

THE
DOCTRINE
OF
EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT:

A Discussion

OF THE QUESTION

“DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THE DOCTRINE OF THE ETERNAL
CONSCIOUS SUFFERING OF THE WICKED?”

BETWEEN

DR. J. LITCH,
OF THE CHURCH OF THE MESSIAH, PHILADELPHIA,
IN THE AFFIRMATIVE,

AND

ELD. MILES GRANT,
OF BOSTON,
IN THE NEGATIVE;

On the Evenings of November 9, 10, 11, and 12, A. D. 1858,

AT THE MUSIC HALL, IN BOSTON.

PHONOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED,

BY

JAS. M. W. YERRINTON.

These shall go away into everlasting punishment. — *MATT. XXV. 46.*
They shall be as though they had not been. — *1 COR. 13.*

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY DAMRELL & MOORE.
1859.

K2433-6



Stereotyped by
HOBART & ROBBINS,
New England Type and Stereotype Foundry,
BOSTON.

OPENING SPEECH OF DR. LITCH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: As has already been announced, it falls to my lot to open this great debate. The motives which have influenced me in appearing before you in the position I now occupy are, that my ordination vows bind me to use all diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and false doctrines; and the Scriptures of Divine Truth admonish me thus: "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his ways shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." My convictions are most deep and settled that the negative of the question which has been announced is a very great and dangerous error, dangerous to the eternal interests of those who come under its influence; and, as a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ, bound to vindicate his truth, it is my duty on all occasions to stand up for the truth of God's most holy and blessed Word.

The question resolves itself into this: First, Will all the human race be finally saved and made happy? if not, secondly, Will some of the human race be annihilated, to avert their eternal suffering? or, thirdly, Will some of the human race suffer eternally conscious anguish? One of these three things must occur. The advocate of the negative of the question before us is a well-known advocate of the doctrine that some men, namely, all finally impenitent men and women, will be stricken from existence: and this is the point I am to combat, and establish the truth of the affirmative of the proposition before us, that the Scriptures *do* teach that the wicked will suffer eternally and consciously.

We commence, then, by analyzing man. What is man?
(3)

What do the Scriptures represent man to be, that he may suffer eternally and consciously? In answering this question, I remark that the Scriptures exhibit man as a compound being. The elements of that composition are, first, the body, — the bones, flesh, muscles, sinews, arteries; second, the soul, constituting the living, quickening principle of man; and, third, the spirit, constituting the intelligent principle that actuates man. You will find these three elements divinely stated and recognized in the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testaments. The great apostle to the Gentiles recognizes them as the elements of man's nature when he says, "I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." — 1 Th. 5 : 23.

So far as the earthly portion of man's constitution is concerned, I do not need particularly to dwell upon it; it is manifest, it exhibits itself to the senses. The inner, hidden, invisible principles of man's nature are those that require, more especially, to be exhibited and illustrated by the testimony of Holy Writ. That man has a soul, a living principle within him, the Scriptures teach in such language as this: I refer to the expression of Rachel, the beloved wife of the patriarch Jacob, when, in her dying moments, "it came to pass, as her soul was in departing (for she died), she called his name Ben-oni." The soul, the living principle, departed, and the result was, "she died." The prophet, when he was called to the chamber of death, and entreated to restore the dead child to life, offered up the prayer to God: "O Lord, I beseech thee, let this child's soul come into him again; * * * and the child's soul came into him again, and he revived."

The Scriptures speak also of a separate existence of the soul. You read of this in the sixth chapter of Revelations, where it is written: "When he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the Word of God, and for the testimony which they held; and they cried with a loud voice, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them, and it was said unto them that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." The same fact is

manifest in Revelations twentieth, where it is written: "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the Word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." The soul, in all these different instances, is recognized as a distinct element of man's nature, having a separate existence, capable of going out of the body, and of existing out of it.

On this point, it is replied that "soul" signifies the whole man, the whole person; and this passage is quoted in proof of the assertion: "God made man of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." I admit this, and I admit that the import of the passage is, that man became a living "person," and that, in a great majority of instances of the occurrence of the word "soul" in the Scriptures, the import of it is "person." But that is a figurative, and not a literal use of the word. The literal use we have in the passage where it is said: "And it came to pass as her soul was in departing, for she died." "O Lord, I beseech thee, let this child's soul come into him again." That is the literal use of the word; it is a distinct element of man's nature. "I saw the souls of them that were slain for the witness of Jesus;" not the souls that were slain, but the souls of the *persons* who were slain. I will illustrate. You say, there are in the harbor twenty "sail." Why do you call them thus? You do not number your row-boats or steamers in the number of such craft. Why not? When you see a steamer ploughing her way through the water, you do not say, "There goes a sail." Why not? For the simple reason that she has no "sail." When you speak of "a sail," you mean a craft that is furnished with sails, and propelled by wind, not a row-boat or steamer. A part, by a figure of speech, is used to represent the whole. You express the whole of the craft when you say, "a sail." So, when you say "the soul," a part of man's nature, an element of his nature, you express the whole being, man, if he is living; and when you say that such a person's soul departed, you do not speak of the whole man, you speak of that element which

he possesses that is called a soul, and which may be separated from the man, as you may take the sail from a vessel.

This, I presume, will be sufficient to make perfectly manifest to every mind the nature and use of that word "soul." It will not be necessary, therefore, for us to spend any time upon the point, that the Scriptures speak of the whole man as "a soul." They speak of him thus for the simple reason that he has a soul. Man was not called a "living soul" until God "breathed into him the breath of life, and he became a living soul;" because God produced the soul in him. Up to that moment he was not a soul. When that soul was thus produced by the breath of the Divine Being, he became a living soul, and he became a living soul because that soul was a living, quickening principle; without its presence, he was but a dead mass of clay, dust organized. And here, perhaps, I should say that the word translated soul (*psukee*) is indifferently translated, in our English version, "soul" or "life," showing clearly that it is the life or living principle.

I pass now to notice the spirit. Man has a spirit. "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding." That spirit is the conscious spirit; so recognized in the Scriptures of Divine Truth, as in 1 Cor. 2: 11 — "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? So even the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God." The spirit, then, the *pneuma* (that is the original word), is recognized in the Scriptures of Divine Truth as the conscious principle, that which apprehends, that gives us intelligence, sensibility, knowledge. The apostle recognizes this fact when he prays that his brethren may be strengthened by God's spirit in the inward man. That spirit is the inward man, the inside man, — the man that dwells within the tabernacle, within this casket of clay.

That this spirit leaves the body at death, is taught both in the Old and New Testament Scriptures. The Psalmist teaches it when he says, "Put not your trust in princes; nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His spirit (and the same word that is generally rendered "breath" is also rendered "spirit") goeth forth, and he returneth to the earth;" not his *spirit* that has departed,

"he returneth to his earth. In that very day his purposes come to naught;" he can execute them no longer. I give you the translation adopted by all critics. I have never found a Biblical critic who does not consider that to be the precise meaning of the passage. This is the only occurrence of the word rendered "thoughts" in the Hebrew Scriptures, and it means, not that his spirit, his soul, perisheth, is blotted out, but that the purposes he has formed cannot be executed. The wise man teaches the same sentiment when he says, concerning man, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." They will separate; there is to be a decomposition of man.

That this spirit does exist, in a separate state, after the dissolution of man, I think I shall be able abundantly to show you from the testimony of the holy Scriptures. And the first passage that occurs to my mind on this point is the testimony of the Evangelist, when speaking of the appearance of our Lord Jesus Christ walking upon the sea. He said that the disciples were affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit; and, in like manner, when he appeared in a room after his resurrection, and they thought it was a spirit (*peuma*), and he said: "Handle me and see. A spirit has not flesh and bones, as you see me have." He was matter, substantial matter, flesh and bones, which a spirit has not and is not. A disembodied spirit is something ethereal, airy, perhaps more subtle even than the electric fluid itself. The evangelist teaches this also when writing, in the Acts of the Apostles, of what the Pharisees believed, not only that there would be a resurrection, but that there were angels, and spirits; and it was with this definition that the great apostle to the Gentiles exclaimed, "I am a Pharisee." He stood on that side of the question, in view of their explanation of what was embraced in the idea of a Pharisee, and especially did he believe in the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead.

Once more: the apostle Paul, in the twelfth chapter of his Epistle to the Hebrews, teaches that same doctrine when he says, "Ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; * . * . * but ye are

come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels; to the general assembly of the church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect," — not to just men made perfect, as they will be in their glorified bodies, but to the *spirits* of just men made perfect, — "and to Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." Paul teaches this same doctrine, and he was a believer in it, when he says, "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, whether in the body or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth; I knew such a man: he was caught up into the third heaven, and into Paradise, and heard unspeakable things, which it is not lawful for man to utter." If Paul had believed that there was no such thing as having an existence out of the body, he would not have spoken of the possibility of having a consciousness out of the body, and of being caught up into heaven. Therefore, the fact that he stated that he knew a man who was caught up into heaven, either in or out of the body, is a demonstration that he believed he could be there, and be conscious, out of the body.

These scriptures will be sufficient to illustrate my point, that man has a spirit that leaves the body when it dies, departs from it, and is capable of knowing in a separate existence out of the body, of having something out of the body, and of being received into Paradise; of having a place in Mount Zion, the heavenly Jerusalem, with angels and the "spirits of just men made perfect."

The combined being, man, composed of a body made of dust, a soul, the life-principle, and a spirit, the intelligent principle, has been illustrated before you. The possibility of these elements having an existence, separate, the one from the other, has been illustrated before you from the Scriptures of Divine Truth; and hence it is that our Lord Jesus Christ said, "Fear not them that kill the body, and are not able to kill the soul (*psukee*), the living principle; but rather fear Him that is able to destroy both soul (*psukee*) and body in hell." That is the very plain declaration of the Son of God, that, although the body may be killed, the soul cannot be destroyed; that it survives and will survive forever. It cannot be killed by man; he

cannot destroy it. It is its nature to exist, to live. It is in the body, and it is alive; it is out of the body, and it is *psukee* (soul) still. It does not cease to live because it leaves the casket, nor cease to be alive because that casket is decomposed and prostrate in the dust.

There is a principle that I wish here to state, and that is, that you may affirm that of a part which you cannot affirm of the whole, and you may affirm that of the whole which you cannot affirm truly of its parts. A man may be dead; the elements of the man may exist in conscious life. Here is a vessel of water, for instance: the poles of a galvanic battery are applied to it, and the water is decomposed—it is dead, if you please; there is none left. But the elements of that water exist; and they exist in their own nature, and, so existing, they are immortal: whatever is incorruptible, indecomposable, is, by implication, immortal. Oxygen gas, chemists assure us, is a simple body; it cannot be decomposed—it is immortal. Hydrogen gas, chemists tell us, is indecomposable; it is therefore incorruptible, and, by implication, immortal. The elements of man's nature may be decomposed, separated from the combination in which the great Creator placed them at the outset; but these elements shall exist according to their own mode of existence. When the water to which I have referred has been decomposed, you will find a residuum at the bottom of the vessel, an earthy substance, and you will find two elements that cannot be decomposed or destroyed; but the water is destroyed; the water is dead; it does not exist. This, then, is my illustration of the fact that you may affirm that of a part which you cannot of the whole, and you may affirm that of the whole which you cannot of a part. You may speak of man as dead; but what is death? It is the decomposition of the man.

[The moderator called "Time!" and Dr. L. took his seat.]

REPLY OF ELDER GRANT.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Allow me the pleasure of saying that the gentleman who has just addressed you is considered one of the best Bible students in our land, and consequently you may expect an able defence of the affirmative of this question.

It has been asserted that man is composed of three dis-

tinct parts—body, soul, and spirit. We do not object. The question then recurs, What is man? and, Mr. Chairman, this is a question of some moment; and I know of no way of answering it, especially as it is a Bible question, but by reference to the Bible. We were referred to the creation, Gen. 2: 7—“The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.” Question, Which is *the man*? Is it that which God formed of the dust of the ground, or is it that which God breathed into his nostrils? I think it must be one or the other. “The Lord God formed *man* ;” is that *man* that he has thus formed, or is it something to put a man into? Settle that question, will you? We are going to appeal to your reason, as well as to the Bible, for we believe they are in harmony. I repeat the question. Is that *man* which he has formed, or is it something to put a man into? If it is the man, then that which God breathes into his nostrils is not the man. Both cannot be the man. If it is not the man, but a house to contain him, then it is not the creation of *man*, but of something to hold him. This body, we are told, is but a casket to hold man—a prison-house. Singular, that God should make a man and put him into a prison, to begin with (provided this body is a prison-house), and then tell him, as long as he obeys Him he must remain there (for this is the substance of it); and if he disobeys Him, He will let him out; which was the result of his death, as we are told; and then the real man flies away.

“The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into him the breath of life, and man became a living soul.” We are told by our opponent that the word “soul,” in this passage, is used in a *figurative* sense; and that “soul,” in the passage where Rachel’s death is referred to, is used in the *literal* sense. I would like the proof of this assertion. Let us go back to the first use of the word “soul.” The word *nephesh*, which is the word rendered “soul” in all cases, with two exceptions (and it occurs seven hundred and fifty-two times in the Old Testament), occurs for the first time in Gen. 1: 20—“God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life” (*nephesh*), rendered in the margin “living soul.” In this first example where the word occurs, it is applied to animals. Is that a figurative use?

The second is in the 21st verse : " And God created great whales, and every living creature (*nephesh*—soul) that moveth." Then the "great whales" are living souls! The third case is in the 24th verse : " And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creatures (*nephesh*—soul) after his kind." The next is in the 30th verse : " And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life (*nephesh*—in the margin, "living soul") I have given every green herb for meat." These are the first four times that the word soul (*nephesh*) occurs in the Bible, and it is applied to beasts in all these cases.

We now come to its first application to man, Gen. 2 : 7, which I have already quoted : " And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living (*nephesh*) soul." Precisely the same word in the original. Does soul mean any more or less here than in the first four instances we have noticed ?

The next use is in the 19th verse of the second chapter. " And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam, to see what he would call them ; and whatsoever Adam called every living (*nephesh*— "living soul") creature, that was the name thereof." Now, I fail to see that *nephesh*, "soul," in Gen. 2 : 7, is any more figurative than in the first four cases in which it is used, and in the 19th verse of the second chapter.

I think, gentlemen of the chair, we have settled the point, without going further, that "soul" *primarily* means the whole being—the whole man. Hence we read, eight souls were saved in the ark. Eight figures, or something represented by figures of speech? Paul speaks of a certain number of souls that escaped at a time of shipwreck. We say, so many souls perished on board a wrecked ship. What do we mean? Every one understands us.

Another rendering of this word is "life." It is rendered "life" one hundred and twenty times in the Old Testament, out of the seven hundred and fifty-two. In the case quoted respecting Rachel's death, it is said, "As her soul was in departing,"—observe what follows,— "for she died." Did Rachel die? Render *nephesh* "life," in this

example, and it is perfectly plain — “as her *life* was departing.” Such, I think, was the use of it there.

We are referred to another passage, — “The child’s *soul* came into him again.” It is in 1 Kings, and the subject commences with the seventeenth verse of the seventeenth chapter: “And it came to pass after these things, that the son of the woman, the mistress of the house, fell sick, and his sickness was so sore, that there was no *breath** left in him.” Then the prophet prays, “O Lord, my God, I pray thee, let this child’s *soul* come into him again.” The word here rendered soul is *nephesh*. What has left the child? The breath of life. What does he wish to come back? His life, — the breath of life. Had the child gone? No, for the prophet stretches himself upon the child, and prays that his life (*nephesh*) may come back. He wished to have the life restored (the *nephesh*); and hence, instead of praying for the breath, he says the life (*nephesh*).

This is the only passage in the Scriptures where anything is said about the soul’s return. The prophet prayed that the soul of the child might come into him again; “and the Lord heard the voice of Elijah, and the soul of the child — the life of the child — came into him again, and he revived; and Elijah took the child, and brought him down out of the chamber.”

So much for the word “soul.” We will lay it by now, and come to “spirit.” That is said to be the real man also, — the inside man, — which leaves the body at death. We find no proof of such a fact. Please refer to Ps. 146: 4, where it is said, “His breath goeth forth, *he* returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.” We are told, “his purposes.” Very good; we do not object particularly to that, though it is not the word used. Does he continue his thoughts? “In that very *day* his thoughts perish,” — when his breath went forth. The word here rendered breath is used three hundred and eighty-five times in the Old Testament, and is the only word rendered “spirit,” with ten exceptions. My opponent made a mistake in one of his quotations, when he referred to the appearance of our Lord upon the sea. The word used is not

* This is the same word that is rendered *breath* in Gen. 2: 7, where it is said, “And God breathed into his nostrils the *breath* of life.”

pneuma, but *phantasma*. They thought they saw a phantom coming, not a spirit (a *pneuma*). You have heard, perhaps, of the phantom ship, which was seen borne swiftly along, with the sails all spread to the breeze, apparently, but after it was viewed for a while, it vanished out of sight, and was seen no more. Similar scenes occur quite frequently, though a hallucination of the mind, owing to some peculiar condition of the atmosphere. Remember, these are phantoms, not realities.

What is this *pneuma* or *ruakh*? There are four uses of it in the Bible. *First*, "spirit" is used to represent a being. *Second*, to represent an influence proceeding from a being, as the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father. And there is a spirit proceeding from every man. We see it in mesmerism and psychology. If I shake hands with a man in the dark who is my enemy, I recognize him as such. I know it by some spiritual communication.

Third, it is used to represent a state of mind, as "haughty in spirit," "proud in spirit," &c. And, *fourth*, — which is the point we wish to come at, — it is used to represent the atmosphere we breathe. This word, as I have remarked, occurs three hundred and eighty-five times in the Old Testament; it is rendered wind ninety-seven times, and is the only word rendered wind in the Old Testament. We will examine a few passages where it is rendered breath.

We read, "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their breath; they die, and return to their dust." — Ps. 104: 29. Where is the man, then? We were told that man might be separated into his different elements — body, soul, and spirit. If it takes the union of these elements to compose the man, when they are separated which is the man? We were told, in illustration, that water might be decomposed, and then neither of the parts is water. We have a union of the parts, oxygen and hydrogen, and then we have water. When we have separated them, the oxygen is not water, and the hydrogen is not water. So, if it takes the union of body, soul, and spirit, to make a living soul, I ask again, where is the man when we have separated these parts? We have it in Eccl. 12: 7 — "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." There the word rendered spirit is *ruakh*, which we

have three hundred and eighty-five times in the Old Testament, and the corresponding word *pneuma*, three hundred and eighty-five times in the New Testament, and neither of them is rendered "soul" once in the whole Bible. "Then shall the *spirit* return to God who gave it;" not the *spirits* return. If these are the real men who go back to God, then the men were created before man was formed from the dust of the ground, or created separately from him, at any rate; for we have already found that the "Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Now, if we take away that breath of life, then what will he be?

Plato affirms that "the immortal is definite in number, and it is impossible that there should be more than there actually are; so that, whatever be the number of the souls, all must have existed from eternity."

Says Parkhurst, an eminent lexicographer, "As a noun, *nephesh* hath been supposed to signify the spiritual part of man, or what we commonly call his soul; I must, for myself, confess that I can find no passage where it hath undoubtedly this meaning."

McCulloch, in his able work in defence of the credibility of the Scriptures, says, "There is no word in the Hebrew language that signifies either *soul* or *spirit*, in the technical sense in which we use those terms, as implying something distinct from the body." I will give you the rendering of Gen. 2:7, as found in the Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature, edited by Dr. Kitto, "And Jehovah God formed the man [Heb. the Adam] dust from the ground, and blew into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living animal." What was necessary to make that man to live? The breath of life. If it be taken away, what will be the result? He will die, and in that very day, his thoughts perish. "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust."

The Lord talked to Adam in the Garden of Eden. He had sinned, and the Lord said, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken. Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Where is the man? What would common sense say? The man has gone back to his orig-

inal elements, and the spirit has returned to God. The man is separated, dissolved, and no longer exists as a conscious being.

Dr. Kitto further remarks on this passage, "We should be acting unfaithfully, if we were to affirm that an immaterial, immortal spirit is contained or *implied* in this passage." And if an immortal, immaterial spirit is not implied in the account of the creation, where shall we find it?

Bishop Tillotson, a believer in the immortality of the soul, says, "The immortality of the soul is rather suffered, or taken for granted, than expressly revealed, in the Bible." Allow me to quote from Justin Martyr, one of the Fathers; for I wish to intrench myself behind some good authorities, — not the best, for the Bible is the best, — and I am hoping, before I get through, to erect a bulwark of truth on the Bible that no bombshells of error can affect. Justin Martyr, one of the Christian Fathers, who had been a Platonist, says, "If you meet some who are called Christians, who dare calumniate the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and who say that there is no resurrection of the dead, but that at death their souls are received up into *heaven*, do not regard them as Christians." That was Justin Martyr's opinion.

William Tyndale, who gave us the first printed English edition of the New Testament, says, in answer to Thomas More, a Platonist, "And ye, in putting them [souls] in heaven, hell, and purgatory, destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection. If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good case as the angels be? And then what cause is there of the resurrection?"

And I repeat the question: "If a man go to heaven independently of his physical organism, what necessity of this organism, or prison-house, in which to confine him eternally?"

We come back to the word rendered "spirit," *ruakh* or *pneuma*. We read in the Old Testament (Job 27: 3), "The spirit of God is in my nostrils." Is Job in his own nostrils? And it is the same word that is rendered "spirit" where it is written, "The *spirit* returns to God who gave it;" and where it reads, "Thou takest away their breath; they die, and return to their dust." [Time.]

REJOINDER OF DR. LITCH.

MR. MODERATOR, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: You have been asked which is the man—that which was made of the dust, or the breath of life which God breathed into that dust? If God made man of the dust, as the Scriptures affirm, that is the man. If God produced a soul by breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, that is the man. If God, who hath stretched forth the heavens, and laid the foundations of the earth, “formeth the spirit of man within him,” that is the man. “Mr. Thomas is dead,” you say. “How do you know?”—“I saw him in his coffin.” A Spiritualist comes along, and says, “Last evening I received a communication from Mr. Thomas.” Which is the man? Both. You mean that you saw the body of Mr. Thomas, and you call that the man, Mr. Thomas; the Spiritualist means that the spirit of Mr. Thomas came to their circle, and wrote on their table a communication, and that is what he calls Mr. Thomas. Either of these three elements of man’s nature, by a figure of speech, taking a part for the whole, is called the man, distinguished as the individual. There is sufficient of the man’s elements there to identify him; there is the identity, therefore he is the man. The *whole* man is the whole being. The man dies; that being is decomposed, dissolved, separated, and that is the phenomenon death.

“Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it.”—Eccl. 12: 7. Job says “the spirit of God is in my nostrils,” and my opponent asks whether Job’s spirit was in his nostrils. I was not aware before that Job’s spirit and God’s spirit were identical. If the spirit of God was in Job’s nostrils, it is no evidence that Job’s spirit was in his nostrils. The manifest meaning of the word there is, that the breath of God, which He had given him to inhale and exhale, was in his nostrils.

My opponent wants to know whether God put the soul in a prison-house, to begin with,—if this body is a prison, in which man’s soul was to be shut up, and kept there forever, if he obeyed God. I reply, it is a temple, in which God placed that noble part of man’s being, called the soul,

and He meant it should stay there forever, if man would be obedient. It is not a prison; the soul is not imprisoned here. The prison-house is a darker place.

Once more: My friend wishes the proof that the word "soul" is used in its literal sense. I reply, it is manifest from the universal usage of language. You call no vessel that goes upon the water "a sail" unless it has a sail; and the literal import of the word sail is, that it is a piece of canvas, or something else that is spread to the wind, against which it may press, and move your vessel forward. That is a sail, literally; and because a vessel is furnished with that instrument, the vessel is designated by that term, — a part for the whole, — and usage makes it proper that we should designate it as "a sail." But nobody believes or understands that the ship is all sail, — nothing but a sail itself.

"*Nephesh*," — soul; does it mean less or more in the beasts than in man? That is the question. I reply, it means just what it expresses in both. All living beings that God created are living souls; that is, they have a living, vital principle that animates them. But yet, I suppose that when the Divine Being brought these creatures into existence, made them living souls, and came to man and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, that He made him something more noble, and exalted above the brutes that He spoke into existence, and that swarmed the waters, the air, and the earth. That is my idea of it; that in man it is a nobler principle, a more exalted principle. That everything that lives and breathes possesses a living principle, is true; it does not need a philosopher to tell us that. If he asks, will they still exist out of the body? I reply, if I were informed on that subject by the Scriptures, I would inform him; but, as I am not, it is no part of my theology.

Once more: He brings up the words "breath" and "soul," and endeavors to make them synonymous.

ELDER GRANT. I rise to make a correction. I did not claim that "soul" and "breath" were synonymous; but stated the opposite.

DR. LITCH. I think I am in order, Mr. Chairman. My friend quoted the words, "Breathed into his nostrils the breath of life," and said it is the same word which is rendered "soul" in the passage where it is said, "the breath

departed from the child . . . and the child's soul came into him again." The word "breath," in Genesis and in Kings, and "soul" are the same. The idea is that "breath," in the two instances, is the same, and that the "soul" is the breath that went out. Am I not correct?

ELDER GRANT. I said the *life* returned by the agency of the breath.

DR. LITCH. The Scriptures say *nepshesh* returned, — the soul, — as I asserted at the outset.

The next point is founded on the passage, "The breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, and that very day his thoughts perish." Where is the man? I reply, the man has died, and the spirit has gone to God, the body to dust. That is the disposition the Scriptures make of him. The passage asserts that his *ruakh*, his spirit, goeth forth, and the man that was made of the dust returns to dust again, as the word of God declares. My friend has not shown us that the soul was made of the dust, or that the spirit was made of the dust. I have shown that God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, and man became what he was not before that act of the Divine Being. I have shown, from Zechariah 12: 1, that "the Lord formeth the spirit of man" — who was made of the dust — "within him." He did not make it of dust, and therefore no part of it returneth to dust. He did not form his breath in him; he inhales that from the atmosphere; but He formeth his *ruakh* (spirit) in him, and that is the principle that "knoweth the things of man, as the spirit of God knoweth the things of God."

My friend says there is a spirit in every man, but he does not think it is an intelligent spirit, that lives outside of him. But he says, there is such a strong spiritual influence that he can tell an enemy by shaking hands with him in the dark. I am glad that he has got so far on the way, and I am in hopes that he will go further before he gets through with this discussion, and come to the conclusion that it is a spirit that is capable of conscious existence, although it shall come out from the man.

Now, the question before us is not What does Plato teach, or Kitto teach, or Tillotson teach, or Justin Martyr teach, but, it is What do the Scriptures teach? [Elder Grant, "Amen!"] My friend has quoted Justin Martyr. I am not prepared to-night to reply to that. I will do so,

Providence permitting, to-morrow evening; and I will show you that the passage which has been read is a garbled quotation.

