

Immortality In Christ Or Eternal Death.

<http://www.creationisonline.com/TSK/Immortality.html>

Being two lectures delivered in the music hall, Birkenhead, on Tuesday and Thursday, January 26th And 28th, 1875,

By Henry Smith Warleigh,
(Rector of Ashchurch, Tewkesbury,)
In reply to the Rev. H. P. Linton, M.A., and the Rev. A. M. Symington, B.A.,

WITH DISCUSSION THEREON.
Capt. H. J. WARD in the Chair.

SUBJECTS OF LECTURES:

- 1.—Is Man Naturally Immortal; or, Is Immortality the Gift of God in Christ only?
- 2.—Is Evil to be Eternal; or, Shall there be a Final Extinction of all Evil Persons and Things?

Is man naturally immortal? Or is immortality the gift of God in Christ only?

WITH DISCUSSION THEREON.

IT is not because controversy suits my disposition, but because we are told to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," that I have accepted the invitation of my friend Captain Ward, and that I presume to present myself before you to give a lecture, or rather attempt to give a lecture, upon the subject printed on the placards. I have said my motive is to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, and I am bold to say that the natural, unconditional immortality of the soul is not part of the faith once delivered to the saints. I am equally bold in affirming that the dogma of endless torment is not part of the faith once delivered to the saints. I therefore coincide with the announcement of the chairman, that this doctrine is not found in the Bible. It cannot be found in genuine writings of the apostolical fathers. Those who are read in that literature know how exceedingly difficult it is in the present day to point out who was the author of many ancient treatises, as also to point out what part of the treatise is genuine and what is forged. Upon that point I am happy to be able to agree with Mr. Symington. He told you that the church to which he belonged made no account whatever of those called the fathers of the Church. He said, in effect, that they were children in theology, though big men, fit to be burned. I suppose he meant that their volumes, being so large, would make a bonfire. I am happy to be able to say, as a clergyman of the Church of England, that the doctrine is not found in her articles or formularies. When I was impelled, now some time ago, to publish a defense of a Christian brother, now in London,—I refer to Mr. Minton,—some of my neighbors said, " Mr. Warleigh is a dishonest man, or he would not speak against the doctrine of endless torment, while he holds the living of Ashchurch." That set me a little upon my mettle, and I wrote a second pamphlet to show that the Church had expunged the dogma of eternal torments from her standards of doctrine.

Without going into this matter, I would say that I could not, examine, give my signature to the Articles and the Prayer-book of the Church of England if I believed in endless torments, and in the unconditional immortality of the soul. These doctrines were once in her articles, but at the revision held as long ago as 1562, the whole synod, brought together for the revision of the Prayer-book, deliberately expunged from the forty-two articles, the two which together enforced the doctrine of endless torment. And I argue, that unless the Church has declared, in some other formulary, that we are to believe in these two doctrines, then the opposite of the expunged doctrines are those to be received at present. But I will not enter upon this now. I am only justifying myself a little, because my brethren, in many parts of the country, have so frequently said that I am a dishonest man. The pamphlet which announced these facts came down amongst some of the brethren like a bombshell. I did not say they were dishonest,—I am not accustomed to give tit for tat,—but I gave the facts of history, and left them to infer who was the dishonest man. If these doctrines are not in the Bible, whence do they come? The chairman has answered that question. These two doctrines have their origin in heathenism. Those of you who have read ecclesiastical history know how very early—alas, alas!—in the Christian Church, the mystery of iniquity began to work, until by and by large numbers of the feasts, fasts, and ceremonies of pure heathenism had been adopted. These things were engrafted upon the Christian Church because it was thought they would contribute to the conversion of the heathen. If Christ's ministers had stopped at the rites and ceremonies it would have been a good thing for the truth. It was very soon found impossible for them to hold their philosophic heathen opinions and make them square with the Word of God, that Word being taken literally and in its natural meaning. I refer to such men as Clemens of Alexandria, and Origen, who applied new meanings to certain words found in Holy Scripture. They were not willing to square their philosophy with the Bible, and so they squared the Bible with their philosophy.

Consequently, they read many words of the Bible in what has been in these days called a non-natural sense. They were obliged to interpret " death " in some texts as meaning life, and they were obliged to interpret the word " destruction " as meaning preservation,—the very opposite of the natural meaning of the words. I assert, though I have not time to prove it, that the two doctrines mentioned by our chairman can be introduced and supported only by rationalism and the traditions of the elders. How is it, then, that many of our brethren quote Scripture in support of these doctrines? They do it precisely upon the principle of our friends the Roman Catholics, who quote certain texts of Scripture to prove the supremacy of the Pope and transubstantiation. I have conversed with many of them, and when I have asked for texts of Scripture justifying the doctrine of transubstantiation, they quote, " This is my body," etc.; and for the supremacy of the Pope, they quote, " Thou art Peter, and upon this rock," etc. I argue that they cannot take the supremacy of the Pope and transubstantiation out of these texts. They bring the doctrine to the text, and then pretend that they take the doctrine out of the text. Now, our brethren act precisely in the same way. They bring an a priori meaning to the text. Those who uphold the unconditional immortality of the soul, and endless torments, bring meanings to the texts which I challenge them to take out of the texts. We are often confronted with a statement of this kind, " Ah, but the Bible is interpreted in so many different ways; how are we to decide? " There is one way of deciding this question, and all I ask you to do, whenever you read the Bible, is to take the words lexically, and the sentences according to their grammatical force. I think this a reasonable canon of interpretation of all books. If you find in any book phraseology inconsistent with the grammatical force of the language in which it may be written, or words contrary to their lexical meaning, then you are down upon the writer at once. That is all I ask you to do in examining the question before us. When you read God's Holy Word, if you come to the word " death," do not interpret it as meaning " life;" and when you come to the word " destruction," do not interpret it as meaning " preservation." Now, our friends are obliged to do this and we say their meaning is not taken out of the text, but brought to the text. This is handling the Word of God deceitfully, and is the cause of all our sects and parties. Believe me, nine-tenths of the difficulties of the Bible are not intrinsic, but are brought to the Bible on account of our " isms." The Bible really is the poor man's book, and God would not have given it to him to read unless He knew that the poor man could understand it. I altogether repudiate the six-volume elucidators of the Bible; and I contend that none of man's commentaries can reflect such clear light on our minds as the Book of God, without note and comment, can do. And these six and ten volumed commentaries are no more to the Bible than a farthing candle is to this beautiful gas. But these are preliminary observations. You will see at once that I agree with what has been announced by our opponents, that the Bible, and the Bible alone, forms the ground upon which we are to discuss this question. Now, if it taught me the doctrine of unconditional immortality, I would believe it without a moment's hesitation; but the Bible tells me the very opposite; and to show this I shall necessarily be obliged to quote many passages, which I fear to some will prove dry and uninteresting, and be a tax on their patience. I adopt this method, however, that you may judge for yourselves how God uses the words employed in this controversy.

Tonight, the subject is the immortality of the soul, and I must explain myself before I begin. The usual doctrine is that man is unconditionally immortal. We do not accuse our friends of saying that the immortality in man is not derived from God, as Mr. Symington would seem to imply that we do. Of course, everything must be derived from God. They say that when once man is born, from that moment his soul is in its nature immortal; that that soul of man can never die, but that it must live on as long as God lives. The doctrine we maintain is this—that when God made man, He made him capable of immortality upon the fulfilment of certain conditions. Immortality was, and is, a gift of grace; not a natural endowment to be inherited by natural means. I use the phrase "conditional immortality " to indicate that, in our opinion, no man will live forever on account of any intrinsic quality which he has, but on account of a vital faith, by means of which the true Christian is brought into union with the Source and Giver of all life. We wish to be clearly understood; and I repeat that no man is naturally immortal, and that if he would be so he must be content to accept it as a gift of God through the atonement of Christ. It appears to me, our friends suppose they derive their immortality from the flesh—perhaps I had better say from God as their Creator, through the medium of their natural birth. We receive it from the Cross of Christ, through the medium of a new or spiritual birth. This is one amongst the innumerable blessings purchased for us by our adorable Redeemer, the Son of God. He shed His precious blood in order to buy back this and other blessings, which we by our sins had forfeited. Therefore, if you and I would find this immortality, we must, as the second of Romans tells us, "seek for it by patient continuation in well doing; " and if we would obtain life forever, we can so obtain it only by being united to Christ, as the branch to the vine. As He is the source of life, we gain immortality as believers in Him, and as members of His mystical body. Our opponents seem content to receive it from God as the Creator; we say We receive it from the Cross of Christ, on condition of our union with God through Christ, and of our continuance in that union.

Now, it shall be my purpose to quote to you certain texts-of scripture where the word soul is found, or where by a consistent translation it ought to be found. Let me here say, it appears to me our English version was made in favor of Platonism, or that the translators were imbued with Platonic philosophy. They looked at the various texts in the Hebrew or Greek through Platonic spectacles. The word. for soul is nephesh in Hebrew, and it is made to stand for forty different words in the English Old Testament Scriptures; and as the English reader does not see this, I will point out some few passages where the word nephesh occurs, and then you will be better able to understand the real state of the question. As our friends perpetually refer us to the Bible, to that Holy Book we will go. I shall proceed by a series of propositions.

1. Man cannot be immortal, because the same phraseology employed in describing man is perpetually applied to all the lower animals in creation. Let me start from Gen. 2.7, the text so often quoted, and so much relied upon by our opponents:— "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 soul." Observe that

"living soul" stand for nephesh chayah in Hebrew, and I will read passages where the same words are applied to all the lower animals. Gen. 1. 20, 21:—" And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life [nephesh chayah], and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. And God created „great whales, and every living creature [nephesh chayah] that moves, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and .God saw that it was good." The thirtieth verse reads: —

"And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that crept upon the face of the earth, wherein there is life [nephesh chayah], I have given every green herb for meat; and it was so." There again the same word is used. I have alluded to the second chapter, seventh verse, and now I will read the nineteenth verse:—"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 creature [nephesh chayah], that was the name thereof." Genesis 9.10, says:—" And with every living thing [nephesh chayah] that is with you, of the fowl, of the cattle, and of every beast of the earth with you; from all that go out of the ark to every beast of the earth." In Leviticus 11.46, speaking of what was to be eaten and what was not to be eaten, we read:—" This is the law of the beasts, and of the fowl, and of every living creature [nephesh chayah] that moves in the waters, and of every creature that creeps upon the earth." I might read various other passages where the same language is found; but these are sufficient to show that the phraseology applied to man in Gen. 2.7, and given by translators as the "living soul" is also applied to the beasts of the earth, even down to-those which creep, and to the fishes and the fowls of the air. The argument will present itself to everyone, that if this phraseology (nephesh chayah) proves that man is in his own nature unconditionally, intrinsically, innately, inherently immortal, then it proves also that the lower animals of every kind are also immortal; unless God, somewhere or other, tells us in His Holy Book to the contrary. Now I challenge any man to find a single text or phrase, from Genesis to Revelation, to contradict those I have quoted. I have searched every text bearing upon the subject, and I know there is not one.

2. This word (nephesh) translated "soul," is applied also to the beasts of the earth, and I will quote a few passages on that point. Leviticus 22.10, 11:—" There shall no stranger eat of the holy thing; a sojourner of the priest, or a hired servant, shall not eat of the holy thing. But if the priest buy any soul with his money, he shall eat of it, and he that is born in his house; they shall eat of his meat." Here the soul or nephesh is said to be bought, and to eat. Again, Leviticus 24.17 And he that killed any man shall surely be put to death." Mark the phraseology of the original—" He that killed the soul of any man." The next verse contains the same law—"He that killed a beast shall make it good;" literally, "He that killed the soul or nephesh of a beast, shall make it good, beast for beast;" literally, soul for soul. I need not quote more. I have given you two specimens, and every Hebraist knows a good many of such specimens. If the English reader goes to the margin he will often find the reading there somewhat different from the text.

3. In the next place, the word nephesh is applied to dead bodies. Lev. 21.1:—" And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto the priests, the sons of Aaron, and say unto them, There shall be none defiled for the dead among his people;" literally, for the nephesh, meaning, dead body. Numbers 9. 6:—" And there were certain men who were defiled by the dead body of a man, that they could not keep the Passover on that day." Here, then, is an instance of the word nephesh, translated soul, also applied to a dead, body. See also verse 10: " by reason of a dead body," or, dead soul.

4. In Isaiah 19. 10, nephesh is rendered fish:—" ponds for fish;" literally, ponds for nephesh.

5. Again it is used as referring to idols; as in Isaiah 46. 1:—" Bel bowed down, Nebo stooped, their idols were upon the beasts, and upon the cattle; your carriages were heavy laden, they are a burden to the weary beast. They stoop, they bow down together; they could not deliver, the burden, themselves, [literally, their souls] but are gone, into captivity."

6. In Isaiah 10.17, 18, the same word is applied to trees:—" And the Light of Israel shall be for a fire, and His Holy One for a flame; and it shall burn and devour his thorns and briers in one day: and shall consume the, glory of his forest, and of his fruitful field, both soul [nephesh] and body; and they shall be as when a standard-bearer fainted." This word nephesh is often translated life, and I do not find fault with that translation; but there is vegetable as well as animal life, and here is an instance where nephesh is applied to vegetable life.

