Scriptures advocated misery without end. The uniform language is that the Old Testament Scriptures gave but a very dim idea of even a future state of existence, either of happiness or misery. After all that my opponent has said about the passage in Revelations—a highly figurative book (a book which greater men than either of us, men who have forgotten more than we ever will know, have declared their inability to understand), he has not attempted to prove that the future state is intended. I demand his proof that the lake of fire is in the future state. In the 19th chapter of the Revelations we read of *beasts* and false prophets being cast *alive* into a lake of fire burning with brimstone; but what ground is there for referring this language to the immortal state of existence. My opponent admitted my criticism on the verse in Thessalonians, and he also stated—and it was but a bare assumption on his part, without proof—that the

sentence, "they would be banished from the presence of God," means that they would be banished from the happiness of the saints. But as there is no such statement in the sacred text I reject it. If he contends the passage has a double meaning; then I wish to know why it may not have fifty meanings. My opponent's criticism on Heb. ix., 27, is amusing. I reminded him there was a Greek word omitted by the translators, which if inserted in the text would make it read; "As it is appointed unto *these men*"—that is, the Jewish High Priests—"once to die, but after this the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many. It is plain that this is the meaning of the passage; it was appointed unto *the Jewish High Priests* once to die. I would ask this audience—What has my friend, Mr. Harris, brought forward this morning to prove the doctrine of endless misery for any portion of the human family. He has proved the doctrine of a resurrection from the dead, which no Christian, no Universalist denies. No; it is the pillar of our faith; Jesus and the resurrection is the foundation of all our hopes. My friend has attempted to prove the doctrine of a resurrection of the same identical body; but in this I conceive he failed, inasmuch as he has not presented testimony sufficient. St. Paul plainly sets it aside: "Thou sowest not that body that shall be;" but it shall be a spiritual body in the resurrection, and consequently it cannot be the same body of flesh and blood which is to enter there. But it was really amusing to hear the quotation from Luke, 20th chapter, in relation to the resurrection. He quoted part of the subject where it says, they who shall be accounted worthy of obtaining the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage, and that there shall be *no more death*. My friend knows that he cannot bring his second death into the immortal state of existence, for he knows that when the sacred writers speak of death, they speak not of death in the immortal state of existence. There is no more death there, for they are equal to the angels of God in heaven, being children of the resurrection. Not because they maintained certain characters in this life, but because they are children of the resurrection. If there is a human being who will not be raised from the dead, I assert he will not be a child of God. All are to be raised from the dead, consequently *all* will be children of God, *being* children of the resurrection. The statement of the Apostle is, "As in Adam *ALL DIE*, even so *IN CHRIST* shall *ALL* be made alive." All go down *IN ADAM*, and all come up *IN CHRIST*, the Lord from Heaven.

Mr. HARRIS.—My friend commenced by stating that I had as yet failed in proving a lake of fire and brimstone in a future state. I will ring it in his ears again. Rev. xx., 11: "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 found no place for them." This

was no mysterious book yesterday, when he quoted from it, but it became mysterious last night. "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." There it is again, and every time it comes out, it only injures his cause. My friend has never touched the eleventh verse to-day, because, if he touches that verse he would have to acknowledge that he had no place left on which to kindle his fire; he would be without any place for hell, according to his idea of things. His statements are however down in black and white, and will cross the Niagara River and find a home in the Republic. My friend stated, "that the Old Testament gave but a dim light of a future state." Be it so, life and immortality are brought to light by the gospel, and the question asked by an afflicted Job,—If a man die shall he live again? is answered in John 11 and 25: "I am the resurrection and the life." It is by the resurrection of Jesus Christ that we shall be raised. In order to divert my mind from the subject, my friend said: "What have I to do with the battles of kings and captains." I will, however, call the gentleman's attention close to this part of my subject. I like a tight gripe—a firm hold—in order that we come to a fair conclusion. My friend said I agreed with him about the Thessalonians. I agreed with him so far as to say, that the Jews persecuted the Thessalonians; but the part on which I disagreed with him was the more essential part, as far as this debate is concerned, viz.:—Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power? We come now to definitions. The word *αἰώνιον*, from which everlasting is translated, according to Grove's Greek Lexicon, means immortal, perpetual, unending state. I will quote Aristotle, the tutor of Alexander the Great, he said it was derived from *αἰών*, that is from being, or being without end. This was the opinion of him whose pupil conquered many nations, when he mounted his Bucephalus and rode into battle and dyed his sword with human blood. My friend touched on Hebrews ix., 27, and said it had reference to the Jewish High Priest. This time he did not say anything about figurative language. But what does the Apostle say,—"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." Here it is appointed unto men once to die—(thank heaven not twice)—for if man dies a second death, he does not do so by the appointment of heaven. My friend is satisfied that I proved the resurrection. I am glad I have done so. But, he says, I have not yet proved, resurrection of the same identical body, forgetting that I told him what the afflicted Job had said: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh will I see God." My friend did not quote that passage in Phillippians iii., 21: "Who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." But he went on to 1 Cor. xv. 44: "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." And

again: "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 some other grain. But God giveth it a body." But it is evident that it is no resurrection unless it is the same body,—it would be a new creation. The reason of Paul's remarks is this:—Those individuals that shall be found on earth shall be changed, and of course as it is the same body, the individuals will have those bodies changed. Those that are alive will be changed, and those that died will be raised with the same body. My friend stated that I could not prove endless misery before the resurrection. Of course that is the reason why I began with the resurrection this morning, and as the gentleman has admitted that I have proved the resurrection, I am coming now right on to the very point to prove the endless misery of the ungodly in the future state. Now we are coming to close quarters. Now for argument. Matthew xiii., 30: "Let both grow together, until the harvest; and in the time of harvest, I will say to my reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn." Now I will give you the explanation of that parable from verses 37-41: "He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man. The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one. The enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear." May God help them to listen! (Amen.) Here friends is not only a parable, but its explanation by Christ himself.

Mr. LAVELL.—My friend seems to be very anxious sometimes about the time being up. I hope, however, he will keep up his courage. He alluded to St. Paul's figure of grain illustrating the resurrection of the dead—to illustrate the change that shall take place. But let any of you farmers take a grain of wheat and put it into the ground—is it the same identical grain of wheat that you reap next harvest? No, certainly not. So, then, since it is sown in corruption, it is raised not in corruption; for Paul states that it is raised in incorruption, consequently it is not the same identical body in the resurrection. When I spoke of Revelations xix, in which there is something evidently belonging to this world, my friend says it is figurative; but he keeps quoting from the Revelations, and we do not know whether he believes it figurative or literal. He took a dive into Greek



however, in his last speech. He said, a short time ago, that he was going into deep water, I think so he is, but I would advise him to walk into it very slowly for fear he go beyond his depth. He gave us a criticism of the Greek noun *αιων*, and said the word meant, on the authority of Grove, "immortal, perpetual, unending." I will risk the assertion that there is not a lexicographer on the face of the earth, unless it be Grove that will give the definition "endlessly" to the noun *αιων*—that the word means "endless" I admit. But what gives it this meaning? It is the subject to which it is applied. Will my friends have the candour to admit that the word means limited time frequently, for, why impose upon the audience and tell them that it means "immortal, perpetual, unending?" Not so! the three days Jonah was in the whale's belly are characterized by the same word. Pickering, an eminent lexicographer, says *αιων* means "age, lasting, period of time, whether longer or shorter." Parkhurst—"denotes duration of time, but without regard to the period of duration." Anthon—"age, time, eternity." Pearce—"an age, is the proper meaning." Schleiser, a celebrated German, "space of time, whether longer or shorter." Dr. Watts says it does not mean "endless" when applied to punishment; and such is the opinion of Giles, Wright, Seely, Alexander Campbell, and others are of a similar opinion. One of the greatest Biblical scholars in existence says, and says truly, that the radical idea of *αιων* is "indefinite duration." Here then the gentleman as he talks of grappling will have an opportunity of doing so shortly. So much for his criticism on the word *αιων*. But he takes his ground with the authority of Aristotle that the word means "always being," as it is compounded of *αα* "always," and *ων* "being;" and therefore it means "endless state of being." I aver that there is no such agreement among lexicographers, in regard to the derivation of this term. It is not necessary to form *αιων* from these two terms. It may be derived from the verb *αιων* and it need only be its present participle converted into an adjective. Its proper force, in reference to duration, seems to be, a duration as long as it lasts; but it may be completed and finished as "an age," "a dispensation." I also maintain that the sense of words depends more upon usage than upon derivation. The question is,—What is the use of this word in the Greek? This is the question before us. My friend's quotation from Matthew xiii., is not to the point. "The field is the world, the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one. The enemy that sowed them is the devil. The reapers are the angels." I deny that the end of the world means the end of this material world. It is the end of the *αιων*, the very word my friend depends upon to prove "endless." Here it is expressed that *αιων* means end, *αιων* is the noun, the adjective cannot mean more than the noun from which it is derived. Neither can the adjective of it be used to express an

endl  
my f  
ence  
awar  
pass  
the e  
Jerus  
Jorue  
orth  
that  
that  
out of  
fact i  
make  
Matth  
us.  
there,  
eviden  
my fr  
intere  
the w  
impor

" N  
that  
I state  
this v  
with t  
the pu  
eterni  
which  
Rev.  
but he  
furnac  
and th  
sage  
mean  
out of  
kingd  
unto a  
of hea  
measu  
gripe  
overlo  
the w

endless duration. The expression "furnace of fire" is used here, and my friend assumes that this furnace is in the immortal state of existence; but I demand proof of this. I wish to know from him if he is aware that Egypt is called a furnace. Isa. xxxi., 9: "And he shall pass over to his stronghold for fear, and his princes shall be afraid of the ensign, saith the Lord, whose fire is in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem." He will learn from this, that the furnace of fire was in Jerusalem, and he knows this is so. "The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity." Here we are expressly told that there shall be no sinners in his kingdom, for they shall be gathered out of it. There shall be no iniquity committed in his kingdom. The fact is, the gentleman does not understand the parable at all. He must make another attempt, and a better one. In quoting the passages from Matthew xiii. my friend takes for granted the very point at issue between us. Why does he quote these passages? I know that they are all there, but the fact is, a mere statement of a passage of scripture is no evidence of the proposition under debate. If I do not understand it as my friend does, I see different from him; yet I claim to be as deeply interested in looking at the subject as my friend is. We both believe the word, and he was bound by every rule of controversy to show its import.