I have already alluded to the passage cited with regard to "the spirit of God," in Job's nostrils, and therefore will detain you no longer upon that point, but will proceed to my direct argument on this subject. I have shown you from the Scriptures the constitution of man, — body, soul, and spirit. I have shown you the scriptural recognition of these three elements outside of man. I stand corrected in one quotation which I made, in reference to the appearance of our Saviour upon the sea. The disciples supposed it was a phantom, not a spirit, as I stated. But my friend has not replied to the quotation I made in reference to the appearance of the Saviour in a room, where his disciples were assembled. They thought they saw a spirit, and he said, "Handle me and see. A spirit (*pneuma*) hath not flesh and bones, as you see me have." I hope my friend will attend to that.

I shall now proceed to show you that the Scriptures do recognize, not only that the soul can and does exist after the man is dead, but that there is something capable of enjoying and suffering after the man is dead. And I quote to you the narrative of our blessed Saviour, as given us in the sixteenth chapter of Luke, of two men who had lived and who died. The one was very rich, the other was very poor. The rich man was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day; and the poor man was a beggar who sat at his gate, full of sores, desiring to be fed with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table; and the dogs came and licked his sores. "And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died and was buried. And in hell (*hades*) lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom; and he cried and said, Father Abraham have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented." Does not that establish my point, that after death there is a something

of man that may suffer or enjoy, that may receive comfort, or be the subject of torment?

But it is replied, This is a parable. Granted, for the sake of the argument, and only for the sake of argument. But what is a parable? A comparison of one thing with another, a thing well known with something less perfectly known, for the purpose of making the less perfectly known and understood, more manifest. All parables are founded upon facts that have existed, do exist, or, in the nature of things, may exist. No parable can be founded upon a thing that never did exist, does not exist, and, in the nature of things, cannot exist; for there can be no comparison between such a thing and something else. Now, the case which our Saviour described had existed, did exist, or, in the nature of things, may exist, or he could not have founded a parable upon it. I think that will commend itself to the good sense of every considerate man. There is no getting away from this principle. A thing that never did exist, and, in the nature of things, cannot exist, I repeat again, is not a subject for comparison, and cannot be. Then, if the thing had existed, or did exist, my point is established. If the thing then existed, my point is established; if the thing may exist, my position is established, and there is no escaping the conclusion that there is something of man after death that is capable of torment and of enjoyment. Sometimes it is attempted to carry this forward into the resurrection state; because, forsooth, "the dead know not anything." But I would remind any one who should attempt such an exploit as this, that the scene is not laid in Gehenna, to which place God is able to consign both soul and body, when the body shall be raised from the dead to receive its final doom, but it is hades, the place of the dead. I presume my friend will tell you, before we close, that it is the grave; but, no matter, it is where the dead are; it is the place where the man, in some form, may suffer, and it is the place or state of the dead. But it was a place of the soul in the days of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of his great progenitor, the Royal Psalmist, when he said, speaking by the spirit of Christ within him, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hades, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption;" and so said Peter, full of the Holy Ghost as he was, on the day of Pentecost, "His soul was not

left in hades, neither did his flesh see corruption. This Jesus God has raised up, whereof we are witnesses." It is a place of the soul, brethren; it is a place of departed spirits; it is a place of consciousness; it is a place where man may suffer, or where man may enjoy. It is not necessarily to be understood as a place of torment. I speak of Father Taylor, and I say, he is in Massachusetts. "No," says one; "he is in Boston." It is a great distinction, but I affirm again "Father Taylor is in Massachusetts." "No; he is in Boston." Are either mistaken? One of us spoke of the city in which he lives, the other designated his state, that is all. Paradise may be in hades, or any other place may be in hades, which is simply the unseen or covered, and is the place of the disembodied spirit. That is the simple idea — an invisible state, nothing more nor less. The fact that he is in hades does not necessarily imply that he is in a bad state or place. A person may be in Massachusetts and be in Boston, Springfield, or Worcester; these words may designate his particular locality. You have my idea of the meaning of the word hades, in which the rich man was after he died; not his spirit, for that went to God to be disposed of; his body was buried; that was not capable of suffering after the spirit had left it; it was a dead, inert mass of matter. So much for the demonstration of Scripture, that there is something of man after death transpires, and before the resurrection, in that state called hades, that is conscious and capable of suffering and enjoyment.

You may ask, Is the soul immortal? I reply, it is incorruptible, and it is, by implication, immortal. The Scriptures do not call it immortal. You ask, Is the spirit of man immortal? I reply, if it is not a subject of decomposition, it is immortal by implication. The Scriptures do not call it immortal, nor do they say that the angels of God are immortal, although they cannot die. It is not necessary that the Scriptures should say of anything that it is immortal, in order that we should recognize that it is so. I will define my idea of immortality, — that it is the continuous life of a living, organized being in the condition in which he originated, and was made to subsist; that just so soon as he is decomposed, so that he no longer exists in that condition, he is mortal, that is, subject to death. Immortality is the perpetuity of existence in the mode of being that was originally intended for him to enjoy.

God is immortal, for he exists in that mode of being, and will to all eternity. Man was made immortal, for he was made to exist, body, soul, and spirit, to all eternity, if he had not sinned, and mortality is the fruit of sin. He has become mortal because he sinned. The law read, "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Adam did eat, and then God came and pronounced the sentence, after he had called the culprit to judgment, and said, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." That is, decomposition, dissolution, mortality, death, or whatever phrase you please to use to express the idea. Immortality is never affirmed either of the soul or the spirit of man, but of man as a whole; that is, in the resurrection, when, "in the twinkling of an eye, at the sound of the trumpet, the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall all be changed." Then man is again immortal; he has passed back again into the original condition in which God made him. He designed him at the outset to exist to all eternity, and has restored him to that state, to an undying condition. It is written that they who have a part in the resurrection out from the dead "neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. They are children of God, being children of the resurrection." That is man's immortality restored. It relates to the whole man. But if there is any part of man designated to be mortal, it is the body, and that is constantly referred to as mortal. Hear this: "If the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your *mortal bodies* by his spirit that dwelleth in you." What is the mortal part that goes to corruption, to dust? It is the *mortal body* of man. But the whole man is mortal, so long as he is in a state of combination, and subject to dissolution. The sentence has gone forth, the penalty is inflicted. That penalty has been going on ever since Jehovah met man in the Garden of Eden, and asked, "What hast thou done?" and pronounced the sentence, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." The man, then, as a whole, when he exists in the nature in which he may exist to all eternity, is an immortal man; but when he exists in a nature that is subject to decompo-

sition, so that the body, the dust, "shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it," he is a mortal man; and when that spirit has gone forth, and the body is left a lifeless mass, it is a mortal body; and I will thank any man to show me, from the Scriptures of Divine Truth, one solitary instance where even the intimation is made, concerning the soul or spirit, that it is mortal, or the subject of death, except when it is used in its figurative sense, for the whole person. ["Time."]

REPLY OF ELDER GRANT.

My able opponent spoke, in the commencement of his speech, of the *body* of Mr. Thomas and the *spirit* of Mr. Thomas. Now, the body and spirit of Mr. Thomas implies that Mr. Thomas is something aside from both of these. Which is Mr. Thomas?

DR. LITCH. My friend is mistaken. I did not use the phrase, "body of Mr. Thomas."

ELDER GRANT. I noted down the words. And then he remarks that *the man is the whole body*. I agree with my opponent fully, that the whole body is the man. Man's body, he says, is the temple for the soul. I shall want some proof on that point. I do not admit that the soul exists in man as a distinct entity, — distinct from the body.

He says, man is more noble than the beast. True. He says the soul of man is more noble than that of the beast. That is an assertion to be proved. Man is more noble in his reasoning powers, but we have yet to learn that the principle of life is any more noble in one than the other. We are then referred to Zech. 12: 1 — "The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, saith the Lord, which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him." My opponent dwells upon the words "within him," and I suppose would have us believe that He formed the spirit "within him." But we read, "He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." We should infer from that, that this spirit existed before, and consequently was not formed in him. What is that spirit thus formed? You will observe, he is referring

to the creation. "He stretcheth forth the heavens," referring to the commencement of things in this world's history. "And layeth the foundation of the earth." There is another act of creation. What then? "And formeth the spirit of man within him." Now, gentlemen of the chair, I wish to show that this spirit here referred to is the *air* we breathe. Amos 4: 13 — "For, lo, He that formeth the mountains (back again at the creation) and createth the *wind* (precisely the same word in the original, *ruach*), He createth it;" man has it within him; he cannot live without it. Let the atmosphere we breathe be taken from this planet, and every living thing upon it would die in a few moments; and every vegetable would die, for they cannot live without air. They breathe by means of their leaves, and other arrangements. Everything would die. Job 27: 3 — "All the while my breath is in me." We are told by popular writers that the soul dwells in man just as man dwells in a house. Which is the man? Suppose this hall were the house in which I live, and you come to the door and call, "Mr. Grant!" Do you mean the hall, or me? Which is the man? "God formed man out of the dust of the ground." I shall stick to that text, until it is proved that man was not formed of the dust of the ground. "All the while my breath is in me, and the spirit of God is in my nostrils." I cannot see that our brother gained anything on that point, and so I pass on.

In the forty-first chapter of Job, and the sixteenth verse, when speaking of the scales of the leviathan, we read, "One is so near to another, that no *air* can come between them." The same word that is rendered spirit. Is that the man? If this breath of life is the man, then wherever we find it we have found a man. If it takes this particular organization to constitute a man, then wherever we find that, whether it is on the earth, or on Jupiter, or Saturn, we have found a man. Again, in Job 1: 19 — "And behold there came a great wind." The same word that is used where he says, "He taketh away their breath, they die." Is it true? Are they dead, or are they alive? Adam was told, "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Did Adam die, or is he alive now? A certain being had said, "Thou shalt not surely die." He who made him said, "Thou shalt surely die." Which told the truth? If Adam is alive now, did not that de-

ceiver tell the truth? But we learn he was a "liar from the beginning." That is the only place where I can find the doctrine taught to our race that man is immortal. But when he says, "Thou shalt not surely die," he includes the conscious part—the soul. Is it the conscious part? My brother does not claim that the body is conscious, independent of the soul.

Job 7 : 7. — "O, remember that my life is *wind*." The same word that is rendered spirit. My life is dependent upon air, the wind; I cannot live without it. Chap. 12 : 10. — "In whose hand is the soul of every living thing" (then every living thing has a soul), "and the breath of all mankind." The same word which is rendered spirit in the passage where it says, "And he formeth the *spirit* within him." "And, lo, he that formeth the mountains and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, he createth it." What for? To keep us alive on this planet.

Again, Job 32 : 8. — "But there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." I admit that there is a spirit in man—the breath of life. What is the result when it is taken away? Job 34 : 14—15. — "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to dust." What part would he set his heart upon? We claim that it is the being he formed from the dust of the ground. We must stick to that, and, by the help of God, we will do so. We both believe the Bible; though we differ on this point. We wish to know where the truth lies. The word rendered spirit in this passage is *ruakh*, and the one rendered breath is *n'shahmah*. Both words are rendered spirit, and breath; sometimes one and sometimes the other. "Cease ye from man whose breath (*n'shahmah*) is in his nostrils." — Isaiah 2 : 22. Now, "if he sets his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." That seems to harmonize with the idea that we cannot live without this breath of life. "All flesh shall perish together, and man shall return"—where? To heaven? He did not come from there. To hades? He did not come from there. "And man shall return again unto dust." That looks reasonable. Separate the various parts, and where is

the man? Suppose I have a wagon that is broken to pieces, and you pick up one piece—it is not the wagon; you pick up another—that is not the wagon. You have to put them all together—then you have the wagon again. Just so when we separate man into his primary elements. My brother admits that it is not the spirit or soul that is immortal, but the *whole man*. “This mortal shall put on immortality.” That would make the soul mortal. We are taught to “seek for honor, glory, and immortality.” We do not seek for what we have. I do not seek for my book when I have it. We are to seek for it—how? “By patient continuance in well-doing.” But suppose I do not do well, what then? How do I get immortality? I leave my opponent to answer.

Ps. 104 : 29. —“Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust.” Breath here is the same word that is rendered spirit. He takes it away. But, says one, “Is there not air in us after we die?” Allow me to illustrate. Suppose I have a clock which has been wound up and is running. By and by, it stops. What made it stop? You say, because it ran down. I wind it up, and set the pendulum in motion, and it runs on. Just so with man. “The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and blew” (Kitto says the word should be rendered “blew,” not “breathed”) “into his nostrils the breath of life;” and so long as that motion continues, the man lives. But by and by the machinery has run down; there is no power within to continue that action. Sometimes, when a man is pronounced dead by drowning, his friends cannot give him up (as was the case with one of the sufferers by the Norwalk disaster), and they continue their efforts to resuscitate him, until finally he respire again. That looks reasonable. If they can get the machinery to act, so that the muscles can contract, and then expand, and form a vacuum in the lungs, and air is forced into them, then, if you can continue the action so that air shall be exhaled and inhaled, you have the machinery started again. When the action of the machine ceases, then the man dies. We have it here, —“Thou takest away their breath, they die.”

Again, Prov. 25 : 14. —“Whoso boasteth himself of a false gift, is like clouds and wind without rain.” The original of that word wind is the same that is rendered

“spirit.” Isaiah 7: 2.—“And his heart was moved, and the hearts of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind.” The same word again. Ps. 146: 4.—“His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.” I wish to call the attention of my opponent to this point, that man knows nothing when he is dead. He will admit that a man may be knocked down and made unconscious. Now, if we knock him harder, and dash his brains out, do we bring him to life? In Ezekiel we have a representation of the resurrection, in the description of the valley of dry bones. “And when I beheld, lo, the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above; but there was no *breath* in them.” The same word. He prophesied as commanded, “and the breath came into them, and they lived.” “And I shall put my *spirit* in you (the same word again), and ye shall live.”

We now come to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. This, I remark, is the only passage in the Bible that carries the idea of existence after death. He says he will grant that it is a parable, for the sake of the argument. I would not wish to have him do so. “There was a certain rich man which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day; and there was a certain beggar.” “And it came to pass that the beggar died.” Do you believe that? Now, what constitutes the beggar? Is the idea conveyed that the soul, the spirit, went? That is sheer assertion. Give us the proof. “The beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham’s bosom.” Suppose this book represents the man that died, and some one came along and carried him away,—what have they got? They did not take the soul, but the *man*. If you take it literally, that which died was the beggar, and he was carried to Abraham’s bosom. “The rich man died,”—did he die?—“and was buried.” The *rich man* was buried. There is no intimation that anything went off that was conscious, in hell or hades. And here I remark, fearless of successful contradiction, that the word *hades*, rendered hell, and the corresponding word, *sheol*, never refer to future punishment.

DR. LITCH. I have admitted all that.

ELDER GRANT. “And in hell he lifted up his eyes.” Then he was not dead, or he must have come to life. How do you get along with this, if you take it literally?

But, says one, it is the soul. Let us read it that way. The beggar's body died, and his soul was carried to Abraham's bosom. And the rich man's body died, and his soul was buried. No, that does not read well; so we must change again. But, "it came to pass that the rich man's body died and was buried;" and in hell he lifted up the eyes of his soul, and saw Abraham's soul afar off, and Lazarus' soul in the bosom of Abraham's soul; and he cried out, "Father Abraham, have mercy on my soul, and send the soul of Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of the finger of his soul in water, and cool the tongue of my soul." And where is he? In hades, which my brother admits does not refer to a place of punishment.

DR. LITCH. My friend misunderstands me. I did not say it is not used to represent punishment, but *final* punishment; and that it is a place where something of man may be tormented or comforted in the intermediate state.

ELDER GRANT. A word on hades, from authority. It is used eleven times in the New Testament, and rendered "grave" once. Donnegan defines it, "The realm of Pluto; the infernal regions; the shades below; the abode of the dead." Greenfield says, "The invisible abode or mansion of the dead; the place of punishment; hell; the grave." That is the theological definition, we grant; but we deny that it is the classical definition. Dr. Kitto says, "A careful examination will lead to the conclusion that no sanction to an intermediate state is afforded by those passages where hades occurs, but that they denote the grave, * * both of the righteous and the wicked." Dr. George Campbell, the Presbyterian commentator, says, "In my judgment, hades should never, in Scripture, be rendered hell. *Sheol*, the corresponding Hebrew word, signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to goodness." Moses Stuart concurs with the others.

With my brother's view, there is a difficulty in regard to this parable of the rich man and Lazarus. If it is taken literally, then the whole man was buried; if the soul, then it proves too much. My brother declares that parables are founded upon what has been, or is, or, in the nature of things, may be. Let us see. In Ezekiel, we read of two eagles with great wings, that cropped off the tops of the cedars, and carried them and set them in a city of merchants. Do eagles do this work? "And it grew,

and became a spreading vine of low stature, whose branches turned towards him." Do eagles plant trees, and then stay until they grow up and turn towards them? Remember, this is a parable. It is explained to represent what two kings did, not two eagles. It is not to show what two eagles did or may do. I never heard of eagles cropping off the tops of trees and setting them by the side of waters. In Judges 9: 7, and onward, it is written: "And when they told it to Jotham, he went and stood in the top of Mount Gerizim, and lifted up his voice, and cried, and said unto them, Hearken unto me, ye men of Shechem, that God may hearken unto you. The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them" (do trees do any such work?); "and they said unto the olive-tree, Reign thou over us."

I come back to the rich man and Lazarus. I can find nothing to sustain a literal rendering. It proves too much. If the "rich man" means literally a rich man, and death means literal death, then we have here a piece of history. Now, I think, if I had time to give the connection, I could show that it has no reference whatever to man between death and the resurrection. I take this ground, and am not alone; for such men as Wakefield, Lightfoot, Dr. Gill, and others, have advanced the same idea.

And I remark again, that this is the only passage that intimates a conscious state between death and the resurrection. And yet we learn from the Bible that "there is no knowledge, nor wisdom, nor device, in the grave (*sheol*, the corresponding word is *hades*, and so rendered) whither thou goest." Hence, I read, "The wicked will be silent in *sheol*." *Silent* there. There is no groaning there—there is no consciousness there. This Bible can be brought to prove it. We shall hold to this point. We have the plain Bible declaration that "there is no knowledge, nor wisdom, nor device, in the grave (*sheol*, or state of the dead) whither thou goest." *No knowledge there!* Gesenius says, "*Sheol*, the under-world, a vast subterranean place, full of thick darkness, in which are congregated the shades of the dead; hell; purgatory." Here he is giving the theological definition. Parkhurst, another lexicographer, defines it, "An invisible place; state of the dead," &c. ["Time."].

REPLY OF DR. LITCH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I would not detain you further, were it not that it has been announced that I shall close in a fifteen minutes' speech.

I have been querying in my mind why my friend should spend so much time in quoting so many texts to prove what is not disputed, that the word *ruakh* means sometimes, and a great many times, breath, wind, and air, and that soul does really sometimes mean mind. I cannot understand why he should spend so much time to prove these points, when they are freely conceded, and not attempted to be denied. The question is, do the passages I have quoted, where the words soul and spirit are used, and manifestly used, to express their existence outside of the body, and their existence as an intelligent principle, a living principle, that is in man, and makes his body live, and gives him sensibility and intelligence, — the question is, I say, do they mean what they express? These are the points to be considered. I have thought that perhaps his condition was very much like that of my friend Mr. Bosserman, a Universalist clergyman of Baltimore, with whom I had the honor of debating last March. He said, in one of his speeches, that his opponent had begun in the wrong place, but he would begin in the right place, and if he came across his path, he would hit him if he could. I have queried if my opponent is not of the same opinion — that I had begun in the wrong place, and determined that he would begin on an independent course of his own.

A few words with regard to those great eagles. I suppose no well-informed person, on reading that parable, would mistake the word "eagle" for anything but a metaphor; and when you understand the word "eagle" as a metaphor, and the word "vine" as a metaphor, your parable is all plain, and all these actions of the eagle and vine are perfectly natural.

In regard to what was called Jotham's "parable," I have never read it. I have read Jotham's *fable*, which is an entirely different form or figure from a parable, and has nothing to do with this subject.

Now, with regard to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. My friend has certainly labored very hard — I

give him full credit for it—to dispose of this terribly complex affair. He is something like Mr. Storrs, at Springfield, as related by the Rev. Mr. Hawkes, of Providence. He gave a lecture on this same subject, and presented three views. Mr. Hawkes said to him, “Which of these views do you wish us to receive as the true one?”—“Either of them.”—“But I do not believe them; they do not satisfy me.”—“Nor do they me.” [Laughter.] I presume my friend is very much in this position; none of his views suit him; they do not meet his case exactly. But, if he would admit what the Scriptures so plainly teach, that the spirit does depart, and that which is of the dust returns to the dust as it was, he would not have so much difficulty.

How does he know what the organs of the spirit are? How does he know the spirit has no fingers, no eyes, no tongue? that the spirit has no sensibility? Who has informed him upon these points? Let this arm be severed from the body, let it be given to the flames and reduced to ashes and scattered to the four winds, and so long as the breath of life remains in these nostrils, so long will sensibility remain in that arm. You may go into the street and ask the first man or woman, or the last, who has lost a limb, large or small, — and no matter how long it has been severed from the body, — you may ask him or her, “Sir, or Madam, as the case may be, have you sensibility — consciousness, where that limb was?” and he or she will tell you, “Yes, always.” The spirit of man is the inner man, that animates the whole man. There is no part of man that is not animated by the spirit, and there is a response to its influence throughout the whole fabric, to its remotest extremities. And it is a unit — you cannot separate it. You may take away the casket, the temple, but there stands the inner man, undecomposed, with all his members entire, perfect.

I state this as a fact, and I know whereof I affirm — not from one, two, or three testimonies as to the psychological physical fact of consciousness in that lost member, but probably from hundreds of testimonies of individuals who have lost members: and I have never found an instance of such a person who did not tell me he had consciousness there. You may ask the question as many times as you please. Let it be settled, if it can be, that man is in spirit sensible to outward

influences. And if that is the fact, the spirit of man is possessed of all the members of man, and the consciousness of man, and it is susceptible of consciousness out of the body, and there is sensibility after the physical form in which it was once encased has passed away.

I would rather have that one fact than the opinion of Plato, Parkhurst, Kitto, and the long list of worthies that have been quoted to us. A fact is a fact. Now, with me, scripture and fact are equally authoritative. What is fact, I know the Scripture never contradicted— [Elder Grant, "Amen!"]—and what the Scriptures tell us, facts will not contradict. When I have facts, corroborated by scripture, I plant myself there, and the universe cannot move me.

[The debate of the first evening here terminated, and the audience were dismissed with the benediction.]

SECOND EVENING—WEDNESDAY.

[THE meeting was called to order at 7 o'clock. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Burnham, of Newburyport; after which the moderator stated the question under discussion, and announced that, in accordance with previous arrangements, Elder Grant would open the discussion this evening, on the negative side of the question.]

SPEECH OF ELDER GRANT.

GENTLEMEN OF THE CHAIR, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Perhaps it may not be out of place for me to define my own position in relation to the subject under discussion. Some, I perceive, misapprehended my remarks last evening in relation to the question. I believe most firmly in the doctrine of eternal punishment; but I do not agree with my brother as to what that punishment is. He believes it is eternal conscious suffering, but I believe it is eternal destruction. We both believe it is *eternal*.

We spoke last evening of the creation of man. My opponent took the position that he is composed of three distinct parts—a body, soul, and spirit. I do not disagree with him, in the main, in relation to this proposition.

I believe that man is composed of body, soul, and spirit. But I do not agree with my opponent as to what this spirit and soul are. I do not fully understand or comprehend my brother, and I hope he will make the point a little plainer to-night, as to what constitutes *man* — whether it is the body, the soul, or the spirit; or whether it takes all three of them combined to make the man; whether it is proper to call either the one or the other, abstractly considered, the man.

My brother believes the spirit is conscious between death and the resurrection; I do not believe it. We both believe in a resurrection of the body, both of the righteous and the wicked. This the Bible most plainly teaches. But my brother thinks that between death and the resurrection, the spirits or souls — and I wish he would tell me which, or if it be both — go to hades, a place somewhere under ground, or above, or all about, I believe he declared; that they remain there, comparatively happy if good spirits, and quite unhappy if spirits of bad men; and that at the resurrection these spirits will be liberated from their prison-house and put into their bodies, and be judged, and that the spirits of the wicked — either in the body or out of it, I do not know which is his position — will be tormented eternally.

We assumed last evening that the words, “soul” and “spirit” are not synonymous, and remarked that the word *nephesh*, which is rendered soul in the Old Testament, is found seven hundred and fifty-two times, and that is the only word rendered “soul,” with two exceptions; that *ruakh*, the word rendered “spirit” in the Old Testament, with two exceptions, is never rendered “soul,” though used three hundred and eighty-five times; consequently, we take the position that soul and spirit are not synonymous. My brother, I believe, claims that, but yet has not made it plain to my own mind. I wish him to make it more distinct; perhaps I am dull of comprehension.

I understood my brother to admit, first, that the Scriptures do not say that the soul or spirit is immortal. (If I claim too much, he will correct me.) “Immortal,” he defined to be, continued existence. That being so, he must give up the immortality of the soul and spirit, — that is, so far as the Bible is concerned; for we are here to discuss the subject on Bible truth. I understood him to ad-

mit, secondly, that it takes all parts to make the man. If so, we argue that neither of these parts is the man, considered separately; and that these parts must be united again before we can have the living man. I understood him to admit, thirdly, that man is made of dust, and he cannot return, of course, to what he was not.

It is claimed by my opponent — and it is a true claim — that facts harmonize with the Bible; and my brother made one statement that I shall remember, probably, as long as I live: “*A fact is a fact.*” I grant it; and that all facts are in harmony with the Bible, and that no fact, or truth, if you please, contradicts any truth in the Bible.

He spoke of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, for the purpose of showing that there is consciousness in hades, — *sheol*, the state of the dead. Well, admitting the fact that there is consciousness there — (and here I remark, as last evening, that it is the only passage in the Bible, that I can find, that intimates a consciousness between death and the resurrection, admitting that it is an historical account) — that being a fact, I say, let us put the Bible by the side of that fact. I presume my brother will let the Bible stand in preference to any other book. I think we are agreed upon that. I read in Eccl. 9: 10, in relation to that very place where the rich man is said to be, in hell, — *hades*, the state of the dead, — that there is no knowledge in *sheol*, or *hades*, that there is no wisdom there, that there is no device there, that there is no work there. Shall we put that down as a *fact*? “*A fact is a fact,*” whenever we find it in the Bible or elsewhere. Is that a fact? We are discussing this question on the Bible. We consider the Bible as our law in this matter; my brother does, I do. We both believe the Bible; singular, that we should differ so. I repeat, if there is consciousness in hades, how shall we get along with this passage, which declares that “there is no knowledge, nor wisdom, nor device, in the grave (*sheol*) whither thou goest”?