7. But what you will be most surprised to hear is, that nephesh is applied to something or other which the ladies of that day used in their toilet. In Isaiah 3—which the ladies, and especially the fast ladies of the present day would do well to read over—the twentieth verse speaks of the " bonnets, and the ornaments of the legs, and the head bands, and the tablets, and the earrings." The original for " tablets" is "houses of the soul;" and many have been the conjectures of expositors as to the meaning; and one of them was not far wrong when he proposed that " bethi ha nephesh" should be rendered, " smelling bottles; " for the cognate verb to nephesh, means to snuff up, or to smell. If however modern so-called orthodoxy be true, then this luxurious appendage of a lady's toilet should be called in our language "a house for an immortal soul," although it was something a lady could put upon her toilet table, or carry in her pocket. These are some specimens to show how the Holy Spirit uses the word nephesh or soul in the Bible; and I put it to every thoughtful person, whether, if God had wished to teach the immortality of the soul, He would ever have used a word to teach it which He applies to beasts, dead bodies, fish, idols, trees, and to articles of a lady's toilet? And especially when He had other words which would exactly have expressed the doctrine if He had designed to teach it? Seeing God's book is a revelation concerning the nature and

future destiny of man, we may be sure that if our souls were unconditionally immortal, He would have told us so in words which could not be mistaken.

8. Nephesh is so often used in the same way as we use the word persons, that I need not quote examples. But our opponents take advantage of this, in order, if possible, to turn the edge of Ezek. 18. 4, " The soul that sinned it shall die." Their gloss is, " the person that sinned," etc. They forget, however, that " person " in-eludes both soul and body. The prophet's testimony to the dying nature of the soul is clear and decisive.

In the Greek of the New Testament, the word psuche exactly corresponds to the Hebrew nephesh, and is mostly rendered by soul. Yet in Acts 2.31, psuche is used interchangeably with sarx, or flesh; and is applied to the dead body of Christ. In James 5.20, we read, that "he who converted a sinner from the error of his ways, shall save a soul from death." And in Rev. 8.9, as also in Rev. 16.3, psuche is applied to fishes, and is rendered "life" in the one case, and "living soul" in the other. If the fact that man has a soul proves him to be immortal, then fishes are immortal likewise, for they also have souls. Yet fishes are not immortal, for they are not capable of being one with Christ, nor are any others of the lower animals; but man is capable of this oneness, and may by faith have everlasting life, or immortality.

Let me now remind you of a remarkable fact: that although nephesh and psuche occur about a thousand times in the Bible, yet in not a single case do they carry with them the idea of immortality; nor in any instance is there affixed to them any word which signifies immortal, or never dying, such as we frequently find in modern theology. How passing strange is this! If modern theology, on this point, is right, then the Bible is wrong, and its Divine Author should re-write it according to modern enlightenment, and the traditions of men I As, however, the Divine Author of the Bible cannot err, therefore modern theology is wrong, and the sooner the teachers of it correct themselves the better it will be for the salvation of souls, and for the interests of the cause of Christ. I will venture to assert that our popular Christianity—that which is called Christianity at the present day—is not the Christianity of the Lord Jesus Christ. On one occasion, He said, "When the Son of Man cometh, will He find the faith upon the earth?" But if He were to come to-morrow He would not recognize this religion, so obscured is it by rationalism, and by the traditions of the Christian elders. So vastly important is the doctrine we teach that, whether men will hear, or whether they will forbear, we dare not desist from spreading it; till this portion of our Master's truth be established, till His revealed character be no longer maligned, till the Bible shine forth in its pristine purity, and the salvation of souls is no longer retarded.

But it is sometimes said that, according to the Old Testament Scriptures, the soul is spoken of as engaging in religious exercises, and that, therefore, it is the seat of religion, and also of the intellect. You are aware that we find, especially in the Psalms, such phraseology as this—"Praise the Lord, O my soul," "I lift up my soul unto Thee," and such language. These texts, it is averred, prove that the soul is a kind of entity within us, capable of living independently of the body—some have even said that when out of the body it is far more capable of thinking and living than when in the body—and that this entity is called upon to praise God and pray unto Him. Now, a well-known Hebrew idiom is a conclusive answer to this argument. Nephesh, with certain suffixes, was used by the Hebrew people instead of the personal pronouns; and nepheshi, rendered "O, my soul," means no more than " O, myself." Every Hebraist is well aware of this. Balaam said "Let me die the death of the righteous;" literally, "Let my soul die the death of the righteous." Joseph's brethren said, "Let us not kill him, but sell him;" literally, "Let us not kill his soul." This idiom is applied not only to the soul but also to the spirit and to the flesh. I will read two texts, that you may see what the real meaning of the Spirit of God is. Here is what I find in Psalm 63.1—

"O God, Thou art my God; early will I seek Thee: my soul thirsted for Thee, my flesh longed for Thee, in a dry and thirsty land, where no water is." The same kind of idiom is here applied to both soul and flesh; and the flesh is represented as having a longing for God equal to that of the soul; but every Hebraist knows that the real meaning reads thus:—"O God, Thou art my God; early will I seek Thee; I thirst for Thee, I long for Thee, in a dry and thirsty land, where no water is." I turn to Psalm 84.1, where a similar example is found—" My soul longed, yea even fainted, for the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh cried out for the living God." Here are the heart, the soul, and the flesh, alike longing for God; and yet I am quite sure our friends would not say the flesh longs for God. The same idiom is applied to God Himself, although He has not a human soul: " If any man draw back, My soul shall have no pleasure in him." (Heb. 10.38, 39.) This is a quotation in the New Testament, from the Old, and the Hebrew writers of the New Testament frequently employed Hebrew idioms, though they wrote in Greek. You will often find this feature in the epistles of St. Paul, who thought in Hebrew, and was as well able to write in Hebrew as in Greek. In 2 Cor. 7.5, 6, we read, " When I came into Macedonia, my flesh had no rest," etc. Referring to the same thing, in chap. 2.13, he says—" My spirit had no rest," meaning, in both cases, "I had no rest." Jesus uses the same idiom when He says, " My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death." I challenge the world to show a single passage in the whole of Scripture where we are taught that the soul is the seat either of the religious affections or of the intellectual faculties.

I now ask, then, What is there, either in the word soul, or in any word associated with it, in Holy Scripture, to show that the soul is immortal? The answer is, Nothing whatever. Now, seeing Mr. Symington professed to discuss this question upon the sole ground of the Bible, we have a right to inquire whether he was aware of all these texts, so essentially connected with his own chosen subject? If he was not, then he was not competent to handle it, though Mr. Linton says he knows no one more competent; or if he was, then he

was not justified in withholding them from his audience. In either case he is not, on the question before us, to be relied upon as a teacher of Holy Scripture. If I were to use similar tactics, I fear Mr. Linton would deem me a "disingenuous controversialist," and perhaps, in such a case, it would be difficult to show that his judgment was wrong.

I wish to remark, in the next place, that "God only hath immortality." I ought to lay some stress upon this, and give an explanation. Mr. Symington complains that our friend Mr. Ashcroft, and not only he, but we "annihilationist's," as Mr. S. calls us, have brought in new phraseology; namely, "inherent immortality," and so on. Now, we do this in order to be as explicit and as clear as possible, so as to make it impossible for our opponents to misunderstand and misrepresent us; both of which they frequently do. They sometimes altogether ignore the evidence we adduce, and recast their traditions and rationalistic arguments as if they had never been answered; and as if we, to their great surprise, were ignorant of the commonest texts which they reiterate. This is scarcely honest. Others take a small part of our evidence, and argue as if it were the whole, and of course make themselves appear triumphant! Others substitute their own propositions for ours; then they answer themselves, and leave it to be inferred that they have answered us. Others give us bad names, and associate us with somebody or other who is well known for his errors, that thus they might bring our teaching into disrepute. We never get a just, fair, or tolerant antagonist. They apparently do not perceive that these tactics do not weigh with the thoughtful, and that the thoughtless do not weigh them at all, though they are ready to assent to almost anything which is fashionable and received by the multitude. Many thousands of the laity, among whom are some of the most pious and learned, are demanding from their spiritual guides that our arguments be taken as they are, and fairly grappled with; and that when they ask for bread, they should not be presented with husks, out of which all the corn has been thrashed. Now, to prevent misconception, we express ourselves thus:—unconditional, or innate, or intrinsic, immortality. Our opponents say they are aware that a creature's immortality is derived from God. Of course it is. Is not everything derived from Him? But this is not the point. It is, whether, when once a man is born, he must, from the constitution of his nature, live forever; and that therefore the wicked man must live forever in a place of suffering, seeing he is not fitted to live forever in a place of joy. We hold that the wicked shall become extinct. Our opponents hold that they must live on miserably, and that forever, on account of the soul which they have, and which is said to be immortal in its own nature. I do not hesitate to affirm that this heathen, self-exalting dogma of the unconditional immortality of the soul has put the whole machinery of the Bible out of gear.

I will now read 1 Tim. 6.15, 16:—"That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: which in His times He shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality." Observe God only hath immortality; just as He is the only Potentate, etc. etc. The word only occurs in each clause, and if there be others who have immortality, then there are other Potentates; other Kings of kings and Lords of lords. Here, is, however, an inspired, absolute assertion, without any room for any restriction: God is the only Potentate: God only hath immortality. No creature can have it except by being united in holiness with the only Source of it. This is the absolutely necessary condition of the immortality of man. Be in Christ; you shall live forever. Be out of Him; and you die forever. We properly blame the Pope because he arrogates to himself the divine and infinite attribute of infallibility; yet our opponents arrogate to themselves the divine and infinite attribute of immortality. If the one is blasphemy, the other is surely the same. "Ye shall be as gods," was the devil's original successful bait; and alas! it is successful still. Would that man knew, and kept in his own place! He is man, and not God; a creature, and not the Creator; finite in all respects, and infinite in none: and it is "in God we live, and move, and have our being." (See Acts 17. 25, 28.) I say, if man can have one infinite and divine attribute, he can have all the others as well. Then we should not only have immortal men, but as many gods as there are men, and, if our opponents are right, as many gods also as there are devils. Further to support our view, I read, John 6.57:—"As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father, so he that eats Me, even he shall live by Me." Here is Christ declaring that as man He lives by the Father; and He declares further, "so he that eats Me, even he shall live by Me, as I live by the Father." Again, John 5.26, 27: "For as the Father hath life in Himself; and hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is Son of Man." As Son of Man He had no authority to execute judgment, or to have life in Himself, except through the gift of the Father; and if our blessed Lord and Master, who is our great Rabbi and Teacher, did not arrogate to Himself, as man, to have life in Himself, it really appears to me to be the height of presumption and arrogance for poor, sinful, mortal creatures to claim it. We maintain that immortality and eternal life come to us only through Christ; and that death is the wages of sin. This doctrine is humbling to human nature, but on that very account it is the more likely to be true; for it makes Christ all in all. It is a positive fact, none can have immortality except through God. He only has immortality in Himself, and He communicates it to us, when we seek it by a union with Christ Jesus.

It is sometimes said that the intense longings we have for immortality prove that man is immortal. That there are such longings I do not dispute; nor do I dispute that they come from God's Spirit. But I have yet to learn that to long for a thing proves the possession of it. The very fact of longing for a thing implies that we have it not. Still, this longing does prove that we are capable of immortality, and may obtain it if we set to work in a right manner. It seems to me that God very graciously puts into our breasts this unceasing longing for immortality to make us reflecting men; to induce us to inquire about it from the only Book that can teach, us rightly concerning it; to induce us to seek it, and when we get it to hold it fast.

It has been said that universal consent is on the side of the immortality of the soul. I deny, however, this universal consent. The dogma has never been universally received; for some of the best and wisest of mankind have rejected it in all ages, except in the Papal dark ages. If all mankind had universal knowledge, and if all of them were correct in opinion; then, if all of them were to hold this dogma,

there would be some ground for proving it from universal consent. But seeing the natural understanding of all men is darkened, and their reasoning powers in Divine things crippled, I must say, that even if the universal consent of such persons could be proved to be on the side of any given opinion, this would not establish the truth of that opinion, but the contrary; for when our Lord tells us that the many go in at the broad gate, did He not refer to the incorrect opinions of these many, as well as to the badness of their morals

It would appear, then, that even when an opinion is held by the million, this fact does not prove it to be true; and also that when an opinion is held by the few, this fact does not prove it to be untrue. Indeed, seeing it is the few that enter in at the narrow gate, it is rather in favor of a doctrine when it is held by these few. In all ages, the many have been on the side of wrong, the few on the side of right, whether in opinion or practice. We could, however, tell of the rapid growth of the opinions we advocate among all classes, both in the Church of England and out of it.

In delivering the lecture, it was stated that an ex-Baptist had told the lecturer that two-thirds of the ministers who belonged to the Baptist Union did not believe in endless torment. Since then, another Baptist has denied the fact; and as, in either case, we have but assertion or denial, this part of the lecture is omitted. Still, the testimony was borne to the lecturer. Nor would it be otherwise than honorable to the discernment of the Baptist body, as it would show that they were on the Lord's side, and searching their Bibles, independently of the trammels of party. If the doctrines advocated by the lecturer spread for the next twenty years as they have done for the last ten, the ministers of all Protestant sects in England will be converted, and then. Christianity will shine forth in its original power and glory.

Great is this truth of God, and it will yet prevail; and I would affectionately, earnestly and respectfully entreat my fellow ministers of Christ of all denominations, not at once to conclude that we must be wrong, and they right, but fully to weigh the Scripture proofs and arguments which we adduce. The difference between us is wide, if not vital. They, as well as ourselves, should reflect on the solemn words of St. John's third epistle, verse 9, "He that abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God." We bring serious charges against their doctrine when we say, that it is not in the Bible; that it is dishonoring to God and Christ; that it hinders the salvation of souls; that it burdens and perplexes enlightened thoughtful believers in Jesus; and that it is fruitful in the production of infidelity. We beg our brethren not to scorn these charges, but to consider fully and impartially whether they are just. We beg they will not be hasty in again affirming their doctrine; for if they do, it will be the more difficult for them to perceive the truth, to repent, and to amend. I say these things under a solemn sense of responsibility, and in the spirit of brotherly love, and in the interests of truth and of souls. I would beseech them to consider their teaching. Is not the holy cause of Christ languishing everywhere, both at home and abroad? May there not be some hindrance in our teaching? Is not genuine Christianity God's cure for the ills of humanity, and can this cure be that inefficient system which it has seemed to be almost ever since the days of the apostles? O let us open our eyes and inquire for the old paths, and walk therein; and we shall find peace and prosperity among our populations. The peoples shall praise God, and He will give us His blessing.

