

#### FOURTH PROPOSITION—ELEVENTH SESSION.

MR. CONWAY, Chairman—The last proposition is this: The Scriptures teach that the final punishment of the wicked will consist in the total extinction of their being.

Mr. Williams affirms,

Mr. Hall denies.

*(Mr. Williams' First Speech of One Hour.)*

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, RESPECTED FRIENDS:—We have shown you clearly from the scriptures of truth that man is a creature formed from the dust of the ground; that he was made alive by the impartation of the breath of life; that he became a living, breathing, thinking creature. We have shown you as a result of this formation that it is possible for a man that is formed from the dust of the ground to die and to be destroyed. We have shown you in our last proposition that there are some men who live and die like the beasts that perish and are no more and never shall be any more and that therefore the absolute destruction of their being is a matter of fact. This class has been referred to frequently in the previous proposition as those who “sleep a perpetual sleep and shall not awake,” who shall “never have a portion any more forever in any thing that is done under the sun”; who are “dead and shall not live, who are deceased and shall not arise, who have been visited and destroyed and all their memory has perished;” that is the end of such and consequently the destruction of their entire being has taken place.

But there are others to whom we have called your attention who have become amendable to law, the law of the gospel; they are to come forth from the death state when there shall be a “resurrection of the dead both of the just and the unjust.” These “unjust” ones will receive their final punishment at the tribunal of Christ and it will be the entire destruction of their being; and so after that they will no longer exist in a conscious state.

Against this proposition our friend is here to affirm that instead of God destroying the wicked, they are to be preserved alive eternally. He will want you to believe that it is the purpose and plan of God, prearranged from eternity, to preserve the vast majority of the human family in writhing torture through the countless ages of eternity yet to come. I want you to believe that God’s plan and purpose is that the wicked are to perish; that the time shall come when “God shall be all and in all,” and his glory shall fill the earth as the waters cover the sea. That is the issue. My proposition affirms the utter and absolute destruction of being of all those who are wicked and found unworthy of having a being at the judgment seat of Christ.

We shall also see, in addition to this, that when Christ returns there will be nations of the earth alive on the earth, referring to which time the prophet Isaiah says, that “darkness shall cover the earth and gross darkness the people” (Isa. lx.). Referring to the same time the prophet Daniel says that “there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation” (Dan. xii: 1). When

the Lord comes to take to himself his power and reign, these nations "will rage, and they will imagine vain things" (Ps. ii.); they will say, "Let us break their bands asunder and cast their cords away from us." This will be the uprising of the people on the face of the whole earth, rebelling against Christ, not knowing that he is the Messiah. Then it is said, "I will set my king upon my holy hill of Zion," and that he "shall rule them with a rod of iron; he shall dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." Here then is the destruction that shall overtake the rebels against Christ when he appears to establish his kingdom. These rebels will not have been raised from the dead; they will be alive when he comes, and inasmuch as they rebel against Christ and his sovereign power, he will break them in pieces like a potter's vessel.

This is my conclusion that I shall show to the scriptural, that the final end of the wicked will be their absolute destruction. The question then is, Are the wicked to be *preserved* or are they to be *destroyed*? Would it be amiss for me to ask the question. Why should God wish, why should God plan, why should God prearrange, why should it be His desire to preserve wicked rebels unrepentant, unrepentable, sinful, degraded beings? Why do you, my friend, wish to have it so? do you preserve anything that is obnoxious to you? anything that annoys you? anything that interferes with your happiness and that is unfit to be preserved, if it is in your power to destroy it? Where you have control over anything that is a nuisance to you, do you preserve it? If you have a dog that is a very wicked, mad creature, that kills your sheep and bites your children, do you preserve the dog, or do you get rid of it, so that thereby you need not look upon a creature that is obnoxious in your sight and a danger to life and property?

God is wise and just and good and powerful; he has power to destroy the wicked and he will destroy them. They do not deserve to be preserved; they do deserve to be destroyed inasmuch as they are obnoxious in his sight. It is only His forbearance that allows them this fleeting life. Has he arranged to preserve eternally that which is obnoxious in His sight? or, in His wisdom. His goodness and power, has he arranged that they shall be forever blotted out of existence? You remember that the sentence in the garden of Eden was, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." You remember the serpent came along and said, "Has God said, that in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die? Yes. Well, the serpent said, "You shall not surely die," you "shall become as gods." Now what were the gods referred to here? All the gods who were known of then were angels, for the angels visited the garden of Eden. You remember Adam hid himself behind the trees of the garden from the presence of the angel. These were the angels referred to, no doubt, and called, as they are in other scriptures, gods; and therefore the serpent says, Instead of dying you shall become like these gods. Now did they become like the gods? My friend has endeavored to prove to you that they did not have to become like gods, that they were made like them when they were created. The serpent, however, did not go back quite as far as my friend. In what sense did he mean they would become as gods? One sense was they would become as gods knowing good and evil, but there was surely more than that implied in it. "You shall not surely die" by eating of this forbidden fruit, but you shall become as gods; you shall live forever. My friend says that man, though wicked, is to live forever like the gods. That is exactly what the serpent said. Now when a man had partaken of the forbidden fruit what was done with him? Listen! "Lest he

put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life and eat and live forever"—that is, perpetuate his life now in a state of sin—they drove him out of the garden of Eden. The Bible says, Christadelphians say, I say that God succeeded in his purpose of preventing the perpetuation of sinners by driving man out of the garden of Eden and away from the tree of life. What was his purpose in casting our first parents out? To prevent man from perpetuating his life in a sinful state. Did He succeed? No, according to my friend's theory, if evil men are to be preserved through the countless ages of eternity, God did not succeed. After he had driven man out of Eden what was man? A creature God had given up to destruction or one destined to be eternally preserved? You will see that the real purpose of God was to drive man out of Eden lest he take of the tree of life and eat and live forever. Where did he drive him? out of Eden where all would perish if not rescued by the gospel; perish we shall if we do not believe the gospel, and if we are rescued for a time and then become unfaithful we shall at last suffer the second death. In that case our first death would be temporary; but our second death shall be eternal death, not eternal life in misery. That is where the difference is between myself and my friend.

Now I had better call your attention to what the Scriptures say. They should have the first place, and I will quote a number of scriptures at the start. I will do this for two reasons; to give my friend time to examine them, as I do not want to reserve any for my last speech and take him unawares, I will read them now and then he will have time to examine them if they are capable of being shown in a different light.

Job xx: 4-8, "Knowest thou not this of old, since man was placed upon the earth? that the triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment? Though his excellency mount up to the heavens, and his head reach unto the clouds; yet he shall perish forever like his own dung; they that have seen him shall say, Where is he? He shall fly away like a dream and shall not be found; yea, he shall be chased away like a vision of the night."

Psa. xxxvii: 38, "But the transgressors shall be *destroyed* together; the end of the wicked shall be cut off."