It was claimed that all parables are founded on facts, or what has been, is, or may be. We cited our brother to the parable representing an eagle cropping off the top of some cedar-trees, and carrying them away and setting them out in a city of merchants, and they grew, and another eagle did a similar work, and so on. Our brother

admits this is a parable; but we are confident no such thing ever took place. This parable, then, is not founded upon fact. Eagles do not crop off the tops of trees and set them out. But we were told that when we understand that metaphor of the eagle and the vine, it is all very plain. Admit it. So we claim for the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, when we understand the figures, it is all very plain and simple indeed. It was remarked that, perhaps, we were in doubt as to what it does mean. No; that is not the position of your speaker. We have no trouble with the parable; but we are not here to give an exposition of it, but simply to show that the exposition which has been given cannot be made to harmonize with the *Bible*. It declares that the rich man died and was buried in hades, or hell; that the poor man died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom. Where is Abraham? If we go back to Gen. 15: 15, we read of him, "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace." What does the word "thou" represent? It must include the conscious part. "*Thou* shalt go to thy fathers in peace; *thou* shalt be buried in a good old age." Where is Abraham, when he is "buried in a good old age"?

We were referred last night to the souls under the altar. Rev. 6: 9. — "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held." Where was the altar? Up in heaven? Do they sacrifice there? Observe: he saw them "under the altar;" not in some other place; not in heaven, or down in hades. The altar is not there. They do not sacrifice in hades. These were persons that were slaughtered for the witness of Jesus. Dr. Clarke very properly remarks, "The altar was upon the earth, not in heaven;" and he says, in speaking of their cry, — for it seems they are in an unpleasant condition, at any rate, and if these are the souls or spirits of good men, as they certainly are, how could they be in such an unhappy condition, if they had gone to a comparative state of enjoyment, much better, at least, than it is here? — "they were crying, 'How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell upon the earth?'" and remarks, that it is "their blood, like that of Abel, crying for vengeance." You will recollect that it is said, "The Lord said

to Cain, The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground." He did not say that Abel had come up to heaven and made complaint that Cain had killed him, or that he cried unto him out of hades; but "the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me *from the ground.*" I read in another passage, referring to Christ, "His blood speaketh better things than the blood of Abel." The word rendered "souls," in the passage from Revelations, is correctly rendered "persons" by Prof. Whiting, a very distinguished linguist, as some of you know. We believe it was their actual cry, as they were being led up to slaughter, "How long, O Lord!" or else, as Dr. Clarke remarks, that it is the voice of their blood, crying, like that of Abel, "from the ground." But observe, gentlemen of the chair, these souls are under the altar; it must be a figure, or a representation of what he saw. He sees them slaughtered, — piles of them, — hundreds, thousands, millions, — in one night seventy thousand were slain, — he sees them under the great altar, the whole mass, crying, like Abel's blood, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?"

Again: we are referred to Revelations 20: 4, — "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and the word of God," &c. The word here rendered "souls" is rendered by Prof. Whiting "persons." "Person" and "soul" are used interchangeably in the Bible, both rendered from the same word, *nephesh*. "I saw the souls of them that were beheaded." If they were "beheaded," as we understand the word, it killed them; they were dead when they were beheaded, and could not reign until they should live again. They "were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands, and they lived." There we have it; they came to life before they began to reign. Having been beheaded, which killed them, he saw these persons afterwards, and they lived — then what? Then they "reigned with Christ a thousand years."

We were referred last evening, as proof that the spirit is the real man, — the inner man, — to the case of an ampu-

tated limb, an arm, for instance; and it was said that we feel a sensation in the limb that has been cut off. That is true, under certain circumstances. But, suppose, after the limb has been cut off, a screen is put up before the man, so that he cannot see you, and you cut with a knife or burn with fire the place where the arm should be — he does not feel it. How happens that? And you know, if the sensor nerve is severed, the man does not feel at all; you may cut his hand off, and he does not feel it. You know that the whole man is paralyzed by ether, chloroform, and in paralysis, very frequently; and if it can be paralyzed in the living man, why may it not be in the dead man? Is it necessary that it should live independently of the body, because it is sensitive when the man is alive? Our opponent says, strip off this cage, take off this grosser form, and there the man stands, the whole man. I should like the proof. "A fact is a fact," remember! Now, demonstrate it, and I am prepared to admit it is true, that when a man is taken to pieces, the outer man destroyed, the inner man stands forth a complete man.

I wish now to give one or two positive passages, proving that the whole man dies.

I will refer first to the instance of the good man, Moses, as recorded in Deut. 31 : 14, 16. — "And the Lord said unto Moses, Behold, the days approach that thou must die. . . . And the Lord said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers." "*Thou shalt sleep.*" Does that include or exclude Moses? In the thirty-fourth chapter, fifth, sixth, and seventh verses — "So Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there, in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him" — (did he bury Moses, or the house that Moses lived in?) — "he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Bethpeor. And Moses was an hundred and twenty years old when he died."

Once more: Joshua 1 : 1, 2. — "Now, after the death of Moses, the servant of the Lord, it came to pass that the Lord spake to Joshua, the son of Nun, Moses' minister, saying" (now, hear what the Lord God of Israel says, and remember that "a fact is a fact"), "Moses, my servant, *is dead.*" Is that a fact? Would it be a fact if Moses was alive anywhere? — in hades, *sheol*, heaven, Gehenna, Tartarus, anywhere you please. "Moses, my

servant, *is dead!*” Mr. Chairman, I want this point met, and a good many more like it. “*Moses, my servant, is dead.*” How much does that word “*Moses*” cover? It must take the real man, certainly. We cannot leave him out. And why did he die? Because he trespassed against the Lord among the children of Israel at the waters of Meribah Kadesh, in the wilderness of Zin. Well, if Moses went to Paradise, a place of delight, he gained by his trespass, because he died and went there before Joshua, who obeyed the Lord, and had to go on and pass through Jordan, and suffer many trials and tribulations.

We have now the testimony of our heavenly Father on this point. We will call upon his Son to testify. In John 11: 11 to 14. — “These things said he (Jesus): and after that he saith unto them, Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but I go that I may awake him out of sleep.” (Death is frequently represented as a sleep in the Bible.) “Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep he shall do well.” (They knew he had been sick, and that sleep would rest him, and thus he would “do well.”) “Then said Jesus unto them, plainly, *Lazarus is dead.*” Is that a fact? “A fact is a fact.” “Then said Jesus unto them, plainly, *Lazarus is dead.*” Was Lazarus alive at that time? If so, I think we might impeach the witness. If you can prove to me that Lazarus was alive at that time, I say, I think the witness might be impeached. I dare not undertake it. My ordination vows will not let me do it. “Then said Jesus, plainly, LAZARUS IS DEAD.”

Follow the witness a little further, in verse thirty-two: “Then, when Mary was come where Jesus was, and saw him, she fell down at his feet, saying unto him, Lord, if thou hadst been here my brother had not died.” Mary believed, then, that Lazarus was *dead*. Verse thirty-nine: (they have got to the sepulchre)—“Jesus said, Take away the stone. Martha, the sister of him that was dead, saith unto him, Lord, by this time he stinketh; for he hath been dead four days.” Another record declares that he had been in the grave four days. Verses forty-one to forty-four: “Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me: and I knew that thou hearest me always; but

because of the people which stand by, I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me. And when he had thus spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth." Where was Lazarus? "And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes." Where did he come from? Why, from out that sepulchre. "Lazarus, come forth." He does not call him out of hades, to come into that body, or out of heaven. John 12: 1—12. — "Then Jesus, six days before the Passover, came to Bethany, where Lazarus was, *which had been dead.*" Supposing he had been alive when he called to him, then he was not dead; but Jesus said, "*plainly, Lazarus is dead.*" The ninth verse: "Much people of the Jews therefore knew that he was there; and they came, not for Jesus' sake only, but that they might see Lazarus also, whom he had raised from the dead."

I ask this candid, common-sense congregation, if they had never heard these Scriptures read before, and understood the common occurrences of the day, if it would not be perfectly plain that Lazarus was dead, that is, if they had not the idea, somehow, that when a man is dead he is alive?

Verse 17. — "The people, therefore, that was with him when he called Lazarus [where from?] out of his grave, and raised him from the dead, bare record." "Bare record" of what? Why, that Lazarus was dead, and that Jesus raised him from the dead. Is this a *fact*?

We have brought the testimony of the Lord God of Israel declaring of one of his good servants that he is dead: "Moses, my servant, is *dead.*" Now, his Son comes in to testify, declaring, "Lazarus is *dead.*" ["Time."]

REPLY OF DR. LITCH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: If my friend would admit the principle that I stated last evening, that that may be truly affirmed of a whole which cannot be truly affirmed of its parts, and that that may be truly affirmed of the parts which may not be truly affirmed of the whole, his difficulties would not be so great. You may affirm that of the whole man which you may not affirm of the parts of that man. You may say of a whole man, he

is dead, because he is decomposed; the parts no longer sustain their original relation to each other. That is death, the scriptural definition of death. And Lazarus "was dead;" and "Moses died." But the same good Being who said Lazarus died, said also that he was borne by angels to the bosom of Abraham, — either that or another Lazarus, — and that he was comforted there. If he was dead, he had a resurrection. That Teacher spoke to the Pharisees, who believed that what he said was the true doctrine, and that the spiritual nature of man did exist in consciousness after it left the body. The teachings of that great Teacher, if the fact was not as he represented, must have confirmed them in their error.

Again, this same book, the book of God, which tells us that Moses died, and God buried him, tells us that, on the Mount of Transfiguration, when the Savior's face did "shine like the sun, and his raiment was as white as light," "there appeared unto him Moses and Elias, which appeared in glory, and spoke of his decease." There was something of Moses that was alive, if he died; and if my principle is correct, that you may affirm that of the whole which you cannot of the parts, and that of the parts which you cannot of the whole, the problem is solved, that there is no contradiction.

He asks, Which is the man? I reply, All are the man, and a sufficiency of man's identity exists in each one to justify us in denominating each, when separated, by the name of the man. It does not require that every portion of an object be presented, in order for you to designate that object as the thing. Here is a book; it is torn in pieces, and half of it has gone one way, and half another. The book is destroyed, yet, if you find one half of it, you speak of the remainder of that book as the book. You find, perhaps, the other half in another place, and you say, There is that book. You find sufficient of it to identify it; and, when you find that identity, you may designate it by that name. That is usage — *usus loquendi*. If you please, I will read from Dr Kitto. He was quoted upon the negative, last evening, as denying that Gen. ii. taught the distinctive existence of the soul, and left in a manner to leave the impression upon the audience that he did not believe in a separation of the soul.

ELDER GRANT. I believe I remarked that he did believe in the immortality of the soul.

DR. LITCH. I stand corrected, and I will forego the reading of the extracts.

A quotation was made from Justin Martyr. I promised this evening to show that it was a garbled extract. Justin Martyr did say, as my friend read, "If you have conversed with some that say there is no resurrection of the body, but that the souls, as soon as they leave the body, are received up into heaven, take care that you do not look upon them as Christians," &c. He did say that, but it was not all that Justin Martyr said. He said, "I affirm that no soul perishes entirely, for that would be joyful news to the wicked. What then? Why, that the souls of the righteous are received in the place of happiness, and those of the wicked, the unjust, in a place of misery, torment, in expectation of the great day of judgment." That is my belief of the teachings of scripture, precisely.

I proceed to notice another point that has been presented, and that is, where Solomon says, "There is no knowledge, nor wisdom, nor device, in the grave whither thou goest." *Sheol* is the right word, our friend says; I shall not dispute it; and all I have to say upon that point is, that the word *sheol* is sometimes used to designate the grave, but that is not its general import. The Lord Jesus Christ proclaimed, when he was on earth, "And behold, a greater than Solomon is here," and taught that in *hades*, which is the Greek translation of the word *sheol*, there was a certain man, who in that state lifted up his eyes in torment, consciousness, and saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. It is an established principle of biblical interpretation that the New Testament is to be the exposition of the Old Testament, and that the Old Testament teachings are to be interpreted in the light of New Testament statements.

Once more. I come now to the souls under the altar. He says that Dr. Clarke says they certainly were not in heaven. But who shall I believe, Dr Clarke or the Scriptures of Divine Truth? The man who wrote that declaration said he heard "a voice saying, Come up hither. And a door was opened in heaven, and immediately I was in the spirit, and I saw a throne set in heaven;" and he proceeds to discuss the whole arrangements of the

heavenly kingdom. In this wondrous vision, he saw before God a golden altar, on which was offered up much incense, with the prayers of the saints. He saw under the altar, not the blood of martyrs, but "souls," — the living principle that animates the man; not the man himself, not the blood of the man (the word from which soul is derived is not used for blood), but he saw the souls (the *psuchai*) of them that were slain for the witness of Jesus and the testimony which they held; and they cried, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell upon the earth? And white robes were given to every one of them. [Were white robes given to blood?] And it was said unto them [not unto the blood] that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." It is not the persons themselves, but the souls of the persons, that were slain. And besides, if he could establish his interpretation in this case, it would not meet the case in the twentieth of Revelations — "I saw the souls" (not the blood, for "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God") "of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, * * * and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

I remark again, in regard to this great doctrine, that the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ are the standard of Christian doctrine. The teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles do not so much as even seem, on the face of them, in a single instance, to teach the doctrine of unconsciousness in death, — not so much as *seem* to teach it. I shall give you an illustration of what I am now about to say, that throughout the New Testament Scriptures, those who believe in the unconscious state of the spirit of man in death, when they come to the New Testament quotations bearing upon this subject, uniformly refer to those quotations, not for the purpose of establishing their doctrine, but to remove those passages out of the way, that they may not stand as obstacles to its suc-

cess. To begin with the passage in Matt. x., — “Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” My friend will refer to that, probably, before he concludes; and if he does, he will attempt to explain away what appears on its face. So he will the passage in the seventeenth chapter, where Moses appeared in glory with our Lord Jesus Christ; — and so where the Saviour stood in a room with his disciples, and said, “Handle me, and see; spirits have not flesh and bones, as I have.” And so, as he has already tried to do, and probably will try to do still further, with regard to the history given of the rich man and Lazarus; and likewise when our Lord Jesus Christ said, “God is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living; for all live to him.” If God is the God of the living, and he is called the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, they have an existence still, — they have an identity, and consequently they may have a resurrection; but if man has no identity left in death, there is no possibility of any resurrection. You may make a new man, and call him Abraham, or Isaac, or Jacob, or Moses, or Adam; but, if there is no identity preserved in death, there is no possibility of a resurrection of the dead. The answer that is sometimes made to me on this point is, “God can do all things; with him, nothing is impossible.” Nothing but a contradiction or a falsehood is impossible with God, I grant. Here is a palpable contradiction. The man is blotted out, has ceased to be, has lost his identity as a man, has no conscious spirit; then there may be a new man made, but there can be no resurrection of the dead. Hence the saying of our Saviour, — Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are alive, and so are all others; God is their God, because they are alive, and they shall have a resurrection; God will fulfill his promise to them in the resurrection. The apostles and evangelists taught that the Pharisees believed in angels, in spirits, and in the resurrection; the Sadducees denied; and Paul, in view of this fact, said, “I am a Pharisee.” So also he said, “I knew a man in Christ about fourteen years ago, whether in the body or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth.” Paul must have believed, then, in the possibility of consciousness out of the body, and the possibility of his being in Paradise out of the body.

Take the case of the promise of our Lord Jesus Christ to the penitent thief, "*This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.*" Take the declaration of Paul, "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven."

What is this thing that dwells in the tabernacle here and now, groaning, and knows that "if this tabernacle be dissolved, it has a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens"? Again, he said he was in a strait between two, . . . and had a desire to depart and be with Christ, which was far better; "nevertheless," he says, "to abide in the flesh is more needful for you, and having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all, for your furtherance and joy of faith." And again he said, as quoted last evening, in the twelfth of Hebrews, concerning the inhabitants of the heavenly Jerusalem, "The spirits of just men made perfect." "But ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect."

The passages I have quoted from Revelations, — the two passages in which reference is made to the souls under the altar, and to the souls that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and the word of God, — they all, on the face of them, palpably teach the doctrine of consciousness after death; and yet my friend says he does not know a single instance, except the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, where any such thing is taught! It runs all through the New Testament. If this be the fact, then certainly I have established what the Christian doctrine is on this subject.

I come now to the notable passage in Ecclesiastes, "The dead know not anything." The importance attached to this is very great; and here I apply my axiom, already laid down, that that may be truly affirmed of the whole which may not be affirmed of its parts. Of the man as he was, it may be truly affirmed he is dead, and does not know anything; and it will never militate against the

teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ that the rich man in hades "lifted up his eyes being in torment," and that "Lazarus was comforted." It will never militate against the teachings of Holy Writ that Samuel was called up, and reproved, admonished, condemned, and pronounced sentence on Saul, King of Israel. It will never disprove the fact that Moses appeared upon the Mount of Transfiguration, and conversed with Christ. It will never disprove the statement that the souls of them that were beheaded and slain for the witness of Jesus, under the altar, cried, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell upon the earth!" Nor will it disprove or affect the existence of "the souls of those that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God."

I do not believe that the man, as a man, knows; but that the spirit in man exists out of the body, I have proved; that the spirit of man out of the body may exist in consciousness, I have established by the teachings of Holy Writ.

And now I refer you to another subject, and that is, the subject of "familiar spirits," as proof of the separate existence of man's spirit, and its consciousness after death. In the eighteenth of Deuteronomy we have a law which was established to prohibit the practice of necromancy, divination, dealing or consulting with familiar spirits, using witchcraft, or divination after any manner, declaring that the nations of the land of Canaan had practised these things, and because of these abominations, "the Lord thy God hath driven them out from before thee. Thou shalt be perfect before the Lord thy God. The Lord thy God hath not suffered thee so to do." What is this dealing or consulting with familiar spirits, and who are these familiar spirits? I will show you that they are the spirits of the dead; the Scriptures so recognize the fact.

In the eighth chapter of the prophecy of Isaiah, we read, "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter, should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." There is the evidence of the existence of familiar spirits, and the fact that the nations of

antiquity did practice dealing with familiar spirits, and the Divine declaration that it was seeking "the living to the dead," when they sought to them that had familiar spirits, and to "wizards that peep and that mutter." God established that law to prohibit dealing with familiar spirits. He declared that the thing did exist, and has thus interpreted it.

The word necromancer is from *necros*, the dead, and *mantas*, divination—divination by the dead. All this fortune-telling by those spirits who come and rap on tables, and write through mediums, or speak through mediums, and tip tables, is necromancy; it is divination by the dead. The Scriptures of Divine Truth have given it that name, and it is another proof of the existence of the soul after death.

Demonology is another proof of the fact. The Scriptures speak of "demons." They use the term frequently. Jesus Christ and his apostles have used it some seventy-five times, or more, in various forms. They never defined it. How shall we know what was meant by it? By ascertaining the usage of the times in which Christ lived, the times which preceded him, and the times which succeeded him. I quote from Rev. Alexander Campbell, in his lecture on "Demonology." He says, upon this subject, that from the most ancient times it has been the universal belief of Greeks, of Romans, of Jews, of Christians, that demons were the spirits or souls of the dead. He quotes from Moses, who spoke of the Moabites, and their sacrificing to devils, demons, and leading the Israelites into the same sin; and he antedates even Hesiod, the oldest of Greek poets, by a thousand years. David, King of Israel, in the one hundredth and sixth Psalm, speaks of the same fact. Plutarch, "the biographer," as Mr. Campbell calls him, "of all the gods," speaks in this wise in reference to this subject: "The spirits of mortals become demons when separated from their earthly bodies."

Again, he quotes from Josephus, the Jewish historian, who avowed this conviction. He says, "Demons are spirits of wicked men, who enter into men and destroy them, unless they are so happy as to meet with speedy relief." Philo says, "The souls of dead men are called demons." Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, and many others, avow the same opinion. That is the usage of the

word by Greeks, Latins, Jews, and Christians, — the Christians in the days of Christ and after Christ; — and thus is established the use of the term. Christ used it, the apostles used it, never defined it, and must have used it in its common acceptation.

SPEECH OF ELDER GRANT.

GENTLEMEN OF THE CHAIR, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Perhaps my first point now should be to meet the charge of garbling, made last evening, and repeated to-night, in all kindness, of course, though the charge does not put one in a very enviable position before an audience like this. Garbled means "sifted; bolted; separated; culled out, to serve a purpose; as, to garble a quotation."

That is the full definition Mr. Webster gives. "To cull out for a purpose." Elder Berick, the Chairman, has visited Mr. Abbott to-day, at Cambridge. The old book has been examined from which the extract I read was taken, and Mr. Abbott says that quotation is correct, and that it is not garbled in the sense in which that term is generally used, that is, to "answer a purpose." God is my witness, that I am not the man to do any such work, but that it is a faithful and truthful rendering of the sense of the passage. After making, in substance, these remarks, the following question was put to him: "Do you know of anything in Justin Martyr's writings that does, in any sense, qualify this passage, so as to add to or diminish its force?" Answer.—"I do not." Mr. Chairman, I plead "not guilty" to the charge of "garbling." Mr. Abbott gave it as his opinion that Justin Martyr did believe that the souls of the righteous were in hades.

A word in relation to my object in bringing this in, last evening, among other extracts from old writers. It was to show that these persons did not believe they should go to heaven when they died, and that the soul is not immortal; for I wish to have it established most fully, if possible, by my opponent, that the souls of the dead do go to hades, and I shall at once intrench myself behind that scripture which says, "There is no knowledge, nor wisdom, nor device, in hades" (sheol, the state of the dead).

I believe that to be a fact. You know, Mr. Chairman, that it is a very common belief among the people that, when men die, their souls go to heaven. I know clergymen who preach that there is no intermediate state. I quoted the passage for that object, to show that Justin Martyr did not believe in going to heaven at death. Mr. Abbott gives it as his opinion that Justin Martyr did believe that the souls of the righteous were in hades, and that they were conscious, but that in no instance does the soul of man ascend to heaven at death. I wished to prove from those old writers that they did not regard the men who held this doctrine as Christians. This doctrine was that of the Gnostics, and was regarded as a great heresy. "The Gnostics were a sect of philosophers that arose in the first ages of Christianity, who pretended they were the only men who had a true knowledge of the Christian religion. They formed for themselves a system of theology, agreeable to the philosophy of Pythagoras and Plato, to which they accommodated their interpretations of Scripture. They held that all natures, intelligible, intellectual, and material, are derived by successive emanations from the infinite fountain of Deity. This doctrine was derived from the Oriental philosophy." I apprehend that is one reason why Paul said, "Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy."

DR. LITCH. I believe my brother was not understood. My understanding of his object was that he produced the extract to make the impression upon the minds of the audience that Justin Martyr did not believe in a separate existence of the soul after death; and it was with a view to that understanding that I proposed to show what Justin Martyr did believe upon that subject, and that, although he did say what was quoted, yet he said much more. And, I would say, further, that perhaps the word I used ("garbled") was too strong. I certainly would not have it understood in the sense of the definition which has been given. As far as that is concerned, I exonerate my friend.

ELDER GRANT. That is perfectly satisfactory.

Perhaps I had best refer to Moses first, as I made a strong point there, and had reason to, of course, because the Lord said, Moses was *dead*. I *do* feel strong, when I have such a declaration to fall back upon. My brother

has brought forth scripture which appears to contradict this. I most firmly believe that the whole Bible harmonizes, when we understand it correctly, and I would not knowingly present anything to this audience that I thought would not harmonize with the Bible. He who made me knows I am honest in this statement. I believe, friends, what I say here, because I believe the Bible teaches it, and I claim to have no other reason.

We now turn to the transfiguration, as recorded in Matt. 17: 1—9, inclusive, and Luke 9: 27—36. Matt. 17: 1—9. — “And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them; and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him. Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and, behold, a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him. And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their face, and were sore afraid. And Jesus came and touched them, and said, Arise, and be not afraid. And when they had lifted up their eyes they saw no man, save Jesus only. And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the *vision* to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead.” There are two positions to take upon this subject. First, that it is a *vision*, like that which John beheld upon the Isle of Patmos. Things seen in a vision do not have their accomplishment while the vision is passing. John saw “a new heavens and a new earth.” They have not come yet. He saw “the souls (or persons) of them that were slain for the witness of Jesus.” Did they then exist, or was that a vision? The word rendered vision is from *horao*; to see, behold, to be admitted to witness, to see *mentally*. *Horama*, the word in the text, signifies “a thing seen, sight, appearance, a supernatural appearance, vision;” and Greenfield quotes as an example Matt. 17: 9 — *this very verse*. It is like the one John saw, a supernatural, not a natural vision, not ordinary sight. But it is certain that Jesus appeared

to them differently when there from what he did ordinarily. His countenance changed, and "his raiment became white as no fuller could whiten it;" but when he came down from the mountain he looked as before. This shows that it was a supernatural appearance. But, mark! there is nothing said about the *spirit* or *soul* of Moses being there. It is said "Moses and Elias appeared unto them." Elias, as you know, is the same as Elijah in the Old Testament. Elijah was translated; he did not die. I read in Luke 9: 27, "But I tell you, of a truth, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God." Then this vision was to show them the kingdom of God, a miniature representation of it. Christ appeared then as he will appear in his kingdom, his face shining as the sun, and clothed in raiment white as the light; and there appeared two of his subjects, Moses and Elias, talking with him, as they will appear in the kingdom.

I will notice a few other passages bearing upon this point. Acts 9: 10, 11, 12, where the same word is used that is rendered vision here. "And there was a certain disciple at Damascus, named Ananias; and to him said the Lord, in a *vision*, Ananias. And he said, Behold, I am here, Lord. And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul of Tarsus; for behold he prayeth, and hath seen in a *vision* [the same word again] a man named Ananias coming in." Did Ananias come in? No: he saw him in a vision, a supernatural appearance, coming in, as we see things in dreams, for instance, or in an abnormal condition. In the twelfth chapter of Acts, eighth and ninth verses, we have another use of the same word. — "And the angel said unto him, Gird thyself, and bind on thy sandals. And so he did. And he saith unto him, Cast thy garment about thee, and follow me. And he went out and followed him, and wist not that it was true which was done by the angel, but thought he saw a *vision*," — a *horama*. He did not know it was true until he found himself in the city, and then he was satisfied that the Lord had delivered him; but it was so sudden, so unexpected, that he thought, at first, he saw a vision.

Acts 11: 5. — "I was in the city of Joppa, praying, and in a trance I saw a vision," — a *horama*. What did he see?

“A certain vessel descend, as it had been a great sheet, let down from heaven by four corners; and it came near to me; upon the which when I had fastened my eyes, I considered, and saw four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air.” Were there actually four-footed beasts in the sheet, or was it a vision, a *horama*, an appearance? Again; Acts 16: 9.—“And a vision appeared to Paul in the night. There stood a man from Macedonia, and prayed him, saying, Come over into Macedonia and help us.” Did a man come over from Macedonia? O, no; but “in a vision he saw him there.” The man was “over in Macedonia;” but Paul sees him in a vision, just as you see people in dreams, and talk with them. “And after he had seen the vision, immediately we endeavored to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called us for to preach the Gospel unto them.” How called? By this vision.