MR. HARRIS.—My learned opponent has stated what I admit, that *alavov* did not necessarily mean "everlasting or unending." I stated that words, were "univocal, equivocal, and synonymous." That this word is an equivocal word, I now admit, but we find it coupled with the word destruction, represented to take place when time ends,—the punishment the persons were to receive in an unending state in eternity,—and therefore the word must be governed by the passage in which it occurs, that is the point. My friend is still afraid to come to Rev. xx., 11. He told us about the furnace of fire being at Jerusalem, but he dare not touch this passage, because it would lead him not to a furnace of fire in Jerusalem, for all the earth would be fled and gone, and there would be no place for them. My friend brought on the passage I quoted from Matthew xiii., and he said it certainly could not mean what I stated; but I think I shall make a very excellent case out of this. He wanted to know if there were no sinners in Messiah's kingdom. He knows very well that the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that sowed good seed in his field. Again: the kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened. We will have a tight gripe on this point by and by; we must have it; but lest I should overlook it, I will refer you to a few passages of scripture to show that the word everlasting means endless duration. Psalm lxi., 1, 2: "Lord

thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God." Gen. xxi., 33: "And Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and called there on the name of the Lord, the everlasting God. Here, both these passages are applied to God, and cannot necessarily mean any thing else than endless duration. We shall turn our attention now for a little to this parable, or rather to this explanation of a parable which the Saviour has himself given: "The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity. The harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels; the tares are the children of the wicked one." Now we are plainly told that the harvest is the end of the world. We cannot allow the gentleman to refer this to the destruction of Jerusalem, from the fact that the *seed was to be scattered all over the world.* "The good seed are the children of the kingdom; the tares are the children of the wicked one; and as the tares are gathered together and burned, so shall it be at the end of this world. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. *When they are thus separated,* then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." At the time these wicked ones are to be suffering under the influence of this fire, weeping and wailing and gnashing their teeth. Now at the very same time that the righteous are to be shining as the sun in the kingdom of their Father, the wicked are to be wailing and gnashing their teeth. Unless the sorrows of those that are wailing and gnashing their teeth are equal in duration to the joys of those that are shining in the kingdom of their Father, there will be a contrast between the two parties. My friend did not say a word about the righteous shining in the kingdom of their Father. In fact, he said little or nothing on the subject, so that I will not treat him to any thing on that point at present; but will invite his attention to one or two things growing out of the circumstances of one individual I will call him Judas Iscariot. Matt. xxvi. 24: "The Son of Man goeth as it is written of him; but woe unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had never been born." Better never to have been in existence than to be found in the position that Judas Iscariot, the betrayer of Christ, was found in. No circumstance in life, no circumstance in the world, in which a man could be placed, although he lived a thousand years, and then went to immortal bliss, but would be preferable to non-existence; and yet it is here declared that it would have been better that he had never had an existence. In Mark iii., 28, it is said, "Verily I say unto you, all sin shall be forgiven unto men, and blasphemies

whe  
 agai  
 eter  
 coul  
 cern  
 ther  
 had  
 not  
 nati  
 We  
 "ete  
 state  
 to w  
 Mat  
 that  
 final  
 disp  
 bette  
 he  
 whe  
 wou  
 thin  
 done

the  
 will  
 rem  
 man  
 affir  
 posi  
 mer  
 upon  
 gave  
 imm  
 him  
 the  
 of t  
 othe  
 arov  
 Jeru  
 mur  
 onc  
 sac  
 dec

wherewith soever they shall blaspheme; but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." Stronger language could not be framed; ideas could not be couched in stronger language than what is here used concerning those that committed the sin against the Holy Ghost. That there are some that could commit it, there is no doubt, or these words had never been written, and if they did commit that sin, they were not only never to be forgiven, but they were in danger of eternal damnation—to be then condemned, eternally condemned to eternal misery. We have here, in the first place, "hath never forgiveness," and then, "eternal damnation." This is what we may say refers to the future state,—*"eternal damnation."* Here are two passages of scripture to which I invite my friend's attention. As soon as he has attended to Matthew xiii. 30, and when he has proved the point he has undertaken, that this does not refer to the immortal state, or the winding up, the final consummation of all things, he would have done something to disprove the point I have in hand; and when he has proved that it were better for Judas to have been born *and* to have acted as he did, he will have done something towards disproving my position; and when he proves that the man who sinned against the Holy Ghost would have been better to have been born, he will have done something towards disproving my position; but until that, there is nothing done.

Mr. LAVELL.—My friend has just stated that when I have proved that the quotation from Matt. xiii, 30 does not refer to the immortal state, I will have done something towards disproving his proposition. I would remind my friend that I am not here to-day to prove a negative. No man can prove a negative. My friend has forgotten that he has the affirmative to-day. I had it yesterday. He is bound to prove his proposition to-day, and I am bound to follow him and show that his arguments are not sufficient to do so. He wishes to turn the labouring oar upon me again to-day, but this cannot be, as he has the affirmative. I gave him one or two objections to Matt. 13, 30, that it did not refer to the immortal state. He assumed two points on which I demand proof. I wish him to prove that the end of the world, in the passage alluded to, means the destruction of this material universe, for it is notorious that one of the words rendered "world" is in the original *αιων*, and the other *κοσμος*, two entirely different words. But he says that the end of *αιων* or age—could not possibly have taken place at the destruction of Jerusalem. Let us see whether it did or not. Heb. ix, 26—"For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once, in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." The end of the world did take place. St. Paul declares that Jesus did appear in the end of the world, or age, to put

aways in. Then my friend has assumed that the word "everlasting," when applied, to destruction means endless destruction. But on what authority does he make this assertion when he knows that it is an equivocal word. He thought, however, to get over the difficulty by stating that it meant the end of time, without one word of proof. This, really, is logic. Truly my friend is going into deep waters, as he said. But my friend has repeated the statement that I dare not face the passage in Revelations xx, 14—"Death and hell were cast into the lake of fire." This is the second death. And in the 15 verse—"And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." My friend asks, Was there ever such a blunder as to suppose that this merely has reference to time? I would advise my friend to study his Bible over again. He quoted a passage to prove the endless misery of Judas; but he is bound to prove that Judas will suffer to all eternity. The passage reads—"Now the Son of Man goeth, as it is written of him; but woe unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed; it had been good for that man if he had never been born." Now I appeal to every man and woman of common sense if there is anything in that verse to prove that Judas will suffer to all eternity in the immortal state. It is indeed said, "better for that man if he had never been born." Hear what Dr. Adam Clarke says upon this point. He says "there is no positive evidence of the final damnation of Judas in the sacred text." Here is one leading commentator against him, and I believe that Dr. Clarke is right, for there is no evidence in the sacred text that Judas was endlessly damned. Then in reference to Matt. xxvi, 24—"Woe unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed; it had been good for that man if he had not been born." Dr. Clarke says:—

"I have considered this saying in a general point of view, in my note on Matt. xxvi, 24, and were it not a proverbial form of speech among the Jews to express the state of any flagrant transgressor, I should be led to apply it in all its literal import to the case of Judas, as I have done in the above note to the case of any damned soul; but when I find it was a proverbial saying, and that it has been used in many cases where the fixing of the irresistible doom of a sinner is not implied, it may be capable of a more favorable interpretation than what is generally given to it."

So much for the case of Judas. My friend has quoted a passage from Psalms, "Even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God," and he says the word "everlasting" here means endless being. So it does, and every individual will acknowledge that it does. And why? because it is applied to God whose nature is endless, and this is the rule the gentleman said he would be governed by in the debate, that the subject to which the words applied would govern their meaning. But let the gentleman show when the word is applied to punishment, whether it then means endless from its very nature. He has quoted a verse in Mark 3, in reference to the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Here the word *never* is derived from the same word—*αὐν*, eternal is translated from, and does not of itself mean endless misery in a future world.

I deny  
duratio  
state o  
bound  
But he  
misery  
attemp  
would  
endless  
not ne  
sacred  
This is  
love pla  
now pro  
teaches

Mr  
speech  
him to p  
advanced  
end of t  
Jewish  
appeared  
himself.  
antyp  
evidenc  
salvatio  
is a plac  
to the en  
Son of m  
sown is  
are the r  
and to bi  
be the ca  
burning  
of holy w  
upon. I  
have giv  
the name  
it, that h  
public.  
evident.  
ome of th  
brethren  
and conse

I denied his assertion that the word eternal and never, mean endless duration, and that damnation has any reference at all to the immortal state of existence. When he quotes a passage of Scripture I am not bound to notice it unless he shows its bearing upon the question at issue. But he makes the bold assertion that this condemnation means eternal misery, and that is all we get. I told him yesterday that the moment he attempted to prove that *condemnation* meant endless misery that I would prove negatively by the same evidence he would produce, the endless misery of our Saviour. Let him attempt it if he dare. It is not necessary to be in the eternal world to be condemned, for the sacred penman hath said "He that believeth not is condemned *already*." This is the condemnation that light hath come into the world and men love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil. I will now prove that the passage in regard to the blasphemy of the Holy Ghost teaches the ultimate salvation of all men, instead of endless misery.