Psa. xxxvii: 10, "For yet a little while and the wicked *shall not be*"; they shall have no being is what my proposition says; "yea thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be." I have affirmed that *their entire being shall be destroyed*, and here David affirms the same thing. If the wicked are not to be found, then they have no being; their entire being has been destroyed. "Thou shalt diligently consider his place and it shall not be." What can this mean? It certainly cannot mean that the place where the wicked lived shall not exist! Suppose you have a little town in Kentucky and nearly all the people there are very wicked people; now that little town is the place of those wicked people, and in speaking of them we say, "Yet a little while and they shall not be; thou shalt diligently consider their place and it shall not be." That certainly would not mean that the little town, or the ground on which it stood, should not be. What then does the Psalmist mean by this? He means that there will be no place where it will be possible to find the wicked; therefore they will be out of existence and their entire being will be destroyed. If the place of the wicked be a burning hell specially prepared, created and arranged for the very purpose my friend claims; if God has in his plan from the beginning created a burning hell

just as literally and really as he has heaven above, if this is the place that is especially arranged to hold the vast majority of the human family, then that place, according to my friend's horrible creed, must be prepared forever. Let me put my friend's idea into the words of the Psalmist: "Yet a little while and the wicked shall always be; yea thou shalt diligently consider his place and it shall always be." That is how it ought to read to satisfy my friend; but how does it read? "Yet a little while and the wicked *shall not be*; yea thou shalt diligently consider his place *and it shall not be*." You will not find any place for them, because God will have destroyed every enemy, even the last enemy, which is death. You know very well that when the last enemy is destroyed every other enemy is destroyed. You cannot talk about destroying the last enemy until you have destroyed every enemy but the last. And mark you, it is the last enemy that shall be *destroyed*, not preserved; destroyed is the word. I need not waste my time defining to you what the word "destroyed" means. I have no doubt that the word destroy sometimes means destruction of character, and that a man might be said to be destroyed when his character is destroyed, but when the man is destroyed literally the *man* is destroyed; wherever you read of the destruction of a thing you mean the destruction of the thing spoken of; therefore there is no difficulty about this if we take words to mean what they say.

Psa. xxxvii: 20, "But the wicked shall perish, and the *enemies* of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; *they* shall consume; into smoke shall *they* consume away." It does not matter, my friend, whether you are speaking of the body or your "immortal spirit"; if there is such a thing as your "spirit entity," and that is the *enemy* of the Lord, or if it is a moral entity, you cannot escape the power of the passage. My friend will admit that the wicked "immortal souls" he believes in are to be *enemies* of the Lord and notice what shall become of these enemies of the Lord, whether they are bodies or souls or spirits, or what not; if there is one man inside of another or four men or one hundred men; they, spirit, body or soul, call them what you like, are "enemies of the Lord." If the soul is the enemy of the Lord and the body is an enemy of the Lord, the question still is, Where are they going? What is to become of them? Listen! "The enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; *they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away*." Why such a comparison to the fat of lambs? It is a reference to the fat of victims burned on the altar. Did the same fat of the lambs continue to burn always and never cease to burn? Or did it burn up entirely and disappear? That is a question for you to consider. The enemies of the Lord are compared to the fat of lambs; if you take fat and put it in the fire, do you think the fire will preserve the fat? Of course not; I will not insult your common sense by dwelling on that point. Now the Psalmist says that the enemies of the Lord shall be like the fat of lambs; in what particular? In what sense? They shall consume just like the fat. If these enemies are "immortal souls," then they shall consume like the fat of lambs; if they are "immortal spirits" they shall consume like the fat of lambs, if they are mortal bodies, they shall consume like the fat of lambs; whatever they are and wherever they are, they shall consume like the fat of lambs. Does that prove my proposition? I leave it to you as common sense men and women.

Psa. cxlv: 20, "The Lord *preserveth* all them that love him, but the wicked will he—what will he do with them? Will he preserve them too? Is that it? Oh yes, my friend will say, he will preserve the wicked just as long as he will pre-

serve those he loves; the only difference is he will preserve the one in the burning fires of hell, and he will preserve the other basking in the light of heaven. This is what my friend says; I will read what the psalmist says: "The Lord preserveth all them that love him." There is a reason for that; is there any reason why he should preserve those who hate him? Let us be reasonable; is there any reason on the face of the earth or in the heavens above why God should preserve them that hate him? Again I will read the verse: "The Lord preserveth all them that love him, *but all the wicked will he destroy.*" How many? *All* of them, whether you call them bodies, souls or spirits, whether inside of each other or outside of each other.

Now we do not need to stop here to quibble about the definition of this word destroy. Common sense gives you the correct idea of its use in such language as this. It is placed in contrast with another word, and the contrast will help to determine its meaning. Here is one class on the one hand and these he will *preserve*. The word destroy is antithetically placed against the word *preserve*. Surely he does not preserve those on the left hand as long as he does those on the right.

Psa. civ: 35, "Let the sinners be consumed from off the earth and let the wicked *be no more*;" That is how this book reads. Mr. Hall's book—not his own writing, but by one of his brethren—reads, that sinners will be preserved in hell just as long as saints are preserved in heaven. That is what the author of this book says; that is what Mr. Hall believes; what does God's Word say? "Let the sinners be *consumed* from off the earth, and let the wicked *be no more*."—let them have *no more being*. That is what my proposition affirms; it needs no further elaboration.

II. Pet; ii: 12, "But these as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed; speak evil of the things they understand not; and shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption." Why, actually then the Scriptures speak of some men as brute beasts! When my friend asked me if I believed all men were on a level with the beasts, I had to answer only some men. There are thousands of men who have reached a level lower than the beasts of the field. Now we have the apostle's testimony, "But these as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and—preserved? Is that it? Listen to what God says, my friend, "made to be taken and DESTROYED." What kind of men are they, Peter? Mr. Hall says they are "immortal souls;" partakers of God's very nature. Preposterous! Well, I do not care if they are "immortal souls," Peter says they will utterly perish in their own corruption. Whatever they are and wherever they are, they will utterly perish in their own corruption.

Oh, but look here, says our friend, what about the text that speaks of the rich man and Lazarus, and of the Scripture that tells us of the worm that dieth not and the fire that is not quenched? We will make all allowance in this speech for poetic language, and symbolic language, and figurative language and literal language. We will take up the question of "unquenchable fire" for a moment. Jer. xviii: 27, "I will kindle a fire in the gates thereof and it shall *devour* the palaces of Jerusalem and *it shall not be quenched.*" What is the work of unquenchable fire? Suppose this whole town is on fire, and you say the fire is unquenchable; it can never be quenched; do you mean it will always be burning and that the town will be preserved in the fire? or do you mean that it will utterly destroy your town and that it cannot be quenched? So then the fire that was kindled by the Romans in the gates of Jerusalem burned down the temple and there was no

power on earth that could quench it. Now apply that to the wicked: "He will gather his wheat into his garner." That is what you do with wheat, what do you do with the chaff? Do you gather and preserve your chaff? He will *burn up* the chaff with *unquenchable fire*. Who are the chaff? You know they are the wicked. I do not have to tell you that, do I? Does it say, The chaff will be preserved in unquenchable fire? He will *burn up* the chaff in unquenchable fire. Does that mean that the fire will always be burning and never burn out, or does it mean a fire that cannot be quenched and therefore will burn until it absolutely devours its victims?