We have spent so much time on the Bible doctrine of the soul, that little is left for considering the Bible teaching on the spirit of man. Holy Writ makes a wide difference in its use of the two words, and never confounds them, as popular theology does. The spirit of man is a portion of the Spirit of God, put into man's body to produce physical and mental life; and, in the case of the regenerate, to bestow also .spiritual life. The great Neshamah, or Spirit of God, is the Lord and Giver of all the life found in all creatures; for life cannot arise from any disposition of the atoms of which matter is composed. The soul is animal life, and is one effect, or manifestation, in the body, of the spirit which dwells there. When the spirit—not the soul—returns to God who gave it, then the soul, or animal life, comes to an end; just as an effect ceases when its cause is removed. At the resurrection, the spirit takes possession of the body again; and again produces in it both mental and physical life. The wicked had no spiritual life when they died; and so they will not have it when they are raised again. Holy believers however had the spiritual, regenerated life when they died; and therefore they shall have it also when they are raised in the last day. To these holy believers the spirit will be forever preserved and secured, and they shall live forever. After however the wicked have been judged, they will be cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death; by which both soul and body will be destroyed forever. One great mistake of our opponents is, that they confound soul and spirit, though even in the English version it is done but once, in Isaiah 57.16, where we read, "sou/s which I have made," though in the original it is " spirits, which I —God—have made." I have fully considered the fourteen or fifteen hundred places where the words for soul and spirit occur, and I can assure you that in no single instance is the one put for the other. On this point, as well as on some others, popular modern teaching is opposed to the teaching of the Bible; though its teachers profess to believe in it. There is an absolute need of a reform in our received theology.

I want to say, in preparation for next Thursday's lecture, that it is quite useless for our friends to take so much pains to prove that " everlasting " means " everlasting." It is quite beside the mark. Therefore, Mr. Symington and Mr. Linton may save themselves the trouble of r proving it. I allow all the endlessness of the idea which they attach to the words everlasting, eternal, forever and ever, etc. etc.; and I am grieved that our opponents do not perceive that their arguments on this point do not touch the position we maintain. Yet I contend for the extinction of the wicked, as will be shown in the next lecture.

I wish to make an observation about the word " annihilation." I protest against its use, whether it come from friend or foe. Annihilation is the destruction of particles. Extinction is the destruction of parts. There is no such thing as annihilation; but extinction goes on every

day. I contend for the word extinction, because it is a scriptural word, found in Isaiah xliii. 17. Speaking of the wicked, he writes, " they are extinct, they are quenched as tow."

From what you have heard to-night, I trust you will see that we are not deserving of the epithets which Mr. Symington's pamphlet applies to us, and to our utterances, such as the following:—" Disingenuous controversialists, " " insolent untruths, " " poor scholarship, or something worse." " The Bible with them is a witness to be tortured." It is said also (page 31) that we forbid you to accept the Bible's teaching. We are earnest truth-seekers, and constant Bible readers, wishing to learn all it teaches, and neither more nor less. How else can we declare the whole counsel of God, or bring out of our treasury things new and old? We take its words literally, and its sentences grammatically—the only effectual method of understanding, any book. We reject on this question the traditions of the elders, and the rationalism of man, believing that God only can teach us what is our nature and destiny. Honor God by diligently and prayerfully reading His word, and He will honor you by showing you its meaning, and by making you feel its power. I have long known the blessedness of this method, and find the Bible to be a rich mine of precious jewels. My heart loves the Bible, and my intellect bows to it with reverence. In my study, I often sit admiring its contents, and to me it is manifest that God only could have written it. As a nation we profess to believe it, and take it as our guide. And yet, alas I it is fearfully mangled, and dreadfully handled and perverted, even by those whose official duty it is to hold forth the word of life; and if any other book were treated as God's Book is treated, no one could make head or tail of it. I entreat you, take the Bible alone as the foundation of the faith, independently of the traditions and philosophy of men; for not till then shall we get rid of such fearful heresies as the natural and unconditional immortality of the soul, and the doctrine of endless torments.

The Discussion.

MR. COWLEY came forward to ask a question, but made a speech. He referred to Polycarp, Ignatius, Clemens, Justin Martyr, and other fathers, in favor of endless torment, and quoted also the words of Christ in the 25th chapter of Matthew,— " These shall go into everlasting punishment." He alluded to a sermon by Bishop Alford supporting his argument. We have been taught to-night, he said, that my body is my soul, and when I die, I die like a beast. I have shown that Jesus teaches eternal torments.

Answer.—Our friend has put a long question, or rather series of questions. I am quite aware of the passages he has read from the English translations of the fathers, and I could produce very many more where like phraseology is found. I know, of course, the 46th verse of the 25th chapter of St. Matthew, and notwithstanding that, I say the wicked will become extinct. Our friend has made a very common mistake in supposing that everlasting punishment means everlasting punishing, .as if the act or process of punishment were endlessly carried on. I am sorry to hear from his testimony, which doubtless is true, that one whom he calls a right reverend Bishop, has made the same mistake. I know, as well as Bishop Alford, that the word used is " everlasting; " and I have already said I am willing to let our opponents take this and like words in all their endless significance; but I hold that " everlasting punishment " expresses, not the everlasting process of punishing, but the everlasting result of the punishment.

If Bishop Alford is right, the passage ought to be read thus:—" These shall go away into everlasting punishing." Compare this with other like phraseology. We have, as you will remember, the phrases " eternal judgment," " eternal covenant," " eternal redemption," " eternal salvation." Would the right reverend bishop have us to suppose that eternal judgment signifies eternal judging? Would he say that eternal salvation is eternal saving, and that it indicated an eternal process of saving? that eternal covenant meant the eternal process of covenanting? that eternal redemption meant eternal redeeming? In the case of eternal judgment, we say the phraseology means that the process of judgment is not endless, but that the result is endless, inevitable, unchangeable. It does not mean that the act of saving should go on forever and ever; for salvation, if it take place at all, must take place in time; but the results of salvation will go on without end. So of the " eternal covenant." The process of making it is not endless, but the result is. In the phrase " eternal punishment," the language is the same in construction and grammatical government. If the bishop has not observed that—and even a bishop cannot observe everything—I am quite sure, though I know nothing of him, that he is a candid man, and will allow my criticism if it is mentioned to him. He will have the capacity to see through my argument. The word used in the original, and translated punishment, is kolasis, and in classic writers it is applied to the pruning of trees. (A Voice: You cannot give an instance.) I bear true testimony when I say kolasis means pruning or cutting off.

A GENTLEMAN: Is it not translated torment?
MR. TINLING: And wrongly so!
MR. WARLEIGH. For the nonce, I grant your premise—

what is your inference? Let it be torment: but does it mean endless torment? that is the point. The punishment of kolasis is the being cut off from God, the source of life, and this is death; not life in pain. When interrupted, I was going on to say that the word signifies the act by which a branch is literally cut off; not an act or process by which it is endlessly cut, yet never severed; as our opponents aver. The act of pruning is temporary, the result to the pruned branch is endless; for when once cut off, it will never be grafted on again and made to bear fruit. Our Lord says, John 15.6, " If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch, and it is withered, and men gather them, and cast them into the fire and they are burned." I have yet to learn that a withered burnt-up branch of a tree, is a suitable figure to represent the sinner in hell, where, according to our opponents, he is never withered nor burnt up. It is a fearful figure, and represents the destruction of body and soul in hell. A branch burnt up is a branch no longer, and a man burnt up is a man

no longer. This is my answer to Mr. Cowley and Bishop Alford, and I hope to strengthen it on Thursday, by many portions of holy Scripture.

Question.

I came here to-night expecting to hear the first epistle of John, 5th chapter, verses 11 and 12, dilated upon, but they have not so much as been read. Will the lecturer kindly inform the audience what distinction he makes between existence and the life as mentioned therein?

Answer.

The difference between existence and life is this:—Many things have existence, such as this table, but they have not life. I never use the word existence, when I mean life or living existence. Mere existence gives no capacity for either pain or pleasure, as in the case of a stone; but living existence, in the case of man, gives capacity for either. The eternal life which the believer has shall put him into the circumstances, and give him the capacity, for endlessly enjoying those pleasures which are at God's right hand forevermore. The wicked are to die " the second death; " and this will deprive them of the capacity of either pleasure or pain.

Question.

Whether the view the lecturer has given us to-night does not lead to materialism?

Answer.

My answer to that question is, No! If I could have gone on to give what I consider the Bible view of pneumatology, our friend's question would have had no place. Yet, I made a great distinction between the soul and spirit of man. I need not be concerned with illogical inferences. The question is, Are my Bible examples true examples? If not, let some one else show that they are not in the Bible. But if they are there, I am not concerned with my friend's inference from them, even though it were logically drawn, which it is not. Man is more than mere body; he has a soul and spirit. The soul, I tell you candidly, expires with the body; but the spirit returns to the God who gave it. " Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit." Without this spirit, the body and soul would not be alive; deprived of it, they must die. The spirit returns to the body on the morning of the resurrection, and reanimates it; otherwise it could not be made alive again. Sinners shall be judged according to the deeds done in the body, and sentenced to the second death. The spirit will then be taken from the body as fully as at the first death, the difference between the two being that after the second death there will be no more resurrection, no More animation, no return of the spirit to give life to the wicked.

Question.

If all die in Adam, and all be made alive in Christ, will they who get resurrection from the dead possess immortality?

Answer.

I believe that at the resurrection the spirit will return to the body. When the wicked are raised up to stand before the judgment seat of Christ they will have as much life as they possess now; but the fact that they will have life thus given to them, in order to be judged, does not prove that they shall have immortal life; for the sentence pronounced against them will be everlasting destruction; they shall utterly, says St. Peter, perish like the brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed. (2 Pet. 2.12; see also Malachi 4.1-8.) Though the wicked at the judgment day will have a living existence, that living existence will not be endlessly prolonged, but they will be sentenced to death; and death is not a living existence. The end of the wicked will be death or destruction. They will be deprived of the spirit a second time, and it will again return to God who gave it, never to be given any more.

The Questioner.

It will come up again in a different kind of body, and therefore the question is not answered.

The Lecturer.

Our friend refers to the 15th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, and he argues that the wicked, at the resurrection, will have as incorruptible bodies as the just. I say—and I challenge him to prove otherwise—that this chapter refers entirely and solely to the just, and does not refer to the wicked at all.

Question.

As the lecturer has given the interpretation of the word kolasis, in Matthew 25.46, I ask him to give me a single instance from Greek authors where that interpretation can be given?

Answer.

I cannot do so at this moment. If our young friend has Scott and Liddell's Lexicon, he will find examples from the classical writers where it is used to signify the act of pruning, or cutting off.

Question.

What construction do you put upon this text, " He that loveth his life shall lose it; but he that hated his life, the same shall save it? " Now, there is life lost and life saved; are these two the one life? Is it the one organic life we all possess at present, which, in the next state, will be continued to eternity? Is there an essential difference between a life laid down and a life gained?

Answer.

In that passage our Lord is discoursing about what shall take place by persecution. " If you, on account of persecution, shall cease to confess Me, you will live in this life, but not in the world to come; but if you are bold and faithful in professing Me, and lay down your life as a martyr, you shall find it again in the resurrection."

The Questioner.

The grammatical construction will hardly bear you out.

The Lecturer.

Look at the connection, and you will find it so.

Question.

Will the lecturer describe the soul—what it is; and what the spirit is also? If God is immortal, and created man in His own image, did He not impart to man that which is part of Himself?

Answer.

The soul is the animal life. It is one effect of the Spirit of God breathed into man. The spirit is a portion of the Spirit of God breathed into man to make his body and soul alive. When God breathed into Adam He imparted to him more lives than one. Adam had bodily, mental, and spiritual lives. By the fall he lost the last. Taking the source of man's spirit into consideration, it is the Spirit of God; but viewed as the portion dwelling in man, it is spoken of as the " spirit of man." When the wicked man dies the second death, both his physical and his mental life come to an end; for the spirit has finally left him. How then can he live? The spirit now strives with the wicked man; but there is a time when God says, " My Spirit shall not always strive with man." When this striving portion of the spirit leaves the sinner, it returns to God who gave it; and in the last day the spirit, which kept the wicked alive, shall return to God who gave it. The one illustrates the other.

Question.

When we take up the Bible, how are we to know whether a thing is right or wrong according to the Hebrew and Greek?

Answer.

Our brother cannot of his own knowledge tell whether I bear true or false testimony. It is a disadvantage I very much regret our noble working men cannot get over. I have proposed that a version of the Bible should be made, containing something like forty words in the original languages, written in English letters. I should put at the end a glossary of these words, and I think, as far as the present controversy is concerned, the English scholar would thus be pretty nearly upon a level with the Hebrew and Greek scholar. I am now preparing a version of this kind of- the whole Bible, though I do not know whether it will ever be published.

One or two other questions were asked, amidst much-noise and confusion, and they will be found fully explained. and answered in Mr Warleigh's second lecture.

Is Evil To Be Eternal?

Or shall there be a final extinction of all evil persons and things?

With discussion thereon.