Once more. *Horasis* is another word from the same root, employed in Acts 2:17.—“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* [the same word; not actual things, but the representatives of them], and your old men shall dream dreams.” Revelations 9: 17 (the same word).—“And thus I saw the horses in the *vision*.” Did it actually take place while he saw it?

When they came down from the mount, “Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead.” We argue that Moses appeared in a vision, not as a disembodied spirit, but just as Elijah, a real man, appeared there; just as John saw persons in a vision, and as Paul saw the man over in Macedonia.

But, taking the other view, and admitting that he was actually there, then he must have been raised from the dead; for I intend to hold to the fact declared by the Lord, “Moses, my servant, is dead.” Therefore, if he appeared upon the mount actually alive, he must have had a resurrection; and if he was not dead, certainly he needs no resurrection, nor any one else. The very reason why we need a resurrection is because people are *dead*.

But we are met by the objection, that if he was there by resurrection, then Christ was not the “first-born from the

dead ;" for we read of Christ, Col. 1 : 18, that "he is the head of the body the church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the preëminence." Now, if this means that Christ is simply the first to come from the dead, the scripture is not correct : but if it means that Christ is the first raised to immortality, then it is all plain ; for it is a fact that Elijah raised the widow's son, 1 Kings 17 : 21 ; it is a fact that Elisha raised the Shunamite's son, 2 Kings 4 : 32—35 ; it is a fact, also, recorded in Jude, ninth verse, "Yet Michael, the archangel, when, contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation." I do not know whether the dispute was about the resurrection or not, because it is not stated ; but, if my brother holds the passage to mean that Moses was there, he must have been raised from the dead, or else I do not see how we can avoid an impeachment of the Lord's testimony, when he said, "Moses, my servant, is dead." It is a fact, too, that before this event, Christ raised Lazarus, the widow's son, and the daughter of Jairus. So much on that point.

It was stated by my brother that *nephesh* (or soul) never means blood. Let me read from Lev. 17 : 14.—"For the life (*nephesh*) of all flesh is the blood thereof ;" — or the soul of all flesh is the blood. Here *nephesh* is used to represent blood ; and I might refer to many other instances, if it were necessary.

Another point is made with regard to demons. I hope to have the privilege of meeting that more fully to-morrow evening. I have some documents at home which I wish to present, particularly bearing upon this subject. But a word about necromancy. The idea was carried, if I got it clearly, that necromancy existed, and that the Jews did consult with departed spirits, or else our Lord would not have made a law against it. That looks like a sound argument. A necromancer is defined to be "one who pretends to foretell future events by holding converse with departed spirits." The word "pretends" cannot be left out without "garbling" the definition given by lexicographers. It is the *pretence*, we admit. We were referred to Isaiah 8 : 19, 20.—"And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter ; should not a people seek unto their God ?

for the living to the dead?" more fully rendered, and literally, as by Dr. Clarke, "why should ye seek unto the dead concerning the living?" Why? "The dead know not anything," and they cannot communicate anything until they know something. Really, gentlemen of the chair, I think it is a fact that the dead know not anything. Do you ask why I think so? I answer, because I read it in the Scriptures of truth, "The dead know not anything." It is in Ecclesiastes 9 : 5. I will read a little in connection, lest some should think I do not read it all; commencing with the second verse, and reading to the seventh. "All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked; to the good and to the clean, and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth and to him that sacrificeth not; as is the good, so is the sinner [What! in all things? O, no; but in some things], and he that sweareth as he that feareth an oath. This is an evil among all things that are done under the sun, that there is one event unto all: yea, also the heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their heart while they live, and after that they go to" — hades? — *sheol*? — no, it does not read so — "they go to the dead." Well, how is it when they get there among the dead? Then will they know more than all the living? "For to him that is joined to all the living, there is hope; for a living dog is better than a dead lion." What is the idea conveyed? Why, this, that anything living is better than anything dead. When a thing is dead it is not good for anything. "For the living know that they shall die." They do not know it now-a-days — do not believe it. "The living know that they shall die." How is it when they die? The living know something, "but the dead know not anything." That is the reason, gentlemen of the chair, why we think we do not get any communications from the dead; why we throw the whole system of demonology upon demons, as we shall endeavor to do, if we have opportunity. "The living know that they shall die, but the dead know not anything." But, ask some, is there not something that falls to their share? "Neither have they any more a reward" — the present tense; not, they *shall not* have; the word "shall" is not there. "Neither have they any more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished ["perished" means

wasted away, departed wholly]; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." How, then, can they come back here, and visit us in our circles, and communicate with us? Is not that having something to do with things under the sun? I should think so. Most assuredly they have a great deal to do with things under the sun, if that is the true theory of demonology. "Neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." Where are they? Job prays, in the midst of his afflictions, "O, that thou wouldest hide me in the grave" — *sheol*, the state of the dead. Well, what does the wise man say, after declaring that "the dead know not anything"? "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no knowledge, nor wisdom, nor device, in the grave [*sheol*, state of the dead] whither thou goest." ["Time."]

REPLY OF DR. LITCH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am sorry that my opponent does not consider at all my proposition, that that may be affirmed of the whole which cannot of its parts, and that of the parts which cannot of the whole; it would save him a great deal of useless labor.

Vision, he says, signifies to see. That is one of its definitions; and another is, to have a supernatural representation made to us. The meaning of all words must be determined by the connection in which they stand. How are dictionaries made? By learning the use of words by the best speakers and writers. How does it happen that each word has so many definitions? Because writers and speakers use these words in all the different senses. Here is a passage which affirms, "There appeared unto them Moses and Elias, talking with Jesus." And what was the subject of their conversation? They spoke of his decease, "which he should accomplish at Jerusalem;" not something away back in the past ages of the world, but an event then immediately pending, and soon to come to pass. It was not a vision of the past, not of the distant future, but of an impending event. *Did* they come and talk with Jesus? *Did* they speak to him on that subject?

My friend does not deny that Elijah might have come, for he was translated, and did not die. If Elijah *did* come, so did Moses. Moses, he says, God and Joshua declared were dead. But the evangelists, three of them, declare that Moses was there on the Mount of Transfiguration. There were three witnesses who saw him. That was a vision. That is one definition of the word vision — seeing. I have a vision of the persons in this house ; I see them ; and it is a true vision which I see. I have a vision ; and that was the kind of vision which those three apostles had of Moses and Elias, who appeared in glory, and talked with Jesus, and spoke of his decease, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.

God is a spirit. The labor of my friend last evening seemed to be to show that “spirit” means wind, breath. God is a spirit, — that is his substance. Man has a spirit. The spirit of God communicates with the spirit of man, as in the eighth of Romans we read, “And the spirit of God beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God.” Man’s spirit is so much allied to the spirit of God, that they may communicate with each other, — the Divine spirit may communicate to and with man’s spirit. How would it read, “The spirit of God beareth witness with our *breath* — beareth witness with our *wind*” ? The idea is preposterous. The spirit of man is recognized there as a sentient being. “What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man, which is in him ? So also likewise the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God.” The spirit of man, then, is conscious, as is the spirit of God, — not in degree, but in fact.

A few words respecting blood (*nephesh*). “The blood thereof is the *nephesh* thereof.” And why ? The same authority that declares this also says, “For the *nephesh* is in the blood.” That is the reason. It is a figurative use of the word *nephesh*, as is the use of the word “soul” figurative when it expresses the whole person. It is *nephesh*, because the *nephesh* is located in it. It is the animating principle, that gives vitality to the blood, gives it vigor and strength. When it departs, the blood coagulates, is decomposed. No matter whether the soul leaves the body, or whether the blood is drawn from the body ; as soon as it is separated from *nephesh*, it coagulates, decomposes — it is gone.

My opponent says that a necromancer is one who *pretends* to consult with the dead. I said the word necromancer is from the Greek words, *necros*, the dead, and *mantos*, divination—divination by the dead. That is the meaning of the word; not pretends to divine by the dead, but *divination by the dead*. No matter what the lexicographers may have said. They would define it according to their idea of the existence or non-existence of the thing. The lexicographers probably did not believe in the possibility of communication with the dead. But the prophet Isaiah believed in the possibility of communications with the dead. I was exceedingly happy to hear the correct interpretation my friend gave of that passage. It has fully established my position, that the meaning of the term "consulting with familiar spirits" is to go to the dead to inquire concerning, or in behalf of, the living. That is God's definition of the thing. It has existed; he has defined it; it is so; and it is an unanswerable argument in support of the doctrine of the separate existence of man's spirit. There is no getting away from it.

There is another class of passages to which I call your attention. I have been cited to the cases of the dead who were to go to their fathers. And the Lord declared to Abraham, as in the fifteenth of Genesis, "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace, and be buried in a good old age." Abraham's father died before he came into the land of Canaan, and was buried where he dwelt, in Haran. Abraham was buried in the cave of Machpelah. Their bodies did not come together—what did? He was to go to his fathers. So did Jacob declare concerning himself—"I shall go down to *sheol*, to my son, mourning." His body was buried in the cave of Machpelah; and did he expect there to meet Joseph, who he believed had been torn in pieces by wild beasts, and devoured? David said, concerning his dead son, "He shall not come to me; I shall go to him." Why could not his dead body be brought to the room where he was, if it was in an adjoining room? Or perchance he was then bending over it, with tears! The idea was, that he could go to the place of departed spirits, where he would find that son. And so of a multitude of other instances of the occurrence of the same phraseology.

It was the belief of the ancients that there was a future

state, a spiritual existence after death and before the resurrection. It was the universal belief of the nations of antiquity that the spirit of man existed after death. It is said to have been the doctrine of Plato; but it antedated Plato at least as far back as the days of Moses; and all the nations of the land of Canaan believed in the separate existence of the soul after death, and practised divination, or dealing with familiar spirits. It existed through the whole history of the Israelitish nation, and they fell into the same sin for which the nations of Canaan were driven out before the Lord and before the people. It has existed through all the succeeding ages, down to the present time. It has been the universal belief of mankind. When I say "universal," I do not mean that it has been the belief of every individual, but of the great mass of mankind; and many have believed that they have seen and conversed with departed spirits.

I know the effort that has been made to throw contempt upon this subject, but I know, by long experience and observation upon this point, that there is all but an universal opinion in the world that departed spirits do manifest themselves to men in the flesh. For the last eighteen years, I have made it my business, on all proper occasions, to avow myself a firm believer in the appearance of disembodied spirits to man; and during that time I have introduced the subject into hundreds of circles, where there were three, four, or half a dozen persons assembled, more or less; and in no solitary instance have I conversed with them ten minutes, before I have drawn forth from some one of the company, or all, a "ghost story," as you are pleased sometimes to call it, that either they themselves, or their personal friends and acquaintances, knew to have been a fact. They *know* it. And this will account for the fact that belief in the separate existence of the soul was so universal among all the pagan nations who had not the Bible. It did not come from philosophy; it did not come from Plato, or any other heathen philosopher; it came from the experience, from the observation, from the knowledge, of the great masses of men, who had become acquainted with these facts; and they indulged themselves, to a very great extent, in the same practice that now exists, of holding communication with those departed spirits.

The subject of future existence after death has thus been

canvassed. I have established from the word of God this fact, that man has a body composed of dust, a soul that is the life, — my friend acknowledges it to be the life, or living principle — he has done it on several occasions, — and a spirit, which I have proved from the Scriptures to be the intelligent element in man, which knows the things of man just as the spirit of God knows the things of God. I have shown that the spirit and soul are known to have gone from the body at death, and to return to it when life was restored. “Her spirit returned into her again.” “His spirit returned into him again.” Both soul and spirit go forth in death, return when life is restored, and take possession of the body. I have shown that the Scriptures recognize the separate existence of both soul and spirit after death, by various quotations. I have shown, too, that all that our Lord Jesus Christ says on this subject seems, on the face of it, to carry the idea of a separate state of conscious existence after death. I have given you a great variety of passages, spoken or written by Jesus and his apostles, that carry that conviction to the human mind; and I have told you that those upon the opposite side, instead of quoting them to support the doctrine they advocate, if they bring them up at all, quote them for the purpose of explaining them away; and you have had a notable example of it here this evening, — the attempt to explain away that plain, positive fact, that Moses appeared upon the Mount of Transfiguration, that he conversed with Jesus, and spoke of his decease, “that was to be accomplished at Jerusalem.”

The subject of necromancy has been attempted to be met and done away with, by showing that the definition of the word is the “pretence” of divination by the dead. I have shown you that the import of the word is “divination by the dead.” There is no “pretence” about it.

With regard to Moses. I grant that Moses is dead. He was dead when he appeared to Jesus; and yet he appeared on the Mount, and conversed with Jesus there. He was not raised from the dead. He “appeared in glory.” But Jesus was to be the first that should arise from the dead, in glorious immortality. He resuscitated men who were dead; men had been resuscitated before that time, but they were resuscitated in mortality, to die again. But Moses appeared in the same glory on the

Mount of Transfiguration with Elijah. He appeared there, as my friend suggests, as the representative of that class of persons who shall appear with our Lord Jesus Christ in his kingdom, who shall have died before he comes; and Elijah as the representative of those who shall be translated at the appearing of the Son of God.

I have thus endeavored to establish my position, that man may and does exist, in spirit, in a state of consciousness, between death and the resurrection. I shall endeavor, to-morrow evening, to enter upon another part of this debate, and produce direct evidence from the Scriptures of the truthfulness of the affirmation of the question before us, that the wicked will exist in eternal, conscious suffering; and, with these remarks, I leave the subject.

REMARKS OF ELDER GRANT.

REFERENCE was made to the child of David. David said, "I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me." Perhaps we can find where both are. In 1st Kings, chapter second, first and second verses, and the tenth, we read, "Now the days of David drew nigh that he should die." My brother seems to wonder why I do not grant his proposition, or notice it, that what may be truly affirmed of a part may not be of the whole, and *vice versa*. Whatever is true of the whole may certainly be true of every part. If I declare that my finger is mortal, then mortality applies to every part of that finger. If we find that the whole man is mortal, then we prove that every part of him is mortal. I read, "Shall mortal man be more just than God?" I there find the word "mortal" applied to the *whole man*. I find that the whole man was formed of the dust of the ground, and that the Lord called nothing else man but that which he formed of the ground. And it is declared of that man that he is *mortal*; if immortal, he cannot die. Now, let us see further what is said about David. He says to Solomon, "I go the way of all the earth; be thou strong, therefore, and show thyself a man." Where do all the earth go? To heaven? to hades, or *sheol*? * * * "So David slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David." We still hold, gentlemen of the chair, that the word "David" covers the intelligent portion of the man. Let us read further. Acts 13: 36. — "For David, after he

had served his generation, by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers and saw corruption." What idea would be formed of a favorite domestic animal, of which we should say, "It fell on sleep, and was laid in the tomb, or in the field"? Where is that animal? Has it gone away to some other sphere, some other place of consciousness? Is one death so defined, and the other so very differently, — the exact opposite? "They have all one breath." "David fell on sleep," says Paul. "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them that are asleep." And why? "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." But, supposing the dead do not rise? In 1 Cor. 15: 16-18, we read, "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." What does he mean? Does he mean to say that they have gone to some other place, and are enjoying eternal life? Imagine that, while Jesus is lying in the tomb, the second day, that you die, as my brother would have it, and go to heaven or to hades, and one inquires of you, "How did you get here? Did you come by the way of the resurrection?" — "No." — "But Paul has said, and it was just as true before he said it as after, if it was a fact, 'If Christ be not raised, . . . then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished,' and Christ is lying in the tomb; it is only the second day, and you have died while he has been lying there, and have come to paradise; you have not perished." Tell me, candid hearer, if you have got eternal life, and will exist independently in heaven or hades, if you have perished, which means come to nothing, departed wholly?

Psalm 17: 15. — "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I *awake* with thy likeness." That seems to harmonize with what we have just read. "I shall be satisfied," says David [his conscious part, certainly], "when I awake with thy likeness." When is that? At the resurrection in the last day. This "vile body" shall "be fashioned like unto his glorious body." — Phil. 3: 21. But is not David now praising the Lord in hades, or in some other place? Hear him. Psalm 115: 17.

—“The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence.” “Let the wicked be silent in *sheol*.” They are silent there; they are not wailing, they are not mourning there; they are “silent in *sheol*.” “The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into *silence*.” “I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me.” We shall find him — find him where David is, silent in hades.

Acts 2 : 29-33. — “Men and brethren,” says Peter, “let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day.” I ask, how much does the word “David” cover here? I believe it covers the whole man, and it remains to be proved to me that a man is *alive* when he is *dead*. I sometimes feel myself occupying a ridiculous position before an intelligent congregation, when I have to stand up and argue, hour after hour, to prove that a dead man does not know more than all the living, — to prove that a dead man is not alive. I am perfectly astonished at it, I confess, when I have the positive declaration that “the dead know not anything,” — “his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.” We come back to the quotation from Peter: “Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell (*hades, sheol*), neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. For *David is not ascended into the heavens*.” Where is he? He “fell on a sleep, and was laid to his fathers.” We are told that at death we go to Christ. Is Christ in hades now? I cannot believe it. “David is not ascended into the heavens; but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool.” What is the meaning here? Peter is trying to show that the promise in the Psalms does not apply to David, because

he is *dead* and buried, and saw corruption, but to Christ. He did not see corruption; but David fell on sleep and saw corruption, and was laid to his fathers; he is dead; and he said, "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness."

I will, if I have time, briefly allude to another objection, having reference to the account of Moses at the bush, Luke 20: 27—38. Certain Sadducees met Christ, and denied that there is any resurrection of the dead; and, to puzzle him, spoke of a woman who had seven husbands, and asked whose wife she should be in the resurrection. He answers, "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can they die any more (what does the word "they" represent?); for they are equal unto angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised (or, as Tyndale renders it, "shall rise") even Moses showed at the bush (how?), when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him." Or, as in Matt. 22: 31, 32 — "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Or, as in Mark 12: 25—27 — "For when they *shall* rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels which are in heaven. And as touching the dead, that they rise; have ye not read in the book of Moses how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living: ye therefore do greatly err." Now, what is the argument? Where is the point he is seeking to reach? He is among a class of persons who deny the resurrection of the dead. If these persons are alive, where is the argument? His point is that they are *dead*, and he says, Now, that the dead shall rise, Moses showed at the bush. But how did he show it, if they were not dead? Then we can see the proof that they were dead. What is the conclusion? They must live again. ["Time."]

THIRD EVENING—THURSDAY.

[The congregation were called to order at seven o'clock, when prayer was offered by Rev. D. I. Robinson. The question under discussion was then stated by the moderator, and Dr. LITCH took the floor.]

ADDRESS OF DR. LITCH.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Before proceeding with the debate, I will embrace the opportunity of correcting some impressions which I am informed exist with respect to my views. I understand some take me to be a spiritualist, in the common acceptation of that term. I am a spiritualist, so far as belief in the fact that spirits do manifest themselves and communicate to man in the flesh is concerned. I am not a spiritualist in the sense of belief in the right to seek to have them communicate. I believe it to be a forbidden practice; that the law of God has most peremptorily forbidden it, and declared that all who do such things are an abomination unto the Lord.

There is, I am informed, an impression that I conveyed the idea that the Scriptures sanction demonology. I endeavored to communicate this idea, that the Scriptures do teach that the spirits who possessed men in old times and in modern times are the spirits of dead men. I quoted from Rev. Alexander Campbell's lecture on demonology to show that that was the understanding of the ancient Greek poets, philosophers, and historians, of the Latins, of the Jews in the time of Christ, and of the Christian fathers who followed Christ; that our Saviour and his apostles used the term frequently, but never explained it, and hence they must have used it in its common acceptation. With these remarks, I will proceed to the subject.

I announced last evening that I should on this occasion direct my attention to the second part of this great subject: "Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of the eternal conscious suffering of the wicked?" I have already established, as I believe, the fact that man possesses a spiritual nature, which leaves the body at death, and exists in consciousness between death and the resurrection. If I have succeeded in this, as I believe I have unanswerably succeeded, then it follows that death is not a cessation of

conscious being. This the Scriptures abundantly teach; and the question presents itself, What is death? I reply, the penalty of God's law. God declared to our first parents, in the Garden of Eden, "In the day that thou eatest thereof (that is, "of the tree of knowledge of good and evil") thou shalt surely die;" and in pronouncing sentence on the culprit, after conviction, he said, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," and, until that time, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread. When thou tillest the earth, thorns and thistles and briars shall it bring forth unto thee." That is the penalty of God's law for original sin, for the sin of our first parents. And thus the apostle teaches in 1 Cor. xv., "As in Adam all die," so he teaches in his epistle to the Romans, "By one man's disobedience, sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death is passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." There is no human being descended from Adam who is not subject to that penalty. We derived our existence from that fountain; and we can derive nothing from a fountain that does not exist there. If Adam was subjected to death as the penalty of his offence, he could produce nothing but mortal children; and hence the Scriptures teach us that man is mortal, that is, he is subject to death. And what is death? I reply, as I have on former occasions, it is a dissolution of the man, as we read in Eccl. 12: 7 — "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." We read, also, in the second epistle of Peter, chapter one, "Knowing that I must shortly put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me. Moreover, I will endeavor that ye may be able, after my decease, to have these things always in remembrance." He understood putting off the tabernacle to be his decease. There was something in the tabernacle that should put off the tabernacle when he deceased; that is, a dissolution, separation of the spiritual and physical. That is the scriptural definition of death. But, whatever is implied in that death, our Saviour experienced it. Our Saviour died, "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." If death, as my friend upon the negative has asserted, is a cessation of conscious being, if in death the being is stricken from conscious existence, then all that appertained to our Lord Jesus Christ was stricken from conscious exist-

ence. There is no escaping that conclusion, by any possibility. But *did* our Lord Jesus Christ cease to be, when he died? His own teachings show the contrary. Upon the cross, he said to the penitent thief at his side, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Paradise is a place of delights. Our blessed Saviour, in his dying moments, said, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit" (*pneuma*). There was something of our Lord Jesus Christ that in the day of his death must be in Paradise, to fulfil the terms of his promise to the man at his side. It was not his body; that was taken down from the cross and laid in Joseph's new-made tomb, a stone laid at the door, and thus it was enclosed.

Again: if all that there was of Jesus Christ ceased to be, who sustained the universe? for of him we read that he is the being who created all things, and for whom all things were created, and that he is before all things, and that by him all things consist. The universe is conserved, or held in consistence, by Jesus Christ. If he was stricken from existence, who sustained the universe? Of Him we read, "In the beginning was the Word; the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made. With him was life, and the life was the light of man. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." In view of this declaration, would it not be blasphemy to think that this being, for three days and three nights, was stricken from conscious existence, and the universe left without its Creator?

Again, our blessed Saviour said, as you will read in John x., "No man taketh my life from me. I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." Tell me that the being who is a nonentity, who has ceased to be, who has been blotted from being, and has been in a state of nonentity for three days and three nights, can produce an entity! But to this absurdity we are driven, if the position of my friend is true; and there is no possibility of escaping it. No, my hearers, that Being who upholds all things by the word of his power, when he expired upon the cross, having committed his spirit into the hands of his Father, existed, and

I believe most faithfully fulfilled his promise to the penitent thief at his side — “This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.” Whatever death may mean, then, it does *not* mean the cessation of conscious being.

Leaving this view of the subject, I notice some of its synonyms. One of them is “perish;” as you will read in Luke 13 : 2 — “Suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they suffered such things? I tell you, Nay; but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.” These Galileans had been slaughtered, and their blood mingled with the sacrifices; it was death — “perish.” “Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower of Siloam fell, and slew them, think ye that they were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay; but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise [die] perish.” “Perish” is a synonym of “death.”

But my friend referred you last evening to the passage, 1 Cor. 15, which reads thus: “For if Christ be not risen, then our preaching is vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ; whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.” My friend said, and endeavored to leave the impression upon your minds, that it necessarily follows, if Christ be not raised, then those who have fallen asleep in Christ have ceased to have existence. No such conclusion is to be deduced from this promise. I have shown you that death is not a cessation of conscious being; I have shown you that “perish” is a synonym for “death;” and I will now show you that there may be consciousness, and yet these individuals perish. Take an illustration. Our Saviour, in his parables, referred his disciples to the lost sheep, and the lost piece of money; and to one who said, “Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep which was *lost*.” The same word which is rendered “perished” in the 15th of 1st Corinthians is here rendered “lost.” Was the sheep out of existence, and then did he find it, lay it upon his shoulder, and bear it home rejoicing, saying, “Rejoice with me, for I have found the sheep which was out of existence”? “Rejoice with me, for I have found

the piece of money which was *lost*." Had the money been annihilated? The same word is used here which, in the 15th of 1st Corinthians, is rendered "perished." So, when the prodigal son returned to his father's house, the father said, "This my son was dead and is alive again; he was *lost* [not annihilated, but he had been in distant countries] and is found." It is the same word that is used in the 15th of 1st Corinthians, and there rendered "perished." The word does not, then, necessarily imply cessation of conscious being: Anything is "perished" which is perverted, and so perverted from its original condition that it no longer performs the functions assigned to it. Suppose this arm were powerless, withered, I would speak of it as my arm, which is "perished." And why? Not because there is no arm there, not because it has ceased to exist; but because it has become perverted from its original condition, so as to be unable to perform any longer the functions for which it was designed; it has perished. That is a proper and legitimate use of the term; and it is a fair illustration. I say, anything so perverted from its original design and condition as no longer to perform its proper functions is "perished," in the scriptural use of that term. I admit that there is an extreme sense of this word, *apollumi*, which is, to cease to be, to be blotted from existence; but it does not necessarily follow, that, in any given case where it is used, that is its import.

I will endeavor, then, to illustrate the passage before us. What does it mean? God made man a living being, composed of body, soul, and spirit, to perform the functions of life. The reason assigned for his creation in Genesis is as follows: "There was not a man to till the ground." It appears there was no man to govern this new world which God had produced; so "God created man out of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul," — a living soul, having received a soul from the Almighty Creator. God's original design seems to have been that this man should continue in this condition to all eternity, and all his race, to be rulers of this lower world, which He had then created; death supervenes as the fruit of sin, and the man perishes when he dies; he can no longer perform the functions for which he was created, and is "perished." If Christ be not risen from the dead, he is eternally perished,

for there is to be no resurrection of the dead. He can never be delivered from this perished condition except by the resurrection. His dust may exist in the universe, his spirit may exist in hades, but the man that God made to accomplish the object He had in view can no longer perform those functions. This is the sense in which the apostle uses the phrase.