"It is better for thee to enter into *life* maimed than having two hands, or two feet to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched." The word hell there is Gehenna, and Gehenna is the valley into which the carcasses of criminals and the refuse of the city were cast and where the fires were always burning according to law. What the fire did not burn the worms devoured; the worms and the fire devoured the carcasses. "Where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." What does that mean? The worm did not die, therefore its victims were *devoured*. That is the force of the phrase "the worm dieth not"—the certainty of its devouring its victim. What now do you learn from the fact that the fire shall not be quenched? You learn the certainty that the victims cast into hell, *Gehenna*, will be devoured by the fire. Therefore in the face of this shall we conclude that the victim of the fire and the worm shall be preserved, or shall we conclude the opposite of that, the certainty of their being devoured and destroyed? Now this word Gehenna is the name of the valley of Hinnom, where they offered little children and burned them in the fire in sacrifice to a false god, and where criminals among the Jews were cast. The Jews looked upon it with horror. And when Christ comes to punish his enemies, and when the time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation comes the wicked will be cast into Gehenna. The prophet says that all nations shall come up to Jerusalem to do homage to Christ, and then they shall look into Gehenna, into that which in our translation is called hell, and there they shall "see the carcasses," not "immortal souls," "of the men that have transgressed, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" (Isa. lxxv.), because the worm will surely devour and the fire destroy.

When the Lord said, "I will send out my sword against all flesh, and it shall not return any more" (Ezek. xxi: 5), are we take it to mean that the sword would always be slaughtering? When he says, "I have sent out my word and it shall not return unto me void," what does he mean? He tells you; "it *shall accomplish* that where unto it is sent." So then when the sword was sent out, it accomplished that for which it was sent—utter and absolute destruction. So the sending forth of a sword never to return is an expression to show the certainty of destruction by that sword, just as the kindling of a fire never to be quenched shows the certain and utter devouring of its victims, and the undying worm shows the devouring of that upon which the worm preys.

I want to call attention to a few other points now. I will begin with the word *sheol*. My friend has called attention to the fact that the word *sheol* means the death state and not any particular grave. I will give you a place where I leave you to judge whether it is a state of misery such as my friend thinks the rich man was in literally, in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus.

When supposing that his son Joseph was dead, Jacob refused to be comforted for he said, "I will go down into the *grave* unto my son mourning." The word *grave* here is from the Hebrew word *sheol*, which in other places is translated *hell*. Let us read *hell* here, with my friend's view of *hell* in mind, and we make Jacob say, "I will go down into *hell* (torment) unto my son mourning." I will not allow you, my sons, to comfort me; I am going down to *hell*, to my son. Did he believe his son Joseph had gone down into a burning *hell*? He used the word *sheol*, the very word my friend uses for his burning *hell*. He believed Joseph had died and had gone into *sheol*, the death state, and that he was dead there, not alive. As my friend even admits to you, it is the *death* state and not the *living* state. Now Jacob said, It is of no use to try to comfort me; let me die; "Let my grey hairs go down with sorrow to *sheol*." Would his grey hairs go down to my friend's burning *hell*? Does the "immortal soul" have grey hairs to take to a burning *hell*? No, my friend says his grey hairs would not go to *hell* but to the *grave*. What is this Jacob is speaking of? Let my grey hairs go down with sorrow to *sheol*? What is this *sheol*? It is the *death* state, and in the death state he would be in the *grave*.

Again we have another, Gen. xlii: 38, "If mischief befall him in the way which ye go, then shall ye bring down my grey hairs with sorrow to the *grave—sheol*." Bring down his grey hairs with sorrow to *hell* would be the reading if our translators had given the same word here they do elsewhere.

I. Sam. ii: 6, "The Lord killeth and maketh alive; he bringeth down to *sheol*, the *grave*, and bringeth up." There is death and resurrection, going into the *grave* and coming out.

I. Kings ii: 6, "And let not his hoar head go down to the *grave—sheol—in peace*." Here is a wicked man of whom it is said, "Let not his hoar head go down to *hell* in peace. He was to be punished in this life. Could a man go down to a burning *hell* in peace? No, but he could go down to the *grave* in peace, could he not? In that very case you have the word *sheol* translated *grave*. He was not going to let him go down to the death state, to the *grave*, in peace.

Job xiv: 13, "O, that thou wouldst hide me in the *grave—sheol*:" Now just imagine for a moment that the word *sheol* here represents a burning *hell*, and try to persuade yourselves that Job cried out, O, that thou wouldst hide me in *hell*! When Job was passing through the excruciating pain and torture he was then enduring, he cried out that it was preferable for him to die than to live in that state, and he besought God to hide him in the *grave* and keep him there in secret till thy wrath be past, and then to call him out of *sheol*, out of the *grave*. and I, he says, will hear and answer thee. Therefore he says, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand in the latter day upon the earth, and though after my skin worms (in *sheol*) destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." There is hope then of resurrection out of *sheol*. The psalmist said that the Saviour's soul should not be left in *sheol*. My friend told you that the Saviour's soul went up to heaven from the cross; here it is said that his soul was not left in *sheol*. The Greek word in the Septuagint is *hades*, the word you have when you come down to the New Testament. *Hades* in the Greek is the same as *sheol* in the Hebrew. The Old Testament was written mostly in Hebrew, and where *sheol* is used in the Old *hades* is used in the New, as you will see from Peter's quotation of this passage from the Psalms. Paul tells us what this *hades* is that has been spoken of here. He says, "O

death where is thy sting? O *grave*, where is thy victory, and the word for *grave* here is *hades* in the Greek. So in the resurrection we come out of the grave, out of *sheol*, out of *hades*, not out of a burning hell such as my friend is fighting for. But some go down to *sheol* who never come out, and those who do come out and are proven "unjust" at the judgment, having been found unworthy, suffer the second death, and go back to *sheol* and "sleep a perpetual sleep and shall not awake." Because "the wicked shall not be; yea thou shalt diligently consider his place but it shall not be."

Now I will quote from Job xvii: 13, "If I wait the *grave* is mine house"—*sheol* is mine house. Where will you go when you die? "*Sheol* is mine house;" I have made my bed in the darkness—the darkness of the grave.

Psa. xxx: 3, "O Lord, thou hast brought up my soul from the *grave*." Is that an "immortal soul" brought up from the grave, I wonder? Then souls go into the grave. "But thou hast brought up my soul from the grave," in doing which he had prevented him from dying and going into the death state. If he had gone down to *sheol* where would he have gone? Into the grave. How do you know? Because Hezekiah says, "Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the *pit of corruption*. What is this pit, Hezekiah? Answer—"For the *grave* cannot praise thee." That is the pit, the grave, or *sheol*. This is where men go when they die.

Psa. xlix: 13, "Man that is in honor abideth not, he is like the beasts that perish. Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them." Now let me read the Hebrew word, "Like sheep they are laid in the grave—*sheol*." Are sheep ever laid in this dreadful place my friend talks about? There are no sheep there, but here the psalmist says that the wicked go down to *sheol*, hell, the grave like sheep, and death shall feed on them." Oh no, my friend will tell you, death shall not feed on them, they shall be preserved; they shall not die; they will be more alive when they are tossed about in the flames of hell than they ever were here. "But God will redeem *my* soul from the power of the grave," which means that he will not redeem them, who like sheep are laid in the grave, from the grave, because they go down into *sheol*, into *hades* like sheep for death to feed upon them. Do you believe in the resurrection of sheep? Is it the destruction of the entire being in the case of sheep? Will that be the destruction of the entire being of those who are laid in the grave like sheep, if we take this comparison? I will ask, does my friend believe in the destruction of the entire being of sheep?