MY CHRISTIAN FRIENDS,—There are a good many preliminary observations in which I should be glad to indulge, but I do not think there will be time, and I shall therefore forego the advantage, if an advantage it be, and enter at once upon answering two questions. It was proposed that one of them should be answered to-night; the other was left unanswered only on account of the confusion arising from so many questions being asked at a time, when I could listen to but one. Perhaps my anxiety to listen to all made me sometimes mistake a question. The first I shall deal with was asked by a brother, a working man, who stood here [under the platform], and it was concerning the image of God. He said I had maintained that God was immortal; that it was written that man was made in the image of God; and that God being immortal, and man being made in His image—therefore, said our brother, man must be immortal also. The question was, " What do you say to that? " My answer is this: The argument goes too far. If our brother was right, the same argument would make man omnipresent, omnipotent, and omniscient. If man, in our friend's sense, was made in the image of God, and if God is omnipotent, then if our friend's argument is valid, man must be omnipotent. If God is omniscient, and man be made in His image, then man must be omniscient. In other words, if man is made in the image of God, then man is himself a god, because he must necessarily possess those attributes considered to be included in the image of God. I think we may well be satisfied with the words in Col. 3. 10: " Put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of Him that created him." Most certainly the image of God in man does not include the infinite attribute of inherent immortality.

Another brother put a good many questions, and amongst them he asked one, which he was charitable enough to say I shirked. I never shirked a question yet, and I have no occasion to shirk his. He proposed, if I understood him aright, that it should be answered this evening. In his statement, before he put the question, he referred to 1 Cor. 15. 22, "For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." His argument was this, that if all die in Adam, then all are to be made alive in Christ. He understood the first "all" as referring to all mankind who have ever lived, do live, or will live to the end of time; and he argued that the second "all" must be as extensively applied. But a little further on, he said, the apostle writes that all the sons and daughters of Adam shall be raised with incorruptible bodies; and if all mankind are raised with incorruptible bodies, then these bodies—of the wicked as well as those of the righteous—will live forever and ever. I suppose our brother would add, that as the wicked cannot live in holiness and glory forever and ever, not being prepared for it, therefore the incorruptible bodies of the wicked must live in torment forever and ever. I think I represent the real point of his question and argument. My answer, in the midst of a great deal of confusion, was that 1 Cor. xv. applied exclusively to the people of God, and that he could gain no argument whatever as applied to the wicked. It was because that kind of answer was given that our brother—who said his name was Worrall, and that he was pastor of some church somewhere, I could not catch where—taunted me with shirking the question. If you will give me a little time I should like to read a few passages from this same chapter. Verses 21 and 22:—"For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." There our friend stopped, but if he had gone on he would have read in the next verse—"But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at His coming." There is a resurrection of two classes of persons, the resurrection of the righteous and of the wicked; and as I have said, it is the resurrection of the righteous only on which this chapter treats. This will be evident when I read a verse or two, commencing with the 41st:—"There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differed from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead; it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption." There he stopped, but he should have read on—"It is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power. It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." Now does this description apply to the wicked? Are the wicked raised in honor, or in glory?

When the wicked are raised, are they raised with spiritual bodies? for, says the apostle, there is a natural body and there is a spiritual body. I must say I was much surprised that a pastor and teacher of a church should take the passage and apply it in the way he did, because, as far as I know, the commentators and preachers who are on what I suppose to be his side of the question, say that this chapter applies exclusively to the righteous. Therefore you cannot argue from the privileges of the righteous, who are in Christ, to the non-privileges of the wicked, who are not in Christ. I first of all doubted whether he was a universalist or not; for if his argument had any applicability or strength it would prove that all mankind—the wicked as well as the righteous—would ultimately be saved, and then how could he maintain endless suffering for the wicked? You, who are readers of the Bible, know that there are innumerable passages where the word "all" applies only to the persona concerned in what is spoken of. It does not show that as all fall in Adam, all shall be saved in Christ. The point is this: all that fell, fell in Adam; all that are saved, are saved in Christ. Take one proof out of scores. The apostle, in chapter 7. 7, writes to the same Corinthians, "I would that all men were even as I." Read on a little further, and you will find that he means, "I wish all were single, and not married." I suppose our brother would not argue that the apostle would have all to be unmarried, especially as the same apostle says, "Marriage is honorable in all."

I am aware that I have to bring before you to-night that which is unwelcome to many. I am also aware that it is difficult to get rid of notions in which we have been educated, and notions which those who are deemed pillars of the Church advocate; which are first taught in the nursery, and continue to be taught in our school and college course, and afterwards taken for granted. It is uncommonly difficult for us to forget the impressions thus produced, and to look at the bare Word of God, so as to see really what the Holy Scriptures do say, and what they do not say. I will show, if I have full time, that a great many of the things said in behalf of what we call endless torment, and which 'are supposed to be in Scripture, are really not in Scripture at all, but only in our traditions; and that in other instances we bring meanings to the Scripture, and then fancy we have taken the meaning out of the Scripture. I remember some time ago a young man strove to convince me that a Christian can live without sin, and ought to live without sin. He said he was an example, for that he had lived without sin for two years. I said I could not pretend to such a state of holiness, for I was full of defects and imperfections; but that I trusted to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior. I asked him what text he could point to as showing that a Christian can live without sin, and he quoted this one, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect." I could not make him see that he was bringing a meaning to the text, and not taking the meaning out of it. I have given you this example in order to show what I mean by bringing an interpretation to the text. I have said, I can feel for those who have this struggle. Let me give you a little personal history. Not long after I was ordained, now thirty-five years ago, while reading the Holy Scriptures in my study, and afterwards while reading them in my family and in the public service of the Church, many passages struck me which, in their natural meaning, altogether conflicted with the received opinions of the thousands around me, and with those which were then my own.

I said to myself, "The passage seems to say so and so, and yet it cannot be, for the many think the contrary. I have been instructed differently." I thus unconsciously brought the Word of God to the standard of man's instruction; instead of bringing man's instruction to God's holy Word. I repelled, with horror, the thoughts which presented themselves to my mind, because I thought they were temptations to infidelity. I did not then see that what I resisted was the truth; and that what I received was part of infidelity, and of the great apostasy. As time *ore on, more and more light was reflected on my mind, though I still resisted it. By and by the light was so

clear, that I was compelled to yield; for I saw if I did not I should be fighting against the God of Holy Scripture. I kept my views to myself, knowing how unwelcome they would be to my friends, and all with whom I had anything to do; but my conscience perpetually accused me of cowardice. God had given me light, and something seemed to say to me, " Reflect it upon others." When I could contain no longer, and when opportunity served, I published a pamphlet on the subject, in defense of Mr. Minton, now in London; and by so doing regained inward tranquility. In this way I was brought into the controversy. I did not seek it, for I naturally shrink from strife of every kind; but I felt that my Master had laid a duty upon me, and now; wherever a door is opened to me, I dare not refuse to walk in, and give what little help I can. towards the vindication of my Master's character, and for-the establishment of His blessed soul-saving truth. It is in this spirit I present myself to you—not as a wrangler striving for the mastery, but to try my little best to point out to you the way in which you may discern and embrace, and then propagate, the truth. If any Christian brother, in the spirit of Christian love, and not in the spirit of mastery, will show me, upon the ground of Scripture, that I am wrong, I shall be the first to give him hearty thanks. It must, however, be on the ground of Holy Writ, and not that of human authority, or tradition. I had better make a confession of my faith, so as to exclude some of those positions which our opponents put forward, and thus give themselves much useless trouble, though they seem to fancy they meet us with unanswerable arguments. For instance, no opponent need trouble himself to prove that there is a resurrection of the unjust as well as of the just. I believe it. No one need prove to me that the wicked will have to stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, to be condemned for the deeds done in the body. No one needs to show to me that every wicked man will receive terrible punishment after he has been judged and sentenced. I believe, that " indignation, and wrath, and tribulation, and anguish, shall be upon every soul of man that worketh ill, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile." Our friends say, too, that punishment shall be eternal. I believe it, and they need not quote texts to prove it to me. Now I hope I have stated exactly my position; and I have done its not only for my own sake, but for yours, when by and by you may choose to question me.

It seems to me that the mistake our opponents make is this,—they substitute an endless process for an endless result; and this mistake runs through all their quotations, from Scripture, all their quotations from the ancient fathers, and also—according to a newspaper given to me to-day —their quotations from the Athanasian Creed. In going into this point, I will start from the epistle of Jude, verse, 1.7. Mr. Symington refers to this passage as dead against, us; but we shall see that it is entirely on our side. " Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." You must know the meaning our opponents put upon this text is, that the fire, designated " eternal fire," is an endlessly flaming fire; and they add to it, what they think is a just inference, that the victim shall never be consumed in the fire, but that the fire shall preserve him; and that thus he shall have to endure the sufferings of the fire for millions, billions, trillions, and quadrillions of years; that at the end of that time the tortured victim will have to go on, and endlessly on, through the same process; except that his horrid blasphemies during these myriads of ages, will induce the Almighty God to' turn His infinite vengeance upon them still more fiercely. If our opponents would speak out in comprehensible English language, this is exactly what they would say. You will please observe that the point now is, not whether " eternal " carries with it the idea of endlessness. I grant it, and Mr. Symington need not again take pains to prove it. The point is, whether the Apostle Jude meant by " eternal fire," an endless process of turning, or an endless result of the burning. Now I aver that he meant an endless result, and not an endless process. For if the inspired Jude meant by " eternal fire," an endless process of flaming, then the flames of Sodom and Gomorrah must have been burning from the days of Lot to the days of Jude, and from the days of Jude to the present time, and must go on from the present time to the judgment-day, and—according to our opponents—from the day of judgment through endless ages. But what is the example? The inspired apostle expressly sets forth Sodom and Gomorrah as an " example; " and I ask if that example gives the idea of an eternal process of burning, or an endless result? I need not answer yes or no.

The fire of Sodom and Gomorrah went out not long after God, in His just wrath, had kindled it, even as soon as the cities of the plain were destroyed. But sometimes our opponents say, " They are set forth as an example or type." It was said to me once, " Is not the antitype always much greater than the type? The punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah is the type; the antitype must be much more fierce; and what can it be but a punishment of endless duration." But our opponents altogether mistake the word used by the Apostle. They suppose he used the word tupos, from which we get our word type; but, instead of that, he used the word deigma, which means sample or specimen. It was applied to the sample the merchant took into the market, to show to the buyers a specimen of what he had in his store. If the merchant at any time took a specimen which was better than the material in his store he was considered a dishonest trader. By the selection of deigma, and not tupos, the apostle clearly indicates that the fires of Sodom and Gomorrah are not types, but a specimen of what the wicked shall suffer. If the specimen fire was one of an endless result, and not one of an endless process, then the " eternal fire " which the wicked shall suffer is of the same character. The process of their conscious pain shall not be endless, but its result shall be so; and if, as our opponents aver, the process of punishing the wicked shall be endless, then Jude's sample is no sample at all; but if, as we say, the punishment of the wicked is endless and irretrievable only in its results, then Jude's sample is an exact picture of the eternal unquenchable fire which the wicked shall endure in the lake of fire, where, as in the case of Sodom, the fire shall go out when it has done its work; namely, that of destroying the wicked. Invariably in the Bible, where the execution of wrath is spoken of in connection with endlessness, the reference is to the result, not to the process. The cities of Sodom and Gomorrah have not been endlessly flaming, nor will they be so for the future; but they were entirely destroyed in a limited time, and have never been rebuilt. If our opponents choose to interpret the cities as meaning the persons in the cities, the position is not altered; for whether it be the cities or the persons, there is still the word deigma, a sample, and the Apostle Jude tells us it is a sample of what wicked persons shall endure in the great day of God's wrath. You will now see that Jude's is not a sample of an endless process of burning and punishing, but an example of the endless result of that burning. My friends remind me of Lamentations 4. 6, where it is expressly

stated by Jeremiah, that the punishment of the Jews, the people of God, should be greater than that inflicted on Sodom and Gomorrah, which " were overthrown " in a moment; as showing incontestably that there could not be an endless process, since the overthrow was " in a moment." That the result is endless, facts prove, as we have seen.

I beg to go to another sample, because I want to point out to you, as far as time will permit, that this is the uniform method of Holy Writ, and not an exception which we pick out for our purpose. I will defy anyone to produce anything to the opposite. Here is another specimen, from Isaiah 34. 8-10, " For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompences for the controversy of Zion. And the streams of Idumea shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up forever; from generation to generation it shall be waste; none shall pass through it forever and ever." I beg you to observe the phraseology. Here we have burning and fire that shall not be quenched; and smoke ascending up forever and ever, by night and by day; and none shall pass through it forever and ever, in consequence of this fire that ' shall not be quenched. Now, I ask, is this an example, or sample, of an endless process of burning, or of an endless result of burning? In other words, did the process of the destruction of Idumea go on forever and ever; or was the process temporary as to the period of its execution, but endless as to its results? I need only point to history, and to the simple fact that the ever burning pitch is gone out long ago, but that flumes is finally destroyed.

With your leave, I will bring one more example of this kind of writing, and it shall be from a portion of Holy Writ which our opponents are very fond of quoting; but they quote only a small part, and never look at the connection. to see what is the real meaning of the Holy Spirit of God. I read, then, from Revelation 14. 8-11:—" And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication. 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 measure 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 the smoke of their torment ascended up forever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receives the mark of his name." I have nothing to-night to do with what is meant by Babylon and the.

44 LECTURE ON THE QUESTION:

beast, but here is a judgment to be poured out upon some place or persons, and the smoke is to ascend forever and ever. Mr. Symington applies this passage to individuals, as individuals, and says it points out the endless torments which the wicked shall endure in the next world. But we have to show, not how this language may be expounded according to modern traditional notions, but how it is used by the Spirit in His Book. And here again I argue that it does not refer to individuals at all, as individuals. It is the same kind of language as is applied by Isaiah to Idumea, and it is applied to some nation or state called Babylon, whatever it may be. Now for the proof whether the " forever," etc. etc., refers to the result or the process: our opponents say to the process; I say to the result; and therefore I go to the 18th chapter of Revelations, and there I read exactly the same language as in chapter 14.—" And lie cried mightily, with a loud voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." This refers to the time when judgment had already been poured out upon Babylon in this world. I go on to read: " Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire, for strong is the Lord who judges her." Mark the next: " And they cast dust on their heads, and cried, weeping and wailing, saying, Alas, alas, that great city, wherein were made rich all that had ships in the sea, by reason of her costliness! for in one hour is she made desolate."