Mr. HARRIS.—The first remarks made by my friend in his last speech here are that I wanted him to prove a negative. I do not want him to prove a negative at all; but I want him to disprove what I have advanced in favour of the proposition we are now discussing. The end of the world, he made an effort to prove meant the end of the Jewish age, from the simple fact that St. Paul said, "But now hath he appeared in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Christ appeared in the end of the Jewish age as the grand antitype of all the types prefigured under the law, and this is strong evidence that he will appear by and by the second time without sin unto salvation to those who look for him. With reference to Matt. xiii., that is a place he cannot get by. There is no getting by it. It refers directly to the end of the Gospel dispensation: The good seed is sown by the Son of man; the bad seed is sown by the devil; the place where it is sown is the world; the harvest is the end of the world, and the angels are the reapers. They are commanded to gather together first the tares and to bind them in bundles and burn them. This we have shown will be the case with the wicked. They will be cast into a lake of fire burning with brimstone, which is the second death. On this passage of holy writ, my friend has made no remarks worthy of my commenting upon. He does not like to enter upon it, he seems afraid to do so. I have given you the meaning of it, and if it is not as I have said, in the name of common sense let my friend give us the true meaning of it, that his opinion and mine may be placed side by side before the public. That this could not take place until the end of the world is evident. It could not take place until the sowing is over. My friend has one of the tares and goes round to scatter them. I and all my ministerial brethren go round and scatter the good seed. The seed is not all sown, and consequently the harvest is not come and will not come until the

seed has been all sown, for the harvest is the end of the world. My friend still keeps away from Rev. xx., 11: 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. That passage remains untouched. He then turned his attention to Judas Iscariot, and he brought forward Dr. Clarke, to prove that it was good for Judas to have been born, according to the quotation the Doctor said, there were some damned spirits but there was no evidence from the passage that Judas was damned. But the text on which the Dr. made the remarks attributed to him was Acts i. 25: That he may take part in this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place. While the passage I brought forward was Matt. xxvi. 24: "The son of man goeth as it is written of him; but woe unto that man by whom the son of man is betrayed, it had been good for that man if he had not been born." Now I say it would be good for man to be born in any circumstances, and live in any situation provided when he died, he would have unending felicity. This is the point. It is not Dr. Adam Clarke, it is the Bible we have to do with. Do the scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery for any of the human family. I maintain that they do, and I assert that this text affirms the endless misery of Judas from the fact that it states that it would have been good for him if he had not been born. My friend requested me to prove that "everlasting" or "immortal" is applied to the happiness of the saints, or to anything in connexion with their happiness. I am prepared to do so. Romans ii. 7: "To them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory and honour, and immortality, eternal life." Here the word is applied to the happiness of the saints of God, verses 8 & 9. But unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile. But glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile. Here those who by patient continuance in well-doing, glory, honour, immortality and eternal life are promised; but unto them that are contentious, tribulation, wrath, anguish and indignation upon every soul of man that doeth evil. My friend turned his attention to the sin against the Holy Ghost. He thought he would scare me away from that passage by saying if I believed it proved eternal misery, he would prove that Christ was endlessly miserable. O! sound logic! O! sound logic; where the word is to be understood by the connexion in which it stands. There is no passage in the Bible that fairly understood refers to the endless misery of our Lord Jesus Christ. We are told that the person who commits the sin against the Holy Ghost is in danger of eternal damnation. How could a man be in danger of being burned without fire; or of being drowned

witho  
nation  
misery  
mann  
blasph  
Witho  
withou  
above.  
future  
could  
in thei  
finger  
it by B  
I do no  
ruined  
commi  
dama

Mr. I  
of sin a  
ever sp  
neither  
maintai  
referenc  
says, "  
dispens  
Christia  
salists;  
Jewish e  
to end e  
may be  
phemy  
and inas  
forgiven  
forgiven  
—the Cl  
blasphem  
age, and  
trate by  
to C, the  
shall be  
t his mont  
me as sa  
all the ot  
I would p

without water? How then could they be in danger of eternal damnation provided there was no such thing. But there is unending misery in a future state for those that are finally impenitent. All manner of sin and iniquity shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. Without forgiveness there is no salvation; without salvation no grace; without grace no enjoyment here; without enjoyment here no felicity above. I have thus proved that man's punishment will be in the future world, in the unending state. O, awful! though it is said some could commit this sin, I believe some did commit it. They had light in their head and malice in their hearts. They knew that with the finger of God Jesus cast out devils, and yet with this light they said he did it by Beelzebub. John refers to it, and says "There is a sin unto death." I do not say that ye should pray for it. *They are ruined! they are ruined!* There is no salvation for that man who commits the sin against the Holy Ghost. He is in danger of eternal damnation.

Mr. LAVELL,—I said I would notice Matt. xii., 31, 32: "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men," &c.; "but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. Now, Sir, I maintain that the word rendered "world" in this passage has no reference whatever to the immortal state of existence. Dr. Clarke says, "I am fully satisfied the meaning of the word is, neither in this dispensation, viz. the Jewish,—nor in that which is to come, viz. the Christian." This is the opinion of other commentators, not Universalists; and therefore the word here means a limited period,—the Jewish dispensation and the Christian dispensation, both of which are to end ere the Saviour delivers up the kingdom to the Father, "that God may be all in all." Mark the expression: "*All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost;*" and inasmuch as the Saviour saith "All manner of blasphemy shall be forgiven," it follows that the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall be forgiven but not *in this age*—the Jewish,—nor in *that which is to come*—the Christian. But the great truth is stated, that *ALL MANNER of blasphemy shall be forgiven* unto men. The word *now* here means *age*, and if it did not my argument would be unsound. Let me illustrate by a simple statement. Say I owe five dollars to A, five dollars to C, ten dollars to C, and five dollars to D; and I say, all these debts shall be paid, but the debt of ten dollars to C shall not be paid during this month, nor in the month which is to come. Would you understand me as saying that I would never pay C his ten dollars, while I paid all the others? Certainly not. You would understand me to say that I would pay the whole of the other debts at present, but the debt of



ten dollars to C would not be paid this month nor during next month—that which is to come. Neither shall the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost be forgiven in this age—the Jewish,—nor in the age to come—the Christian, which we know was then in the future. I cannot allow my friend to assume that language then future is necessarily future now, without a particle of evidence. I base my argument upon the word *now*, rendered “world,” means here a limited period—an age. On the authority of Dr. Adam Clarke, and others, I maintain that it does so. I maintain also, that no person *now* can commit the sin against the Holy Ghost, which was attributing the miracles of our Saviour to the power of Beelzobub. The passage in Mark, iii., 30, in connexion with this says, “Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit.” This was the sin against the Holy Ghost. I will now give you a negative argument. I maintain that the doctrine of endless misery is not taught in the Old Testament Scriptures. I do not believe it is taught anywhere in the Bible; but I shall confine myself to the Old Testament, and I call upon my friend to produce a passage which can be made to teach that God will condemn any of his creatures to a state of endless misery. It is so far acknowledged by the celebrated Dr. Campbell, Warburton, Bishop Bull, Dr. Paley, H. Millman, and other great writers, that instead of this doctrine being taught in the Old Testament, they say it is not revealed there. I will now prove that it is positively contradicted, — Lamentations iii., 31, 32: “The Lord will not cast off for ever. But though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies.” Again, Isaiah lvii., 16: “*I will not contend forever neither will I be always wroth; for the spirits should fail before me and the souls which I have made.*” No only do God’s prophets not proclaim endless punishment to any portion of the human family, but every one of them declares the salvation of all men. St. Peter declares that the time of the *restitution of all things* has been fixed. Acts iii. 21: “Whom the heavens must receive until the restitution of all things, which the Lord spake by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.” Psalms vii., 31: “The righteous shall be recompensed in like manner, *much more than the wicked and the sterner.*” Let us glance at a few of the punishments administered by God in the Old Testament. Take the case of Adam and Eve. Gen. iii., 16, 17: “Unto the woman he saith, I will multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children, and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake. In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field.” It must be

ad  
the  
fun  
fir  
tru  
wh  
for  
the  
tho  
enn  
see  
one  
gro  
the  
that  
thin  
whi  
wha  
are  
grin  
welc  
diffe


any  
the  
the i

frien  
punis  
He v  
over  
rema  
iniqu  
not b  
then  
undec  
pene  
nor i  
it was  
and t  
Gospe  
close

admitted that it was necessary for man to know before transgressing that punishment would be inflicted; and if the doctrine of endless punishment be true, it was true when this command was given to our first parents. If a belief in this monstrous doctrine be necessary to true piety and religion, it was equally so before Adam sinned. Then why did God not state it here, the very place where we should first look for it. God did not tell them he had fixed the place of the trial. To the tempter he said, Gen. iii., 14, 15: "Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Not one word of endless misery in all the punishment for the first transgression; not even misery at all after death. The words were, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." My friend affirmed, that I said I would prove Christ endlessly miserable. I said no such thing unqualifiedly. I said I would prove it by the same logic by which he would prove that damnation meant endless misery; that is what I said. I have perceived a number of individuals, who, I believe, are Methodists, looking sneeringly, or else shaking their heads, or grinning contemptuously during the time I am speaking. They are welcome to do so; although common sense might teach them to act differently.

[The Moderator stated that as they had agreed not to manifest any degree of approbation or disapprobation, it would be well that all the audience would give each speaker that respectful attention which the importance of the subject demanded.]