There is another view which will shed light upon this subject. The resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ is a demonstration of the sufficiency of the atonement. Christ declared that his blood was to be "the propitiation for our sins." "This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for you, and for many for the remission of sins." He said, I will rise on the third day, to prove the truthfulness of my assertions, and demonstrate that I am what I profess to be. If Jesus Christ's dead body had been, or could have been, presented a dead body on the third day, or after the third day, from his crucifixion, there could have been no demonstration given to the world of the sufficiency of the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ; Christianity must have died then and there; but Christ being risen, he has opened the door of life to humanity, and has demonstrated the great problem, which remained so long unsolved, "If a man die, shall he live again?" And it is faith in this fact that justifies and saves the sinner. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." If Jesus Christ is not risen, faith in that fact is belief in a lie; there is no justification; ye are yet in your sins; they that have perished [slept] in Christ are lost. They are perished, they are eternally perished; but they are not therefore blotted out of existence, any more than the sheep that was lost, or the piece of silver that was lost, or the son that was lost, had ceased to exist. They would still have existed in the invisible world — in hades.

Again, there is another synonym of "death" — and that is, "destroy." When a person is killed, he is said to be destroyed. That is true. The same remark which has been made upon the word "perish" will hold good in reference to the word "destroy," that it does not necessarily imply a cessation of conscious being. The man is destroyed. You may destroy an object, and yet all the

parts of that object may exist. You may tear the leaves from this book, and throw them down in a mass, and the cover beside them; you have destroyed the book, but you have not put out of existence one syllable of the printed matter of that book. You may destroy a man by decomposition, — and anything which is decomposed is destroyed, — but you have not destroyed the nature of his soul, which is the life, nor of his spirit, which is the intelligent power in him. They remain, they exist, in their own nature, and they exist in life. Our Lord Jesus Christ said, “Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul.” If the soul necessarily dies with the body of man, he who can kill the body can and does kill the soul, and cannot help killing the soul. Concerning the spirit, the apostle Peter has written (1 Peter 4: 6), “For this cause was the Gospel preached to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.” God lives as a pure spirit. Men die, and are held amenable to the judgment; and that they may be brought to judgment, they live according to God in the spirit; and it is on this principle, and on this principle alone, that the language of the 20th of Revelations can be realized — “I saw the dead” [not the men who were dead, but were risen from the dead, and stood there in their bodies] — “I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, * * * and the dead were judged, every man according to his works.” [“Time.”]

REPLY OF ELDER GRANT.

I WAS glad to hear my brother announce, last evening, that he purposed to-night to take up the subject which was announced on our handbills; but, as he has gone still further into questions which have been previously discussed, I suppose I must follow. I regret that this is so, and I am hoping that we may yet have a future opportunity for continuing our discussion. I will notice a few points that are in the past.

My brother defined man last evening — Man, the body; soul, the *principle* of life; spirit, the intelligent *principle*. As *principles* are not beings, not accountable, it follows

that soul and spirit are not beings, if they are *principles*. There we leave it.

2 Cor. 12 : 1—5. — “ It is not expedient for me doubtless to glory. I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ, above fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I cannot tell, or whether out of the body, I cannot tell, God knoweth) ; such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man (whether in the body or out of the body, I cannot tell, God knoweth) ; how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter. Of such an one will I glory ; yet of myself I will not glory, but in mine infirmities.” This proves nothing, as I can see, for my brother ; for it is something that took place while Paul was *alive*— we are talking about dead men. Paul speaks of that man in the third person, and we apprehend he means the same as Peter did when he was let out of prison, and “ wist not that it was true, . . . but thought he saw a vision.” We apprehend that Paul meant he did not know whether he was carried bodily into paradise, or had a vision and saw it ; but it was certainly an event that took place while he was alive, and does not refer to the dead. He speaks in another place of being “ absent in body, but present in spirit.” Not that his spirit had gone out and left his body dead ; but that, while his body is in one place, he is present with them mentally in another.

My brother remarks, “ what cannot be decomposed is immortal.” Oxygen cannot be decomposed, therefore it is immortal. Electricity cannot be decomposed, hence immortal. But, are they *conscious* ? Man can be decomposed, and, consequently, it follows he is not immortal.

Jesus appeared in a room to his disciples. I know not why this passage was brought up. If it was brought to prove a disembodied spirit, it proves too much ; for he says, “ Handle me and see ; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” He is not a disembodied spirit.

1 Cor. 2 : 11. — “ For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him ? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God.” Is spirit an entity, a being ? The “ spirit of error ” is mentioned in the Bible, “ spirit of bondage,” “ spirit of anti-Christ.” I find twenty-three different spirits men-

tioned; — are they separate entities or beings, conscious beings? There is an influence from our heavenly Father, the Holy Spirit, and there is an influence which proceeds from man.

Hebrews 12: 18. — “For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire,” &c. Macknight renders this, “Now, ye shall not come to a tangible mountain, . . . but you shall come to Mount Sion, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, . . . to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better things than that of Abel.” Then they must have bodies, if they are perfected; for my brother does not believe they are perfect until they enter the kingdom, until their bodies are raised. Dr. Clarke says, “The description in these verses does not refer to a heavenly state. . . . In heaven there is no need of a Mediator or sprinkling of blood; but these are mentioned in the state which the apostle describes.” The “first-born,” he says, are “those who first received the Gospel of Christ, and who are elsewhere termed ‘the first fruits,’ — ‘the spirits of just men made perfect.’” He says, “We cannot understand these terms without the assistance of Jewish phraseology. The Jews divide mankind into three classes: first, the just perfect; second, the wicked perfect; third, those between both. The just perfect are those who have conquered all brutal appetites and gross passions; . . . the wicked perfect are those who never repent; . . . the intermediate are those who are influenced partly by the evil principle, and partly by the good. . . . The spirits of the just men made perfect, or the righteous perfect, are the full-grown Christians.” — That is what Dr. Clarke says upon the point. But, at any rate, if this is in a future state, they are perfected, and they are not perfected without the body.

2 Cor. 5: 1. — “For we know [*we*, plural number] that if our earthly house [not houses — only one house spoken of for the whole — is it one body for all souls and spirits?] of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building [not buildings] of God, an house [not houses] not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens.” Is there a body prepared in heaven which has been there eternally, into which we

all go at death? Certainly it must be so, if my opponent's position is correct.

Well, what does it mean? In John 14 : 2, 3, we read, "In my Father's house [not in my Father's body] are many mansions. . . . I go to prepare a place for you." Paul speaks of this world's arrangement. Here is his tabernacle for a little time. If it be dissolved,—and Peter says it will be,—what will become of us? He says, "We have a building of God, an house not made with hands." John saw it in Revelations, 21 : 3.—"And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the *tabernacle* of God is *with* men,"—not *is* men. When this arrangement in this world is destroyed, we have "a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens."

My friend says he grants that Moses is dead. Well, that is just what I have been trying to prove. God says he is dead.

It is remarked that it is no matter what lexicographers say. I shall have to refer to words, by and by, and to what shall I appeal for their meaning?

DR. LITCH. To the Bible.

ELDER GRANT. The Bible is not a dictionary of words. We appeal to it for the truth of doctrine, not as a lexicon.

Nearly all believe, it is said, in the immortality of the soul and spirit. I grant it. Nearly all believed at one time that the earth stood still, and that all the planetary systems went around it;—was it true for that reason? Nearly all the world, at one time, lay in wickedness, and believed that Christ's Vicegerent was at Rome;—was it true? Are we to rest on such an argument, I ask? "To the law and to the testimony."

Samuel was referred to as proof that the soul exists in consciousness after death; but the Scriptures do not say anything about Samuel's soul or spirit coming up to Saul;—it was *Samuel*. Hence, if my brother contends for the actual appearance of Samuel, he must show how he could get to Saul; for we read that Samuel died and was buried at Ramah, sixty miles from Endor. He came up with his old mantle. Do spirits wear mantles?

Familiar spirits, we are told, are the spirits of wicked men; but the spirits of wicked men are in hades. How do they get out, and visit us in our circles at the present day? Do they go in voluntarily, and come out when they

please? or has God given them a furlough to visit their friends? I wish this point met.

We are referred to Luke, 8 : 55. — “Her spirit came again, and she arose straightway.” The word rendered “spirit” is frequently rendered “breath.” Wakefield and Thompson both render it “breath,” in this passage. James 2 : 26. — “For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.” Here we have a similar case. In the margin they put “breath.” It is the same word. No man can live without breath.

I pass now to the thief on the cross. This has been referred to frequently, and it will be thought, perhaps, that I wish to evade it, if I do not notice it. It does not read when thou *goest* into thy kingdom, but “when thou *comest*.” My brother believes that Christ has not come into his kingdom yet, and will not, until he comes the second time, personally, visibly, in the clouds of heaven. He believes this as strongly as I do, and preaches it too.

Where is paradise? We have been told it is in hades. Let us see if the Bible will not settle it. He has discarded the dictionaries; let us come to the *Bible*. Rev. 2 : 7. — “To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.” In the Septuagint, paradise is put for the Garden of Eden. We know where the old paradise was in which Adam was placed; that is not the one certainly which is referred to in Rev. 2 : 7. Is that hades? Is “the tree of life” in hades? It was not there when Adam was alive, and we do not believe it is there now. But “the tree of life” is “in the midst of paradise” somewhere. Where is it? In Rev. 22 : 2, where we have a description of the new heavens and the new earth, where the kingdom is to be, we read, “In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life.” In Rev. 2 : 7, we find the tree of life in the “midst of the paradise of God,”—now we find it is in the city of God; then paradise is there—in the kingdom. The thief said unto Jesus, “Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee to-day, Thou shalt be with me in paradise.” We are told, “He does not say to him yesterday, or to-morrow, but to-day.” If we put the comma on the other side of to-day, then it will harmonize with all the passages brought before you.

A word in relation to the comma. The original Scriptures were written without any punctuation marks, even without any spaces between the words. Punctuation is a comparatively modern invention, and it was not until the sixteenth century, I believe, that the comma was introduced at all. Let me show you the power of the comma. In Hebrews 10 : 12, we read, "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God." We are told that this teaches that Christ will never come again. The punctuation varies in different Bibles. In the English Bibles, and in many American, the comma is after forever, and reads as follows — and correctly — "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God."

Take another passage, — Matt. 19 : 28. — "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." What does "regeneration" mean? We are told, "conversion." Was Christ "converted"? That is what the punctuation makes, in many Bibles. In others it is as follows: "Ye which have followed me, in the regeneration," &c. ; which makes it all straight and plain. Now, if we put the comma on the other side of "to-day," — being, "I say unto you to-day, thou shalt be with me in paradise," — the meaning will be clear.

But we may be told that with this reading the word "to-day" is superfluous. Then we shall find many superfluities in the Bible. Deut. 15 : 15. — "Therefore I command thee this thing *to-day*." Did Moses need to tell them that it was this day? They already knew it. Again; Deut. 11 : 8. — "Therefore shall ye keep all the commandments which I command you *this day*." Again; in the eighth chapter, nineteenth verse. — "And it shall be, if thou do at all forget the Lord thy God, and walk after other gods, and serve them, and worship them, I testify against you *this day* that you shall surely perish." He does not mean they will perish that day. I recollect that on one occasion Daniel Webster said, "I speak *this day* for the Union;" and Mr. Choate, on another occasion, said, "I also speak *this day* for the Union." Why use the words "this day"? I heard a minister preaching in Bridge-

port, Conn., on this subject, and after he had preached a sermon against the position I have taken, he knelt down and prayed, "We thank thee, O Lord, to-day, that we are alive." We use "to-day" in precisely the same sense in which Christ used it in the passage we are considering. The Savior spoke as others did.

"To-day shalt thou be with *me* in paradise." Did Christ go to paradise that day? Paradise has not come yet. We have shown from the Scriptures that it is in the new earth. But after he had risen from the dead, they came to see him, and he said, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father." Then he certainly had not been with the thief in paradise. He was on earth forty days after his resurrection, and then ascended to his Father—not to himself. Said he, "I ascend unto my Father and your Father; and to my God and your God." If the thief went that day, he went forty-three days before the Saviour did, if it refers to heaven. I have yet to learn that the "tree of life" is in hades.

We leave this point now, and come to another. I am asked the question, "What is death?" I should like to refer to definitions, if I may be allowed to do so by my opponent. Says Mr. Webster, "Death is that state of a being . . . in which there is a total and permanent cessation of all the vital functions, when the organs have not only ceased to act, but have lost the susceptibility of renewed action." He also gives a theological definition—"Perpetual separation from God, and eternal torments." But you are aware that theological definitions are given by theologians and copied by lexicographers; we wish to know the meaning of words as they were used in the days of the Savior and the Bible writers. Perhaps we can settle it by looking at examples. We are referred to Gen. 2:17.—"But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." How did Adam understand that word "die"? If it means to *live*, how would we express life, or how would we express death? How would we express death, if we should not do it in the language employed in the Bible?

But we are told that Adam did not die, literally, that day; consequently that it is not literal death, but spiritual death, that is referred to. Let us look at that. "In the

day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die"—or "dying, thou shalt die," as in the margin. Which dies, the body, the spirit, or the soul? Our brother must say the spirit, or soul, we think. Then the penalty must come on that, not the body; for the conscious being is addressed, "*Thou shalt surely die.*" This phrase, "*Thou shalt surely die,*" occurs twenty times more in the Bible, and I assert that in every other instance the death is a literal death; and if my opponent disputes it, I will read every passage, for I have them before me. I repeat the assertion, that in every other of the twenty cases the phrase "*Thou shalt surely die*" refers to physical, not to moral death. Is this first example an exception? I pass on.

He asked if Adam was immortal. I have heard it stated, in a certain article of faith, "Adam was created immortal." If so, he could not die. Then what is he a probationer for? What was the object of the Lord in putting him on trial? We believe he was on trial to see whether he should have eternal life. If he was a probationer to obtain it, did he not lose it when he sinned? If he was a probationer to retain it, did he not lose it at the same time? Let us see. After he had sinned, God said, "In the sweat of thy face shalt *thou* eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast *thou* taken; for dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return." And after this, the Lord says, "Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken." If Adam was immortal, how was it going to affect him, to keep him from the tree of life? If it was *moral* death, would he restore himself to holiness by eating of the tree? Lest he should eat and live forever, he is driven out, and goes back to the dust—for I read that he lived "nine hundred and thirty years, and he died." There is but one death mentioned, and that is a penalty or punishment for sin. "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."

"But," says one, "he did not die that day." How do you know that the word "day" was not used in a spiritual sense? We are told, the Jews understood it to mean a thousand years. But, passing that, did he not commence

dying or wasting away that day? Judicially, he was a dead man. In Gen. 20: 3, we read, "God came to Abimelech in a dream by night, and said to him, Behold, thou art but a dead man." Why? On account of what he had done, this sentence should fall upon him. We say, we shall sail to Europe to-day. We mean, in sailing, we shall sail, — as in "dying, we shall die." Not that we shall get there to-day, but commence to go. So Adam commences "wasting away." The Greek of Symmachus renders the phrase, "thou shalt surely die," "thou shalt be mortal." Likewise the Syriac, which is approved by Jerome and Grotius. The Arabic renders it, "Thou shalt deserve to die." The Targum of Jonathan, "Thou shalt be subject to death." Vatabulus says, "Thou shalt be subject to death both of body and soul." *Be*, the word there rendered "in," is also rendered *after*. On this point I appeal to Parkhurst and Gesenius, Hebrew lexicographers, who both assure us that "in" is rendered *after*. Take Numbers 28: 26. — "Also *in* the day of the first fruits, when ye bring a new meat-offering unto the Lord, *after* your weeks be out, ye shall have an holy convocation." "In" and "after," in the verse, are from the same preposition found in Gen. 2: 17, which is rendered "in." They present this passage as an example. Now, if you put "after" in the place of "in," it is in harmony with all the facts. It is certain that God did not contemplate that Adam should die that very day, because He said, "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground;" and he lived nine hundred and thirty years, and then died. Satan said, "Thou shalt not surely die." I leave it with the congregation to decide which they think told the truth. Both addressed the conscious part of man. Satan negatived the Lord's positive declaration, "Thou shalt surely die." Satan says, "Thou shalt not surely die." If Adam is alive to-day, as a conscious being, in hades, did not Satan tell the truth? "*In* the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." We contend for the word "after," because it harmonizes with the context and with the facts.

The example in Num. 28: 26 is to the point, and a very clear case.

Here we have the word legitimately rendered "after;" indeed, we cannot use the word "in." Hence Parkhurst

and Gesenius give "after" as one of the words rendered from the Hebrew preposition *be*, which should be used in Gen. 2 : 17. ["Time."]

SPEECH OF DR. LITCH.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I have a high respect for Dr. Clarke as a linguist, but I do not feel myself bound by all his judgments on particular texts. If Dr. Clarke did think there was no need of cleansing heaven, the great apostle to the Gentiles taught differently. He said that it was "necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified by such sacrifices, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these;" and hence, that Christ entered heaven with his own blood, the blood of sprinkling, with which he purified those heavenly places.

My friend has asked, if spirits are in hades, how they get out, whether they have a furlough. I reply, yes, they have a furlough. You have an instance of the kind in the history of Ahab, King of Israel, who had a large number of prophets. He called them together, and asked them, "Shall I go up to Ramoth-Gilead to battle, or shall I forbear? And they said, Go up; for God will deliver it into the king's hand." Then the prophet Micaiah was called, who, after being adjured to speak the truth, said, "Therefore hear the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting upon his throne, and all the host of heaven standing on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, Who shall entice Ahab, King of Israel, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead? And one spake saying after this manner, and another saying after that manner. Then there came out a spirit and stood before the Lord, and said, I will entice him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go out and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail. Go out, and do even so. Now, therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil against thee." In 2 Thess. ii., I read, "Because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved; for this cause God shall send them a strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they

all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." Then spirits cannot come forth without the permission of their Maker; but, if it pleases him, for purposes of judgment on incorrigible offenders, and impenitent sinners, to send them forth, to exert their malign influence as a punishment for their sins, who shall say He has no right to do it?

With respect to the use of the word "to-day," I will quote a few passages. "The grass of the field, which *to-day* is;" "Sodom would have remained unto *this day*;" "It was called unto *this day*;" "We have suffered many things *this day*;" "Unto you is born *this day*;" "He began to say, *This day* is this scripture fulfilled;" "Have seen strange things *to-day*;" "*This day* is salvation come to this house;" "*To-day* is the third day;" "Thou art my beloved son, *this day* have I begotten thee;" "Called in question for *this day's* uproar;" "As you all are at *this day*;" "Called in question by you *this day*;" "All that hear me *this day*;" "*This day* is the fourteenth;" "We are blinded unto *this day*," &c. I will not quote more. The foregoing determine the scriptural use of the phrase; and its signification shows the use which the Saviour made of the words. Not only does no speaker in the New Testament announce that "to-day" or "this day" is the one in which he was speaking, but the Saviour was in the habit of announcing that events would transpire in "this day." He was in the habit of using it to indicate when the events of which he spoke would transpire. "Many will say unto you in that day;" "So will it be in the end of this world;" "The third day he will rise again;" "This night thy soul shall be required of thee;" "Thus will it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." I notice more than fifty instances thus designating the time in the future, when the events of which he spoke should transpire. Another peculiarity was in the use of the phrase, "Verily I say unto you," as in the following: "Verily I say unto you, until heaven and earth pass;" "Verily I say unto you, these things shall come upon this generation;" "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass until all these things be done." This shows the use our Saviour made of the phrase, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise." He was never in the habit of speaking otherwise.

With regard to Samuel, I have only to remark, that the history does affirm that Samuel died, and, as my friend declares, was buried—sixty miles from Endor. The same Scriptures also declare that Samuel conversed with Saul, and pronounced his doom, and reprov'd him for disturbing him and calling him up. If he was dead in the sense of total unconsciousness of being, he could not have been there; if he was dead, but yet alive in the spirit, as the Scriptures declare he did live, he could have been there. If he was dead, and yet his soul lived, as the soul may live when the body is killed, he could have been there in spirit, and not otherwise. I believe the testimony of God's truth in reference to the fact of his appearing when dead, as well as to the fact that he died.

I will now proceed with my argument. I am to show you that the punishment of the wicked is to be eternal suffering. I shall first show that it is to be suffering, irrespective of its duration. If the punishment of the wicked was simply their being stricken from existence, there could be no degrees of punishment. Suffering, and to be stricken from existence, as penalties of the law, are incompatible, they cannot coëxist. If the penalty of the Divine law embraces simply annihilation of conscious being, blotting out of existence, it cannot consist of suffering. If no part of the punishment is suffering, there can be no degrees in punishment; all must suffer alike. The first damnable sin which a man commits incurs the full penalty of the law, which is, to be stricken from existence—if that be the sole penalty. There can be no degrees of being stricken from existence; it is either to exist or not to exist; "to be, or not to be, that is the question." How can any one partly be and another partly not be, as the penalty of the law, if that penalty is, not to be? Should it be said, "But it consists partly in suffering, and partly in being stricken from existence," it would entirely change the ground. The man who is in a state of suffering, and can see no end to that suffering except by ceasing to exist, will not dread that cessation of existence; he will crave it, he will pray for it, and its coming will be no punishment to *him*. No doubt, your minds will supply you with abundant illustrations of this fact, in the agonies of humanity you have witnessed, where the poor objects of distress and misery have long prayed that they might

die, to be out of their sorrows. So it must be with every being in a state of suffering and anguish, who can see no termination to that anguish except in ceasing to be. He must pray for death; and the great penalty would cease to be a penalty to him, and become an object of longing desire—a reward. I say, therefore, that suffering and termination of existence are incompatible with each other—they cannot coëxist.

But do the Scriptures speak of the punishment of the wicked as their ceasing to suffer? I will first call attention to *Matt. 13: 40—42*, “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.” That is the punishment of the wicked, when they shall be gathered out of Christ’s kingdom, and receive their final doom. The condition into which they are cast is a condition of anguish, of suffering, of “wailing and gnashing of teeth.” Again, “There shall be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of heaven, and you yourselves thrust out.” Is that simply ceasing to be, or is it a state of bitter anguish, of despair, of torment? “Who will render to every man according to his deeds;” “to them who 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;” which will be in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus. “Tribulation and wrath, indignation and anguish,” are not cessation of being; and yet it is to that that those who are “contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness,” shall be subjected: that is the portion which awaits them.

The Scriptures represent the future punishment of the wicked, as in a lake of fire which is unconsumable. *Mark 9: 43, 44.*—“To go into hell fire; into the fire that never shall be quenched, where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched.” This language most certainly conveys the idea of a state of torment, of protracted torment, —I will not now consider how long. *Matt. 25: 41.*—“Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for

the devil and his angels. The idea of existence in fire is expressive of a state of torment and suffering the most terrible, the most extreme, of which the human mind is capable of forming a conception.

I come now to the most important text bearing on this subject in the Evangelists. Matt. 25 : 46.—“ And these shall go away into everlasting punishment ; but the righteous into life eternal.” The words here rendered “ everlasting ” and “ eternal ” are the same. They must, then, have the same meaning, and the duration of the punishment of the wicked must be as enduring as the eternal life of the saints of God. When the one shall come to an end, then also shall end the other.

My friend last evening said he, with me, believed that the punishment of the wicked would be eternal, but that it was an eternal non-existence. I submit that it is an impossibility that an eternal nonentity should be punished. That which does not exist cannot be punished. There must be a conscious being, in order to punishment. If, then, the punishment is to be eternal, — and it is to be eternal suffering, — for the word “ everlasting ” in that passage is the same precisely as in this forty-sixth verse, — then it must be eternal punishment in the fire prepared for the devil and his angels. Hence, the punishment of the wicked will be eternal conscious suffering. There is no escaping this conclusion. The word *kolasis*, rendered “ punishment ” in this passage, is elsewhere used only by John in his first epistle, where he says, “ Fear hath *torment*,” and it is there translated “ torment.” If that is the same word, and if it is the synonym of “ punishment,” then the punishment here spoken of is torment. “ These shall go away into eternal torment, but the righteous into life eternal,” — and my point is established.

There is a passage sometimes quoted from the fourth of Malachi to meet this point, and to establish the reverse, that the punishment will be an entire destruction of being. It is as follows : “ Behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven ; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble ; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch ; but unto you that fear my name shall the Son of righteousness arise, with healing in his wings ; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves

of the stall. And ye shall tread down the wicked ; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts." Now, we are asked, when "root and branch are burned up," what is there left? That depends upon what is meant by the phrase "root and branch." The *usus loquendi* of "root and branch," when these two words are used in connection in the Scriptures (and it is the only use), when applied to human beings, denotes father and son, parent and child. "There shall go forth a root out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots." Our Saviour is understood to be the subject of that prediction — a descendant of David the son of Jesse, a root and branch — the parent and the child, or descendant. So, also, "I will raise unto David a righteous branch," as in Jer. 23 : 5. It is father and son again. "I am the root and offspring of David ;" that is, I am the source from whence David derived his existence, the root from whence he sprung, the being who brought this whole universe into existence, and by whom it consists. "I am the offspring of David ;" again it is the "root and branch." This is the use of the phrase in the Scriptures, when referring to humanity. It does not, then, mean to burn them up, body and spirit, and leave them neither body nor spirit ; no such inference can be deduced from the passage. The teachings of the Word of God are so plain and so palpable upon this subject, that suffering is to be the punishment of the wicked, that I do not believe there is an infidel in existence, who looks upon this Bible impartially, who will not say that it plainly and palpably teaches the doctrine of the eternal conscious suffering of the wicked. He reads it there ; he understands it ; it is uttered in the plainest, simplest, and most positive form of expression ; and it is only when the mind has become perverted by false modes of reasoning that anything else can be deduced from the book. It is by assuming that the words destruction, destroy, perish, &c., when used in the Scriptures in reference to the final punishment of human beings, must have their extreme sense of cessation of being, which there is no necessity of applying to them. Indeed, it cannot be applied to them consistently with the harmony of Holy Writ.

There is a passage in the fifty-ninth Psalm that is sometimes quoted, at which we will glance for a moment.

Speaking of his enemies, the Psalmist says, "Consume them in wrath; consume them, that they may not be." That is a strong expression; and, if there is language within the lids of the Bible that will express the idea of an utter extinction of being, that expresses it. There is nothing stronger. And yet the context shows that such is not its meaning. "Consume them in wrath; consume them, that they may not be; and let them *know* that God ruleth in Jacob unto the ends of the earth. And at evening let them *return*, and let them *make a noise like a dog*, and *go round* about the city. Let them wander up and down for meat, and grudge if they be not satisfied." That is not an extinction of conscious being that, "consumes them, that they may not be," and yet leaves them in a state where they may "*know* that God ruleth in Jacob unto the ends of the earth." There is nothing stronger than this to prove the extinction of their being. And, if this is so, then it follows that man, after he is "consumed," after he is "destroyed," after he does "perish," may have so much of conscious being as to *know*, as to enjoy, as to suffer; and this the Scriptures teach, both in the Old and New Testaments. ["Time."]

REPLY OF ELDER GRANT.

THE subject is fairly before us now, and I am heartily glad. It has been said that "destroy" is a synonym for "death" and "perish." We admit it; but perhaps the point will be best settled by examining a little more thoroughly. We will notice a few passages on this subject.