Then I go to the 21st verse: " And a mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all." And the 22nd verse: " And the voice of harpers and musicians, and of pipers, and trumpeters, shall be heard no more in thee; and no craftsman, of whatever craft he be, shall be found any more in thee; and the sound of a millstone shall be heard no more in thee; and the light of a candle shall shine no more at all in thee; and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee; for thy merchants were the great men of the earth; for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived." I want you to remark the language. There is the smoke going up night and day forever and. ever, just as in Isaiah, and yet you see the same Babylon, fallen, fallen, " in one hour." Now, I argue from this that it is plain the inspired Apostle John points out here, not an endless process of burning, but the endlessness of the result; for Babylon, when destroyed, shall not be built any more. With respect to the process, we have "a day" and "an hour" mentioned; but with respect to the result, we have several times the phrase, " no more" repeated. This exposition will enable me to answer the question of Mr. Cowley, presented to me with a good deal of confidence. First of all, he said that a certain father used the words, " everlasting fire," and then he referred to Matt 25.46. It is quite evident that this Christian. father did not use that language as we use it in the present day. If there were time I could quote to you some passages from Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Theophilus, and many others, where the same idea as mine is found. They referred to a result; our opponents make them refer to a process. It will enable me also to answer a gentleman who wrote in the Liverpool Albion of to-day, above the signature of Robert Brown, 70, Dorrit Street.

Referring to the lecture given in this room last Tuesday, and to the statement of the lecturer that the Church of England had expelled the doctrine of eternal torment, he says: " Surely the reverend gentleman must have forgotten the Creed of St. Athanasius, which says the wicked shall ' go into everlasting fire.' " No; I had not forgotten it. How could I, when I read it so frequently? I have some degree of memory remaining yet; but if my memory were not one quarter what it is, I could never forget the Athanasian Creed. Nor do I want

to alter a single word in it: I would, if need be, contend for the language in it. Mr. Brown might have quoted another passage in that creed: "Without doubt shall perish everlastingly." I wonder he did not produce it. I am afraid he had forgotten, at any rate, part of this creed; for in his anxiety to bring arguments against me, he would much rather have brought two than one, had he thought of it. To "perish" expresses an act accomplished. The expression is not, "without doubt shall be perishing everlastingly," as if the process of perishing were to go on endlessly, and the punishment, if I may use the word, were never to be accomplished. There again it is the result, and not the process; for when a thing has once perished, it is never resuscitated, if it has everlastingly perished. If I had been a universalist, Mr. Brown might have quoted this creed against me, and it would have been conclusive and final; but inasmuch as I am not a universalist, but an eternal extinction of the wicked, therefore, you see, it does not touch me. I say the same of "everlasting fire."

It is remarkable indeed, that this part of the Athanasian Creed confines itself to Scriptural language: "everlasting fire?" is a Bible phrase. I have given one example from Jude, to show the force of this phrase, and I challenge the world to disprove that whenever this language was used in the earliest and best times, it referred to the result, and not to the process. It was not until heathen philosophy had been brought into the Church that these texts were applied to an endless process. When the doctrine was brought into the Christian Church,—the doctrine that man is unconditionally immortal,—they who did so had to take those texts which, as you see, apply to the endlessness of the result, and make them apply to the endlessness of the process.

These fathers deserve our reprobation, not our approbation; for many of them sowed the seeds of heresy, which to the present day, have plentifully borne pernicious fruits; and the teachers of the Bible now are not yet free from their sad effects, whether they admit it or not. As Dr. Cumming once said, "I really do not want the fathers when I have the grandfathers." That is enough for me; and I tell you, if all the fathers in existence, and all the popes, cardinals, and archbishops, were to come and impose upon me any opinion whatever contrary to God's written word, taken literally and grammatically, I should say that I have the word of God for my guide, and that is stronger than the authority of all men put together. I remember an argument used to an Irishman who had embraced Protestantism. A person said to him, "Patrick! if all the cardinals were to say, This is the way, and all the parsons were to say, No! this is the way; which would you believe?" "Well, your honor, I would say I have the map in my pocket, and I will take it out and look at it myself." This Bible is the map. I do not need any one to tell me which way the railway goes to my home; for I have Bradshaw, and can judge for myself.

I will now proceed to another phase of the subject. Mr. Symington, in his lecture, seemed to reproach our brother, Mr. Ashcroft, a good deal, and to intimate that he must have been ignorant "or something worse," when he put new meanings on old words; and he seemed surprised indeed that Mr. Ashcroft, and the rest of us who are joined with him, should be so ignorant as not to know that the word death is used in "a spiritual sense." We all know that, just as well as we know we have heads upon our shoulders. We all know there is such a text as this:—"You hath He quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." Speaking of a woman living in pleasure, St. Paul says,— "She is dead while she lives." There is the application of the word death to the spiritual state of man as well as to the physical. But that is not the question. Mr. Symington, and others, call this another sense, or another meaning. I quite admit the application of the word death to the spiritual condition of the unconverted, but I have yet to learn that it is used in another sense. It is incumbent on Mr. Symington to show, in order to maintain his position, that when man is spiritually dead, he is not spiritually dead. His argument is this: "There are texts which speak of men as dead when they are alive in this world; and why should not other texts speak of him as dead in the next world, and as alive at the same time? Death is used in a spiritual sense." Yes: but the point is: when the word death is applied to the unconverted condition of man, does it carry another "sense" with it than that which it indicates when it applies to a physically dead body. I can see a different application of the word, but I cannot perceive a different sense. The idea in both cases is the same. When a man is spiritually dead, he is not spiritually alive at the same time. Death is the antithesis of life, as darkness is the antithesis of light; and where the one is, there the other is not. So, when the wicked are dead through the second death in the lake of fire, they are not and cannot be alive in any sense or degree.

And notwithstanding the taunt of Mr. Symington, we still say, "death always means death, and life always means life." And when he avers that, in thus speaking of the word death, we contradict the teaching of our Lord, he is far from right; for when Jesus applied the word "dead" to the spiritual destitution of man, He meant, the man had no spiritual life while in that condition. Spiritual death is the antithesis of spiritual life. When, too, Jesus applied the word to a dead body, He meant, that that body had no physical life; and never did He intimate, or imply that in the one case He used it in one sense and in the other case in a different sense. Jesus was the most accurate Thinker and Teacher that ever lived, and nowhere does He favor the confused logic of Mr. Symington. Even supposing that Jesus did use the word death in different senses, instead of different applications, does that prove, that when the wicked are dead and destroyed, He meant that they should be alive and preserved? Whatever He tells me, I will believe. If He told me that endless torments were true, I would believe in them with my whole heart; simply upon His testimony, as written in the Bible. But He does not. I beg of you to remember what I tried on Tuesday night to say, in the midst of some confusion. Mr. Worrell observed that the original word in the 7th verse of the 2nd of Genesis was in the plural; and this is quite true, though I never heard persons on his side who thought it was in their favor. They try to make it out that, although it is plural in the Hebrew, it ought to be singular in English. God breathed more lives into man's body than one: He breathed into it what we understand by physical life, and also what we understand by mental life. When, too, man was first made, God breathed into him what we understand by spiritual life. When Adam came out of the hands of his Maker, he loved his God with all his heart, and mind; and soul, and strength; and when he had his beloved Eve, I have no doubt that he loved her as himself, and very likely, a great deal better than himself. Since the fall, it is possible for man to be alive as to one of

these lives, and to be dead as to another. The Ephesians, who worshipped Diana, were alive physically, but dead spiritually; until it pleased God to quicken them into spiritual life. I hope I have made myself clear.

I may refer to another matter in Mr. Symington's lecture. He says we give new meanings to words; and with regard to the words "destroy" and "perish," he says they are applied where existence does not come to an end. We contend that "to destroy" means to bring that person or thing to an end, to which the word is applied. May I give an illustration? There is a table. I might take a hatchet and cut it to pieces, and I ask you, is it a table then? It is brought to an end as a table, but the material remains. Suppose I then take the pieces of wood and put them into a fire; they are reduced to ashes, and invisible gas. They are wood no longer. If I could take the ashes and put them out of existence, such an act would be annihilation, but I cannot do that. Chemistry teaches us that though we can change the various molecules of matter, in all sorts of ways, we cannot annihilate or bring to an end a single particle. We can destroy the structure of the table, or of a rose, or of a house. Go to the 7th chapter of St. Matthew. Two builders are mentioned, one of whom built upon a rock, and the other on sand: one house tumbles down—is it a house any longer? No; the material is there but not the house. I ask, then, what is meant by "destroy," or "perish?" We extinctionists say, in the case of man, that it is to bring to an end his living existence. When a house is destroyed it is a house no longer, and when a man is destroyed he is a man no longer.

Again, our opponents would say—There is a sheet lost; but was it out of existence? One of ten pieces of money was lost; but was it out of existence? They put in "existence," even when they speak of man, instead of living existence, or life. It enables them the better to construct their argument, though still very illogically—I do not want to say dishonestly. To illustrate by other examples: "Put off thy shoes from thy feet;" "loose the colt and bring it to Me;" "the bottles perish and the wine is spilled." Our opponents argue thus: "Here are, in the original, some of the words on which you rely to prove that sinners shall be put out of existence (we say living existence); but when the shoes were put off, were they not still in existence? When the colts were loosed, were they out of existence? When the bottles perished, were they out of existence?" Now all this is inaccurately and very illogically put; and I have had to expose it again and again; you will see through the sophistry when I put it to you. When the shoes were off the feet, were they on the feet still? When the colt was loosed, was it bound in the stable still? When the bottles burst and spilled the wine, were they bottles still, and fit to hold wine? This is the true state of the argument, and you will see the correctness of our definition of the words "destroy," etc., when we say that they mean to bring to an end that person or thing to whom or to which they are applied. When, therefore, we read that the wicked shall "be punished with everlasting destruction," we understand that their living existence shall be brought to an end. "Destruction" expresses that the process of the act of destroying is completed, and "everlasting" shows that the act shall never be reversed. There is no instance in the Bible where destroy, or any word like it, is found which does not mean bringing to an end that person, or condition of a person, or that thing, or condition of a thing, to which it is applied. Thus, if it is applied to the character of a man, we say his character is destroyed, though the man himself may be alive. Never in the Bible is a person or thing said to be destroyed, or to have perished, and that person or thing to remain as he or it was. When a living man shall be destroyed in the lake of fire, he shall be a living man no longer; that is, he shall be a man no longer, but, as Obadiah, verse 1.16, says, "he shall be as though he had not been." What words can be plainer or more decisively conclusive? Our friends must really be a little more precise in their mode of thinking. I am sometimes astonished, and more often grieved, when I find clerical brethren, and many of them amongst the Nonconformists, thinking loosely and inaccurately, and speaking so loosely and inaccurately. I really must say I pity those who "sit under them," for I am afraid they will contract the habit of thinking and of speaking just as loosely; and where, then, is their knowledge of God's Word?

I will now consider some of those passages so much relied upon by our opponents. The first is Matt. 3.12: "He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Our opponents wish us to understand by "unquenchable fire," a fire that is endlessly flaming, and shall never go out. I think I may challenge anybody to bring forward a single instance in which the word unquenchable, or any corresponding word or phrase, in any language, means fire that is endlessly burning, and that never shall go out. The meaning of unquenchable fire in all the languages I am acquainted with, not excepting the English language, is a fire that has obtained such a mastery that it is impossible to put it out, until it has entirely consumed that upon which it feeds. You have, unfortunately, had in this neighborhood an example of what unquenchable fire is, in the destruction of the magnificent stage erected for the convenience of the numerous passengers going from one side of the Mersey to the other. You know the stage caught fire, and though there was water and every resource at command, the fire was unquenchable. It could not be put out, and did not go out until it entirely destroyed the woodwork of the stage. This is an illustration of unquenchable fire. The allusion is not to the endlessness of torment, but to the impossibility of the sinner escaping the wrath of God; and the fire into which he shall descend will never go out until there is nothing more of him to burn. Let me quote some texts of Scripture to confirm this idea. I read the 2nd Kings 22. 17:—"Because they have for, oaken Me, and have burned incense unto other gods, that they might provoke Me to anger with all the works of their hands; therefore My wrath shall be kindled against this place, and shall not be quenched." Again, Jeremiah, 7th chapter, 19, 20:—"Do they provoke Me to anger, saith the Lord; do they not provoke themselves to the confusion of their own faces. Therefore thus saith the Lord God; Behold, Mine anger and My fury shall be poured out upon this place, upon man, and upon beast, and upon the trees of the field, and upon the fruit of the ground; and it shall burn, and shall not be quenched." Jeremiah, chapter 17:—"But if he will not hearken unto Me to hallow the Sabbath-day, and not to bear a burden, even entering into the gates of Jerusalem on a 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."