Mr. HARRIS.—Sooner than venture to touch Rev. xx. 11., my friend went back to Genesis iii.; to comment on man's fall and punishment; remember he has not looked at that passage as yet. He would not look at Judas either. No! No! No! that is passed over; but it is down in black and white. However he made a remark or two on Matthew xii. 12., to prove that all manner of sin and iniquity shall be forgiven, but blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, neither in this world nor in the world to come; and then went on to state that this particular sin could not be committed under the Jewish dispensation, was committed under the Jewish dispensation, and that it would not be forgiven in the Jewish dispensation nor in the Christian. *If this is the case, then those who committed it were not forgiven in the Jewish dispensation, nor the Christian, and there is no evidence that they will be forgiven, at the end of the Gospel dispensation, and as there will be no forgiveness after the close of time, the gentleman has proved the very thing I contend for.*



"All manner of sin and iniquity shall be forgiven, except the sin against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come"—that is, in this, or any other dispensation. Would it not have been nonsense to imagine that the Gospel dispensation is here alluded to, when he has stated that the sin could not be committed at all? It was nonsense to bring forward such evidence, because it was no evidence at all. They have never forgiveness but they are in danger of eternal damnation. *There is no forgiveness, in the future world, consequently those not forgiven here will not be forgiven, and those not so forgiven will be endlessly punished in the world to come.* My friend endeavoured to illustrate his position with dollars, which I have no doubt you all appreciate. But let us not forget the text, "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." So that his illustration is good for nothing. My friend referred to the parable of the tares, and then went on to state that God, a merciful God, will not perpetuate in eternity the misery of his creatures. Does he charge upon my Father, who is in Heaven the perpetuation of iniquity in this world? Will he say that God is the cause of all the misery and drunkenness and crime that exist? If misery cannot be perpetuated without God, it is a curious thing that God has forbidden sin, if he perpetuated it, *sin leads to misery, and misery will be perpetuated so long as sin exists.* Lam. iii. 31: The Lord will not cast off forever; this has reference to the captivity of the Jews. Psalm lxxxvi. 9: All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name; this does not prove their salvation, for the Devil worshipped 1800 years ago and is not saved yet. My friend named this, but he did not quote the Psalm, but quoted from Isaiah lvii. 16: "I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made;" referring directly to those who are seeking the blessing of God with tears in their eyes, and with broken hearts are crying, "God be merciful to me a sinner." He will not contend for ever, though he be the high and lofty One that inhabiteth Eternity: this may be known by reading the preceding verse. My friend then quotes Prov. xi, 31—"The righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner." But this proves too much for him, and therefore proves nothing at all. It proves the reward of the righteous in the earth, as much as the punishment of the wicked. If the wicked are punished here, that is no proof that they will not be punished hereafter. What proves too much proves nothing; so that my friend has made an effort to fight a man of straw and has done nothing. Acts iii, 21—"Whom the heavens must receive until the time of the restitution of all things." I admire his ingenuity, in quoting this part of the passage and keeping back the other.

What does the verse say? "And it shall come to pass, that every soul which will not hear that Prophet shall be destroyed from among the people." Let my friend bring forward a passage in which any of the Prophets declare that all men will be holy and happy, and he will do something to sustain his cause. There is no such thing to be found in all the Prophets. I will now refer to another argument. If my friend would clear up the tares and the wheat—I would offer him something else. Matt. xxiv, 50, 51—"The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." Here it is plainly stated the wicked are to have their portion where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. Luke xii, 46—"The lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and at a time when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers." This is the doom of all those ungodly creatures. Heb. vi, 7, 8—"The earth, which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for man, by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessings from God: But that which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned." This refers to the apostates of the Apostle's day. This is the end of the ungodly; their end is to be burned. Now if the end of all mankind was holiness and happiness, certainly their end would not be to be burned. I invite my friend's attention again to Judas Iscariot, to Rev. xx, 11, and to Matt. xiii, 24, the Parable of the Tares.

Mr. LAVELL.—I can perceive from the course which my friend is pursuing that he feels he has a desperate work before him. He endeavours to make an effect before this audience this afternoon by declamation and by bombast. This he is welcome to do. My aim in this debate is not to produce an effect so much upon the audience present, as to produce an effect upon those who may read this debate when published. I am discussing here to-day, and did yesterday, knowing perfectly well that this debate would go out to the world, and so far as it has proceeded I feel confident that every unprejudiced mind that will peruse it carefully, will see that the evidence presented here yesterday, fully sustained the point in debate. They will also see that my opponent has signally failed to establish the monstrously absurd and unmerciful doctrine of unending suffering for a part of the creatures of God. In this view, I have not been so careful to produce an effect before this audience. My friend has again called my attention to the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. The arguments I have produced, and the positions I have taken on this point are already recorded and will go before the world. With regard to the parable of the tares

my arguments are there also. My friend has not told us what he meant by the angels in the parable of the tares. He has not proved that the furnace of fire is in the immortal state, while I proved that it was in this life, that it was in Jerusalem, and the reference to that is on record. My reply to the remarks of my friend in the case of Judas, I am willing to allow to go without further addition. My friend made the bold assertion that there is no forgiveness in the future world, but he offered no proof. Yesterday he could not do it. He endeavours to hold up my illustration of the sin against the Holy Ghost to the ridicule of the audience, but I am willing that those who read the debate should also on this point judge for themselves. He says the passage from Proverbs proves too much. Does the gentleman expect to work his passage into heaven and not receive it as a gift from God. He says the times of the restitution of all things is not to the point, unless I prove that all God's holy prophets did speak of it. The inspired penman has said that all God's holy prophets did speak of it, and as this is in the scripture, it is decided testimony in the case. My next negative argument is in the case of Cain the murderer. Gen. iv. 10, 11, 12: "He said, what hast thou done? the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground. And now thou art cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand. When thou tillest the ground it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth." Not one word is said about misery even in eternity, to say nothing about endless misery for tis great offence. See the punishment of the antediluvians. Gen. vi. 5, 6: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart." Then again—Gen. vii. 21—23: "All flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man. All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died. And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven, and they were destroyed from the earth; and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark." Here is all we have of the punishment pronounced upon the antediluvians; not one word of misery in the eternal world, to say nothing of the duration of that misery. We come now to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, Gen. xix. 24, 25: "Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven, and he overthrew those cities, and all the plain and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground." Here is the sum and substance of the punishment pronounced upon the cities of the plain. Not one

word is said about misery in the future world, to say nothing about the duration of that misery. Exodus ix. 15, 16: "Now I will stretch out my hand that I may smite thee and thy people with pestilence; and thou shalt be cut off from the earth. And in very deed for this cause have I raised thee up, for to show in thee my power, and that my name may be declared throughout the earth." From the creation to the punishment of the Egyptians here, we learn that 2500 years had passed away from the time man was created to the time of the plagues and judgments threatened against Egypt. Adam had received the retribution God threatened: Cain the murderer had been punished by God himself; the antediluvians had been swept from the face of the earth. Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities of the plain had been overthrown, and now is about to be fulfilled the tenfold vengeance of heaven on sinful Egypt. Yet not in all this is there the most distant allusion to endless misery. How is this to be accounted for, if endless misery is the truth of God? So you will find it to be the case in the punishment denounced against the children of Israel in the law given on Sinai. In the punishment of Ahab the Ammonite, and of the Jews in Jerusalem. Now I appeal to every enlightened person for an answer to the question,—Why did God omit to annex the penalty of endless misery to the greatest crimes man committed under the old dispensation, if it is the truth of God? The fact is, that inasmuch as there is not one word said upon it in all the punishments inflicted by God in the old Testament, it is not one of his truths; and if my friend believes it is taught, then let him produce the evidence. He has quoted a passage from Matthew which speaks of weeping and gnashing of teeth. But does it say this is to be in the immortal world? Not one word of it. But my friend takes for granted the very point to be proved. Again he quoted,—Luke xx. 46, without saying one word about its bearing upon the point in debate. He also introduced Heb. vi. 8, because it is said there, "whose end is to be burned up." But it does not say that the end is endless death, or after death. It does not say they are to be burned up in the immortal world. As my friend has the affirmative, I demand proof on these points.

The MODERATOR here intimated that a collection would be taken up to assist in defraying the expense of fitting up the seats. This having been accomplished the debate proceeded.