Perhaps he might want to say a little about the question of annihilation. Sometimes this is raised. They say God cannot annihilate anything. Let us discriminate. Can you annihilate this book or this chair, or a horse or a tree? Oh, some one will say, no, we cannot, because we cannot annihilate matter, the atoms of matter. I grant you cannot annihilate the atoms of matter. That tree is composed of atoms of matter. You can annihilate the tree, but you cannot annihilate the atoms of matter of which it is composed; the atoms of matter will go into other forms, but the tree, where is that? The tree is annihilated; the chair is annihilated, the horse is annihilated. So when a man goes down into *sheol* like the sheep and has ceased to be, there is no place for him. He is gone to form other parts of nature. It is said, the atoms of matter remain, true but the atoms of the tree after the tree is annihilated are not the tree, so the atoms of a man after the man is annihilated are not the man. So then in this question



of annihilation you must see the difference between the annihilation of atoms of matter and the annihilation of an organized being.

Now then we come to Hosea xiii: 14, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave, I will redeem them from death . . . O death, I will be thy plagues! O grave, I will be thy destruction." Compare this with I. Cor. xv: 55, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory?" The grave will have no more power after that. In Hosea it is *sheol*, in I. Cor. xv it is *hades*.

Eccles. ix: 10, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might, for there is no work nor device nor knowledge nor wisdom in the *grave—sheol—*whither thou goest." In *sheol* whither thou goest. That is what Solomon says in relation to *sheol*. Why? Because *sheol* is the grave, the death state, and in death there is no remembrance.

Psa. xxxi: 27, "Let the wicked be ashamed and let them be silent in the *grave—sheol*. When one goes down into the grave, he goes down into silence. This word is *sheol*, and if it meant the hell my friend is fighting for it would be foolish to talk about silence there.

Ezek. xxxii: 27, "And they shall not lie with the mighty that are fallen with the uncircumcised which are gone down to *hell* with their weapons of war." Gone down to *sheol* with their weapons of war. "They have laid their swords under their heads." There are men going down to hell and their swords are laid under their heads. What kind of a hell is that? Surely not the hell my friend is going to try to prove to you, where men are tortured eternally. When they buried a warrior in hell they sometimes put his sword under his head, just as when our soldiers are buried they lay their weapons of warfare by their side, but they never took their swords to the hell my friend is representing here.

This word *hell*, where did it come from? I could give you authority after authority, from Dr. Adam Clark and many others that it means the receptacle of the dead, invisibility, the grave. In the part of the world I came from, South Wales, this word is in common use to-day. If they make a furrow in the ground to plant potatoes in they say, "Go and helly the potatoes." And when they gather the potatoes out of the field they put them in a repository where they are kept through the winter, the process is to throw dirt over the great heap and they thus "helly the potatoes." Does that mean that they put those potatoes in hell? Yes, if you know what "hell" means. An invisible state. To be buried out of sight. They bury their potatoes, put them in an invisible place to protect them from frost. Invisibility is what the word *hell* means. You would hear it used in this way in parts of England, Lincolnshire, for instance. When they bind a book, putting the cover on the book was termed hellying the book. They did not put the book in my friend's hell though. Therefore when a man goes down into hell, according to the Bible, he goes down into the grave, into the unseen. The word has been adapted to its present usage by theologians. It ought never to have been given for *Gehenna*. If you take the Revised Version, the American revisers objected; the English old foggy fellows did their utmost to keep it in the new translation and save their hell. They thought this word *Gehenna* ought to be rendered hell. The American Board decided to compromise, and wherever they came to the word *Gehenna*, they said, You shall have the word *hell* in the text, but we will put a foot note calling attention to the fact that the Greek word is *Gehenna*, so it might be known that this does not refer to a burning hell but to the valley of *Gehenna*.

This proposition involves the question of man, his nature and his destiny—all the questions we have hitherto discussed. My friend has been making a comparison all the way through. I am pleading for justice and for reason. There is no earthly or heavenly reason why some creatures should be preserved. They are unfit for heaven; they are unfit to be preserved anywhere. My friend has made many comparisons about brutes, and about beasts. He has made them all "immortal spirits" and he says these immortal spirits are more capable of being wicked than if they were not immortal spirits; therefore he says they must be preserved.

Now come with me and we will take a walk down on the river bank. As we walk along, behold, there is a mother down there holding her tender infant in her loving arms and hugging the little darling to her bosom. She strolls along by the bank of the river and after awhile she puts the little one down on the bank to play and prattle and bathe in the rays of the health-giving sun. Presently a man comes along, he is a human being, but, unfortunately, the poor creature is idiotic, and therefore irresponsible and in the idiocy and ignorance of his "immortal soul," which my friend believes God gave him, or failed to give him, at his birth, he snatches the dear little one and dashes it in the river. The mother is terror-stricken, and in the agony of a mother's heart she rushes toward the river and attempts to rescue her darling child, but that poor idiotic "immortal soul" holds her back. "O my child, my darling babe," she cries out, "You wretch, you wretch, let me save my dear little one!" But the wretched "immortal soul" dashes her back and looks into the river to see the struggling babe and laughs, "Ha! ha! Ha! ha! The child is sinking. The broken hearted mother is in pangs, and all hope to save her darling seems gone, and still this idiotic "immortal soul" laughs and gleefully gesticulates. Now look! look here! see this noble newfoundland dog coming along! He dashes down the bank of the river, he springs into the water, snatches the little one and proudly brings it safely to shore. Which "immortal soul" will you have, the "immortal soul" of that sensible dog, or the "immortal soul" of that poor idiot? Which is the better of the two? There is not a soul here who cannot answer that question.

Now you see that in some cases there are human beings not as good to you as dogs. If it were a question of preserving one or the other of these, which would you rather preserve, that noble newfoundland dog that saved the little one to the broken-hearted mother, or the miserable, wretched, unfortunate idiot who knew not as much as the dog? Then I want to ask you if there was an "immortal spirit" in that idiot why did it not teach him better than to snatch the little babe and throw it into the river? Will my friend have the boldness to tell us that God gives some human beings idiotic and savage "immortal souls? Do not charge God with folly.

There are various phases of this question for you to consider in this matter, and when you consider them in the light of Scripture and reason we have no doubt you will conclude that the Bible teaches what the Christadelphians have been advocating for forty or fifty years in this country, beginning with the noble Dr. Thomas. I have called your attention to a case of one idiot. Alas! there are more than one, they are not all as excusable as this one. There are multitudes of idiotic, degraded, brutish, devilish creatures in the world. Now the question is, will they be preserved or will they be destroyed? Why preserve them? I leave you to answer.