First, Peter asked the interesting question, "What shall the end be of them that obey not the Gospel of God?" I shall endeavor to get a Bible answer to that question. In Ps. 145: 20, we read, "The Lord reserveth all them that love him; but all the wicked will he *destroy*." I wish to know the meaning of some of these terms that are employed to represent the punishment of the wicked. The word here rendered "destroy" (*shāh-mād'*) is defined to mean "to destroy," "to lay waste;" for example, "cities, altars," &c. Lev. 26: 30 is an example. "And I will destroy your high places." "Destroy" does not mean "torment," certainly. I will torment your high places, would not read well. Numbers 33; 52.—"Then you shall

drive out all inhabitants of the land from before you, and *destroy* all their pictures, and *destroy* all their molten images, and quite pluck down all their high places." It cannot mean "*torment* all their pictures." It means "to cut off," "to blot out," persons and nations, I shall give the full definitions. Mr. Pick defines this word, "to annihilate;" that is the only definition he gives. Roy defines *shah-var*, another word from the same root, "He broke, dashed in pieces, utterly destroyed."

We now come to some examples of this word. Mr. Webster's definition, perhaps, may not be out of place. "The word *destroy*," he says, "means to demolish, to pull down; as, to destroy a house; to ruin; to annihilate a thing by demolishing or burning; as, to destroy a city; to ruin; to bring to naught; to annihilate; to devour; to consume; in general, to *put an end to*, to *annihilate* a thing, or the form in which it exists." Is this a synonym of death — to *annihilate* a thing? If it is, I agree; I believe that is just what death is — to put a thing out of existence, to cease to be. If "death" does not mean *death*, how shall we define it? If "death" means *life*, how do we know that "life" does not mean death? "Destruction," says Webster — mark it! — "consists in the annihilation of the form of anything; that form of parts which constitutes it what it is." If this book be destroyed, the form of matter that constitutes it a book is annihilated. The *matter* is not annihilated, but the *form* of matter that constitutes it a book. That is a true and legitimate, not a far-fetched and "extreme definition." My brother has asserted that these are extreme definitions. I shall endeavor to show that that term belongs rather to the definitions given on the other side.

DR. LITCH. That is precisely the definition I gave. The book is torn in pieces, but not one word is annihilated. I said that "annihilated" was an extreme definition of the word "destroy." When the book is destroyed, does the book exist, if it is in annihilation?

ELDER GRANT. Does "destruction" mean to "torment"? Take an example. 1 Cor. 1: 19. — "For it is written, I will *destroy* the wisdom of the wise." Does it mean *torment* their wisdom?

We come now to some applications to the wicked. I have read one — "The Lord preserveth all them that love

him, but all the wicked will he destroy." Mr. Chairman, will it be punishment to *destroy* a man? That depends upon whether life is worth anything or not. If it is not worth anything, then destruction will be no punishment. If you do not value your life, then death will have no terrors for you; but, "all that a man hath will he give for his life;" and "what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul"—or life? We ask, again, if cessation of being is a punishment. If not, why is the criminal condemned to be executed upon the gallows wasting away with fear and anguish in view of the death that awaits him? Is not the loss of life a punishment? Admitting that the sinner is to lose his life, cease to exist, will it be any punishment? If the loss of life is no punishment, then the gaining of eternal life is no reward.

Amos 9: 8.—"Behold, the eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will *destroy* it from off the face of the earth." Psalm 92: 7.—"When the wicked spring as the grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be *destroyed* forever." The word here rendered "destroyed" is the one of which we have given the definition, *shāh-mād'*.

Take some more examples. Gen. 6: 7.—"And the Lord said, I will *destroy* man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowl of the air." *Destroy* them alike. Solomon says, "As the one dieth, so dieth the other." Are those beasts alive? are their spirits down in hades? Now, read the record of their destruction, Gen. 7: 21—23.—"And all flesh died that moved upon the face of the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man." Did the men die too? "All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, *died*." If these plain, positive scriptures do not mean that man dies, tell me how we can express it, supposing he does die. Man had the breath of life in his nostrils, the animals had the breath of life in their nostrils. Solomon declared that they have the same breath; it is common to all. "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." How strong it is made! The word there rendered "destroy" is *nāh-ghāh'*, defined to mean "to blot out, erase." When beast, and cattle, and creeping thing, were "blotted out," were they alive? If language as plain as this will allow any one to draw the conclusion that they are alive, what cannot be made out of it? It seems to me as though we might make it mean anything, prove anything.

In the fifty-first Psalm, and first verse, we have the same word, *nāh-ghāh'*, used again. It is after David had sinned, and, in making his memorable prayer, he says, "Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving kindness; according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions." Does he mean *torment* them? "Blot them out" — *nāh-ghāh* — erase them; the same word is employed in the passage from Gen. 6: 7, I have just quoted, where it is rendered *destroy*.

Take some more examples. Prov. 13: 13. — "Whoso despiseth the word shall be *destroyed*." It is the word *Ghāh-val'*, which means "to be destroyed," the simple definition. And here I remark that there are thirty-eight words in the Old Testament rendered "destroy," "destroyed," "destroyeth," and "destroying," and eleven in the New, and not one of them signifies *suffering* in the definitions given by lexicographers. It is applied to men, beasts, and inanimate objects. These words occur in the Old Testament three hundred and twenty-six times, and in the New fifty-three, making three hundred and seventy-nine in all. What conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, shall we come to on the word "destroy"? Shall we conclude that it means *to preserve, to keep alive*? Jer. 17: 18. — "Let them be confounded that persecute me, but let not me be confounded; let them be dismayed, but let not me be dismayed; bring upon them the day of evil, and *destroy* them with *double destruction*." And in Prov. 29: 1. — "He that, being often reprov'd, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy." This word, here rendered "destroy," is one to which we have referred, signifying "dashed in pieces, utterly destroyed," according to Roy's definition.

Now let us come to the New Testament. Matt. 7: 13. — "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate,

and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat." What is the word here rendered "destruction"? *Apolia*, which signifies, or is defined, "perdition," "ruin," "destruction," "death." I am particular to give you the full definition of these words. That is Mr. Donnegan's definition. "Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction," — to perdition, ruin, death, — "and many there be which go in thereat."

How long is this destruction? We turn to 2 Thess. 1 : 7—9. — "And to you, who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." The word *aionion*, here rendered "everlasting," is the same word that is rendered "eternal." The word rendered "destruction" is *olethros*, which is defined to mean "ruin," "destruction," "death," "the loss of life." Eternal loss of life — would that be any punishment? They "shall be punished with everlasting [or eternal] destruction." What is destruction? It is "the annihilation of the form of anything, that form of parts which constitutes it what it is." When a thing is eternally destroyed, is that thing eternally preserved, in conscious suffering? Am I to understand language in this way? If so, I give up all idea of understanding my Bible. It is said by my opponent that every infidel believes that the Bible teaches the doctrine of eternal misery. If so, I do not know where you will class me; for I do not believe it any more than I believe that I am flying to the moon to-night on wings of air. I do not believe it, because I believe the Bible teaches directly the opposite, as positively and plainly as language can teach.

We are referred to Matt. 25 : 46, as the strongest passage that can be found on which to rest the doctrine of the eternal conscious suffering of the wicked. I grant it. "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." The word here rendered "everlasting" is the same we found in 2 Thess. 2 : 9, — *aionion*. Matthew says, The wicked "shall go away into everlasting (eternal) *punishment*;" and Paul, in 2 Thess.,

that they "shall be punished with everlasting (eternal) *destruction*." Dr. Benson says, "The wicked shall be punished with everlasting *preservation* in indescribable agonies." Does that look like mercy and goodness? I shall endeavor to show, before I get through, that God destroys the sinner in *mercy* and love, and that it is the best He can do with him. He is so merciful, so good, so kind, that He will not let man live in eternal misery: and, for that reason, He refused to admit him to the "tree of life," after he became a sinner, lest he should become immortal, and live to all eternity in misery. How many times I have thanked the Lord for driving Adam away from that tree! As my brother says, "the stream cannot rise higher than the fountain." If Adam were now living in eternal misery, we should have to live also in eternal torment, unless we become holy. But God determined, in the beginning, that man should not live in eternal misery. I cannot preach such a doctrine. I once believed it. I now believe the opposite as honestly as I believe that Jesus is my Saviour. "These shall go away into everlasting punishment;" that is, go away into eternal *destruction*.

The word rendered punishment in Matt. 25: 46 is *kolasis*, from *kolazo*, which signifies "to curtail," "check," "prune," "to chastise," "correct," "punish."—*Liddell and Scott*. It is used twice in the New Testament.—Matt. 25: 46; 1 John 4: 18. The Analytical Greek Lexicon defines it "to curtail, to coërcé, to chastise, punish," and gives, as examples, Acts 4: 21, "So when they had further threatened them, they let them go, finding nothing how they might *punish* them, because of the people, for all men glorified God for that which was done;" and 2 Peter 2: 9, "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment, to be *punished*." The last two are from *kolazomia*, a derivative from *kolazo*. 1 John 4: 18.—"There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear; because fear hath *torment*." This is the same word, *kolasis*. The Syriac of this passage in John reads, "Fear existeth in *peril*." Wakefield renders it thus, "Fear hath *punishment*," and the new translation of the American Bible Union renders it in the same way. "These shall go away into eternal *punishment*;" the wicked "shall

be punished with everlasting *destruction*." Here we learn that the punishment is destruction. Walton and White render it "punishment." The New Covenant renders it "Fear hath punishment." Schleusner, in his Lexicon, renders it "Fear produces *constraint*." That is a very simple meaning. Fear keeps one from going forward. Stephen, a respectable writer, accepts the translation by the word "abscission," or "excision;" cut off. From what? From eternal life. "The wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." The Apocrypha—and I refer to this, because it is written in the Hellenistic Greek, which was spoken by the Jews, and is second to none as authority in establishing the *usus loquendi* of words in the New Testament—renders the word "ruin," as in Ezek. 18: 30, "So iniquity shall not be your *ruin*" (*kolasis*). So in 2 Maccabees 4: 38, "He put to death the sacrilegious wretch, the Lord repaying him his deserved punishment" (*kolasin*). Donnegan defines *kolazo*, the root, "properly, to cut off, or take from; *kolasis*, the act of clipping or pruning."

So much on that word, which is rendered punishment: "These shall go away into everlasting [eternal] punishment."

Brother Paul, what is the wages of sin? "The wages of sin is *death*." Now, I ask again, is death a punishment? That depends, as I have before remarked, on whether life is worth anything or not. But we are told, if they are struck out of existence, it is no punishment. I ask again if eternal life is any reward. Yes; the highest possible reward our Creator could give us. Then eternal death, the opposite, is the *highest possible punishment*. Weigh that, if you please. The loss is just as great to the sinner as the gain is to the righteous; one has lost all the other has gained. I ask, again, would that be any punishment? If there is any one in the hall who thinks death is not a punishment, I wish he would stand up and let me ask him some questions.

We are told by our opponent that there can be no *degrees* in punishment, if the wicked are to be destroyed. I see no more difficulty on this theory than on the theory of my brother. If one sin receives eternal conscious suffering, can ten thousand receive it any longer? Supposing the punishment to be death, when does it commence? If

a man is condemned to be executed on the gallows, when does the penalty begin? Is he suffering his penalty when he is in prison? Certainly not. "There is weeping and wailing when they come up to judgment." That is all true. The man goes to the gallows—is he suffering the penalty now? No. The halter is around his neck—is he suffering the penalty now? No. The drop falls—is he suffering the penalty now? No; for the law says he must hang by the neck till he is dead—dead—dead. When does the penalty begin? When he is *dead*. Supposing he remains dead eternally, is it eternal punishment? It is, if life is worth anything. If it is not, then death is no punishment.

A word further concerning degrees of punishment. Let me illustrate. Here is a person who has killed one man, and another who has killed fifty; we bring them up for trial, and they are pronounced guilty. Does the law say give the man who has killed fifty men fifty times as much torment as the other? What would you say to such a law? You would say that it was barbarous, and cry out for its repeal at once. We inflict the same penalty upon both, and everybody is satisfied. If there are to be as many degrees of torment as there are shades of crime, scarcely any two would be punished alike. Suppose you were traveling in some foreign land, and should hear groaning, and, on inquiring the cause, should find that the people were torturing a man. What would you think? You would say, They are heathen; for no civilized people would do so. And yet, my brother would make God do it *eternally*! "The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance." Would that I might have the privilege of stating to this congregation the blessed results of preaching the doctrine I am endeavoring to maintain! Would I could call the witnesses who have been converted from infidelity by the preaching of this truth, who declare, we can love such a God!

We can see how God can destroy the wicked in love. Let me illustrate. Suppose you have a domestic animal that has been wounded, and suffers constant pain and anguish. All your efforts to relieve it are vain, and, finally, in mercy, you take its life. So I understand God will destroy the wicked. They come up to judgment; the day of probation is over; what can be done? They are

“weeping and wailing,” calling on the rocks to fall on them;— what can be done with them? Mercy would say, “Put them out of their misery!” Love would say, “O Lord, destroy them!” God says, in the words of Obadiah, let them “be as though they had not been.” Does that mean preservation?

Punish with “everlasting destruction.” Is that eternal punishment? President Edwards, the younger, says, “Everlasting annihilation would be everlasting punishment.” Does anybody wish to dispute it? The question is not what God *can* do, but, what has he said he *will* do? He says, “all the wicked will he *destroy*.” Does it mean *preserve*? If so, how can we understand language? The wicked shall be punished with “everlasting punishment.” “The wages of sin is *death*,” not eternal suffering. But we are told that when the wicked have been in suffering as many millions of years as there are stars in the sky, sands on the sea-shore, leaves in the forest, drops of water in the ocean, then the suffering is but just begun; and that, finally, they will suffer more in one moment than all the world comprised have ever suffered, and that is only the beginning! Could we interpret the sentence of death upon a criminal in that way?

“The wages of sin is *death*.” And I hope, to-morrow evening, to call up some witnesses, whose veracity cannot be impeached, on this point. They “shall be punished with everlasting destruction.” [“Time.”]

SPEECH OF DR. LITCH.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: My friend has taken great pains to inform you that all that was on the earth, that lived at the time of the flood, died; and he wants to know if that means that they are alive. I would inform him that it is laid down as a test by the apostle Peter, whether spirits were so far alive as that we could speak to them in prison, that is, in confinement, in restriction, in custody; and he could say concerning them, “Christ, also, hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit. By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which

sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water." There was something left of them, and that something was their spirits.

What does it avail, though there be a thousand or ten thousand instances of the use of the word "destroy," in its extreme sense, if, when it is applied to man, it cannot be shown that the connection in which the word stands requires us to make the application of its extreme meaning to these cases? We have been referred to the 1st of 2d Thessalonians. — "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe in that day." That, we are told, is *apolia*, or *olethros* — eternal punishment. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction" — why, *olethros* is punishment — "from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power." That certainly is a very long punishment, a very long time to have no existence — to all eternity. But yet, I believe my friend holds, with me, that, a thousand years after they shall be punished with this "eternal destruction," they will be up here again, and that punishment cease; and then they will have to go through another eternal cessation of being.

I shall endeavor to show you to-morrow evening, the Lord permitting, what this punishment is which is everlasting. I shall show you what the meaning of this word *apolia* is, as used in the seventh chapter of Matthew, — "Broad is the road that leadeth to destruction;" — that it is not an eternal cessation of being, but that it is eternal suffering in conscious being. I have not time this evening to enter upon that argument, but I shall endeavor to do so to-morrow evening.

Our friend has informed us that to-morrow evening he will give us some authorities of weight, or to that effect. I do not recollect his exact expression. I have given authorities this evening that are of weight. I have given the testimony of the Son of God, that the punishment to which wicked men will be subjected is such as shall produce "wailing and gnashing of teeth;" that it is "to go away into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his

angels ;" that it is *eternal* punishment. But we are told that that punishment is consistent with the idea of a cessation of being, that nonentity may be punishment, and that a nonentity may be punished to all eternity. I confess that this is beyond my comprehension. I can conceive how a criminal, who is to be executed, is punished ; for there is before him a " certain looking forward to judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." It is the fearful responsibilities of another state of existence that renders the thought of departing this life so terrible to the culprit who pays the penalty of his crimes upon the gallows. His punishment is not eternal, nor does the law that inflicts that penalty contemplate it as eternal. The law contemplates it as a single act, beyond which it cannot go, beyond which it has no jurisdiction. It is only the hastening of the penalty which is already pronounced : " Evil and blood-thirsty men shall not live out half their days." That original penalty, pronounced upon Adam's transgression, escapes them, and that is all the jurisdiction human laws have. But there is certainly to be a more fearful penalty inflicted upon the wicked, when they shall have passed beyond the present state of action, and are held responsible for their own personal deeds. Our Lord Jesus Christ is represented in the Scriptures as having paid the penalty for original sin, as in the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, fifteenth chapter, " As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." He has tasted death for every man ; he will bring every human being forth from that death to which they have been subjected by the act and deed of our first parents, unconditionally on our part ; but when our blessed Saviour shall come " in his own glory, and in the glory of the Father and the holy angels, then shall he render to every man according to his works." The son shall not then die for the iniquity of the father, nor the father for the iniquity of the son ; it shall not then be said, " The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." Every one shall die for his own iniquity.

And this brings me to the penalty for our own personal sins, — it is death. It is not the first death, pronounced on Adam and his progeny, for original sin, but it is the second death. The Scriptures have defined the first death

— “Dust thou art, and unto dust shall thou return,” — a dissolution of the man ; — “then shall the dust return to the earth, as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it.” That is death — the first death. But there is as distinct a definition in the Scriptures of the second death as there is of the first ; and the penalty in the second death of our own transgression will be as truly and faithfully inflicted as the penalty for original sin. I shall not attempt a definition of that second death this evening, as my time will not permit me to go into it at large.

Were I to consult my feelings, my sympathies, I would be on the side of my friend at once ; but these are not the arbiters in this case. Sympathy has nothing to do with it. My brother says he can love a God who will blot the wicked out of existence. I can love a God who will fulfil all the threatenings of his law, let them be what they may. That is the God with whose doings *I am reconciled*, and concerning whose will I can say, “Father, not *my will*, but *thine*, be done.” If that God has declared that He will subject the wicked to torment without end, I can love him in his majesty and in his supremacy, and bow submissively to his will. The fact that this good Being has affixed penalties to his laws, which are now in the course of execution, no man can deny ; and these penalties have, for a long series of years, subjected the transgressor to the most excruciating suffering, the most bitter anguish, from which there is no deliverance but by death. How many of these poor wretches, now suffering, being constrained to live, their flesh consuming away from their bones, their eyes from their sockets, and their tongues from their mouths, praying, with agony of desire, that that event may transpire which shall release them from these terrible sufferings ! You need not go far to find them all over this great city ; and if that Being can be good, and merciful, and kind, and permit such inflictions to be borne, when transgressions have been committed, who shall limit the Holy One of Israel, and say, “You may go thus far, but if you go any further, you will cease to be that Good Being” ?

[The debate here terminated for this evening, and the meeting adjourned.]

FOURTH EVENING—FRIDAY.

[The meeting was called to order at seven o'clock, and prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Cook, of Rochester, N. Y. Elder Grant then took the stand, and spoke as follows :]

SPEECH OF ELDER GRANT.

GENTLEMEN OF THE CHAIR, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN : There were a few points mentioned by my brother last evening that demand a passing notice, though not, perhaps, a direct argument. 1 Peter 3 : 18—20 was referred to in relation to the spirits in prison, to which Christ is represented as preaching during the time he was in hades, between his death and resurrection. It reads as follows : " For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit ; by *which* also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison." What does the word " which " stand for ? The spirit that quickened him, evidently. Now, if Christ actually went down and preached to those spirits in hades, there must be *probation* there. I have yet to learn that that is the case, and that he went and preached salvation to the lost, those three days when he was in hades. Other versions make this point plainer. I will read one from Thompson's translation : " Christ, . . . being . . . brought to life by that spirit with which he went, and to the spirits which are [now] in prison, made proclamation *at the time they were disobedient*, — when the long-suffering of God was waiting once for all in the days of Noah, while the ark was a building."

When did he make the proclamation ? At the time they were disobedient. When was that ? When the ark was preparing, in the days of Noah. The simple idea is, that the spirit that raised Christ was employed in the days of Noah ; for Noah was a preacher of righteousness ; and by means of that spirit by which Christ was raised he preached to those who are now in prison — the prison-house of death.

Another point (2 Peter 1 : 13—15). — " Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up

by putting you in remembrance ; knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me. Moreover, I will endeavor that ye may be able, after *my decease*, to have these things always in remembrance." What does *decease* mean? Death. "I" and "my" are the same persons. The one who puts off his tabernacle is to *decease*. I do not see that this proves anything in favor of conscious existence between death and the resurrection.

We were referred to the case of Ahab. A lying spirit came in the mouths of his prophets, to deceive him ; and it is affirmed that this is one of the spirits of demons, and that demons are the spirits of wicked men. Several authorities were referred to last evening as showing that demons are the spirits of wicked men. Thales and Plato, two distinguished Grecian philosophers, who lived several hundred years before Christ, thought differently. Thales held that "demons are spiritual beings, who never had been embodied as men." Plato says, "The demons hold a middle place between God and men." A word from Christian writers on this subject. Tatian, who lived in the second century, says, "The demons who govern men are not the souls of men ; . . . they were ejected from the heavenly life." Theophilus Antiochenus, who was cotemporary with Tatian, says that he who tempted Eve in Paradise was "that mischievous demon called Satan." I should like to know where that demon came from who tempted Adam and Eve, if demons are the spirits of wicked men ; for it was before anybody was wicked, when Adam was good, before any one had died. Where do demons come from ? We answer, we believe them to be fallen angels, of which the Bible speaks. We believe in spirits. Angels are "ministering spirits." This we firmly believe, and that the phenomena of Spiritualism arise from demons. But we do not believe they are the spirits of wicked men, but fallen angels ; and we believe that he who visited Ahab was one of these, not the spirit of a departed man.

My brother laid considerable stress on the word *kolasis*, rendered punishment in Matt. 25 : 46. I would like to have him point me to a single classic author who gives the definition of *kolasis* as "torment."

The case of the rich man and Lazarus has been referred

to frequently. Suppose all that my brother claims is true, — that the rich man is now in hades, in torment, — that does not prove the *eternal conscious suffering* of the wicked, because it is a scene before the judgment, and we are now talking of future punishment; and, as Dr. Clarke says, when speaking of Matt. 5: 26, "Let it be remembered that, by *general consent of all* (except the basely interested), no *metaphor* is ever to be produced in proof of a doctrine." Yet, we assert again that this parable of the rich man and Lazarus is the *only* scripture that conveys the idea plainly that there is consciousness after death, and this only when it is accepted as an account of a matter of fact; and then it proves too much, for it declares that the rich man died, and the beggar died also. But, admitting all that is claimed, I cannot see that this proves the doctrine of *eternal misery*.

Matt. 10: 28. — "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to *destroy* both soul and body in hell." This, we think, proves too much; it shows that *both* are to be *destroyed*, instead of one preserved and the other destroyed. He who has power to create a man, body, soul, and spirit, as my brother claims, has power to destroy the whole man, has he not? "Fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

My opponent refers to the death of Christ as proof that spirits exist, and says, "If Christ died, then God died," &c. I do not so understand the case. God raised him from the dead. It is true our translation reads, "I have power to lay it [his life] down, and I have power to take it again;" but my brother may be aware that the word here rendered "power" is more properly rendered "liberty," "right," "authority." "I have *liberty* to lay it down, and liberty to take it again." "He laid down his life for us" — "made his soul an offering for sin," the Bible says, "and poured out his soul unto death; and God raised him from the dead." And Christ said, after that resurrection, in his last revelation to man, "I am he that liveth and was *dead*, and, behold, I am alive forevermore." The Bible asserts, again and again, that God raised him from the dead. We do not believe that *God* died, but that his Son did. We believe, with the apostle, that *Jesus* died, and was raised again.

My brother endeavors to show there will be suffering after death. We believe, most certainly, that there will be suffering; but the question is, in what will that suffering end? Pain here ends in death; will it there? There will be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth; but in what will it result? We have not intimated that the wicked will be destroyed instantly, or advocated any such idea. We are asked, if God keeps men in suffering here, may he not do it hereafter? It is true, he does permit suffering here, but the Christian feels that there is hope of relief, and if the sinner felt there was no hope, he would be glad to die; and God will allow it, in the proper time — after judgment.

Reference was made to 1 Peter 4: 6, "For this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." That is, we live as God lives, in spirit, after death. Other translations make this passage plain. Macknight's, for instance: "For this purpose the Gospel hath been preached even to the dead; that although they might be condemned indeed by men in the flesh, yet they might live eternally by God in the spirit."

Wakefield renders the same passage thus: "For this indeed was the effect of the preaching of the Gospel to the dead, that some will be punished as carnal men, but others lead a spiritual life unto God."

Tyndale renders it: "For unto this purpose verily was the Gospel preached unto the dead, that they should be judged after the manner of men in the flesh, but should live godly in the spirit." The simple idea is, we should live godly here, have the spirit of God, be like Christ, walk "as he walked."

It was remarked in relation to a certain passage of Scripture, — Mal. 4: 1, — where it is declared that the wicked are to be burnt up root and branch, that wherever these words, "root and branch," are employed, in reference to man, they refer to father and son. This is true in many instances, but it was asserted that it is true in regard to all. Prov. 12: 3. — "A man shall not be established by wickedness; but the root of the righteous shall not be moved." Does this refer to father and son? The plain idea is, that the righteous man is rooted and grounded in

his righteousness, like a tree, and cannot be moved. Rom. 11: 16. — "For if the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches." Does that mean, if the father is holy, all the children will be? The idea is, that if the first fruit be holy, the lump you make out of it is holy; if the root and the stock be holy, so will be the branches. Isa. 5: 22—24. — "Woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink; which justify the wicked for reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him! Therefore as the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust; because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel." Would their fathers be as rottenness for what the children have done? No, the father is not to answer for the child, nor the child for the father. The idea is, that the wicked man is like something all rotten at the root — good for nothing. Hence we think "*root*" does not always refer to parents, when used in reference to men.

Now, in regard to the passage in Mal. 4: 1, granting what my brother claims, that "*root and branch*" refers to father and son, does it help the matter at all? "Behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud [not all pride], yea, and all that do wickedly [not wickedness], shall be stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." What is the figure there? Look at the tree which is pulled up by the roots, and then burned, — where is the tree? Is it growing and bearing fruit? Hear an illustration of the Saviour on this point. "As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of this world." See the farmer gathering his tares into bundles, and burning them, — are they growing in the field? The illustration is a simple and forcible one, as all the Saviour's illustrations were. Another passage. He will "gather his wheat into the garner, but he will *burn up* the chaff with unquenchable fire." What is the wheat? He says it is the righteous, and the chaff represents the wicked. "Gather his wheat into the garner;" take care of that, but *burn up* the wicked, — not *keep* them *burning* eternally. My broth-

er may assert that the word "up" is not there. It is in the original, and I have the authorities here to prove it, if it is disputed; there is no evading that point.