Mr. HARRIS.—My attention was especially directed to the reapers mentioned in the 13th chapter of Matthew. I spoke of the angels of God, and I mean by that, those celestial beings that shall be revealed from heaven with Jesus Christ, when he comes to take vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. The opponents of Jesus Christ will then be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of

his power. My friend considered it monstrous that I should state there would be no forgiveness in the immortal world, I assigned reasons for it that could not be answered. I stated that at the end of time Christ would give up the Kingdom to God the Father, and as there will be no Christ there will be no forgiveness in the future world, for God will be all in all. Let this suffice. My friend said that I wanted to work my passage to glory. Not at all! The sacred penman says, "And shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life: they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. He that believeth hath the witness in himself: Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee a crown of life." This refers to what man does, and as a reward for this faithfulness God gives eternal life. Again,—“When thou makest a feast call not thy rich neighbors, lest they bid thee again and a recompense be made thee, but call the poor, the maimed, the lame and the blind, for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.” Here is evidence that though we would not work our passage to glory yet the fact that we are right in the sight of God is that which will recommend us to his notice, and one of the causes why we will be admitted to his glory for ever. But it is through Christ alone that we receive salvation. And no man can do good until he is righteous; but for this end God works in us to will and do of his good pleasure. My friend brought in the punishment of Cain, and of the antediluvians, and of the Sodomites. I brought up a passage this morning to show that it would be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah than for them that saw the Saviour and heard the Gospel preached and remained impenitent. Here it is stated that the Sodomites will be brought forward yet to be punished for their sins, and in Jude's Epistle it is stated that they are now suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Now for another positive argument. Matt. xxv, 31—41 “When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: And before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in: Naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in for naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto



them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Then shall he address those on the other hand and say, "Depart from me, ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his 46th angels." And having addressed them in this way, he declares in the verse, "That these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." Here the righteous go into everlasting life, while at the same time the wicked are to depart into everlasting punishment. That this refers to the future, any man can plainly see. The Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with shall be gathered all nations. Then having placed them in their him. Then he shall sit on the throne of his glory, and before him respective positions, he invites the sheep,—the children of the kingdom, and says unto them "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Then shall they answer him in the words I have already quoted. But how shall it fare with them on his left hand. O! awful thought! Then shall he say unto them on his left hand, "depart ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." Your punishment is to be with the devil and his angels. "For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily, I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." This will be the end of time, and this governs the meaning of the word here translated everlasting. The word is equivocal, but it is here applied to the last event in time; and consequently it cannot mean "age, lasting." Everlasting blessedness will be the reward of the righteous, while everlasting punishment will be the recompense of the wicked. It will not do to say that this refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, because—1st. We see that at the destruction of Jerusalem Christ did not sit on the throne of his glory,—suppose that were twisted to mean his glorious throne,—any more than he did at the destruction of Babylon or any other calamity. Again, in the second place, all nations were not gathered before him at the destruction of Jerusalem. Again their was no separation of the nations at that time. Again; instead of the disciples being gathered to the exalted position here referred to, every one of them had fled to the mountains of Judea, so that instead of being gathered together they were all scattered abroad. These are reasons sufficient to show that this does not refer, and cannot possibly refer to the destruction of Jerusalem.

We see assembled here all the angels of the living God,—all the holy angels. Jesus surrounded by his holy angels will sit as Judge, and then the wicked shall be punished and the righteous rewarded. That will be an awfully solemn time. Of awful time! As bearing upon the final state, I will direct your attention now to Luke xvi. 26: "And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence." In the context we have an account given of a certain rich man that fared sumptuously every day. But he died and was buried, and in hell lifted up his eyes being in torment, and he saw Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom, and the poor stupid creature instead of asking mercy from God, began to entreat Abraham for mercy. He said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, for I am in torment in this flame. But Abraham said unto him, Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, *there is no passage*. This great gulf is the justice of God, which will not allow them to pass. They could not pass over the justice of the eternal. It will be impossible, the rich man wanted Abraham to send Lazarus to his Father's house to warn his five brethren of their danger. Some persons say this was a pious prayer, that he did not want them to suffer as he was doing; but it was a selfish one. Some persons think that if they go to hell they will have plenty of company. I am sorry to think there is truth in this, for broad is the road that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that find it. Now we see that there is an impassable gulf between these two persons; the saint is in Abraham's bosom, the rich man being in torment is in hell. The saint of God suffered while on earth. If men were punished all their sins deserve, poor Lazarus had the worst of it I tell you; but now his joy is complete, and the rich man who enjoyed all the pleasures and luxuries which this life can afford, and yet lived in the world without God on earth, has reached his final doom.

Mr. LAVELL.—My opponent merely mentioned the punishment of Adam, and of Cain, the Sodomites, and so forth; but not one word of evidence was adduced by him to show that this punishment extended to the immortal state of existence. It is *his business* to prove this. He mentioned a passage to prove that there would be a recompense at the resurrection of the just, and he assumes that this resurrection is an immortal resurrection which is effected by the power of God, and by no power of our own. I demand proof of this position. He has now brought forward Matt. xxv, 31, to the end of the chapter; but there is one important point to be tested in relation to this quotation, viz. —Does the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew refer to an immortal state of existence? If it does, then the gentleman has proved punishment in a

futu  
ning  
deba  
deno  
exist  
shall  
is sa  
glory  
man  
stan  
Man  
fore,  
sinfu  
he oc  
Mar  
eigh  
—"  
be s  
till t  
word  
was  
were  
until  
whic  
nent  
what  
till I  
sayin  
him,  
that  
flee  
over  
deno  
turie  
God  
in th  
ago.  
the s  
Veri  
thin  
that  
whil  
tions  
these  
of th

future life: but if it does not, then he fails to do so. From the beginning of his remarks on this quotation he has *assumed* the very point in debate. He read the passage, it is true; but he did not offer any evidence that what is there stated will take place in the immortal state of existence. He stated that it would take place when the Son of Man shall come in his glory. When did he come in his glory? See what is said in Matt. xvi, 27, 28—"For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. 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.*" Mark viii, 38—"Whosoever, therefore, shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels." Then Mark ix, 1, which is only a continuation of the discourse in the eighth chapter, and which you will find is connected with it:—"And Jesus said unto them, Verily, I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the Kingdom of God come with power." These words were spoken more than eighteen centuries ago, and yet Christ was to come to reward every man according to his works, and there were some standing there beside him who were not to taste of death until he should come. My opponent has said that he has not come, which shall we believe,—the Saviour himself, or my respected opponent? John xxi, 21-23—"Peter seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Matt. x, 23—"When they persecute you in this city flee ye unto another; for verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come." Here is evidence to the point, that the coming of Christ took place eighteen centuries ago. I do not deny that Christ is to reconcile all the world unto God at the conclusion of his kingdom; but I maintain that the coming, in the language I have quoted, took place more than eighteen centuries ago. In the passage my friend quoted from Matt. xxv, you will find the same language. In the 34th verse of the previous chapter he says, Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, *till all these things be fulfilled.*" In the beginning of the 24th chapter it is stated, that his disciples came to him to show him the buildings of the Temple, while they sat on the Mount of Olives, and they put two questions to him, privately. "Tell us," said the disciples, "when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" The Saviour goes on to tell them the signs that shall

precede his coming, and closes with an illustration of the whole subject in three parables, which are contained in the 23th chapter of Mathew. And in that whole discourse he states, that this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled. The Saviour, in the beginning of the 24th chapter, speaks of the Temple of Jerusalem,—that cannot be denied. I maintain, then, that the whole is but one connected discourse delivered by the Saviour in reply to the question of his disciples as to when these things would be, and I call upon my friend to show the dividing line in that discourse—to show where the Saviour leaves off speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, and flees off to the end of time. Let him put his finger on the place where the discourse is divided. Besides, my friend has assumed that *everlasting punishment* here means *endless punishment*. He admitted the word was an equivocal word; but gave, nevertheless, his own assertion that it referred to an immortal life, without one word of proof. Now, as *everlasting* is an equivocal word, let him prove it from the nature of the subject to which the word *everlasting* is applied. Let him prove that all punishment is endless from its very nature, and I will yield the point. I told you that on this position it would turn. Let him show that all punishment is endless from its very nature, and I will yield the point this moment. Let him prove that the word *everlasting* as here applied means *endless*. He may say that the word *everlasting* is applied to *life*, and that if the *life* is not endless the punishment is not. I deny that the life here spoken of is endless. He that believeth on the Son of God *hath* eternal life. This eternal life is the reward given to the man that believes and accepts of Jesus Christ; but I maintain that this everlasting life ends when the Kingdom ends—when Christ's material kingdom ends. When he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, when he shall have subdued all things to himself, and when he shall have become subject to God, and when God shall be all in all. Then shall we enjoy the immortal life which is the gift of God.

Mr. HARRIS,—I stated that this passage refers to the end of time,—the last thing that will be transacted in this world. It is true that my friend has thrown some apparent difficulties in the way, but I will remove every one of them. The difficulties are only apparent; there is no real difficulty at all in it. Matthew xvi., 27, 28, is the first proof-text to establish the point that Christ came at the end of that age. But you will see the connection of the *copulative conjunction* with what follows in the next chapter! “*And* after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James and John, his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them.” We see here the Son of man coming in his kingdom; and Moses, the representative of the righteous dead, was there, with Elias, who had not tasted death, the representative of the righteous living. Moses

and  
show  
King  
viii.,  
“Aft  
and  
and  
shini  
white  
they  
of. I  
taber  
Here  
dead,  
John  
what  
till I  
was t  
were  
city,  
gone  
impli  
he sh  
xxiv,  
fulfil  
woul  
take  
all.  
In P  
acco  
chos  
that  
of d  
decl  
The  
Psal  
again  
for  
indiv  
“Th  
right  
xxiv  
thy  
“Th  
spok

and Elias were here talking with Jesus, the conjunction *and* will show that the kingdom was here the semblance of that glorious Kingdom which we are to see at the end of the world. Then, Mark viii., 38. This will not help him, I assure you, for we are told that "After six days Jesus taketh with him Peter, and James, and John, and leadeth them up into a high mountain apart by themselves; and he was transfigured before them. And his raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow, so as no fuller on earth can whiten them. And there appeared unto them Elias with Moses, and they were talking with Jesus." Here are the same things spoken of. Peter said "It is good for us to be here; let us make three tabernacles, one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias." Here were Moses and Elias, the one the representative of the righteous dead, the other the representative of the righteous living. Then John xxi., 21, 23: "Peter seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, if I will that he tarry till I come what is that to thee?" Remember the New Testament was not then written and the things that were written in the prophets were to be fulfilled. Mat. x, 23, When they persecute thee in this city, flee ye into another, for verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." This implies that they should not be gone over the cities of Israel until he should be transfigured.—That was the coming spoken of. Math. xxiv, 34, "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled. If the word *generation* here meant the *men then living*, we would be bound to admit that all that the Saviour spoke of did then take place; but I do not admit that the word *generation* means this at all. We shall see what the scriptures mean by the word *generation*. In Psalms xxii, 30 it is said, "A seed shall serve him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation." 1st Peter ii, 9, "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness unto his marvellous light. Isaiah liiii, 8, "Who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living." These do not refer to the length of time men should live on earth. Psalms lxxiii, 15, "If I say, I will speak thus; behold I should offend against the generation of thy people." God's children were accounted for a generation running through all ages, a christian generation, individuals who love God. We have also as proof Psalms xiv, 5, "Then were they in great fear; for God is in the generation of the righteous." Here the righteous are called a generation. Psalm xxiv, 6, "This is the generation of them that seek him, that seek thy face, O Jacob."—Here the word *generation* refers to God's children "This generation shall not pass away until all be fulfilled." This was spoken previous to the Saviour's giving an account of his appearing as