Jeremiah, chapter 4:—"Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your heart, ye men of Judah, and inhabitants of Jerusalem; lest My fury come like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings." These specimens, out of many, will be sufficient to show what is the exact force in the Bible of "unquenchable fire," and will prove that the modern sense put upon it is not true. Here are palaces, etc. etc., consigned to unquenchable fire, but it is not burning now, still less are the palaces yet in process of being burnt, but not "burnt up," as our opponents say shall be the case with the sinner; who, unlike chaff, shall be ever burning in the fire, but not burnt up. Here again we have, in the action of the unquenchable fire, a temporary process, but an eternal result. In fact, the distinction runs throughout the Bible. If you would understand an old Act of Parliament, you must go back and think as the framers thought, and get exactly the same idea as they had. If you would really and truly understand the meaning of the Holy Spirit, in His blessed and invaluable Book, you must go back and study, not only the manners and customs of the Jews, but their style of thought, their idioms, and how they applied certain words and phraseology. You must take their standpoint. I don't know that I have ever undertaken, for my own instruction and to enable me the better to instruct others, so difficult a work as to endeavor to think as I can now understand the ancient Jews and Christians thought; and to endeavor to put myself back, so to speak, behind their mind, and see things from their point of view, and to forget for a time the modern point of view. Do you the same, and you will find that what I tell you now is positive demonstration. Unquenchable fire then carried with it a totally different idea to what it now does in modern theological writings. When John said the wicked shall be burned with unquenchable fire, he did not mean that the fire would be flaming endlessly, still less that the wicked should be ever burning in it and not consumed. If our opponents are right in saying that John the Baptist intended to denote endless torment, it does seem to me that he used a very unsuitable figure to indicate it. Take chaff, and throw it into the fire; it will be "burnt up," and be chaff no longer, and the chaff becomes ashes and invisible gas. I really think, as John the Baptist was placed in the fore-rank by our; blessed Lord to teach the people, if he wished to enforce the modern doctrine of endless torments, he would have used a very different figure than that of burning up chaff in or by fire. Our opponents say that chaff represents the sinner, and the act of burning it up represents that the sinner is not burnt up. I cannot, however, think John taught in so senseless a way as that. If I were to give you a lecture concerning the burning of the Liverpool landing stage, and I were to say that unquenchable fire, which "burnt up the wood of that stage, was an emblem of the wicked who were never to be burnt up, but who are to live forever in the fire, what would you say of my power of selecting suitable figures? You would not call me wise, but perhaps a fool. If John, however, wished to say, "God will bring your living existence to an end," could he have used a more suitable figure? If he believed as I believe, and my friends about me believe, the figure is most appropriate, most forcible, and ought to be most deterring to all, for we all naturally dread death and final extinction. John knew this, and used God's own deterring motive when he said to the wicked about Him, "God will deal with you, if you believe not in His Son Jesus Christ, just as persons deal with chaff which they throw into the fire." The figure, then, does not teach an endlessly existing life in the midst of a fire, but what we call extinction.

I now come to another text, the one our friend Mr. Cowley quoted against me with so much triumphant confidence. There was an air about him of self-superiority, as if he fancied I had altogether overlooked his text, and was not aware that such a one existed. I remember once, in the House of Commons, it was proposed to vote an annual allowance of £50,000 to his late Royal Highness the Prince Consort, who was worth, not only £50,000, but £100,000. Colonel Sibthorp got up and proposed £30,000, and he actually beat the ministers of the day. If you had been in the House, you would have seen him walk down the floor in a stately and triumphant sort of way; and Mr. C. walked from the platform as if he thought he had beaten the lecturer. Why, I assure you, I had been reminded of it so frequently, that I could no more forget it than the head upon my shoulders. This argument of Mr. Cowley, if I understood him aright, was supplied to him by the Right Rev. Bishop Alford, who, for your advantage, and your happiness and profit, lives somewhere in this neighborhood as an incumbent. The argument was, that as the life of the righteous is endless, so the punishment of the wicked must also be endless. Quite true—I believe it. I believe in endless punishment, or eternal punishment, but not the interpretation which our friends and opponents put upon the phrase; which is, endless punishing; as if the act of punishing went on eternally. I believe what God says, but not man's perversion of it. If a color is blue, and anyone interprets it as green, it does not make it green, but the interpretation shows color blindness or prejudice in such a case.

I will tell you now, as I could not enlarge then, my reason for not believing the gloss of man, but the word of God as written by Him. First of all, compare the phraseology of Mr. C.'s text (Matt. 25.46) with phraseology exactly of a like kind found in many places of Scripture.

Remember! the gloss they put upon it is, that "everlasting punishment" denotes the endless process of punishing. I say it denotes the endless result,—that the process does not last endlessly, but that the result lasts forever and ever. Thus the punishment of the wicked is quite as long as the reward of the righteous. But to the proofs. There is "eternal judgment," exactly in the same grammatical construction as "eternal, or everlasting punishment." There is also "eternal salvation," "eternal redemption," and "eternal covenant," found in more places than one in Holy Writ. If I turn to the commentators of the advocates of eternal torments, I find they never take "eternal judgment" as if it meant an eternal process of judging the wicked. How long the judgment day shall last I do not pretend to say, because God does not tell me; but certainly, as we all understand it, this great assize shall not go on endlessly. They say very properly that "eternal judgment" indicates the eternal result of the temporary process of standing before the judgment-seat of Christ, for that the sentence then pronounced against wicked men, shall be inevitable, and forever unalterable. As they never interpret as eternal the process of judging, but only the result, so they must do in the case of "eternal punishment," as they do also in the case of "eternal salvation." This phrase does not denote an eternal act of saving. They insist upon it, and they are right, that salvation must take

place within the " acceptable time," but that the results of it, in the next world shall be endless. Then take the words " eternal redemption." Whether we consider it as meaning the price Jesus paid for us, or the rescue which God's Spirit works for us, to bring us from sin to holiness, we cannot suppose that Christ's act of redemption goes on endlessly.

Our opponents properly say, that when Jesus Christ said, " It is finished, and gave up the ghost," redemption was completed. He bore our sins and carried our sorrows, and with His stripes we are healed. I rejoice that we know that it is to His precious atonement we owe all our blessings in this life, and all our happy prospects in the life to come. Jesus loved me; Jesus died for me. In consequence of this I hope to live with Him forever there; and as long as He gives me strength and breath, I hope to live for Him here. But though the structure of all these phrases is the same in all cases, our opponents will apply to "eternal punishment " the idea of an endless process instead of an endless result, as in all the other instances. Their dogma of the innate immortality of the soul obliges them to resort to this ungrammatical perverted meaning of " eternal punishment." They thus argue:—Here is immortal man, who must live forever; and being a wicked man he cannot live in heaven forever, and must therefore live in hell forever, and the act of punishment and the feeling of pain must last forever. Their assumed premise is wrong. Man has not unconditional immortality. He will live forever if, as a mortally condemned sinner he comes to Jesus, and God justifies him, adopts him into His family, and makes him His own dear child. Such a man will not die forever. But it is not so with the wicked; they shall die, and their death shall be eternal.

I said last Tuesday that this view of the subject is favored, and more than favored, by the original Greek kolasia, translated punishment, and which I still say,—notwithstanding the flat contradiction of a young man—primarily means pruning or cutting off. It was frequently applied to the process of improving the tree by cutting off the useless branches. It has been argued as if this process of pruning was intended for the improvement of the branch cut off; but how strange the thought, that pruning improves the branch pruned off? The tree is the thing benefited, and you know that the tree represents the fruitful body of true Christians. When you get rid of all persons, and of all things not true, the tree will be perfect and complete. How glorious will that time be! "Thy Kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven." That being the primary application of kolasis, its secondary application is to the being severed or cut off from God. I cannot fancy any punishment more terrible that can overtake a living human being, bought by the precious blood of the Lamb, and capable of being sanctified by His Spirit, and of living forever, than to be thus cut off from God. It is indeed a punishment, and a terrible punishment. Our opponents interpret the process of pruning as endlessly going on, and yet the branch never severed—the cuts inflicted night and day forever, and yet mysteriously never cut off. We say, the branch is cut off, never grafted on again, but burnt to ashes; so far is it from ever becoming a living branch again. Our Divine Lord says:—" If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered, and men gather them up and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." (John xv. 6.) There Jesus refers to the custom of men taking the branches cut from the trees and making use of them for fuel; and I suppose, when these useless branches are put into the fire they are not preserved there in and by the fire, but are burned up. Eternal punishment, therefore, does not indicate endlessness of painful feelings, or conscious pain, but it indicates the endless result of the temporary pain inflicted by the punishment. Let man be once cut off from God, the only source of life, and in the great day of judgment, he must die forever; for how can the branch live apart from the vine?

The spirit enlivens no longer. Read the 1st chapter of Proverbs upon this subject. The Spirit strives no longer; the means of grace no longer exist; the offers of mercy no longer are made; and salvation is then impossible. The punishment here indicated is the opposite of the reward of the righteous; and as the reward of the righteous is life; so the punishment of the wicked is non-life, and non-life is death. They are to be east into the lake of fire, which is the second death. It is enough to make one shudder and weep. Alas, that any one of our fellow creatures, bought by the blood of Christ, and capable of winning a crown of glory, should be so reckless as to care nothing about it, but go on in sin, and forever perish. I cannot but be deeply affected that my brothers and sisters should be brought to such a terrible end as this. Jesus suffered death for man, and it is His wish that all men should ton brought to the foot of the cross, to be washed in the blood which cleansed from sin—in one word, to be born from above, and so live forever.

Let me go to another terrible passage, often brought forward, from Mark 9. 42-50, a passage too long now to read, but where we find the awful words—" Where their worm dies not, and the fire is not quenched." I have shown the Scriptural force of the phrase " unquenchable fire; " that it is a fire which cannot be put out, and will not go out until it has wholly destroyed the victim; and now I have to show you that the Scriptural force of the phrase, " worm dies not," is of the same kind. Our Lord alluded to, and some of His words were taken from, Isaiah 66. 23, 24, where we are told of what shall take place in the earth in the sight of those who stately go to worship; and the allusion is to the fact that outside Jerusalem, in the valley of Hinnom, or Gehenna, dead carcasses were collected. Each putrid carcass bred its own worm, or worms, which never passed over to another carcass; and hence the expression, " their worm." As is always the case, as long as there was any putrid flesh, so long was there the loathsome worm 'to eat it; but when this flesh was consumed, then " their worm " died, and did not go to another body to keep itself alive. When, however, the carcasses were so numerous as to be injurious to man's health, it was customary to light fierce fires, and burn to innocuous ashes all the carcasses which were there; and so many carcasses were brought, that seldom were the fires allowed to go out night or day. Now, this terrible scene became to the Jews a sample or picture of the punishment of sinners in the judgment-day. It was not, however, a picture of an endless process of consuming the carcass, yet the carcass never consumed; nor does it appear that such an idea ever entered into the people's minds; for with respect to the process of the gnawing in each body, and of the burning of each body, they had the proof of their own eyes, that both came to an end; but with respect to the result, in each case, they knew well there was no end. It was to a people who had such ideas and views as these, that Jesus addressed the awful warnings in St. Mark. Our opponents pervert and lessen

the effect of the warnings, by applying to the process of gnawing and burning what Jesus applied to the result; and if they would speak out in plain, unmistakable language, they would say something like this: Look at that dead carcass. It represents the ever-living, never-dying soul. Look at that worm, whose power is very small, and whose living existence is but for a time. That represents the all-powerful and ever-living Jehovah. Look at the gnawing of the worm.

That gnawing represents the effect of the anger of Jehovah upon the living soul of man dwelling in flames. Look at the insensibility of the carcass which the worm feeds upon. That represents the terrible, indescribable tortures of the living sinner. Then look at the quietness of that dead carcass. That represents the dreadful writhings, groanings, turnings, and twisting of the lost soul in hell forever and ever." Now I say, if our opponents would really speak out, and say what their meaning is in plain language, they would express themselves in this way; and if they do not mean all this, then their argument, from this passage, utterly fails.

Now, I put it to you, whether, if our blessed Master, who is wisdom itself, had intended to teach what our opponents teach, He would have used a figure of this kind. If what our opponents say be true, Jesus would have put His meaning in words so clear and decisive as to make it impossible to be mistaken. He would not have represented a never-dying soul by a dead carcass; nor the terrible endless infliction of pain by the gnawing of worms which was unfelt by the putrid carcass. Look at all the figures our Lord has used, and you will find them worthy of Him, and of His wisdom; but if our opponents are right, I do say, though I say it with reverence, that the figures here used, as interpreted by them, are not worthy of Him, nor in accordance with His usual teaching, such as that in the parable of the tares, where He assures us the tares shall be gathered in bundles to be burnt. And are they tares still, notwithstanding they are burnt? or, can the children of the wicked one, represented by the tares, be living men still, notwithstanding they are burnt up in the lake of fire? O, friends, open your eyes, and exercise the common-sense which God has given you, and which He tells you to exercise.

Search the Bible for yourselves, and see whether those things which our opponents teach you are true; and fear not to follow where the Bible leads; always discerning the difference between what is taken out of the Bible and what is brought to it, by commentators, traditionalists, and rationalists.

But we must not forget the awful words, " everyone shall be salted with fire." The explanation of these words by our opponents is, that as the flesh of animal victims was salted with salt to preserve it, so the bodies of the wicked shall be salted with a fire, which shall not destroy them, but preserve them. I ask, however, did the salt which was offered with the sacrifices prevent them from being destroyed by the fire of the altar? Did it even prolong the process of destruction, still less prolong it indefinitely? If not, where is the analogy? O, why should the professed believers of the Bible make it speak such un wisdom and untruth. No wonder there is so much infidelity among those who identify the utterances of men about the Bible, with the Bible itself. But remember, it is not the Bible which is responsible for this: it is the so-called orthodox teachers who are responsible for it; and I fear a great load of guilt rests upon them, whether they know it or not; and in love to their souls, I would beg them to repent. Further: Salt was among the Jews, and is now among the Arabs, a token of acceptance, protection, and friendliness, and therefore we read in Holy Scripture of " a covenant of salt," and the salt offered with the Jewish sacrifices was a token of God's acceptance and protection, and of His friendliness towards the faithful offering. But mark the terrible and telling contrast drawn by our Lord. To the wicked He applies the token of unacceptance, of wrath, and of destruction. They shall be salted with fire; and fire, you are aware, is in Scripture the emblem of the destruction of whatever it is applied to, and nowhere of its preservation. Let, however, the teaching of Jesus in St. Mark be taken in its natural sense, and it will be seen that He distinctly teaches the final extinction of the wicked. As surely as the worms devour the flesh of the dead bodies, and as surely and inevitably as the fire burnt them up, so surely and inevitably, and without recovery, shall the -kicked be devoured in Gehenna. Jesus knew human nature, and we should be wise, and useful also, if we would use the deterring motive which He employed, and not that other which is of man's invention, and therefore unsuitable and useless. Really, when I see the Word of God so twisted by scripture readers, Sunday-school teachers, ministers, clergymen, and — if Mr. Cowley's testimony on Tuesday be true—even by right rev. bishops, I am not surprised, though deeply grieved, at the indifference of the million to our holy religion; and it is high time for all of them to inquire whether it is not their Christianity which is so inefficient, not the Christianity of Christ. In faithfulness to my God and Master, I must add that the time is come when the pious and the thoughtful among the laity will be no imager apathetic or misled, but will read, and assert the Protestant liberty of thinking for themselves. Infidelity is believing what is contrary to God's Word; and I affirm, and challenge the disproof of the affirmation, that endless torment is a dogma contrary to God's Word; and if our opponents attempt the disproof, let them not ignore our arguments, but fairly grapple with them, and no more repeat those arguments which do not apply to me, and which have been scripturally answered over and over again.