Our friend made a point of being punished as a non-entity. We do not claim that a nonentity is punished; it is an entity that is put into nonentity. Would that be a punishment? If we were nonentities, we could not be punished. And I ask, in all candor, does God do man any wrong when He puts him back to dust, where He found him? Can we plead the right to exist after this life? All the wicked enjoy in this world is clear gain, provided they have no future existence. Hence I claim that God does the sinner no wrong, if He does put him back to dust again.

We were referred to Mark 9: 43—49. This is a strong passage, or thought to be so. "If thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than, having two hands, to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched,"—repeated twice. The word here rendered "hell" is not *hades*, but *gehenna*, and found twelve times in the New Testament. *Gehenna* refers to the valley of Hinnom, a place south of Jerusalem, where the filth of the city was cast to be burned up; and I have yet to learn that they put filth there for any other purpose than to be destroyed. And when the Savior was describing the future punishment of the wicked to the Jews, he used *gehenna* as an illustration. He did not use the word when addressing the Gentiles, and it is not found in any classic author. A parallel passage with this is in Matt. 5: 29, 30.—"If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should *perish*, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell." Supposing one member was cut off and put in there, it would burn up, would it not? Here the word rendered "perish" is *apollumi*,—"to destroy totally." Then, if the *whole man* be put in, he would be utterly consumed, would he not?

Now, I ask if the idea of unquenchable fire proves eternal misery. Will my brother claim it? Will he take the

position that that to which the term unquenchable is applied must exist eternally? Let us take an example. Jer. 17 : 27. — “ But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day, then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched.” There was an unquenchable fire at work upon the palaces of Jerusalem. When did this take place? When the Romans surrounded Jerusalem, in the year 69. Titus was desirous of preserving the Temple, and when a soldier thrust a fire-brand in and set it on fire, earnest efforts were made to preserve it; but all in vain. God had declared, “ Then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched.” Does not unquenchable fire always burn up that upon which it is preying? That was the result there; the Temple was burned in spite of all their efforts, and has been in ruins from that day to this. Supposing we see a house on fire, and gather round it, saying, “ The fire is unquenchable,” — what do we mean? That the house will burn eternally? No; simply that we cannot put the fire out. We never talk of quenching a fire unless there is something worth saving; and, to show that there is no possibility or chance of anything being left, the Scripture says, it shall all be consumed in unquenchable fire. We claim that passage; it is one of our strong pillars, even. Eusebius employs it to express the martyrdom of Christians; Cronion and Julian were scourged, and afterwards “ consumed in an *unquenchable fire*.” Now, if this phrase proves eternal existence, then those martyrs are burning in that fire to-night. Again, “ Epimachus and Alexander, who had continued for a long time in prison, enduring innumerable sufferings from the scourges and scrapers, were also destroyed in an *unquenchable fire*,”* — *pur asbeston*. What was the effect of that fire upon those Christians? It burned them up, as all unquenchable fires would do.

Now, I ask if we can find any proof from the Scriptures that shows that the wicked will exist eternally. Wetstein says, “ The *pur asbeston* denotes such a fire as cannot be

* Eusebius' *Ecl. His.*, Book 6, chap. 40.

extinguished before it has consumed and destroyed all." Bloomfield remarks, "The *pur asbeston* completes the awful image of TOTAL DESTRUCTION."

We were referred last evening, also, to the word "perish," which was said to be a synonym for "death." Let us take a few examples of that word. Job 8 : 13. — "So are the paths of all that forget God; and the hypocrite's hope shall *perish*." What is the meaning of "perish," in this passage? Why, the hope becomes good for nothing, withers away, comes to naught. Shall we put a new meaning upon the word "perish" when we apply it to other objects? Job 6 : 18. — "The paths of their way are turned aside; they go to nothing, and perish." Job, in speaking of the wicked, says (Job 20 : 5—8), "The triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment. Though his excellency mount up to the heavens, and his head reach unto the clouds, yet he shall perish forever; . . . they which have seen him shall say, Where is he? He shall fly away as a dream, and shall not be found; yea, he shall be chased away as a vision of the night." Psalm 37 : 20. — "But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." Wherever there is smoke, there is consumption of what is burning. If smoke continues to rise, the fire finds something to consume; when there is no longer anything to burn, the smoke ceases. The idea of consuming *eternally* and not burn up, is an absurdity. Dr. Clarke says, concerning this passage (Psalm 37 : 20), "This verse has given the critics some trouble. . . . If we follow the Hebrew, it intimates that they shall consume as the fat of lambs; that is, as the fat of lambs is *wholly* consumed in sacrifices, by the fire on the altar, so shall they consume away in the fire of God's wrath."

Let us take some examples from the New Testament on this point. 1 Cor. 1 : 18. — "For the preaching of the cross is to them that *perish* foolishness; but unto us, which are saved, it is the power of God." Here we have the word *apollumi* again, defined to mean "to destroy *totally*." I will give a few other examples of the use of this word. 2 Thess. 2 : 10. — (Speaking of the wicked.) — "And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in

them that *perish*, because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." Do we believe that the wicked are to perish, or continue to exist in their wickedness eternally? 2 Cor. 2: 15. — "For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that *perish*." Take another example, where the word *apolia* is used. Rom. 9: 22. — "What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to *destruction*," fitted "to perdition," "to ruin," "to death"? Hebrews 10: 39. — "But we are not of them who draw back unto *perdition* [unto "ruin," "destruction," "death"]; but of them that believe to the saying of the soul." 2 Peter 3: 7. — "But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment, and *perdition* of ungodly men," — *ruin* of ungodly men. "Behold the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall *burn them up*, saith the Lord of Hosts, that it shall *leave them neither root nor branch*." Peter speaks of that same burning day, and says, "the elements shall melt with fervent heat."

We come to another example. Phil. 3: 18—19. — "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ; whose end is *destruction* [*apolia*, "eternal ruin," "destruction," "death,"], whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things." "Whose end is *destruction*," not *preservation*. Another, in Rev. 11: 15, 18. — "And the seventh angel sounded, and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever. . . . And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great, and shouldst *destroy* them who destroy the earth," — or, as in the margin, "corrupt the earth." The word here rendered "destroy" (*diaphiro*) is defined "to destroy utterly, bring to nothing, blot out;" in a moral sense,

“to corrupt,” “He will destroy” (as in the margin) “them that corrupt the earth;” blot them out, utterly destroy them. And when? Not until the seventh angel sounds; neither does he reward until that day; consequently, men do not go to their reward at death.

Then we learn that, after the resurrection of the wicked, they are to be cast into a lake of fire and brimstone, which is “*the second death.*” A *second* implies a *first*; and the fact that there is a first and second implies that there is life between the two. How could we die a second death, until we have lived once, and ceased to live between? I read of a certain class, the righteous, who lived at the beginning of the thousand years, “but the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished.” Then they are not alive. They are in their graves, waiting their resurrection. Then “they came up, with Satan for their leader, and fire came down from God out of heaven, and *devoured* them.” What does the word *devour* mean? “To eat up,” “to consume.”

These are the words that are used to represent the punishment of the wicked. Shall we say they do not mean the same thing when applied to the wicked that they do when applied to anything else? When we see such a plain passage as this, “The day that cometh shall *burn them up*, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch,” illustrated by the tares of the field, what shall we do with it? And, again, Christ says, in John 15: 6, “If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.” I see a man cutting off branches of trees, and I say to him, “Why do you cut them off?” — “They are useless.” — “What is to be done with them?” — “They are to be burned when sufficiently dry.” What shall I understand by that? that they are to be *preserved eternally*? Here is another illustration by the Saviour. Matt. 13: 40. — “As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world.” I ask, in all candor, what shall we do with such passages as these? Again, Matt. 3: 12, “Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, but he will *burn up* the chaff with unquench-

able fire." If the fire could be put out when the chaff was partly burned, then it would not be "burned up." But, I ask, would it be punishment if the wicked were burned up? ["Time."]

REPLY OF DR. LITCH.

THOMPSON'S translation has been read. It is a free and easy translation, and not reliable as a critical rendering of the Scriptures. Macknight has been quoted; but Macknight says of the passage in 1 Peter iii., that the spirits are now in prison, and that they are the spirits of those who lived in the time of Noah; that is all I claimed in the quotation of the text. Macknight sustains me.

The point for which the passage in the first chapter of 2 Peter was quoted was to show that Peter was to put off his tabernacle—that is, his body—when he died. There is something to him, beside his tabernacle that he should put off; it is his spirit, that shall go "to GOD who gave it."

Concerning the demons, a quotation has been made from a Christian father, showing that they are devils. The word *diabolus* is never used in the New Testament in the plural number. Demon or demons are used there in both the singular and plural; but Satan is always called *Diabolus*, and never used in any other than the singular number. There are innumerable demons—legions of demons possessed one poor being; but *Diabolus* is that arch fiend who goes about seeking whom he may devour, as goes the roaring lion.

The word *kolasis* has been referred to, and was last evening. A great variety of definitions have been given. I grant that there are many definitions of the word. Among others, "chastisement," "punishment," and "restriction," were given; and that is what I believe the word means,—chastisement, punishment, for sin; and punishment is the word our translators have given as expressive of its meaning; and they have given another word, which is "torment." I have been challenged to produce, from any classic author whatever, an instance where the word is used to signify torment. I am not here to discuss what classic authors have said. I am here to

discuss the question, what do *the Scriptures* teach; and that is what they teach. I shall show you, I trust, before the evening closes, that the import of this word is "torment" — suffering, conscious suffering.

If Christ did, as my friend has shown was the meaning — or, he has said that was one criticism given upon it — have "liberty" to take up his life again, if his Father gave him that "liberty," there was something left of our Lord Jesus Christ to take it up; if he had been stricken from existence, he could not have taken it up, no matter how much liberty was given him.

It is said God did not die, but his Son did. But I read in John, first chapter, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; all things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made. The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Did this being, God in Christ, that constituted Son of God, God with us, Emanuel — did this being for three days and three nights cease to have existence, and then did he have liberty, in the state of non-existence, to take up his own existence — a nonentity to produce an entity? It is absurd and preposterous! There is no escaping this.

I do not see that anything is gained by the criticism on the phrase "live in the spirit." The authority quoted says that the meaning is, that they may live in the spirit, and eternally. So I believe that, if there had been no resurrection of Jesus Christ, they would have lived eternally in the spirit, and never have been raised again; but Jesus Christ is risen, and, being raised again, all Adam's race shall again live in the body.

There is no antithesis in the passage quoted concerning "the root" of the righteous; it is not "root and branch." In Malachi there is an antithesis; in Jeremiah there is an antithesis; in Revelations there is an antithesis. "The root and offspring of David." There is none here; why quote it? It is not an apposite quotation.

"If the root is holy, so are the branches." Here there is an antithesis; it is the source from whence springs the holiness; it is the root and the branch again. It is not so

with the body. The body is not the root of the soul, nor the soul the root of the body. God is the being who produced both; Jesus Christ is the being who produced David, and He is also David's branch.

The tares are cast into fire, and what becomes of them? My friend did not quote quite so far as that, but transferred his quotation to another passage, where the chaff is burned up with unquenchable fire. Why did he not finish the quotation in the 13th of Matthew, and tell us what became of the tares? It would not have suited his object quite as well. God is expounding the law, and sentence is the exposition of the penalty of that law. God, the Great Judge of human kind, held the court of assize, called the first transgressors to judgment, and proceeded to adjudicate the case before him. The man was condemned, and sentence pronounced. Was it he should cease to exist? Did that it not include suffering? Did he not say, concerning man, because he had done this thing, that he was doomed in the sweat of his face, and in suffering, and in toil, all the days of his life to eat his bread, until he should return to the dust — "In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life"? On the woman, also, did he not pronounce another sentence than that she should cease to exist? Did he not say, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conceptions; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shalt be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee"? To the serpent did he not say, "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"? Is not that sorrow a part of the penalty of the Divine law, as explained by the sentence, "and he shall bruise thy head"? Then the penalty of the Divine law, originally, as expounded by the Great Creator, Law-giver, and Judge, is something besides being stricken from existence; it is something more than to cease to be; it is something more than, simply, "The dust shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." The execution of that penalty is another exposition of that law. And what has it been? How terribly has the awful import of those fearful denunciations been realized during these six thousand years that have rolled over humanity since that first act of transgression was committed! Shall we say that the Judge went

beyond the penalty of the law in pronouncing this sentence, and in executing the sentence thus pronounced, and expressed *more* in pronouncing and executing that sentence than the penalty of the law included? "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Then surely the penalty of the Divine law is something more than simply to cease to be; it is something more than to die, if that is simply to cease to be. But all that I have enumerated is embraced in that penalty, "Thou shalt surely die." Everything is embraced, or the Judge of all the earth has exceeded the boundaries of the commission he had signed with his own hand.

Now, I have a few words to say in reference to Gehenna. I will not quote the passage again; that has already been sufficiently done. We have been told, concerning its fire, that it is unquenchable, in the sense that it shall not go out until what is cast into it is consumed; and I agree that that is the meaning of it in Jeremiah. But here is a passage that is guarded in a manner that no other passage in the word of God is guarded; it is expressed with an intensity and force such as is not used in any other passage between the lids of the Bible, that I know of. And what is that? Why shall not the objects cast into the fire of Gehenna cease to exist? for Gehenna, my friend assents, is the symbol of a place of future punishment—he has conceded that point, and it is all I ask. We are told, by our blessed Redeemer, that the reason why that fire shall not be quenched, and why the wicked will endure its torment, "where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched," is because ("for" is the word our translators use) "every one shall be salted with fire, even as every sacrifice shall be salted with salt." That is the reason. But what is the object of the salt? What does it do to the sacrifice, or meat-offering? It is a preserver of the meat. I have some passages to which I will briefly refer, on this point. It was a precept of the law, "Every oblation of thy meat-offering shalt thou season with salt; neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meat-offering; with all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt." (Lev. 2: 13.) It is the property of salt to preserve things from corruption. A covenant of salt is put for an everlasting or inviolable covenant. So, Numbers 18: 19.—"It is a covenant of salt forever before

the Lord." 2 Chron. 13 : 5. — "Ought ye not to know that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingdom over Israel to David forever, even to him and to his sons, by a covenant of salt?" This is the reference: as every sacrifice shall be salted with salt, so shall they that are cast into the fire of Gehenna be salted with fire. I can conceive of no stronger expression of the perpetuity of the existence of those who shall be cast into that unending, unquenchable fire, than is here given.

With these remarks, I quote from Dr. Clarke, a favorite author with my friend. He was presented here last evening for an opinion; I quote him for a criticism. "The original word, 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into life eternal,' — 'the original word,'" says Dr. Clarke, "*aion*, is certainly to be taken here in its proper grammatical sense, continued being, *aicion*, NEVER-ENDING. Some have gone a middle way, and think that the wicked shall be annihilated. This, I think, is contrary to the text; if they go into punishment, they continue to exist, for that which ceases to exist ceases to suffer."

But, my friend says he does not believe in punishing a nonentity, but taking an entity and putting him into a state of nonentity, and calling that his everlasting punishment. He asks, "Is it no punishment to cease to be?" I reply, that depends upon the condition in which you find a man. If you find him in a state of enjoyment, blessedness, glory, it is; if you find him in a state of torture, anguish, suffering, it is not. It is the object of desire, the object for which he prays. He longs and beseeches that his sufferings may terminate by terminating his existence. There is a difference between simple existence, life, and eternal life. Our life here is the presence of the soul in the body — that is the living principle; the life of the saint hereafter will be, not *psuche*, — that is not the word, — but *zoe*; and that is the word which is uniformly used, always used, whenever the future everlasting life is spoken of. Now, the natural life is the soul-life; that future life is *zoe*; — the life of God in the soul being eliminated from the life of God that is in them. That is the life that God will give his children. He that believeth in the Son of God hath everlasting *zoe*; he that believeth not the Son shall not see *zoe*. He has a soul; it is a part of his be-

ing; it is a component of that eternal piece of mechanism of the Divine hand, Man; it exists when the body is dead, and it will eternally exist as a part of his being; but the *zoeë* he will never see, if he does not believe in our Lord Jesus Christ. "He shall not see *zoeë*, but the wrath of God abideth on him." "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, should have eternal *zoeë*; and I will raise him up at the last day." That is the portion of the saints of God. The wicked shall never enjoy that renovating, renewing, life-giving eternal life-principle, and have no part in it; they are alienated from it.

Once more. I now call your attention briefly to *sheol*. Having drawn my friend forth from that region of which I have somewhere read,

"It is a land of deepest shade,
Unblest by human thought;
The dreary regions of the dead,
Where all things are forgot;"

I will endeavor to enter the place, and see what kind of a fortress he has. I am indebted for the quotation I shall now give you to my friend Mr. Bliss, of the *Advent Herald*. *Sheol* is thus defined by Robinson: "According to the notion of the Hebrews, *hades*, or *sheol*, was a vast subterranean receptacle, where the souls of the dead exist in a separate state until the resurrection of their bodies. The region of the blessed, during this interval (or an inferior paradise), they supposed to be in the upper part of this receptacle, while beneath was *Tartarus*, or *Gehenna*, the *abyss* in which the souls of the wicked were."

Now, I will give you the use made of this word *sheol*, — its literal use, — "the place of departed spirits or souls of men." You have this in the following passage (Ps. 16: 10). — "Thou wilt not leave my soul [not body] in *sheol*, neither wilt thou suffer THINE holy one to see corruption;" "thou hast brought up my soul from *sheol*;" "God will redeem my soul from the pit of *sheol*." That is its literal use.

I will now call your attention to its figurative use, as a metaphor, when applicable to any secret, low, or hidden place or measure. "Her guests are in the depths of *sheol*;" — "Thou wentest to the king with ointments, and didst increase thy perfumes, and didst send thy messengers

afar off, and didst debase thyself even unto *sheol*." Jonah, referring to his prison in the fish, says, "Out of the belly of *sheol* cried I." — "Thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be brought down to *hades*." It is used, by a metonymy, for grave, the receptacle of the body, which is represented as the mouth of *sheol*, and there are the gates of *sheol*. "Will you bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave (*sheol*)?" "If the earth open her mouth and swallow them up, and they go down quick into (*sheol*) the pit." "The Lord killeth and maketh alive; he bringeth down to the grave (*sheol*), and bringeth up." "There is no work, nor device, nor wisdom, nor knowledge, in the grave (*sheol*) whither thou goest." These are sufficient for my purpose, to show you that there is a literal use of that word, which is, a receptacle of the soul; and that there is a figurative use of the word, which is a secret or hidden place, and used to express the grave; but it is not the Hebrew word that literally expresses grave, which is *keber*; nor is *hades* the literal Greek word which expresses grave, which is *mnema*.

So much on that subject; and now for another passage in the favorite book of Ecclesiastes. "The dead know not anything." And so it was with the lad of Jonathan, *while yet alive*; he "knew not anything." It is a Hebraism, to express ignorance with regard to certain things; and the certain things concerning which the dead were said to be ignorant of, were all things that are done under the sun; as Jonathan's servant was ignorant of the covenant made between his master and his beloved friend David. The lad performed his part, but "knew not anything." He was not in a state of unconsciousness, although he "knew not anything."

My friend said he was not dissatisfied with his view of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus; but, certainly, if he is not dissatisfied with anything he has yet given of it, I do not envy him. I should certainly be most dissatisfied with anything like what he has given as an exposition of that passage.

Christ's appearance to his disciples was referred to last evening. My friend did not see what that had to do with the subject, in particular. I will inform him what it had to do with it. It shows this, that the disciples believed in the appearance of disembodied spirits; so did the Pharisees,

and the judge of our Lord Jesus Christ. The disciples believed, when they saw their Saviour come out of the room when the door was shut, that it was a spirit—*pneuma*. Did he tell them, “No; why, my disciples, there is no such thing as the appearance of a human spirit; they are out of existence as soon as they are dead”? I am real flesh and bone; handle me and see. It is me, myself. “A spirit (*pneuma*) has not flesh and bones, as you see me have”? That is what it has to do with it. It proves that the disciples believed in the appearance of spirits in human form; and our Saviour did not correct them, as he should have done, if he knew such things had no existence. He corrected their other false impressions, when they had them; and would this, if it was an error.

Thus I have endeavored to notice the most of the points my friend has brought forward. There is one passage more to which he has referred, Rev. xx. I will make a few remarks upon that. He says that “the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished.” They that “were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished.” He should remember that before the persons that had been beheaded lived again their souls were in existence, and John saw them. “I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God.” Not the *zoes*, that is, the life of God, but the *psuches*, the souls; not the souls that were beheaded, but the souls of *them* that were beheaded; and *they*—not the souls, but the persons to whom the souls belonged—“lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished.” If the souls of the righteous existed before they were raised up, so also did the souls of the rest of the dead. And, as I quoted the other evening, it is because the soul lives, the spiritual nature lives, and lives out of the body, that John could say, “I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the dead were judged out of the things that were written in the books;” and that Peter could say, “that they might be judged ac-

ording to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." ["Time."]

SPEECH OF ELDER GRANT.

My brother speaks of my exposition of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, and thinks it is not satisfactory. I do not think it is, either; for I have not attempted to give any, as the congregation well know. It is not my province to give any. I simply attempted to show that *his* exposition was not tenable. I should be glad, very glad, to give an exposition of it, but there is no time to do so. I have no difficulty with it. "The rich man died, and in hell (*hades*) lifted up his eyes, being in torment." If it was his body, he must have been buried alive; if it was his soul, it proves too much.

My brother defines soul as the "*principle* of life," and then speaks of the "souls under the altar." I confess I do not understand him. One moment the soul is the principle of life; the next, it is a being under the altar, suffering and groaning, and crying unto the Lord to be avenged! Then, again, "the spirit is the intelligent *principle*" in man's nature; another time, it is a *being* in *hades*, or in some other place, praising God, or weeping and wailing. I have yet to learn that *principles* are *beings*. I never so learned or studied philosophy, or any other science, as to be convinced that principles were entities that could be punished or rewarded, suffer or enjoy. Yet my brother declares in his works that "the soul is the principle of life," and that "the spirit is the intelligent principle." If he will say intelligent *being*, we can understand it; but we cannot understand how *principles* can do and suffer these things. He tells us the body is the man: so the Bible says. Job asks, "If a man die, shall he live again?" How can he live again, if he has not been dead? Said he, "Man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up, so *man* lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not wake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Then, if he is in *hades*, he is "asleep," and he may as well be asleep in the grave as anywhere.

Our friend referred to the salting of the sacrifices. I thought there was a little point to that "salted with fire." I am very glad my brother has brought it up. "For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt."—Mark 9: 48. He thinks this indicates that they are to be preserved eternally. We salt articles to be preserved. Supposing we should put fire in the place of salt, would it preserve them? I think not. Fire would be a strange kind of salt to preserve things. Hammond says, "The word 'salted' (from *halizo*) is made answerable to the Hebrew *mincha*, and is set by Symmachus (Isa. 51: 6) to signify *consumed*, as the whole burnt offering is consumed . . . answerable to the unquenchable fire — *pur asbeston*."

There is not an intimation in the whole Bible that the wicked are preserved in fire. What do the words "burn up" mean? Burnt up like tares, like chaff, like stubble;—why these illustrations? Why not take gold, or asbestos, that can stand fire for a little while? Christ speaks of the tares and the stubble, and says they are burned up, not *burning*. What is "burnt up"? There is something consuming, or else there is nothing consumed; and, if man consumes a little, he will finally be all consumed. Hence, I read, "Into smoke shall they consume away." Will they "*consume away*," or are we to throw aside all these scriptures, and put other words in their places, that mean precisely the opposite? Does death mean *death*? destroy mean *destroy*? burn up mean *burn up*? devour mean *devour*? Will our brother tell us what "devour" does mean? what "destroy" means? what "consume" means? what to "be as though they had not been" means? Am I all wrong? and have we a language in the Bible different from that of any other book, and the most obscure and dark of all? Does death mean *death*, I ask, or is it *life*? I used to hear about "the death that never dies;" that is very much like the life that never lives. If death means *life*, how do we know that life does not mean *death*? Paul says, "The wages of sin is death." Does he mean the wages of sin is *life*?

I call Paul up as a witness, and I wish the audience would act as jurymen; and, if I have time, I will produce everything Paul said on the subject. The only thing I regret is that I have not time to bring out the Scriptures

on this subject. Let us see if Paul says anything that carries the idea of eternal torment. In Acts 13: 40, 41, and 46, we read, "Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets, behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish . . . then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said it was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles."

This is the first time he says a word about punishment of any kind, and he has used the word "perish" to begin with, from *aphanizo*, which means "to destroy utterly," "to disappear and be heard of no more." Webster defines perish, "to waste away," "to come to nothing," "to depart wholly."

We will next examine his first letter to the Corinthians. 1 Cor. 1: 18.—"For the preaching of the cross is to them that *perish* foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." One perishes, the other is saved. A ship goes down in the ocean; a part of the crew and passengers are saved, the rest perish—are they all saved? all alive? This word "perish" is from *apollumi*,—"to destroy totally," "to kill, to bring to naught." 1 Cor. 8: 11.—"And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother *perish*, for whom Christ died?" The same word again. 1 Cor. 15: 17, 18.—"And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*"—(*apollumi*). Again, in verse 32.—"If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we *die*." There is an advantage, if Paul has gone to his reward; if he is in glory, or in some very good place, and is better off than here.

DR. LITCH. So he says.

ELDER GRANT. I have yet to find it out. "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we *die*." Does he mean, go to some good place?

Chap. 3: 17.—"If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God *destroy*; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." Does he mean preserve him? The word "destroy" signifies "to demolish, to ruin, to bring to naught, to extirpate, to kill, to devour, to consume, to an-

nihilate, to put an end to." Shall I reject these meanings, and coin new ones?

The next passage is in Paul's second letter to the Corinthians 2: 15, 16. — "For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that *perish*." [From *apollumi*.] "To the one we are the savor of death unto death, and to the other the savor of life unto life."

Now, supposing we lived in Corinth, and had these two letters before us, what conclusion should we come to about the future punishment of the wicked? — that they are to live eternally in torment?

We now come to his letter to the Galatians 6: 7, 8. — "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap *corruption*; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting." What does that mean — "shall of the flesh reap *corruption*"? [It is from the Greek word *phthora*, signifying "destruction, ruin, perdition, death."] They will reap *eternal misery*? No; they will reap "corruption." "Then," says Peter, "they shall utterly perish in their own *corruption*."

This is all Paul says on this subject in his letter to the Galatians. What conclusion will they come to in regard to future punishment? Will they believe it to be eternal misery?