Now then we come to the Scriptures again; we find there evidences of a preparation for the time we have been trying to keep before you all through this discussion, when every evil that is brought into the world through sin shall be eliminated. We begin at the beginning; then what was said? "Everything was very good." There was no devil there yet; there was no sin there yet, nor sorrow nor suffering nor tears. God did not create a devil nor idiots nor savages. He did not create man in a state of sickness, sorrow, pain and death. Everything was "very good" and everything was given to contribute to the happiness and welfare of man who was called "very good." How was it things came to be very bad? Because man sinned and through it wreck and ruin have followed in its track. It is nearly six thousand years now since sin marred the handywork of God, and this tide of evil has been rolling on, rolling on. Are you aware how many heathen there are in the world compared with the more enlightened? There are many millions of beings and multitudes of generations that have passed into death during these six thousand years, a great company, millions you cannot count, which, according to my friend, are still preserved writhing in the torture of hell, and that is going on and on and will go on and on eternally. Now I ask you, when we come to the winding up of affairs on this sphere, what shall we have, a very good state of things or a very bad state of things? We started out with all things "very good." There was no hell, and no sin, and no devil and no torture; but when we have finished the plan of God, according to my friend, you have billions upon billions and trillions upon trillions of writhing, tormented "immortal souls" who are doomed to continuance of torture as long as the untold ages roll, while only just a few who have been snatched as brands from the burning, are basking in the bliss of a heaven in sight of the horrors of a hell. Surely this spectacle presents the last state as worse than the first; but perish, forever perish, the thought of such a doctrine of heathen and cruel dogmas which should long since have been chased back into the darkness of the savage ages whence it came. [*Time called.*]

---

#### FOURTH PROPOSITION—ELEVENTH SESSION.

(*Mr. Hall's speech of one hour.*)

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I feel that I can voice the sentiments of this large audience this morning in saying that we should not forget a feeling of gratitude to the Father in heaven. It occurs to me that a suggestion of our dependence and the maintenance of a spirit of humility and an acknowledgement of divine providence should always be recognized as one of the important impressions to be made on our hearts when we have met together as we have to-day, and as we have been doing from day to day during the debate every morning fresh from our beds of slumber. It is proper that we should keep in mind God's blessing upon us who gave us his word, who gave us this opportunity to study it.

I am very glad to greet you this morning under the circumstances. My brother is in the affirmative. He has made a statement that comprehends much. His speech is partly in reference to this subject, and partly in reference to other subjects. He has been able in the main to put in the length of the minutes as they

went by. He affirms before you this morning that there is ~~min~~ing a time when God will punish a portion of the human family with total destruction; there is to be an entire extinction of their being.

You will recognize the fact that my brother stands in relation to this question in a peculiar light, because he has always affirmed during the debate the practical extinction of the entire human family. According to the argument that has already been before us, at death everything that constitutes man passes into a condition of extinction. So the brother really has, during the debate, in the various lines of thought he has presented, affirmed that there is a total extinction of the human family. I wonder why in the name of sense, since God has extinguished the whole business, why not let us sleep and be done with it! What is the need of calling up the wicked to have them destroyed? Especially why should God bring out any of these people to extinguish them the second time? He proposes to let off these savages, these heathen, and all those people who have never heard of the gospel, that haven't heard the law, and that don't know the commandments of Moses, by just letting them die and be done with it and end their existence. And in his view everybody that has sought to be religious, that has become Christadelphians or Baptists, anybody that has believed in Christ, if they are overcome by temptation, if something or other inherent in their nature and which they have no ability to subdue, leads them away, and they go down to the grave lamenting their mistake, yet God calls them back to life again, and punishes them for their slight mistake, and allows the grossly wicked to quietly sleep on forever! Why does God preserve these wicked? They have made this comparatively slight mistake—why did not God let those sinners remain dead? He has extinguished them utterly in death, as he tried to prove in a part of his argument. Why does God want to preserve these—raise them up for the purpose of giving them another sentence of and destroying them twice?

On this point we are agreed; there is going to be a day of judgment; that Jesus Christ will return to this earth, and that all the nations of the earth will be gathered before him, and it will be such a time of trouble as we never have seen. He says there will be left nations here and they are going to be taught to fear the Lord. We agree on that. These will be on the earth the dead and living both, those that have been dead and those among the dying. The judgment is going to determine that some people have got to be punished; some are going to be blessed, and some are going to be punished. The point is, what is that punishment? I say that the entire human family will be present. I believe, like John did when he looked forward and saw the judgment seat, and all the dead, small and great, were present.

The brother proved this morning that hades involves the grave; well, the grave and death and the sea give up their dead. I believe they will all be there; he don't, but we are agreed at least that some will be there. Now the question is, What kind of punishment is going to be inflicted on them? He says it will be total extinction; I say it will be destruction, but not in the sense of total extinction. Can it be said of a man that he is to consume and still not be utterly extinct? Can it be said of a people that they are destroyed and yet any of those people remain? You see the force of this argument is going to depend on the definition you give to those words, destroy, perish and consume. If these words do not mean absolute extinction, they do not prove my brother's proposition.

Now just for the sake of the comparison let us turn and see if God's word is intending to express utter extinction whenever it uses these words, destroy, perish, consume. I want to call your attention to Acts xiii: 41, "Behold ye despisers and wonder and perish, for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe though a man declare it unto you." Here are wicked people, and they are listening to a man preaching, and while looking in their faces Paul announces the fact that they "behold and wonder and perish," and there are the folks living and breathing still, and listening to a man talk while they perish.

Paul says, "Though our outward man perish yet our inward man is renewed day by day." Did his outward man perish? He said it did. My brother says that if a thing perishes it is utterly extinct. We agreed on the other proposition that the outer man represented the body, and Paul says it is perishing every day. Is it extinct? It could not have been, for Paul kept on preaching and writing afterwards. If this is what extinction means then I really believe we can have people perish just like the brother read it from the declaration of Isaiah and the Psalmist and Job, and still have something left.

II. Cor. ii: 15, "For we are unto God a sweet savor in Christ in them that are saved and in them that perish." Some are saved? Yes. And some perish? Yes. A sweet savor to both? Yes. It would seem that some who "perish" are still able to appreciate gospel truth.

"With all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish because they receive not the love of the truth." Now, here they are counted as perishing and a message is delivered to them that they might be saved. They were considered as perishing and yet they were alive. I would just like to have this examined by my friend. I have taken time to look up more than forty others like that to prove that the word "perish" does not carry with it the idea of total extinction. I am going to show you my dealing directly with it. I want first to deal with what is essential to the subject.

Let us see about the word destroy; does it mean total extinction? In Job ix: 22, "He destroyeth the perfect and the wicked." You have got the whole thing there; and Job said it. Mr. Williams could not find anywhere except where the wicked were destroyed. But I find him where the perfect and the wicked both are destroyed; are they both extinct? Then you might just as well give up the whole thing; you will never get there.

Job xv: 5, "I will bereave them of children; I will destroy my people." God says he is going to destroy his people as well as the wicked. Does the word destroy there mean to become extinct? He is trying to prove to us that God's people are going to be saved, and God says they are going to be destroyed. What does the word destroy mean? It simply means God's divine judgment coming on them; that they are going to be punished in consequence of wrong doing.

Jer. xxiii: 1, "Woe be unto the pastors that destroy the sheep of my pasture." What pasture? God's pasture. Don't you remember the passage the brother has been on that has so much to say about sheep until the whole debate smells like mutton? Here are sheep, and these sheep are the Lord's people, and he says the pastors of these sheep destroyed them. Are they going to die like sheep and be done with it? What a mistake a man makes to take some specific line of thought in God's word and found a theory upon that without inquiry and comparison!