I want to say one word more. We are accused by Mr. Symington of taking away the most efficacious motive to morality; and a clergyman once said to me:—" If I did not preach eternal torment to my people, they would never repent." I answered, " Do they repent now?" He knew they did not, and he was silent. When persons talk in this way, I cannot help asking:—What deliverance has their doctrine accomplished in the earth? Jesus commanded the Gospel to be preached to every creature, and they say, each creature has an immortal soul, which can be saved only by the Gospel. What influence then has this alleged' powerful motive had, upon its advocates for 1500 years? Look at a missionary map, and see how small a part of the earth is whitened with Christianity. Examine Christendom during these ages, and what good has this long-cherished and oft-urged motive done? Look at home! What has it done in so-called Christian England? Do not sabbath breaking, and drunkenness, and ruffianism, and cheating, and crime abound? Or look at the congregations that run after the popular evangelical preacher, who often hurls the darts of endless torments at his rapt audience; what worldliness, what dressiness, what pleasure-seeking, what hardness of heart and neglect of personal religion. I ask again, what

has your lauded motive done? It is said that the shopkeeping and trading classes of this country, are, for the most part, steady church and chapel goers; if your motive is so powerful, how is it that an Act of Parliament was required to prevent our being poisoned by our food and drinks? Is our doctrine responsible for all this, and much more? No! our opponents themselves being judges. It is theirs. Where, I demand, is its efficacy? Your motive power has failed. Had you better not try ours, and urge eternal extinction?—which has this advantage, that it appeals to a well-known, and universally admitted instinct of our nature; namely, the dread of death. "Skin for skin; all that a man hath will he give for his life." And besides this, extinction is the deterring motive which He who made us urges in his Word, and to it He can give His blessing; but he cannot give His blessing to man's invention, and the devil's lie, uttered in paradise and circulated by those who are called Christ's ministers:—"Ye shall not surely die," but "ye shall be as God"—the immortal God. This motive, too, can be believed. Endless torment cannot be really believed. The human mind is not constructed for it, any more than it is constructed to believe there is no God. Look into the face of your own heart, and ask, and demand an honest answer: Is your faith in endless torment of the same kind as that by which you believe that Jesus is the Savior? Nobody really believes it. And this reminds me of what I had almost forgotten.

Some time since, someone sent me a pamphlet entitled, "Do they believe it?" The writer threw considerable doubt whether the advocates of endless torment believed in it themselves. I really think they do not; or if they do, they seem to me, the most of them, to be inhuman creatures; judging from the perfunctory way in which their duties are discharged. When they are in company, Christ's love and salvation are the last things talked about. They can preach their endless torments, and afterwards can laugh, and joke, and enjoy themselves as much as others. Would they do this, and many more of such things, if they really believed that myriads of their brothers and sisters, and wives, and children, were hasting to endless, inconceivable tortures? Don't tell me that they believe this! or if they do, where is their Christianity? where is their humanity? and what influence has their efficacious motive upon them? Alas, the shams that pass current under the garb of religion! Ye young men who are advocates of this dogma, don't get married. God said: "Increase and multiply," it is true; but for pity's sake don't ever bear the honored, endearing name of father, seeing that ninety-nine hundredths of children grow up, live awhile, die, and then roll, and blaspheme, and agonize, and writhe, in un-known, indescribable, inconceivable, irretrievable misery. Men of Birkenhead, help! Gentlemen of the press, help us to get rid of the false, and to establish the true. I have ever had fair play from the so-called secular press; but from the mis-named religious press, never. Mothers of England, help us! and teach your children God's pure Word, untrammelled with man's traditions.

In conclusion, the rev. lecturer appealed to those who held his opinion to follow the example of Captain Ward, who was indefatigable in spreading and reviving the long-lost truth of the conditional immortality of the soul, and of the final extinction of the wicked.

The discussion.

CAPTAIN WARD said he should be happy to receive questions for the lecturer. He had already received a large number, and he would call upon the lecturer to answer them seriatim. Those to whom it was inconvenient to write questions would be allowed the space of five minutes to speak; but at the end of that time the speaker must sit down, whether he had finished or not. (Cheers.)

Question, by H. J. Whiteside.

Do the words, "their worm," refer to a living something preying upon the body? or does the worm belong to the body or not, and what is this worm—"their worm?"

The Lecturer.

"Their worm" is the particular worm bred in the carcass on which it feeds, and which it never leaves to go to another carcass, and it dies when there is nothing more to keep it alive. But as long as there is anything to feed upon, the worm does not die; and this is the force of the expression, "dies not." The lesson taught is, that as the breeding and the gnawing of the worm arise out of the corruption of the dead body, so the punishment of sin arises from the corruption of the mortal man, and the one is as certain as the other. "They shall utterly perish," says St. Peter, "in their own corruption." "The wages of sin is death." (Cheers.)

Question.

God being infinite in His nature and attributes, can anything else than an eternal process of punishing satisfy His justice? (Oh, oh, and slight applause.)

The Lecturer.

Nowhere in the Bible is the turpitude of sin reckoned according to the dignity of the person sinned against. Sin is "exceeding sinful;" but its turpitude is reckoned according to law, and the help we have had for keeping it. What right have persons to add to God's Word, and make a supposition to support another supposition? Can two, or twenty suppositions, make one certainty? The intrinsic nature of sin, according to promulgated law, is the only just way of judging of its turpitude. And when Mr. Symington accuses us of taking our own notions of justice, and of daring to tell God what He ought to do, he is bearing untrue witness. When we speak of a thing as unjust, we judge of it according to what God tells us in His Word is just. "Sin is the transgression of the law," says St. John, and everywhere the Bible tells us we shall be judged "according to the deeds done in the body," nowhere according to the dignity of the person sinned against. (Cheers.)

Question.

What will become of children dying in infancy? Do you believe in a literal eternal hell fire?

The Lecturer.

I don't believe in a hell fire burning endlessly; but I do believe in a lake of fire, in which sinners will be cast, and where they shall be consumed. I do believe in a literal fire, and that literal fire will bring sinners to destruction. (Cheers.) As to infants, I cannot agree with the man who said to me, " There are infants—plenty of them—in hell, a span long, and will burn in hell forever and ever." (" Shame!") I don't agree with that, for I believe all infants are saved through the blood of Christ. (Loud cheers.)

A VOICE.

We all believe that.

The CHAIRMAN.

Some gentleman wants to kill two birds with one stone. He asks, " What does salted with fire mean? " I think that question has been already answered by the lecturer. I don't think it is necessary to put that question again. (Hear, hear.) " What does their worm' mean? it does not say the worm. W. Davies."

MR. DAVIES rose, and said he referred to the words, " every sacrifice shall be salted with fire," which he wished explained.

The Lecturer.

The burning of salt with the sacrifice was a sign of friendliness; therefore Moses was particular in ordering that every sacrifice should be salted with salt. To be salted with fire means the very opposite of this. This is a sign of hostility and destruction. Some disciples had been quarrelling as to which should be the greatest; thus exhibiting that worldly ambition which has since been such a curse to the Church of Christ. They had also been forbidding someone from casting out devils because he was not of their party. Jesus says, Do not forbid: do not quarrel: be friendly as those who eat each other's salt. " Have salt in, or among, yourselves; and have peace one with another." (Verse 50.) Let the questioner read the whole context, from verse 33.

MR. WHITESIDE.

It is not in the plural, but in the singular. It is " their worm," which is something belonging to the sinner himself.

The Lecturer.

Their worm is the worm peculiar to the body in which it was bred. Still, the worm devours the dead carcass, which is incapable of signifying, as our opponents aver, a living, immaterial, never-dying soul. For my argument, the singular will suffice as well as the plural, (Cheers.)

Question from Mr. George Donaldson.

What interpretation do you take of everlasting punishment in the 46th verse of the 25th chapter of Matthew? Do you take everlasting punishment to be terminable in process, and eternal life interminable? Are these antithetical?

The Lecturer.

The passage speaks of two sentences; one to everlasting life, the other to everlasting punishment. The processes of executing these sentences are both temporary; but the result in each case is alike everlasting. Neither sentence will ever be reversed. The righteous shall live forever, the wicked shall die forever. Life and death are antithetical.

Question.

Reconcile John 5.27, with Isaiah 33.14, " Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings "

The Questioner.

Kindly explain what is meant by everlasting burnings.

" Burnings " is a noun, as the original shows; and it refers to what we call a kitchen fire. The prophet's question implies that no one can dwell with everlasting burnings; as anyone consigned to them would soon be " burnt up." We have here another example of a temporary process and of an everlasting result. John 5. 29 is of the same kind as in all other instances in the Bible.

Question.

Explain Revelation 20. 10, latter part, " And shall be tormented day and night forever."

The CHAIRMAN.

I think that has been answered already, and is rather irrelevant.

The Questioner. —I want to know what interpretation the lecturer attaches to this passage, which refers to the devil, the beast, and the false prophet. If these are tormented, why not men?

The Lecturer.

First of all, I must tell you what I have not had an opportunity yet of saying, that the devil will be consigned to the same punishment as wicked men, viz., " to everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels; " so it is the same kind of punishment. (Hear, hear.) St. Paul expressly tells us, in Hebrews 2.14, that the devil shall be destroyed. The Seed of the woman was to bruise, or crush, the serpent's head. And when you crush a serpent's head you make him as dead as a stone, to use a common expression. The devils know this. They " fear and tremble." They said. " We know Thee who Thou art, the Holy One of God; art Thou come to destroy us before the time? " The devil shall be destroyed, as well as those whom he has seduced, and I say, considering that he is the author of all evil and misery in the world, the sooner the better. (Cheers.) As to Rev. 20.10, its language is exactly like that of Isaiah 34, already considered, and expresses an endless result, not an endless process, as we saw. The process of putting the devil out of living existence will be torment. At the same time you must know that the word translated " tormented " is applied to a ship "tossed" in a rough sea. Let me add that the verse should be read thus:—" And the devil that deceived them (Gog, etc.) was cast into the lake of fire (where the beast and false prophet were cast) and they (the devil, Gog, etc. etc.) shall be tormented day and night forever and ever."

MR. H. J. WHITESIDE.

Something has been said about the inhumanity of endless torments. If it is considered an inhuman thing to permit an endless state of torment after the resurrection, is it not more inhuman to permit a resurrection, when no good can result from the torment? The Lecture—That is indeed " telling God what He ought to do." God tells me that the wicked shall be raised. I don't question the propriety or the righteousness of it. If it were not a proper thing, God would not have said so. They are to be raised so that they may be judged according to the deeds done in the body, and afterwards they shall be put out of living existence; and as theirs must be miserable, I think this doom to be both just and merciful. What I said about the inhumanity was, to believe that our fellow creatures were going to endless misery, and yet to be so apathetic about it. That is inhumanity indeed. (Cheers.) I see Mr. Linton complains of some who said he desired that there should be eternal torments, and he indignantly repels such an accusation. Why, then, I ask, does he bring it against the good God? He and his associates say, God can destroy both body and soul in Gehenna, but that He will not. If so, then God desires it. Is Mr. Linton more benevolent than God? and if Mr. Linton is so sensitive of his own character, shall not we extinctionists be more sensitive of the character of our God, and repel with greater indignation the foul slander that He will endlessly torture the vast majority of His human creatures, and miraculously keep them alive in order to torture them? He can put them out of torture, but He will not! Blasphemy! I cannot trust myself to say all I feel.

MR. COWLEY.

How do you know He won't?

The Lecturer.

You and your followers say so in print. If He will put their body and soul out of living existence, that is on my side; and I shall be glad if Mr. Cowley believes it. They say that God will punish endlessly, although He is able to kill both body and soul in hell; that is, God will raise them up at the resurrection of the wicked, make their bodies indestructible by a miracle hour by hour, so as to keep the flame from destroying their bodies, on purpose to torture these poor creatures. Moloch and Nero never had such a bad character as that, and I will not allow such an inhuman, ungodlike character to be given to my good God. (Cheers.) But I will denounce the vile slander and false witness whenever I have opportunity. Alas, that God's ministers should be among the slanderers of their Master, when they ought to be His defenders.

MR. LEWIS, from the platform.

It is said about Moloch's judgments, " They never came into my heart." (Jer. 7.31.) (Hear, hear.)

Question.

Explain the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, who in " hell lifted up his eyes, being in torments," etc.

The Lecturer.

To explain fully would require a whole lecture. First of all I must tell you the explanation which our opponents give. They say that the parable represents the immaterial soul in an intermediate state, where the soul of the rich man was tormented and tortured. Now I really know nothing of the parable, except what the parable itself tells me. It tells me that the rich man was in hades, had eyes, and a tongue, and a mouth, and spoke; that, in one word, he had a material body, and our opponents gratuitously interpret all this of an immortal, immaterial soul, which they say cannot suffer from material fire. My answer is that the parable tells the wicked what the wicked ought to learn, and what the rich especially ought to learn, viz., if they, instead of helping their deserving poor brethren, give themselves up to living sumptuously and wearing fine linen every day, whilst Lazarus is at their door starving, they will most inevitably, in the last day, lift up their eyes in torments. The parable does not say a single syllable that that torture is to be endlessly inflicted, and other parts of the Bible affirm the contrary. (Cheers.)