Judge,—the one being in Matthew xxiv, 34,—the other in the 25-31 verses. Was the sun darkened? and the moon turned into blood? Did all the holy angels come at the destruction of Jerusalem? I say, No! Were all nations assembled there? I say, No! I agree with my friend that it could not in the nature of things mean the destruction of Jerusalem. All nations were not there. He may say the Jews and the Romans were separated. But, did the Jews and the Romans compose all nations? Did the Saviour invite some to everlasting life, and condemn some to everlasting punishment. I have not assumed that this refers to the end of time; *but I have proved it.* It is when the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father. I would like to turn your attention for a moment to the record of the historian Josephus. He says 1,100,000 were carried into captivity, and if that is the glory of the Lord, I would say "Lord save me from such glory." Was that the time of the glory of the Son of Man? It was a time of destruction, a time of vengeance and great trouble. But the time shall come when the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, and he shall sit upon the throne of his glory. I say, then, that Christ did not come at the destruction of Jerusalem. All nations were not there. There was no separation. The righteous were not gathered together; but they were scattered abroad. From these considerations, I think *it is evident that the passage refers to a time that is to come, and all scripture goes to prove that that time is the final consummation of all things.*

Mr. LAVELL.—I will first attend to the remarks which my friend has just made. He contends that the transfiguration represents the second coming of our Saviour. Allow me to say, that he is the only man in existence, or who has ever existed, who has taken that position, that the transfiguration of the Saviour on the Mount was his coming to reward every man according to his works. This is something new. I will trouble him again with a quotation from his learned and excellent friend Dr. Clarke. He says, in his notes on Matthew xvi. 27—"This seems to refer to Dan. vii. 13, 14—'Behold one like the Son of Man came—to the Ancient of Days—and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, and nations, and languages, should serve him.'" On the 28th verse, he says—"This verse seems to confirm the above explanation, as our Lord evidently speaks of the establishment of the Christian Church, after the day of Pentecost, and its final triumph after the destruction of the Jewish polity; as if he had said, 'Some of you, my disciples, shall continue to live till these things take place.'" Lightfoot says—"Our Saviour saith, 'There be some standing here, who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom,'—which must not be understood of his coming to the last judgment; for there


was not one standing there that could live till that time. Nor ought it to be understood of the resurrection, as some would have it; for probably not only some, but, in a manner, all that stood there, lived till that time." Now, my friend has stated, that if I make out the case, that "this generation" means the men of that time, and not the whole race of mankind, I make out the point. My evidence is this:—There are four Greek words that are rendered, indiscriminately, "generation," "birth," and so forth. 1. *γενεα*, "birth," "nativity," three times. 2. *γενεα*, the thing born or produced, nine times. 3. *σενς*, "race," "stock," "kind," twenty-one times; and 4. *σενς*, "age," "generation," "duration of 30 years," forty-two times. And this very word *σενς* is the word here used in the 24th chapter of Matthew; so that it refers to that generation which should not pass away till all these things would be fulfilled. I therefore claim the point in this debate. My friend still evades the attempt to prove that punishment, from its very nature, is endless. He knows he cannot do it, and no man that lives can do it. My friend brought up the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, in the Gospel of Luke. I wish to know from him if this is a parable or a literal fact; if he understands it as a literal fact, I shall show its absurdity; but I shall also show that in some ancient MS. it commences with the words— "Then he spoke a *parable* to them, saying," &c. But, in any case, whatever it may mean, we read of the destruction of that very *hell* mentioned in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, in Hosea xiii. 14—"I will ransom them from the power of the grave. I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plagues. O grave, I will be thy destruction." Here we read of the destruction of this very *hell* or *hades*. The word here rendered "grave" is in the Greek of the LXX. *hades*, and this word *hades* is rendered so in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, and whether this be a fact or a parable, it matters not, for we are told by God himself that this *hell* will be destroyed. The parable, as a figure, refers to the Jews and Gentiles. If my friend then takes it as a fact, I am prepared to show the absurdity of such an idea, and will illustrate the words as a parable, and will show its beauty. My next negative argument I found, upon the mission of Christ. Luke xix. 10—"For the Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which *was* lost." Not those that *will* be lost in eternity, as the endless-misery-doctrine-gentry will have it. John iii. 17—"For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world, through him, might be saved." John xii. 47—"I came not to the world, through him, but to save the world." 1 John, iv. 14—"And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." 1 John, iii. 5—"And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin." Galatian i. 4—"Our

Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father." Heb. ii. 17—"That he might be a merciful and faithful High priest, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." Acts iii. 26—"God, having raised up his Son, sent him to bless you in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." 1 Tim., i. 15—"This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." Acts v. 31—"Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour." Heb. ii. 14—"That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." 1 John, iii. 8—"The Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." Heb. ix. 26—"Now, once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Dan. ix. 24—"Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness." Col. i. 20—"Having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself." Isaiah lxi. 1—"The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captive, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." In the fourth chapter of Luke; at the 18th verse, we have a repetition of this same passage, applied by the Saviour to himself. From these passages it is abundantly proved that the object of Christ's mission was to save the world, to reconcile all to God. The question then arises, Has God given Christ sufficient power to accomplish this work, the object of his mission? I maintain that he has, and will prove it. I refer now to a few passages to show that Christ will accomplish his work. Luke xiv. 28, 30—"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, he be not able to finish it, and all that behold it begin to mock him, saying, 'This man began to build, and was not able to finish.'" Did Christ begin to build? He did. He began the work of his mission. Is he not able to finish it? Listen to the Saviour himself. Matthew xxviii. 18—"All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth." John iii. 3, 5—"The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." Eph. i. 22—"And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church." Col. ii. 9—"For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." 1 Cor. i. 24—"Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." Isaiah lxiii. 1—"I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save." Here is abundant testimony that the Saviour of the world will complete the work



he undertook. How can Christ be the Saviour of the whole world if only a part be saved? It is impossible. If ten men, for instance, fall overboard, and the captain succeeds in saving *eight* of them, would you call that *saving the ten*? You would not. The captain lacked the power to save all; but it cannot be said that Christ lacks the power and ability to save all men.

Mr. HARRIS.—My friend has made an attempt to disprove the arguments I advanced. If he would take the trouble to read this passage of Scripture, which any schoolboy could read, it would do a great deal to help to clear up his difficulties. I have already spoken of the Transfiguration, and what it represented; but in Matthew xxv. there is an account given of Christ's coming with all the holy angels, and then separating the children of men, after they shall be judged, one from another. I said that all nations were not present at the destruction of Jerusalem, and my friend dare not grapple with me on this point, but keeps entirely away from it. The fact is, that the coming of Christ spoken of in Matth. xxv., 31, refers to his coming to judge the world in righteousness at the last day; when he shall come to reward the righteous and punish the wicked; when he shall give to those who have acted wisely and uprightly, everlasting fruition,—and condemn to everlasting punishment all those who have been disobedient, and *have acted wickedly*. My friend insisted if I understood that punishment was necessarily endless in its nature. I did not say that punishment was endless in its nature; but from the circumstances in which it took place, when man's probationary state was ended, and when Christ had become the *Judge instead of the Saviour, as he condemned* those he judged, and was no longer a Saviour but a Judge, then those *he condemned were judged and could not be saved by him*. An individual if called upon to believe in Christ after the judgment would be called on to believe a lie, for there will be no Christ to save him in a Gospel sense, for there will be no Saviour after the judgment. Christ will then be Judge, and will reward every one according to his deeds, this he did not do at the destruction of Jerusalem. My friend next enquired whether I regarded the circumstances connected with the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, a literal fact. The words are, "A certain rich man"—there is special reference made; but it must certainly allude to something that it is literal of a rich man, and of Lazarus, a poor man. We have an account of the rich man's suffering and of the happiness of Lazarus. My friend said he would apply this to the Jews and Gentiles; but look at it. He will represent Lazarus as the Gentiles received into Abraham's bosom and receiving the blessings of the Gospel. Thus Abraham represents Jesus, and the rich man represents the Jews now shut out from the blessings of God, asking for mercy. We are here taught a wonderful thing. Did the Jews ever