Hosea xiii: 9, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but in me is thine help;" Israel has done destroyed itself, yet the brother is hoping he will in some way get the Jews back to Canaan.

Job xix; 10, "He hath destroyed me on every side, and I am gone." There it is. Job is destroyed and gone. That is like what he tried to tell us about in the other question. Job is destroyed and gone, for he says so. Does this word "destroyed" mean extinct and gone? You certainly could not get language stronger than that, yet he was still in the world. Don't you see the mistake the brother is making in the use of these three words? I am really replying to the whole line of proof in finding out the definition of these three words, and I am giving the definition from God's standpoint.

Now we will turn and see what is the meaning of the word consumed. Psal. vi: 7, "Mine eye is consumed because of grief." Was David's eye burned out? That is what the brother wants the word to mean when it is applied to people. They become combustible material and go up in smoke like the fat of lambs. Did his eyes go up like the fat of lambs? If the psalmist's eye was consumed it went up in smoke. Did David's eye burn up? The thought is ridiculous.

Psal. xxxi: 9, "Mine eye is consumed with grief." Is that all? Listen: "Yea, my soul and my belly . . . My bones are consumed." What is left of him? His eyes, his soul, his stomach and all his bones are gone, burned up, consumed, he says so. My brother finds the word consumed in another place, and he says they are burned up and all gone. If it was so in that case, wouldn't it be so in David's case? Is he burned up? No. What does he mean? A fierce judgment has come and he is suffering. I grant you the words consume, destroy, perish, carry with them the idea of terrible calamity, but they do not carry the thought of extinction of being. Look still further.

Jer. v: 6 "Thou hast consumed them but they have refused to receive correction; they have made their faces harder than a rock; they have refused to return." How could they return if they had been consumed and utterly destroyed?

Psal. cii: 3, "My days are consumed like smoke; my bones are burned as an hearth." There is David going up as smoke just like he said the wicked would go, as the fat of lambs. Do you believe that is literally true of David? Do you believe it means his extinction? There isn't a person here who would say so; my brother wouldn't say so, yet he has got to say it if he gets in his argument for the extinction of the wicked.

Isa. lxvi: 7, "Thou hast consumed us because of our iniquities." There is a nation consumed on account of sin, and yet after they have been consumed they are praying to God, and saying that they have been consumed on account of their iniquities—the very sort of folks my brother said God utterly destroyed. But now we read, "O Lord, thou art our Father; we are the clay and thou the potter; and we are all the work of thy hand; be not wroth very sore, O Lord, neither remember iniquity forever: behold, see, we beseech thee, we are all thy people." And yet they had been burned up on account of sin! I would be willing to leave to this intelligent audience the merits of this whole topic without making another remark. When you understand the terms of God's Word and know what he is talking about, then you do not have any difficulty in understanding what is said. But I now wish to look at some of the scriptures my friend used, to see if we can discover their meaning.

Job xx: 5-8, "The triumphing of the wicked is short." The scripture he quoted here says that the wicked shall perish. What does the word perish mean—extinction of being? Does the apostle Paul become extinct when his outward man

perishes? What does it mean? Trouble, affliction, chastisement, correction. Will that be forever? It will; that is what I say. Listen: "He shall flee away as a dream and shall not be found; yea he shall be chased away as a vision of the night. The eye which saw him shall see him no more." Who? The wicked; the people who have known him here they will not know him any more. Why? Because he dies. Yet a little time and he is going to fail and die and you will bury him, and then you will not any of you see him any more. However, he has not become extinct; he has simply gone into another state of being.

"The transgressors shall be destroyed together." I believe it. What does destroy mean? Does it mean extinction of being? It simply means the visitation of divine displeasure on them. You have got to let God explain himself. These transgressors shall be put under the affliction of God together.

Psa. xxxvii: 10, "For yet a little while and the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place and it shall not be." My brother saw a difficulty in this passage and took quite a little time to explain that the "place" really would be, but that he would not be in that place. If a town like Ingersol, Mo., peopled by infidels is wiped out, the infidels are gone, but the place is still there. The brother had to explain that he did not mean all he said about the place, but he did mean nearly all he said about the wicked. But David said the very same thing about them both; the man will not be there and the place will not be there. If you find the place which still survives, by the very same argument I will find the man still survives.

Psa. xxxviii: 20, "But the wicked shall perish." I have found where the righteous "perish;" did they become extinct? "The enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs." I have found where the righteous were consumed, even David was consumed in smoke, and his bones were burned. Did he become extinct? No sir. If these wicked people can consume and still have conscious being, surely we may believe it when the same man talks about being himself consumed, and yet he didn't become extinct. Neither did they.

Psa. cxiv: 20, "The Lord preserveth all them that love him; but all the wicked will he destroy." That is exactly the character the Lord proposes to preserve, the righteous, but he proposes to destroy the wicked. The word destroy does not mean to totally extinguish; if it does, then he takes his own people and destroys them. When I find God says I am going to preserve the righteous and destroy the wicked, I understand that he has blessings for the righteous and curses for the wicked, and that they both are to continue in being, one under a blessing and the other under a curse. That is what the word destroy means as you see it applied in the passages I have already cited.

"Let the sinners be consumed—where—out of the earth." But, brother, you have got to find where the sinners are consumed after the day of judgment. The Psalmist is talking about sinners being consumed out of the earth. If this is not the place for them, then is there another place for them? We are going to find out directly.

II. Pet. ii: 12, "But these as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption." This is the only passage quoted out of the New Testament through the debate. The brother has been back in the Old Testament among the highly poetical and figurative expressions of those writers. Everybody recognizes the characteristics of these writers, it is not anything against the divine.

authorship of the book. These writers talked about themselves perishing, burning and being consumed in the same way they talked about the wicked. The things they said about the wicked they said about themselves. If there was utter extinction for themselves there will be for the wicked, but not otherwise. How uncertain is a man's standpoint, the foundation on which he stands, if he has to make them the basis of his doctrine.

"But these as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed"—and who made them? God is our Maker. "Made to be taken and destroyed!" Has God made people to be taken and destroyed? Does he mean to say that? I suppose not. "They shall utterly perish in their own corruption." What does that mean? Does it mean extinction? No, because in the 17th verse of the very same chapter, he speaks of the same people, "to whom the mist of darkness is reserved forever." Utterly destroyed means that they are reserved for the mist of darkness forever.

The brother came with the question, Why should God wish to preserve the wicked. God reserves the wicked for the time of judgment, for the mists of darkness into which they enter. We will see what that is after awhile.

That point about the meaning of *sheol*: there is no issue between us on that. I do not believe the word *sheol* in itself considered refers to the punishment of the wicked, nor *hades* either. *Sheol* and *hades* mean the death state and include both departments, good and bad. Jacob and Abraham went down to *sheol*. Lazarus and the rich man went down to *hades*, the under world, the death world but they were in different departments of that death world.

Let me follow some other independent lines the brother presented. First, why should God preserve the wicked forever? I answer: God does not preserve, God reserves. I might as well ask him, why does God preserve the fallen angels which are kept reserved in chains of darkness unto the judgment of the great day? Why does God keep them? Why not let them go down into non-entity? Why preserve criminals for punishment for life in our penitentiaries? Every essential of moral truth demands that the guilt shall indicate the punishment meted out. They are preserved for the exhibition of justice, for the manifestation of God's displeasure, for the vindication of the majesty of the law. That is the reason they are kept.