Question.

Do you believe in a uniform punishment, or degrees of punishment? " Some shall be beaten with many stripes, and some with few."

The Lecturer.

If punishment is to be endlessly extended, where will you get the difference of degrees? I return our friend the question. (Cheers.) I learn that some have sinned more heinously, and also against greater light and knowledge than others, and in the day of judgment they will be punished with many stripes, and I suppose these many will be severer, and will take longer to inflict, than the few. (" Oh, oh," and Mr. Cowley: " There's definition;" and " Order.") I turn from Mr. Cowley and appeal to the thoughtful, the reasonable, and the tolerant, whether many stripes will not take longer to inflict than the few 2 But whether few or many, the end shall be everlasting extinction. (Hear, hear.)

MR. COWLEY.

Where's the parallel between God and man?

The Lecturer.

It is Christ's own parallel, and He it is who draws the parallel between what is done now and what God will do hereafter. Here is the parallel which Mr. Cowley demands. (Cheers and hisses.)

A large number of questions were handed up from Mr. J. B. Hargreaves, who was requested by the chairman to read his own questions.

MR. HARGREAVES.

The first question refers to your own words of Tuesday. I ask, Is it not the case that when the Church of England revised her articles, and reduced them from forty-two to thirty-nine, removing those which, according to Mr. Warleigh, expressed eternal torments, (provided she in none of her formularies decides the question,) did she not leave the question open?

The Lecturer.

Most decidedly not. The rule laid down by the Judicial Council in the Bennett case was this:—When the Church has abolished anything, the opposite to it was to be held by her ministers, unless, in some other place, she had declared to the contrary. (Cheers from Mr. Hargreaves.) She abolished the dogma of endless torments in 1562, and nowhere has she forbidden the belief of the opposite of this dogma. On the contrary, she everywhere declares that life and immortality are gifts flowing from the atonement, and her ministers have often to read that the wicked will " save his soul alive only if he turns from his sins and does what is lawful and right." She often forbids universalism, but oftener still implies extinction. She abolished the 40th article, which taught the natural immortality of the soul; and she implies everywhere that man can be immortal only by union with Christ. At least three times the Judicial Council has declared that the Church of England does not teach endless torments. Now, when the rulers of a household have banished from it a certain thing, I solemnly ask, what right have the servants of that household to retain it, and dispense it to the members of the family?

MR. HARGREAVES.

I have another question. Will Mr. Warleigh give me his opinion on the teaching of the Church of England in the ninth Homily, where it says, " The first cause why men fear death is because they lose their worldly influence and riches; the second cause is painful disease and the struggles of death by which they leave the world; and third, although these two causes seem great and weighty to the worldly man, whereupon he is moved to fear death, yet there is another cause much greater than any of these afore rehearsed, for which, indeed, he hath just cause to fear death; and that is the state and condition of the wicked at the last end, death bringeth all them that have their hearts fixed upon this world without repentance and amendment, and this state and condition is called the second death, which, unto all such shall ensue, after this bodily death; and it is that death which indeed ought to be dreaded and feared, for it is an everlasting loss, without remedy, of the grace and favor of God, and of everlasting joy, pleasure, and felicity: and it is not only the loss forever of all these eternal pleasures, but also it is the condemnation both of body and soul, without either appellation, or hope, or redemption, into everlasting pains in hell." (Cheers.)

The Lecturer.

I can only say that every word of that is in exact accordance with my teaching (" No, no!" and cries of " pains," from Mr. Hargreaves) to-night, for sinners shall have pain, but not everlasting in the process. It will be everlasting in the result; that is how I interpret it. The judges, the two archbishops, the Bishop of London, went over all this as well as our young friend, and I suppose they were as well able to understand these passages as be, yet it was their deliberate judgment, in the face of all that, that the Church of England does not teach endless torments. The Church of England does use the phraseology of the Scripture exactly as it is in Scripture, and everlasting refers to the inevitable result, and not to the process. (Loud cheers.)*

* When in the lecture room, I took it for granted that as Mr. Hargreaves purported to understand the whole bearings of the questions which he put to me, he read from the second Book of the Homilies, which alone has the formal sanction of the Church. On reaching

home, however, I perceived that he read from the first Book, which forms no part of the law of the Church of England. Mr. Hargreaves ought to have said it was the second book from which he quoted, he ought also to have known that his extracts had no bearing whatever upon his argument. Still, as I said at the lecture, there is nothing in his extract contrary to my teaching, as he himself will see when he fully knows what my teaching is. Let me ask him calmly to read my "Twelve Discussions," published by Stock, London.

MR. HARGREAVES.

DO you hold the words, "kill the soul," to mean, to render the soul unconscious, insensible, powerless?

The Lecturer.

Yes.

MR. HARGREAVES asked if there was any difference in the words, "shall kill the soul," and "to destroy both body and soul in hell."

The Lecturer.

There is no difference, except that the phraseology is more terrible in one than the other; it also does say "kill the soul," or destroy the soul; and destroy, remember, is to bring a thing to an end in respect to the state in which that thing is, to which destruction is applied. It is applied here to the whole of the wicked natural man, "body and soul."

MR. HARGREAVES.

It is not in the power of man to destroy his soul? (Matt. 10. 39.)

The Lecturer.

It means this, as you will find from the connection, that our Lord was warning His disciples against unfaithfulness arising from persecution "If from faithfulness to Me, you lose your soul or life by their putting you to death, you shall find your soul or life again in the next world." This is perfectly consistent with all the rest of Holy Scripture. I see no inconsistency in my opinions with that. (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN.

Any more questions?

MR. COWLEY.

I have been very patient, Mr. Chairman, and it is my turn now. (Laughter.) You want to put time in the way now.

The CHAIRMAN.

Now, Mr. Cowley, you shall have the first word. (Laughter.)

MR. COWLEY.

Will the lecturer explain what it was that God breathed into Adam? was it part of Himself, identical with Himself; or was it human spirit? If it was part of Himself, it was a Divine Spirit, and was immortal; consequently it could not destroy itself, as my friend there has beautifully stated.

The Lecturer.

I see that Mr. Cowley makes no distinction between the soul of man and the spirit of man, although the Bible never confounds them. Man is of a three-fold nature, as St. Paul declares, "spirit, and soul, and body." The body is the frame made of dust; the spirit is a portion of the Divine Spirit—

MR. COWLEY.

Then man is Divine. (Cries of "Put him out," and "Sit down.")

The Lecturer.

Please do not interrupt me. The spirit of man is a portion of the Divine Spirit breathed into his earthy organized frame; the soul is the life of the frame or body, and is produced there by that portion of the Spirit which was breathed into that body; for life cannot arise, as Tyndall would have us believe, from the peculiar disposition of the atoms of which an organism is composed. All life, of every kind and degree, can come only from the one Source of life, the Great Neshamah, or Spirit of God. This is the Bible account of the matter, and it fully accounts for all the phenomena of life. No life in the organism can remain longer than that portion of the Spirit remains which imparted that life, just as the effect can remain no longer than the cause of it remains. When man's portion of the spirit returns to God who gave it, and the soul or life of the body ends, then the body returns to dust as it was. I said on Tuesday that when viewed as the portion of the spirit which dwells in the body, it is called the spirit of man, but that when viewed as to its source, it is the Spirit of God. When a man dies in this world it is in consequence of the spirit leaving him. At the resurrection the spirit is sent into him

again, and he again becomes a living man as he was before. To the righteous this spirit shall ever be preserved, and they shall eternally live amidst those pleasures which are at God's right hand forevermore. But the wicked shall be again deprived of his portion of the spirit, and this time forever, for he shall have no more resurrection or resuscitation. He shall die in the lake of fire forever.

MR. COWLEY.

Does the wicked spirit go, to dwell with God? (Cries of " sit down.")

The CHAIRMAN.

The lecturer has already told you, and your five minutes are up. (Hear, hear.) There are other gentlemen waiting to speak.

MR. COWLEY.

I have not had justice in this meeting. (" Oh, oh! ")

The Lecturer.

Let him put his question.

MR. COWLEY.

Where is the spirit of Cain, the spirit of Judas, of Abel, and of Peter now?

The Lecturer.

With God. The spirits of the holy dead are kept by Him in their individual identity, and the portions of the spirit which had been in the wicked are absorbed in Him, just as those other portions are which once strove with the wicked, but which they resisted. Have you ever observed that while the Bible speaks of the soul as lost, and the body as lost, it never speaks of the spirit as lost; and whilst it speaks of the body and soul as redeemed, it never speaks of the spirit as redeemed? This is worthy of deep consideration, and shows that the spirit in man is not--

MR. COWLEY, interrupting

Psuche, is it?

The Lecturer.

Mr. Cowley, who is, I am told, a Scripture reader, really shows how little he is acquainted with that Book which he professes to read. (Cheers.)

Mr. COWLEY.

Do you apply psuche to the spirit, or to the soul?

The Lecturer.

To the soul, never to the spirit. The Bible never confounds the two.

A Questioner.

1 Thess. 5. 23, " May God preserve thy soul, body, and spirit to everlasting life."

The Lecturer.

Our brother does not correctly quote the text. " I pray God, your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." A glance at the Greek will show that it is not unto the coming, but in or at the coming, and it will show, too, that the opposite of the word rendered " blameless" is not sinfulness, but incompleteness. For a man to be complete, in all the integrity of his three-fold nature, he must not be destitute of any one part, or he is not a man in his integrity. Now, the righteous shall be preserved at the coming of Christ in their full integrity, but the wicked will not. After judgment, they shall be deprived of the spirit which made them alive, and they will be men no longer, but will be extinct. The questioner must observe that St. Paul had prayed for the whole sanctification of the Thessalonian believers, and that in order to be preserved in the day of Christ, we must be wholly sanctified now.

MR. COWLEY.

Another question, Did God breathe the same spirit into a fish as he breathed into man?

The Lecturer.

Yes. (Mr. Cowley: Then a fish is a Divine being.) He put a portion of His Spirit into the fish, and without it that organized creature which we call a fish could not be alive. Moses, David, Solomon, Paul, teach this. Why does not Mr. Cowley believe these inspired writers rather than his own illogical inferences? He had better not go out of his own depth.

The CHAIRMAN.

Shall Mr. Cowley go on? (Several voices, " No, no.")

MR. COWLEY.

Answer my question.

The CHAIRMAN.

It has been answered. Cries of " Sit down."

A Questioner.

What will be the result of your teaching on the minds of young people?

The Lecturer.

I trust it will be to establish revealed truth in their minds, and bring out the truth. The second result will be, I hope, to vindicate—

MR. COWLEY (interrupting).

Does the spirit of man—

The CHAIRMAN.

Not another moment; you have occupied too much time already. (Hear, hear.)

The Lecturer.

Let him put the question; but there is a gentleman here whom I am answering.

MR. COWLEY.

O, go on, Mr. Warleigh; go on. I'll give way. (Laughter.)

The Lecturer.

Really, Mr. Cowley, you are very kind, so graciously to give me permission to speak in my own meeting. (Laughter.) I was saying that I trust the second result will be that God's character will be vindicated. The next will be the encouragement of self-condemned and distracted persons to come to the God of Love for pardon and salvation through Christ. (Hear, hear.) After I had delivered a lecture something like the present, a working man came to me and said, " Sir, I could not pray before I heard your lecture. Before that I was afraid to go to the God which had been described to me in sermons. (Hear, hear.) After I heard your lecture, I went to Him in prayer, and He has accepted me." (Cheers.) I hope God may give a similar blessing here. A friend of mine was very recently preaching, and begging sinners to turn to God. A person came up and said, " Sir, I will be a Christian if you prove to me that the Bible does not teach endless torments." He did not put it in that way, but in expressions I do not wish to repeat. The preacher held that the Bible did teach endless torments, so there was no attempt made to rescue this poor sinner. The next morning a girl came up, and said, " I want to love God, I wish to love Him; but I can't love God if you tell me that He will punish me forever in unknown torments." No effort was made for the poor girl, but a clergyman sent her one of my books, and she has written to say that through it she had found joy, comfort, peace, and pardon. (Cheers.) I have lots of grateful letters of a similar character. My lectures have had God's blessing; and as they contain the truth, they are fitted to save souls. (Renewed cheers.)

A GENTLEMAN rose to put a question, but he was told by the chairman that the lecturer could not stay answering questions all night. (Hear, hear.) (It was eleven o'clock, and the lecture began at half-past seven.)

The Lecturer.

Let Mr. Cowley put his question, or he will say it was shirked. (Laughter.)

MR. COWLEY.

When the spirit is renewed to the body and the soul at the resurrection, and when it receives its sentence in that position, does the spirit, after judgment, go into everlasting fire, or does it go back to God again?

The Lecturer.

It goes back to God.

MR. COWLEY.

Then a wicked man goes to God. (" Oh, oh!")

The Lecturer.

Can't Mr. Cowley distinguish between body and soul, and the portion of the spirit which gave life to both? The spirit returns to God,

the body returns to its original elements; the soul, being animal life, expires. How illogical to say the wicked man goes to God. The spirit is not the man, but only one of the three parts, all of which united make the man. If I could supply Mr. Cowley with thoughtfulness, or cultivation of mind, I gladly would. (Cheers.)

At this stage there was some confusion, and Mr. WALTER LEWIS proposed a vote of thanks to the lecturer. MR. COWLEY said he would second it, for the lecturer had given an excellent lecture from his own point of view. The motion was put to the meeting, and carried by acclamation. The Lecturer returned thanks, after which a vote of thanks was accorded to the Chairman, and the meeting separated.

<http://www.creationisonline.com/TSK/Immortality.html>