We will now look at his letter to the Philippians. Phil. 1: 28. — "And in nothing terrified by your adversaries; which is to them an evident token of *perdition*, but to you of salvation, and that of God." "Perdition" means "ruin, utter destruction, eternal death." The Greek word *apolia* signifies "loss, losing, destruction." What does he lose? He loses his life. "What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and *lose* his own soul" or life? Phil. 3: 18, 19 (speaking of those who do not obey the Gospel). — "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ; whose end is *destruction*, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things." Destruction, in this passage, is from *apolia*. What will the Philippians think about punishment, supposing that they have heard or read nothing on the subject but what Paul has written? My brother speaks of the

wicked as those whose end is preservation in eternal suffering; Paul says it is "*destruction*." Indeed, I think Paul was a "destructionist." He says, "I tell you the truth."

We will look at his letter to Timothy. 1 Tim. 6: 9. — "But they that will be rich fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in *destruction* (*olethros*) and *perdition*." *Olethros* is defined to mean "ruin," "destruction," "death," "the loss of life."

Now we will see what he says to the Hebrews. Heb. 10: 38, 39. — "Now the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto *perdition* (*apolia*), but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." Verses 26—31. — "For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall *devour* (*esthia*) the adversaries." [*Esthia* is defined to signify "to devour," "to consume," as by eating and drinking.] "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Chap. 6: 8. — "That which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose *end* is to be burned." We frequently find the wicked compared to thorns, briers, and tares, "whose end is to be burned." What will the Hebrews think about punishment?

Let us see what he says to the Roman brethren; see if he is in harmony in all his letters. Rom. 2: 4—12 — (and I wish the jury would watch carefully, and see if there is any future torment here; for if there is none here, I do not think we shall find it anywhere). — "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the

day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." — [I admit the suffering, the *wrath*. There is no use in trying to show that I believe there is no suffering at the day of judgment; for I believe it; the Bible teaches that there will be. But the question is, will it be *eternal* suffering, or will it be destruction? will the pains end in death, or will they end never?] "Who will render to every man according to his deeds; to them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honor, and *immortality, eternal life*." — [Why should we seek for immortality, if we have got it? It is something to be sought for, by "patient continuance in well-doing." Immortality is that which is not susceptible of death, and knows no change.] — "But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile; but glory, honor, and peace, to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile; for there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also *perish* without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law." Here the Greek word *apollumi* is employed, which is defined, "to destroy utterly, to murder, to kill, to lay waste; from *ollumi*, to destroy, to consume, to make an end of, to perish, to come to an *end*, to die." What will the jury say to that? That is all we find in this connection.

We come to another passage, in the first chapter of Romans. Here he is describing a most wicked class, — as wicked, it seems to me, as men can be. 1: 29—32. — "Being filled with *all* unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful; who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of" — [my brother would say, *eternal misery*, surely; but what does Paul say?] — "worthy of *DEATH*." I have yet to learn that death means suffering. Suffering will produce death, but when we come to the point of being dead, suffering is over. They that do these

things are "*worthy of death.*" *Thanatos* is the word rendered death, and is defined "*extinction of life.*"

Chap. 14: 15. — "But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. *Destroy* (*apollumi*) not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." 20th verse. — "For meat *destroy* not the work of God. All things indeed are pure, but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence." Again; 8: 13. — "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall *die*;" [does he mean live forever?] "but if ye through the spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." There is the opposite — Chap. 9: 22. — "What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath, fitted to *destruction*?" — not fitted for *preservation*. 6: 16. — "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto *death*, or of obedience unto righteousness?" Once more; in his letter to the Romans, chap. 21: 21—23. — "What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is *death*." [Is death eternal suffering?] "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." [Observe the contrast!] "For the wages of sin is DEATH [*thanatos* — "*extinction of life*"]; but the gift of God is eternal life, *through Jesus Christ*." What will the Romans think about punishment?

We look next at his letters to the Thessalonian brethren, and then we shall be through with the examination. 1 Thess. 5: 3. — "For when they shall say, Peace and safety, then sudden *destruction* (*olethros*) cometh upon them," &c. 2 Thess. 2: 8—12. — "And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall *consume* with the spirit of his wrath, and shall *destroy* (*katargeo*) with the brightness of his coming." [The same word is applied to the devil. — "*Destroy* him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." *Katargeo* is defined, "to cause to cease, bring to an end, *destroy*."] "Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that *perish* (*apollumi*) because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong

delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

The next passage brings us to the close of Paul's writings on this subject. 2 Thess. 1 : 6—9.—“It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be *punished* with *everlasting* (*aionion*, eternal) DESTRUCTION (*olethros*) from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.”

What saith the jury? Does Paul teach the doctrine of eternal misery? He says, “I have not shunned to declare unto you *all* the counsel of God.” “I kept back *nothing* that was *profitable* unto you.” He has written fourteen letters, and spoken of punishment twenty-five times — hence he did not forget the subject; it was before his mind, he has spoken plainly, and he has not said *one word* about torment, nor intimated that the wicked are to suffer eternally anywhere. We call for the first scrap of proof that Paul intimated the doctrine of eternal torment. He says nothing about the restoration of the wicked after a limited punishment. He says nothing of their present conscious existence in any place of suffering, but he does declare that they shall *DIE*. That is the “profitable” counsel of God. We affirm that it is profitable, on the authority of Paul. If it was not “profitable,” he would not have declared it. We contend that the doctrine of eternal misery is contrary to the “counsel of God,” because Paul says he has not “shunned to declare . . . *all* the counsel of God,” and he has shunned to declare a word about eternal misery. Yet you will find in Paul's letters every doctrine taught in the New Testament.

Why has he not taught us the doctrine of eternal misery? Suppose we had got hold of his letters for the first time, and somebody says the wicked are to be eternally tormented; we scan every word he has written, and we find the words “death,” “destruction,” “perish,” “perdition,” to represent the punishment of the wicked, but we do not find a word about torment, — what conclusion should we come to, as honest men? Suppose Paul were

preaching to-night, and were here to speak for himself the language I have read from his writings, what would be the conclusion of this audience? — that he taught the doctrine of eternal torment?

It was said by a gentleman, last evening, that I dare not go to the New Testament. *I am in the New Testament.* I find my Savior declaring that the wicked shall be as tares, to be consumed; that they shall be cut off as a branch, and be withered. Another point: I find that the wicked are to be "recompensed in the earth." I find it declared, also, that "the wicked shall not inhabit the earth."

The Psalmist says, in speaking of the wicked, "I sought him, but he could not be found." "Thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be." Says the wise man, "The wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." — Prov. 2: 22. I find the Bible teaching that the whole earth is to be full of the glory of God, as the waters cover the sea. The wicked are to "be recompensed in the earth" — no other place is mentioned in the whole book of God. The vials of wrath are to be poured out here, and the righteous are to take the whole earth and possess it forever. Where are the wicked, then? They are converted, or destroyed. There is no alternative, if we adhere to the Bible.

Now, we ask, is it any punishment? Supposing a man is eternally destroyed, has he lost anything? As we remarked last evening, has he not lost all the righteous have gained? They have gained life; they are enjoying the kingdom, for "the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever." The Bible declares that "the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner." He will punish the inhabitants of the earth "upon the earth;" and the time is coming when everything "on the earth," and "in the sea," and "under the earth," will join in praising God. Where are the wicked then? This is a point we wish to have met. They are either converted or destroyed. The Bible says, *destroyed*. I believe it as firmly as I believe that Christ is my Savior.

A word on the immortality of the soul. Why has not

the Bible said something about it? Why have *not* the fifty different authors employed to write the Bible, in some of their sixty-six books, taught us that man is immortal? I can find no such intimation, except in the saying of Satan, "Thou shalt not surely die." It declares that man is mortal, and that he returns to the dust. Says Job, "O, that thou wouldst hide me in the grave." And he says again, "O, that my words were now written! O, that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead, in the rock forever!" I was thinking of this passage while reading Dr. Barclay's narrative of his travels in Palestine. In the cave of Pelagius, on Mount Olivet, he found engraved upon the rock this sentence: "Put thy faith in God, Domitela; no human creature is *immortal*." It seemed as though Job's wishes were accomplished. This is not the language of the heathen; they believed the soul to be immortal.

But, where will the wicked go? I ask, again, is it wrong for God to destroy them? Does my brother claim that? God says, "All the wicked will he destroy." Does he mean so? Shall we take Him, the fathers, the prophets, and apostles, to mean what they say, or something else? Shall we believe that "consume" means *preserve*, when it says, burn up "root and branch"? I ask if destruction is not bad enough. Do we wish to have it any worse? Some may say that it produces a bad effect to preach the doctrine I am advocating. But it is not so. I wish I had the opportunity to show the great good it has done. A young man came to me, last evening, and said, "You have done me some good; you have made me believe that the Bible is true." There are men here who have been brought to believe the Bible through these teachings. I know of men, who are now preaching the Gospel, who were converted from infidelity by hearing on this subject. They say, "This looks right. It is the best God can do with the wicked."

Suppose I should go up to judgment, and the Lord should say, "Have you preached the doctrine of everlasting *destruction*?" — "I have." — "Why?" — "Because I read it in thy word." — "Have you preached that the sinner would die the second death?" — "I have." — "Why?" — "Because thy word read, 'The wages of sin

is *death.*'" Here comes another, who has preached the doctrine of eternal misery, and he is asked, "Have you preached eternal torment?" — "I have." — "Why?" We think he would be speechless. And there stands a host of infidels behind him, — for I am prepared to state that a large share of the infidels are made so by the doctrine of eternal misery, — and they say, "Had you shown us the justice of God in destroying the wicked, we could have believed the Bible; but we could not believe in a God who would torment any of his creatures eternally." My great wonder is, that a much larger number have not turned infidels under such preaching. [Loud applause.]

ELDER GRANT. Don't do that.

[The Moderator expressed his surprise that the friends of the speaker should have been so inconsiderate as to make any such demonstration, and, Elder Grant's time having nearly expired, he took his seat.]

REPLY OF DR. LITCH.

My friend asks, which is the man, the body or the soul? and I answer, as I have answered before, *both*. The body is the outward man, the spirit is the inward man. The outward man perishes; the inward man, at the same time, is renewed day by day. The passages which my friend has quoted so abundantly, especially from the Old Testament, where the word "destroy" and "destruction" are used, refer to the *first* death. I have shown what *that destruction* results in. I believe, as much as he does, that God will destroy all the wicked, and that death will be their destruction. I have shown you that the destruction of the wicked and the destruction of the righteous both result in this: That "the dust shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it;" that "the righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart; and merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come; he shall enter into peace; they shall rest in their beds, each one walking in his uprightness." I believe that, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, every human being out of Christ will be destroyed — brought to death; but I do

not believe this is a cessation of conscious being ; but that, though the outward man will perish, the inward man will still continue to exist.

He asks if salting a thing with fire will not destroy the object ; and if it was to preserve, why Christ did not use some such expression as salt it with *pur asbestos*? I reply, that he did use that very word in Mark 9 : 43 and 45. — “It is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire *asbestos* ;” that is, that “shall never be quenched.” And it is thus that “every one shall be salted with fire,” as “every sacrifice is salted with salt.” “Asbestos” is the symbol of a substance that cannot be consumed by fire, and that is why my friend asked the question why Christ did not use that word.

“Whose end is destruction” (*apollumi*). I shall speak of that word hereafter, and show you what it means.

He has defied me to produce one syllable from the apostle Paul that shows the punishment of the wicked to be suffering, torment.

ELDER GRANT. *Eternal* torment.

DR. LITCH. I have produced it. He will render “to 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.” To the “eternity” of it, I will attend hereafter.

Now, I come to the summing up of the whole matter. My friend has quoted from Paul all, or nearly all, he has said on the subject of punishment,—I do not now recollect any exception ; and he has shown, I believe, in nearly every instance, that it is to “perish,” to be “destroyed,” &c. Now, whatever these words mean, whatever they are to result in, is the punishment the wicked must receive. I presume you all see that ; and I shall take up these words, and show what they mean. The first that occurs to my mind is *apolia*, as in the seventh of Matthew. “Wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to (*apolia*) destruction, and many there be which go in thereat.” Once more : The word “perish” is translated from this same word *apolia*. When the apostle Peter said to Simon Magus, who desired to purchase the gift of God with money, “Thy money *apolia* (perish) with thee, because

thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money," the same word was used. "Thy money perish (*apolia*) with thee." "Perish" and "destruction" are, then, from the same word. So the apostle Paul said, "Whose end is (*apolia*) destruction." So also the apostle Peter, "The day of judgment and (*apolia*) perdition of ungodly men." "Perdition," then, is from the same word. The three words are all translated from one Greek word. Keep that in mind. There is another Greek word which is translated "destroy," "destruction." It is *olethros*, as in 2 Thess. 1: 9, "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction" (*olethros*). Now, whatever may be the punishment that will come upon these persons, it is at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, "when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe in that day;" and it is an entirely different word from the word which is used when their final doom is in question. When their *final* doom, their future and everlasting punishment, is the subject before us, then the word *apolia* is the word that is used; and this has reference to the destruction of the wicked from the face of the earth at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. They shall live no more in this state, and that may be the destruction that is final to them. It does not blot them from existence, but it transfers them to another state, to meet another doom, which shall come on them, and there is no hope for them beyond that. The sentence that is then pronounced will never be reversed or revoked. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all his holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from the other, as the shepherd divideth the 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 to those on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; and to those on his left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." The punishment which will then begin, at the coming of Jesus Christ, on all the wicked, shall never have an end; but they shall have a resurrection at the

end of a thousand years, and live again in their bodies, and then they shall meet the second death. So much for the distinction between the two words, and the destruction to which it refers.

Apolia, then, uniformly, when applied to the punishment of the wicked, refers to the *second*, not the first death. *Olethros*, to the *first* death, which will then begin, and never end; *apolia*, to the second death, which will come out from it.

Now, what is this *apolia*? My friend says "destruction," and his authorities (and he has quoted many) say it is "ruin." "Ruin" and "destruction" are synonymous terms. A man may be *ruined* in a great variety of respects, and still exist.

Once more: The punishment of the wicked, — as we both agree, — whatever it may be, will be eternal. The Saviour declares, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Now, this same word, *apolia*, is used in the seventeenth of Revelations in reference to the beast having seven heads and ten horns. The angel came to John and said, "Wherefore didst thou marvel? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns. The beast that thou sawest was, and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into [*apolia*, the same word] perdition." Then the doom of the wicked and the beast are the same thing. What is to be the doom of the beast? "He goeth into perdition" — into *apolia*. In the nineteenth of Revelations, in the description of the battle of that "great day of God Almighty, when the beast and kings of the earth and their armies gathered together to make war against him that sat upon the horse" (Jesus Christ) "and against his army," it is said, "The beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." This is their *apolia*. This is their "destruction" or "perdition," — to be cast "into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." I do not now discuss the question what is meant by that symbol, "the beast." Whatever it may mean, it means something that

shall live, and be "cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." This is "perdition," and this is the end to which the word of God declares the wicked shall come, as well as the "beast and false prophet."

My friend has told you that the devil shall be destroyed. Well, what is the destruction to which the devil shall come? is the question; for we are coming to the point here. Wicked men are to go to *apolia*; the beast and the false prophet are to go to *apolia*; and the devil is to be "destroyed." It is not the same word, however, but *katargeo*; and we will try to find out what it means. And in the twentieth of Revelations it is revealed as follows: "And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison (the "bottomless pit"), and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together for battle; the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and 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 prophet are, and they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." This is the "destruction" of the "devil;" this is the "perdition" of the "beast;" this is the *apolia* of the "false prophet." There they are. They were put there *alive*, at the command of Jesus Christ. They have lived there a thousand years. They are there still. My friend will tell you the word "they" is inserted, that it is not in the original. I reply, it is *rightly* inserted. The word *basanisthesontai* (shall be tormented) is in the third person, plural number, and must have for its nominative the pronoun "they," not "which," or "that." "They shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." Who are "they"? This is at the end of the thousand years, and, beyond all dispute, at the beginning of that eternal age that shall never terminate, when the millennial period has entirely passed by. After describing the judgment scene, John says, "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 hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." But it is said that "death and hades"

have no rational existence, and how can they be cast there? I reply, I understand them to be figurative, the container being put, by a metonymy, for the things contained, and that the contents of death and hades, which they gave up, were "cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." The second death, then, is to be cast into the lake of fire, where the devil, the beast, and the false prophet are.

We read of them once more in the twenty-first of Revelations. "He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." But shall they be tormented there? Rev. 14: 9—11.—"And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and they have no rest day nor night who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever."

A few words on this phrase "for ever." It is sometimes said that it means a limited duration; but, whatever it *may* mean, it is the measure of the duration of the glorious reign of our Lord Jesus Christ! But what is its meaning as used by John? We will try to find his usage. Rev. 11: 15.—"And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever." My friend Mr. Reed once said, "I should not expect, if that were my only hope of eternal life, to live more than a thousand years; and I would not give two cents for all beyond ten thousand." I replied that I had a higher estimate of eternal life than that, and of "for ever and ever." I believe Gabriel spoke the truth when he said, "The Lord God shall give unto him (Jesus) the throne of his father

David, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Whatever "for ever and ever" *may* mean, when it is applied to Jesus Christ and his reign, it is a reign of which there "shall be no end." It is also the measure of the reign of all his saints, as you will read in the twenty-second of Revelations—"and his servants shall serve him." Such is the duration of the wicked; and that duration is to be beyond the millennium. It is in the eternal state, day and night, forevermore, that their suffering and torment is to be perpetuated. The sinners who "receive the mark of the beast and his image, and worship him," shall be tormented in some *place*, and "the smoke of their torment there ascendeth up for ever and ever." But our Lord Jesus Christ himself has declared, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." My hearers, if "he that despised Moses' law died without mercy, under two or three witnesses, of how much *sorer punishment*, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace?" We have thus found the definition of the second death, and who shall dispute it?

I have nothing more to say. I have closed my argument. I leave it with you, as I expect to meet it in the day of judgment. I have spoken in honesty, in sincerity, with earnestness, because I believed that the effects of what I was to say were to be met in the great day when God shall judge the secrets of men, by Jesus Christ; and, believing, as I do, that if the watchman see the sword coming, and does not warn the people from God's mouth, that the sword shall come and take that sinner away in his sins; he shall die in his sins, but his blood shall be required at the watchman's hands. In faithfulness, then, I have endeavored to spread before you the testimony of God's most holy and blessed Book. I have shown you what the first death is. I have shown you that it embraces all the sorrows produced by original sin on humanity, and the whole creation that was made subject to affliction, and waits and groans for the redemption of our body, when "the creature shall be delivered into the glorious liberty of the sons of God." And if all the sorrows that have overwhelmed this globe, and its teeming millions of inhabitants, these six

thousand years, are the penalty of *one act* of disobedience, what shall be that terrible penalty which shall be visited upon the sinner for his rebellion through the whole course of his long life against the God who made him?

I trust, my respected hearers, that you will weigh well these arguments. Look these scriptures fairly in the face. I have in no instance appealed to your sympathy. I have, by sound argument and scriptural references, presented before you what I firmly believe to be the truth; and all I ask of you is, to examine that truth for yourselves, with a candid, unbiassed judgment, compare scripture with scripture, and receive the whole testimony of God. I repeat again, that whatever the words "destruction," "perish," "perdition," may mean, they are from one word, *apolia*; it is to be cast into, and have part in, the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, and to be tormented there without limit, and it shall never end.

CLOSING SPEECH OF ELDER GRANT.

A WORD in relation to the punishment of the devil. This appears to be a very strong point, and well presented. "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." A word on forever. "*Aion* — a space or period of time, especially a lifetime; life; also, one's time of life, age; the age of man; young in age, for one's life long; an age, generation; also, one's lot in life, a long space of time, eternity, forever, an era, age, period of a dispensation, this present life, this world." I have given you the full definition, according to Liddell and Scott. I will give a few examples. Ex. 12: 17. — "And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread; for, in this self-same day have I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt; therefore shall ye observe this day in your generations by an ordinance *forever*;" — yet it has run out. 1 Sam. 1: 22. — "But Hannah went not up; for she said unto her husband, I will not go up until the child be weaned, and then I will bring him, that he may appear before the Lord, and there abide *forever*." The words forever and everlasting are used in the Bible some two hundred times in a

limited sense ; hence, we cannot found a positive argument upon this. It signifies the longest possible duration of that to which it is applied. If applied to a thing which is to be perpetual, eternal, then that is its application. Take another example. Jonah says, "I went down to the bottom of the mountains; the earth with her bars was about me *forever*;"—and that "forever" was only three days and three nights long. So I might go on with example after example, to show that that word cannot be taken as a positive argument upon this point.

I will read another passage in relation to the devil. Heb. 2 : 14. — "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might *destroy* him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." The word here rendered "destroy" is *katargeo*, which signifies, "to render inactive, to cause to cease, bring to an end, *destroy*." The same word is employed in 1 Cor. 15 : 26. — "The last enemy that shall be *destroyed* is death." And my brother believes that, and doubts not that death will be *totally* destroyed.

Once more ; 1 John 8 : 8. — "He that committeth sin is of the devil ; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might *destroy* the works of the devil." Now, if he continues working eternally, and all his subjects are at work, they will always be in advance of God, and hence justice can never be satisfied. Just so with the sinner ; if he is living continually, and continuing to sin, and growing worse and worse, justice cannot be satisfied ; he can never be *punished*, but eternally *punishing*. But the wicked "shall be punished (*finished*) with *everlasting* (eternal) *destruction*."

But we are told it is "*day and night* for ever and ever." That looks strong ! But when we let the Bible explain itself, it is all made clear. Job 26 : 10. — "He hath compassed the waters with bounds, *until the day and night come to an end*." And this torment of the devil, and those cast in with him, will only continue as long as day and night last ; that is all my brother can claim. Here we have the *positive* declaration, "He hath compassed the waters with bounds, *until day and night come to an end*." If it does not terminate, then there is no end, and the words are non-

sense. I cannot believe the Lord spoke carelessly. Day and night are to continue until we enter upon the new dispensation, that is, the new earth; and that is to be filled with the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea, and there can be no night there. Hence the New Jerusalem needs no light of the sun; "for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof." But his glory is to fill the *whole earth*; then it will be all light. The wicked are to be punished "upon the earth," and they cannot be taken away by the devil to be punished anywhere else.

The day and night of Rev. 20 : 10 cannot be any longer than the one in Job 26 : 10. The very last we hear of the wicked, they are cast into "the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the *second death*." — Rev. 21 : 8. But the day and night are to come to an end; then the torment of the devil will come to an end. If he is not destroyed, then the words are not correct. It says "*destroy*;" it does not mean *preserve*. Then we will have a clear universe again. The devil and all the wicked are destroyed. Then "all shall" "know the Lord," "from the least to the greatest;" and then, saith the Lord, "they shall not hurt nor destroy, in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be *full* of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

A word on Rev. 14 : 11—12. — "The smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." It is only while day and night last. This is evidently a symbolical punishment, on a symbolical power, which is to take place *before* the final judgment. Do the saints need to have "patience" after the wicked are separated from them, and taken to their punishment, and the righteous are safe in heaven? "Another angel came" with "a sharp sickle," "for the harvest of the earth is ripe." This represents the gathering of the wicked for punishment. We follow along, and we come to the seven angels that have the seven *last plagues*, and "in them is *filled up* the wrath of God;" and we wish to see where they pour them out. We must accept the scripture, which declares the wicked shall be punished "upon the *earth*." "And *after* that I looked, and, behold, the temple of the tabernacle of

the testimony in heaven was opened, and the seven angels came out of the temple, having the seven plagues, clothed in pure and white linen, and having their breasts girded with golden girdles. And one of the four beasts gave unto the seven angels seven golden vials full of the wrath of God, who liveth for ever and ever. And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power [there was where they began their work]; and no man was able to enter into the temple, till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled; — “for in them is filled up the wrath of God.” Now, if these plagues are to continue eternally in their pouring out, then no man can ever go into the temple of God. Then comes the punishment of the wicked, and they are finally devoured by fire that “comes down from God out of heaven.” Then he makes a new earth. — “Behold, I make all things new.” John says, “I saw a new heaven and a new earth;” and we are restored to Eden.

My brother believes that there is to be a place somewhere for the wicked; but David, speaking of the wicked, says, “I sought him and he could not be found.” They were “no more;” they were “rooted out of the earth.”

Here I leave the subject, and will say, with my brother, that what I have said I have said honestly; I have said it because I felt it; and if they were the last words I were to utter, I should have to say what I have said. I believe most firmly in the position I have advanced — that the wicked shall be destroyed. And I would like to present a picture of the other side, as drawn by a popular writer on that subject. Thus speaks Mr. Bolton:

“If the several pains of *all* the diseases and maladies incident to human nature, and *all* the most exquisite and unheard of *tortures*, which ever *were* or *shall* be inflicted upon miserable man, were *all* collected into *one extreme anguish*, it were *nothing* to the *torment* which shall *forever* possess and plague the *least* part of a damned *body*.

“As for the *soul*, let *all* the *griefs*, *horrors*, and *despairs*, that ever rent in pieces any heavy heart and vexed conscience, be heaped together into *one extreme horror*, and yet it would come *infinitely short* of that desperate rage and restless anguish which shall ETERNALLY TORTURE the *least* and *lowest* faculty of the *soul*.”

In speaking of its duration, he says:

“Let us suppose this great body of the earth to be turned into sand, and mountains of sand to be added still, until they reach into the empyrean (or highest heaven), so that this whole mighty creation were nothing but a sandy mountain; let us then further imagine a little wren to come but every *one hundred thousandth year* and carry away but the *tenth part of one grain* of that *immeasurable* heap of sand; and yet when thou hast lain so many *years* in that *fiery lake*, thou art *no nearer coming out than the very first hour thou enteredst in.*”

And yet, God declares that it is “death,” and “destruction,” and “ruin,” and “perdition,” and being “extinguished,” and “burned up;” and it means *eternal preservation*, as Mr. Bolton says! Can I believe it? Shall you call me an infidel if I do not believe it? Then I will bear the reproach until I go to see Him who died to save you and me, and praise Him eternally for the blessed doctrine, — that God is so good, so kind, he will not let men live eternally in misery, but will put them out of misery, and let them be “as though they had not been.”

A word on the doctrines that rest on the idea of the immortality of the soul. First, it causes the worship of heroes; second, the worship of saints; third, prayers to the saints; fourth, the doctrine of purgatory; fifth, the slaying of wives and servants in heathen countries, to wait on the souls of the departed in the other world; sixth, Swedenborgianism, Shakerism, Spiritualism; and last, not least, the doctrine of eternal misery.

If man is an immortal soul, of consequence he must exist eternally in misery, or else be saved; it is either eternal misery, or universal salvation. It cannot be universal salvation, if we adhere to the Bible, for that teaches that all the wicked are to be destroyed; then it is eternal misery. Which shall we believe? Which sets the character of our heavenly Father in the truest light?

May we so believe the Bible as to obey it, that we may escape “the second death,” that oblivion’s waves may never sweep over us! It is our privilege to live forever; but, remember, “The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”