Then he said that in the garden of Eden the Lord said, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." They did die. I have been showing you on a former proposition that on the day they ate of it they were separated from God in their moral natures; while in their fleshly nature they became dying creatures. The brother said that God placed a flaming sword to guard the way to the tree of life lest man should eat and live forever, and that I maintain that they live forever anyhow. But the question of the immortality of the soul was not involved in the eating of the tree of life. The flaming sword was placed there to prevent fleshly and corrupt nature from becoming immortal. God did not want man to live a perpetual existence as an earthly being.

Jer. xvii: 27, "I will kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem and it shall not be quenched." There is a fire burning that shall not be quenched; yet it has gone out; it is not now burning. First let me say that may mean an expression of the wrath God is going to visit on the people in the last days. It was not merely to devour the palaces of Jerusalem but God was going to kindle a fire to burn those people, which should never be



quenched. The very fact that this fire could not be quenched is proof of the fact that there is fuel there on which it could feed. You do not talk about fire without fuel, and the fuel here are those wicked kings and rulers, the leaders of the people of Israel. God is going to remove them and give them as fuel for a fire that shall never be quenched. If they are not yet burning then that fire has got no fuel.

Then again he is to gather the wheat into his garner and burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. There is this distinction, in the case where you burn chaff it is easily consumed and you can quench it; if you do not it will go out of itself; but when you come to burn spirits, though they burn like chaff according to the comparison they do not consume; they are not utterly extinct; consequently you have got fuel and a fire that you cannot quench. Further he speaks of this worm that dieth not and the fire that is not quenched. This gives the idea that Jesus Christ had of hell fire. In looking on the fires of Hinnom, south of Jerusalem, he used it as an illustration of the unquenchable fires of hell. He did not use the word *hades* but the word *Gehenna*. That word occurs twelve times in the New Testament, and eleven times it is used by Christ—once by James. That word *Gehenna* is the Greek term for the valley of Hinnom, south of Jerusalem, in which a fire was kept burning constantly to consume the carcasses, and the worms were always there devouring the dead bodies. A man could look at it one day and the fires were burning, the next day and it was the same thing, and the next year it was the same thing, and for all generations back it had been the same thing. The law required that that fire should never go out, and the worms would never die. They were there writhing in those burning tortures. Looking on this scene Jesus Christ said, Do you see that? That is what I am talking about. Do you see living beings writhing in the flames that never go out? That being never dies, but lives and burns on forever.

Let me call attention to a criticism on that point. *Teluteo* is the Greek word for *end*; *ou-teluteo* means absolutely unending; there isn't any end. This word is used three times and every time it refer to that worm that endlessly dies. It dies today, tomorrow, next week, next year, next century, next thousand years. It never dies, it is endlessly dying. What is the meaning of that word that Jesus says is the picture of hell? It is *ou-teluteo*, meaning an absolute endlessness of the dying state. It is this *Gehenna* I am talking about, always devouring yet never devoured; always consuming yet never consumed. If there should come a time when there would be no worm, when all the fuel was consumed, then there will be no fire. You therefore have a fire and a worm and Jesus says it is a picture of hell. You cannot quench the fire and the worm cannot die. That is Christ's awful picture.

In one quotation the brother made, the xlix Psalm, it is said "death shall feed on them." I should like to know what death is going to feed on if they are to become extinct? What is going to feed on them? Death; yet he says they go out like a candle blown out, perished forever. The wicked go to the grave and death feeds on them; if they are extinct how can death feed on them? That is like the undying worm. A consuming fire has got to have something to consume or else the fire goes out and the worm dies.

That question of annihilation. The brother said atoms could not be destroyed. There is a theory in philosophy about the indestructibility of matter. That being the case there is no such thing as a real destruction of the human

body, since the human body is made up of indestructible material. The material may change form but it cannot be destroyed. I do not believe the wicked are going to have mortal bodies. In the resurrection we are going to have the same identical material in another form.

He says that *hades* is the Greek word hell, and simply means an invisible place. He says among the English when you go to plant potatoes you "helly the potatoes," that is, they bury the potatoes in the ground. Now, look out! You will have a spirit the first thing you know, for there is life in those buried potatoes, else those wise Englishmen would never "helly the potatoes!" According to your own illustration it is possible for life to be in *hades*.

Now you come to the innocent idiot throwing a babe into the water, and the Newfoundland dog rescues it, and we have the fond mother hugging and kissing the dog and kicking the idiot. Just think of the superiority of the brute over the man! I said in my soul, I wonder if the brother has come to a point where he can look with absolute contempt upon the infirmities of humanity! That idiot is a human being. A father and mother have watched over him and cared for him and wept over his deformity. His infirmity has caused human sympathy to flow out. We have got here a system of religion that compares him with a brute, that laughs at the infirmity of the man, and lauds the majesty of the brute. There is something revolting about that idea that would tend to make a man cruel towards helpless beings. But there is one thing true of that poor idiot that never will be true of the dog. When the resurrection time shall come, and defective mortality shall undergo the change to immortality, that poor imbecile will awake to a glorious crown of life, to rejoice with and bless the hearts of that poor father and mother who have watched over him through his earthly life with such solicitude, while the dog will sleep on as a brute forever. There is coming a time when the deformities of the flesh and the infirmities of these bodies shall be changed into the glorious fashion of the body of Christ. I say such a religion, such a gospel as the brother brings to us is a fearful thing to consider. I wonder if it is not cruel in God that he should let that poor idiot live. His divine providence takes charge of him? Why didn't he take the helpless child away when a babe and never afflict the family by the fearful life he has lived? Was it cruelty or was it love?

I have now followed the brother through his speech from one end to the other. Now I want to call attention to the fact we have already considered, Matt. x: 28, "And fear not them which are able to kill the body but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." The word hell, there, is Gehenna; Jesus says the soul and body are to be destroyed in Gehenna. What do you mean by destroy? You mean to afflict, punish, just like it means wherever it occurs in reference to man. You cannot have total extinction of a human being because man is immortal and God only could destroy immortality. God can do it because he constructed man. You have got a human being who has a body man can kill, and you have got a man with a soul man cannot kill. God can destroy both when it is his will.

I want now to call attention to the words employed by the Holy Spirit in speaking of the punishment of the wicked.

1. *Sheol* and *hades* are words which simply represent the death state, without indicating the particular condition of happiness or misery that may characterize it, unless connected with some other word to express it.

2. *Tartarosas* is the verbal form of the Greek word *Tartarus*, and represents the lower portion of the infernal regions, where is to be found the abode of the damned. We have a use of this word in II. Pet. ii: 4, when the inspired apostle says, "The angels that sinned were cast down to *tartarosas*, and delivered into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment."

3. *Gehenna*—the valley of *Tophet*. This was a valley south of Jerusalem into which the garbage and offal of the city was cast, and in which perpetual fires were burning, and where the devouring worm was always to be found. This was Christ's peculiar word for "hell," as he used it eleven times out of the twelve times it occurs. It presented to the mind the picture of a living creature (a worm) writhing perpetually in a consuming flame. To Christ's mind it represented the punishment of the wicked.