ask for Gospel blessings? They have never done it. *Did the Jews ever call upon the Gentiles for the Gospel*, as would be the case if the parable were to read as my friend understands it? *Is the Gospel not open to them*, and have they not despised the salvation offered to them? Do they regard the Gospel dispensation as a dispensation of mercy? Do they not reject it? Have they any desire to receive this salvation? I say they have not, so far as I know, then this parable cannot represent Jews and Gentiles. My friend having made his remarks with reference to the parable, commenced to quote a number of passages to prove that the Son of man came to save sinners, I have already stated that Christ came to save sinners upon Gospel terms, and these terms are repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. I will now offer another argument. Rev. xxii., 18, 19, 20: "I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus." Here are three things mentioned, any one of which would for ever exclude men from the Kingdom of Glory, and, as a matter of course, all who believe in the immortality of the soul, must admit them to be endlessly punished. In the first place, *God shall take away his part out of the Book of Life*; second, his name shall be taken out of the holy city; and third, from the things which are written in this book. Here reference is made to the custom of keeping public records, in which the names of the citizens were enrolled, and from which the names of public offenders were blotted out. O awful thought! "Every one whose name is not found written in the Book of Life shall be cast into the lake of fire." In Rev. xx., 11th and following verses, which I have already read in your hearing, it is stated plainly that "The earth and the heavens fled away, and there was no place for them; and death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." O! awful sentence, to him who would take from or add anything to this book. Can any man take anything from this book? Yes, every man who denies *future punishment takes away from the Book of God*, "and God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and out of the things which are written in this book. He that testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly, and my reward is with me." That the Jews will be excluded from the Kingdom, and that they shall be condemned at the time they are excluded, I will now attempt to prove. Matth. viii., 11, 12: "I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven. But the children of

the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." The Gentiles are represented as coming from the east and the west, and the north and the south, and sitting down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness. When did Abraham and Isaac and Jacob sit down in the Gospel kingdom? They all ceased to exist long before the Gospel kingdom was established; consequently these individuals shall be excluded from the kingdom of heaven at the time when Abraham and Isaac and Jacob shall be admitted into it. As to the nature of the kingdom, see what St. Paul says, 1st Cor., xv., 50: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." Abraham and Isaac and Jacob are admitted into this Kingdom, and yet there are some to be shut out of it. O! awful thought! They shall be excluded from the glory of the Lord which is in the kingdom of heaven. Matth. vii., 21: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father, which is in Heaven." If we refer this to the Gospel dispensation, how does it read? "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, shall enter into the Gospel dispensation." Does that reading convey the meaning of the passage? That it refers to the Kingdom of Heaven we have evidence in the following verse: "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast out devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works." Now, my friend, you have the evidence laid before you. The account given in Matt. xxv. of the separation of the righteous from the wicked, establishes beyond doubt the proposition I have submitted, and no argument that can be advanced will disprove it. "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." O! awful state of the finally impenitent, to be excluded from the kingdom of God. Not only so, but to be shut out where there shall be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth, at the time when the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Here is evidence that individuals will suffer at the time that others are enjoying the happiness and felicity of heaven. My friend made some remarks in reference to the word "generation," but the things spoken did not take place at that time, but will at the end of time. I have already referred you to numerous passages bearing directly upon the meaning of that word, but my friend will not meet me upon these passages, but goes on quoting passage after passage that has no reference to the point in debate, and will not come to the point. He has not yet told us what he understands by the Son of man coming in his glory and all his holy angels with him.

Mr. LAVELL.—If barefaced assertions are to be received as evidence in this debate, my friend will certainly prove his position; but as it is not evidence I am on safe ground yet. My friend wishes me

to tell him what kind of angels are spoken of in one of the passages which he quoted. It seems he is at a loss to know himself what the passage means, and he wishes to turn the affirmative on me, when he knows that I have the negative side of this day's debate. I had the affirmative yesterday, and did not call upon him once to prove a negative. My friend has used the expression "finally impenitent," but this is not a Scripture phrase. It is not to be found in the Bible. He has stated that individuals will be excluded from the Kingdom of God; but I do not believe that individuals will be excluded from the immortal bliss that is given in the resurrection, to all eternity. I believe that every individual will come into this state of bliss on Gospel terms. My friend has more than a dozen times tried to saddle upon me, that I do not believe in salvation on Gospel terms. I would express to all those who differ from me that I do not believe in any other salvation than that which is obtained through the name of Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world. Universalists believe also that no man will be forced to go to heaven;—but that all will be made "willing in the day of his power," and that His kingdom will exist both in time and in the future world, for the Saviour rules in both places until He deliver up the kingdom to God, when God shall be all in all. My friend has used the expression "*probationary state*," but the expression is not to be found in Scripture. It is as if he had said, If a man does not repent here, God will not give him another chance to repent,—not even if he beg the privilege. My God! My God! What can a man be but a monster, with the gospel of glad tidings of great joy in his hand, and yet stand up here and preach such a monstrous idea. He has admitted, however, that the story of the rich man and Lazarus is a parable. I agree with him. He has also stated that this parable is a figure of something. That is correct. But perhaps he felt he could not, at least he did not, tell us what the parable was a figure of. I call upon him now to do this. He has quoted it to prove endless misery, but he did not tell us how it proved that doctrine. He did very well when he gave the Universalist view of the question. But I would beg of him to tell us what this parable represents. He says it represents something; but the question is, *What* does it represent? He has not told us what he understands by the phrase "the Kingdom of God." I maintain, from the Word of God, that "the Kingdom of God" is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. A man may be in the Kingdom and cast out of it. A man may repent and become a Christian and enjoy eternal life; but may lose that enjoyment by falling away. My friend has also glossed over my criticism on the word "generation;" he will not touch that point, I know, as I proved from the meaning of the word translated "generation," that it cannot mean anything else than a generation of men,—that is, the average life time of man, which is thirty years. I will give you, my friends, another argument of a negative form. The promise of God

to Abraham puts the stamp of falsehood upon the doctrine of endless misery. The promise to Abraham, and which was repeated to Isaac and Jacob, you will find in Genesis xxvi, 3, 4—"Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and will bless thee, for unto thee and unto thy seed I will give all these countries; and I will perform the oath which I swore unto Abraham thy father. And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Gen. xxviii, 15—"Thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west and to the east, and to the north and to the south; and in thee, and in thy seed, shall all families of the earth be blessed." Peter says in the Acts:—"In thee shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." This includes every son and daughter of Adam, for the expressions are, "nations," "families," "kindreds." Gal. iii, 8. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, "In thee shall all nations of the earth be blessed." The *fulfilment* of this promise is unconditional. I admit, however, that there are promises that are conditional. If men comply with certain conditions mentioned in them they shall be rewarded. If they neglect to comply with these conditions they shall be punished, for He will by no means clear the guilty. But there are promises unconditional, and which depend not on man but on God for their fulfilment, and this promise made to Abraham is one of them. The fulfilment of this promise does not depend upon man's complying with any condition. If he believes that God will perform his promise to bless all the families of the earth, he will live by faith on the Son of God. Gal. iii, 9—"Then they who be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." When God fulfils the promise which is "the blessing of all families of the earth," faith in that promise will be lost in the reality—the enjoyment of the blessing which is its fulfilment. For the believer works by faith, and walks by faith, and lives by faith; and this faith in the universal promise of God, works by love and purifies the heart. It works by love because it is universal and not partial. Because a God of love will universally bless all; it enables us to look forward to that glorious period when love shall be victorious throughout the wide universe of God. Another argument I will present on the negative side, is the destruction of Death. Hosea xiii, 14—"I will ransom them from the power of the grave: I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction." Here it is plainly declared that death will be destroyed. My opponent wishes you to understand that death will be endless. Whose word is to be believed? Another argument on the negative side will be found in John xii, 32—"And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." I admit there is a condition annexed to it, but the condition is already fulfilled. The condition was Christ's being lifted up. It has been fulfilled, and if his declaration is true, all men will be drawn unto him. Another argument is taken from 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, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." These passages are plain and to the point.

Mr. HARRIS—That my opponent does not believe that Christ has come in his glory is evident from the argument he has offered in his last speech Acts iii., 21: "Whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things." He has thus proved *himself* that he does not believe the position he has taken, or he has stated that he does not believe the word he has just read, for if Christ remained in Heaven until the time of the restitution of all things, he has not come yet for all things are not restituted. At the time the writings were drawn for this discussion at Mr. Gore's, I put the question to Mr. Lavell, Do you as a denomination, continue to administer the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in your church, he answered in the affirmative. This being the case, the gentleman does not believe that Christ has come for St. Paul says in I Cor. xi., 26: "For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show forth the Lord's death, till he come," and of course if Christ came at the destruction of Jerusalem the sacrament would be, therefore, invalid ever since, and I defy the gentleman to get out of it. My friend went on to say that the kingdom will remain in a future state, that is the immortal state. This is directly contrary to what he stated yesterday. He may say that God is the same unchangeable being, that I admit, *but the sinner is not*. He is not in the same position. He has run his race. Ecclesiastes xi., 10: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, in the grave whither thou goest." My friend referred to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. He was very desirous to know how I understood it, I have already said it was designed to represent the condition of the two individuals who had lived on earth. One is represented as being in unending woe, and the other in perfect joy; the one is in Abraham's bosom, and the other in hell, and lifts up his eyes in torments and sees that poor man whom he had despised while on earth, living in comfort, while he himself was tormented. I think any one will understand this to be the meaning of the parable. I will now give one passage more of scripture to prove the endless misery of the wicked. Revelations xxi., 8: "But 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. The proposition is—*Do the scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery for any portion of the human race?* and I think it is evident they do, for "the abominable, and murderers, and idolators, and all liars shall have *their part* in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." My friend

touched upon the covenant made with Abraham to prove that all men will be finally holy and happy; and stated that there were no conditions in this covenant. Turn to Romans iv., 13: "For the promise that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." 22, 23: "And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake, that it was imputed to him, but for us also to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him, that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead." Then follows Galatians iii., 9: "*So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.*" 22: "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." 26, 27, 28, 29: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ. And if ye be Christ's, then ye are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." This shows that the condition is, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. All nations blessed with the gospel and having faith in it shall be blessed with Abraham, and no others. All may enjoy God, and enjoy happiness with him. My friend went on to show that death would be destroyed. He quoted from Hosea 12, 14: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death." I believe that; but at the resurrection it will be "every man in his own order Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that ate Christ's at his coming." My friend produced another argument, from John xii., 32; "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." This Christ said referring to his crucifixion, and not referring to the glory of the Upper World. Has not the world been drawn towards him? Have not thousands and tens of thousands been drawn to Christ, on account of his crucifixion. But certainly he will draw all men unto him to judgment, although he does not say that he will draw them to glory. And at that time when all are drawn unto him, he will say to the righteous, "Come ye blessed of my Father inherit the kingdom prepared from the foundations of the world;" and he will say to the wicked "Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." I have this day brought forward strong, positive, and incontrovertible and uncontroverted testimony, that when Christ would come on the throne of his glory, the heavens and the earth would flee away, and there would be no place found for them; that then the dead, small and great, would stand before God, and the books would be opened, and another book would be opened which is the Book of Life, and that the dead would be judged out of those things written in the books, according to their works. I proved by that passage also that there would be a lake of fire and brimstone for the impenitent, when *the earth and all the things which are thereon shall be*



burned up, viz., when time ends. Then in the parable of the wheat and tares, I proved that the harvest was the end of the world, from the fact that it would not be harvest until the seed was all sown. It could not refer to the City of Jerusalem for this reason,—my friend has not done sowing his tares yet, and I have not done sowing my wheat in the name of God, and I warn you to beware lest God take thee away with his stroke; then a great ransom cannot deliver thee. Then with regard to Matthew xxv, I showed plainly that it was impossible that the things there spoken of could take place at the destruction of Jerusalem. All nations were not there; the nations were not separated, and none were invited to everlasting life, and none consigned to everlasting punishment. That part of the chapter my friend has not touched, but there it stands, and it will be seen that the gentleman cannot meet the arguments in it. The Saviour said this gospel was to be preached as a witness unto nations before that time. Was the gospel preached to all the world before the destruction of Jerusalem? I say no, and it has not yet been preached to all the world. Again, I brought forward the parable of the kingdom of heaven compared to a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind, which, when it was full they drew to shore, and the good were gathered into vessels, but the bad were thrown away. So shall it be at the end of the world; the angels shall come forth and sever the wicked from amongst the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire; there shall be weeping and wailing, and gnashing of teeth. The net is now thrown into the great ocean of time, and it is drawing to the great shore of eternity. Do not be deceived for heaven's sake.—Do not imagine you are right when you are wrong. Do not imagine you are secure unless you have fled for refuge to the hope set before you, "For except a man be born again he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." Again, I directed your attention to the sign against the Holy Ghost, and proved that the man who committed that sin would not have forgiveness. I brought forward Judas Iscariot to prove that it would have been better for that man if he had not been born than to have acted as he did. These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal. "I showed you moreover, that many would come from the east and from the west and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness." When *Christ should come to judge the world in righteousness* and when the wicked shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power. Then we came to Revelations xviii., 8, to show that those whose names were not written in the Book of Life would be overcome. They thought they were safe. They dreamed of happiness and future bliss; but in hell they will lift up their eyes being in torments, and they must suffer in that unending state for *ever and ever*. I also gave you the passage that refers to the man that would add unto the words of the book of this Prophecy God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book, and if any man shall take away from the words of this Prophecy God shall take away his part out of the Book of Life; and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Then I showed you pointedly and plainly that he whose name was not written in the book of life was cast into a lake of fire. I showed that this could not refer to anything in this life but everlasting fire. I showed that the punishment of the wicked was called *everlasting punishment*. But when God speaks of man in his probationary state, he speaks of days. He tells us that man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. His day is short but how long is punishment? I add no more.

Mr. LAVELL:—When an opponent in a debate cries out in loud and boisterous language to his hearers, "O! I warn you all to beware," and when he says to them, "Be not deceived," and all such expressions, and stamps his foot and waves the air with his hand, I understand it to mean that he cries *quarters, quarters!* My opponent stated that I did not believe Christ had come at all, and in doing so he stated what is not true. I stated that the heavens must receive Christ until the restitution of all things; but, I did not deny there is not another coming of our Saviour, when the dead in Christ shall rise first, then they who are alive and remain shall meet their Lord. We do administer the sacrament in our denomination, when we have an established church; but I do maintain that it is not now binding upon any individual; nor can it be proved from sacred Scripture that it is binding upon any individual in the present day. It was binding on the disciples until the Saviour should come in his glory, which coming took place when Christ came in his glory at the destruction of Jerusalem. We believe however, it is a help to a divine life. My opponent said in reference to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, that the one was suffering in unending woe, the other enjoying unending happiness, but gives no proof; and he takes the language the parable is clothed in to be the figure. But the language the parable is clothed in cannot be taken to be the figure; for if you do, you understand it literally. He quoted the passage in the Revelations where it is stated that "the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolators, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death. I have been asking my opponent all day to prove that this was in the immortal world, or whether death was endless or swallowed up of life, or whether it meant a state of endless misery in a future life. As yet I have no proof from him. In referring to the promise made to Abraham, my opponent said that this promise is conditional. I grant that it is, but the fulfilment of the condition rests not with man, but depends upon God, and he is faithful who promised. My opponent brought forward a passage to prove that the children of the promise were children of God by faith. I admit this. These are children of God in a certain sense; but all mankind will be children of God in a higher sense, for in the resurrection they will be equal to the angels of God in heaven. Then they shall be children of God, being children of the resurrection. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive; and "he that is in Christ is a new creature." My opponent said also there was a condition attached to the promise. "And I, if I be lifted up will draw all men unto me," thus signifying what death he should die. I leave it to any intelligent man to say if there is a condition here, and if there was, if that was not fulfilled by Christ. Christ was lifted up on the cross, and he will draw all men unto him if he told the truth which certainly he did. My opponent said Christ would draw all men unto him to be judged, and send them away some to endure unending torment and others to enjoy everlasting happiness. But there is not one word in the text about this. He also quoted a passage from the old Testament where it is stated there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave. But this does not say there is no repentance after death. This is a passage he would like to get but he cannot find it. I defy him to squeeze a passage from the Bible which teaches that there is no repentance after death. I consider that it is a standing rule of eternity, that when a man repents God will save him, and that the kingdom of Christ must exist until all are subdued, and that too on Gospel terms. And when that shall be done, as St. Paul states in his epistle to the Corinthians

it shall be done. "Then Christ shall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father, that God may be all in all." Now to sum up. The arguments I have presented in this debate are based upon, 1st, the desire of God—That God desires the ultimate salvation of all men, and that God's desires would be satisfied was clearly proved. 2nd. Another argument I built upon the fulfilment of the law of Love. That it was consistent with the Love of God that all should be happy. I proved that not one jot or tittle of the law would fail until all was fulfilled. 3rd. I based another argument upon the paternal character of God. I have proved that all mankind are the children of God; that he is the father of all spirits, and that no circumstance or condition of the world can destroy that relation which exists, because it is a natural one. 4th. I also based an argument on the Love of God. I proved that God's name and his very nature is love, and that it was impossible from the nature of his character that he would inflict misery unending on any of the creatures he has made. 5th. I based another argument upon the foreknowledge of God. I proved that God was infinite in knowledge and that he knew all things, at once the end from the beginning; that he lives in an eternal Now, and if he saw that the course of some of the creatures he intended to create, was such that it could only result in endless torments, that all the attributes of his character would cry forbear! O forbear! rather let them remain in nonentity. 6th. I also built an argument upon the justice of God. I proved that this justice required the punishment of sin, but that that punishment could not be endless, and that one great object of his justice was the reconciliation of his creatures, and bringing them all to obedience. Universal justice demands universal right. 7th. Another argument I based upon the Mercy of God. I proved that God was merciful, and that his mercy could not allow an individual of the human race to suffer to all eternity. 8th. I also founded an argument on the Pleasure of God. I proved that it was his pleasure that all his creatures should be made holy and happy. 9th. I proved also from the Will of God, that God *willed* the salvation of all men, and that His *will* would be accomplished. 10th. I proved that it was the purpose of God to save all men, and that what he purposed he would do. 11th. I based an argument upon the Mission of Christ. I proved that Christ undertook the salvation of the whole world; and that the devil—whatever he may be—and his works will all be destroyed; for God has certainly said that they would be. 12th. I also based an argument upon the Promises of God some of which are conditional, but the fulfilment of the promise he made to Abraham, and other promises made, were unconditional so far as man was concerned. And now I have but two minutes left to close this debate. I would say to this audience that I feel glad that I have had an opportunity of standing up here and advocating the glorious doctrine of the salvation of the whole human family, and our Gospel grounds too; and I also feel glad that I have been enabled to stand up here to confront the monstrous and unmerciful, and unjust doctrine of endless misery said to be in the immortal state of existence. I conceive that my opponent has most signally failed in proving his proposition. I feel glad that this debate has been reported by an efficient shorthand writer, and that the Report shall go to the world to show the puerile attempts which are made to defeat the Mission of the Saviour of the World. Gentlemen, Moderators,—I thank you for the dignified manner in which you have presided over this discussion. I trust we shall all meet to praise God in a world without end. Amen;

God,  
The  
, the  
, and  
other  
that it  
y. I  
s ful-  
ter of  
that  
ion of  
atural  
roved  
isible  
nding  
ment  
ite in  
n the  
at the  
hat it  
of his  
in in  
d. I  
t that  
of his  
m all  
other  
was  
uman  
n the  
atares  
will of  
will  
se of  
th. I  
Christ  
evil—  
; for  
based  
con-  
ham,  
man  
ft to  
I that  
g the  
nd on  
abled  
unjust  
ence.  
s pro-  
cient  
w the  
viour  
nified  
st we