4. *Asbeston* is a word occurring seven times, and means "unquenchable, extinguishable." It occurs in Matt. iii: 12, where the wicked are represented as chaff in an "unquenchable fire." Also in Luke iii: 17 and Mark ix: 43.

5. *Teleutao* is the Greek word that means to "end," to "come to an end." The word "*ou*" is the Greek word for "not;" so the compound word *ou-teleutao* means "endless," "unending." It is the strongest Greek term to express the idea of absolute endlessness. It occurs three times, Matt. v: 43; ix: 46, 68. In each case it represents the worm that *endlessly dies*. Look when you would into that consuming fire in Hinnom and you would see that dying worm.

6. *Aion* is derived from *aei*, which means "ever," and *on*, which means "being, existing." Hence its literal meaning is "ever-existing," or "always-being." Our word "forever" comes from this root, as does our word "eternal." Wherever we find this word *aion*, therefore, we find endless being. Now, let me call your attention to a few passages where this word is used to describe the punishment of the wicked.

Rev. xiv: 11, "The smoke of their torment ascendeth forever and ever"—*eis ton ionas ton-aionon*. This is the strongest Greek phraseology that can possibly be employed to express the endlessness of the duration of the punishment to which the wicked will be subjected. David talked about burning and consuming like the fat of lambs; let us see about the smoke. This is after the resurrection and after the judgment. "And the smoke of their torment ascended up forever and ever." When will the smoke of their torment cease to ascend? Never.

Again; Rev. xix: 3, "And the smoke (of Babylon) rose up forever and ever." Babylon, the great spiritual deceiver has come into judgment, and God sends them to the pit, and their smoke goes up and up and up, forever and ever. God says it. Do you believe it? *Eis tous aionas ton aionon*.

Rev. xx: 10, "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are; and they shall be tormented day and night forever and ever." This also is after the resurrection.

Jude 13, "To whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever."

II. Pet. ii: 17, "To whom the mist of darkness is reserved forever." What is this darkness and place of torment? What is the *tartarus* that is reserved for some? It is a place of perpetual, conscious misery, in the lowest part of the death state. Let me say right here, I do not believe the punishment of the people will be in literal fire. I do not believe God's word intends to represent men in a condition of literal fire, but he does take literal fire as a picture of what his punishment is.

Now then, I want to find out about the people in this condition of suffering.

Let us see if God's word says there are any there. Jude vii., "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them . . . are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." They are wicked like the angels that kept not their first estate and are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.

II. Pet. ii: 16, "These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest; to whom the mist of darkness is reserved forever."

Surely, so far as the bodies of the Sodomites are concerned, they went to ashes until the resurrection; their spirits, Jude says, are suffering the vengeance of eternal fire as an example. We had better take it and look at it. We may appeal to sympathy, but God says, Look! God is able to pronounce judgment on those who violate his law, and who are we, to pronounce judgment on God as to the matter of the severity of his judgment? We do not dare to be both criminal and judge. We do not believe these people of Sodom and Gomorrah are going to suffer as much as those who have had greater opportunities. Jesus himself said that it would be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for the people he preached to.

Again, we have the example of the rich man and Lazarus. The brother said he would talk about it but he didn't. There were two men alive in this world, Christ said, one was rich and the other poor. God's word does not call this a parable, though so far as I am concerned, or as the argument is concerned, I do not care whether it is counted so or not. But it reads the history of men Jesus Christ knew. He is telling his disciples what is going to take place on the other side of death. This rich man had plenty and lived in luxury. By and by he died and was buried, and in *hades*—that is the under world, the unseen state, where you cannot see him—he opened his eyes and he was in torment, and he saw Abraham afar off and Lazarus on his bosom. And he besought him to send Lazarus to dip his finger in water and cool his tongue, for he was tormented in the flames.

Here was a man who had lived in this world and gone out of it. He had had plenty while he was here and lived as other rich men live, but in a little while he died and then where did he go? Jesus Christ says he lifted up his eyes in *hades*. Was Lazarus also in *hades*? Yes. Now what was their condition in the unseen state? One was tormented and the other comforted. The rich man calls for water to cool his tongue and he is refused. There is no consolation there. But there is consciousness there on the part of those in the unseen state.

I. Pet. iii: 18-20. We have here the reference to the spirits in prison which once were disobedient when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was preparing. By and by they died, were destroyed by a flood, and at the time Peter wrote they were in prison, but they were not in prison when the preaching was done, but when the writing was done. Peter speaks of them in prison. Here are spirits after death in the spirit world, in prison in that world. Let us look out! There is some actual punishment God threatens against men.

Dan. xii: 2, "Many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to everlasting shame and contempt." Notice, the life is put in contrast with the shame and contempt. Those who come up to life enjoy it, and those who come up in shame and contempt must endure it; and both alike are continuous. There is a continuation of the shame and contempt as well as of the life. There is no contrast in it, if these ungodly

men are called up and sentenced to pass out of existence forever, they do not realize it except for a single moment in which God speaks them into non-entity. God declares their shame and contempt is to be everlasting, just like the life of the righteous.

John v: 25, "He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation." Here the life is one thing and the condemnation the opposite. There is no point in it except in the antithesis. As the life is to be eternal so the punishment is to be eternal.

Matt. xxvi: 24. Speaking of Judas, "It had been good for that man if he had not been born." That could not be said of anybody that lives, if the penalty of sin is to be annihilation; for the momentary pain and sorrow he has is not to be compared with the long life he has been privileged to enjoy anyhow. Yet here is a man whose fate is so terrible, and the judgments of God so fearful after he goes to his own place, that it would have been better if he had never been born. If he just merely dies, and that is the last of it, he might just as well be born.

There are some saved and some lost; the Bible speaks of them. The brother tried to create a sympathy by representing God as punishing forever a man who had sinned first a little here. But I want to show you *why* God punishes forever. It is because they sin on forever. They live on and sin on to all eternity. Note the following passage: Rev. xxii: 14, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life and may enter in through the gates into the city." Where are they? In the city. Who is on the inside? "These are they which have come up through great tribulation and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Is anybody on the outside? My brother says they have all been extinguished. But let us have what God says about it. "For without are dogs and sorcerers and whoremongers and murderers and idolators and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." Are they on the outside? Yes; John says it. My brother says they are all extinct. Which will you take?

Rev. xxii: 11, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still." I thought you were going to extinguish the unjust and the filthy and that they would have no more being! "Behold I come quickly." There is to be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust and each will have his reward. When I come I will give it to him.

I have just given you a hint of what God says about this question. It is too solemn a matter for us to make an appeal to sympathy on. He is going to do right and not punish anybody on the face of the earth unjustly, but there is going to be a punishment for every evil doer; God says so, and we may as well make provision that way. This audience cannot afford to trifle with God's word. These plain statements of unvarnished doctrine which come thundering down to us as warnings are what made the apostle cry out, "Knowing the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." [*Time called.*]

## FOURTH PROPOSITION—TWELFTH SESSION.

(Mr. Williams' First Half-Hour Speech)

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, RESPECTED FRIENDS:—Having presented some of the positive and distinct testimonies of the word of God, my friend has endeavored to cope with these testimonies, to say that they do not mean what they say, and has tried to destroy their force by quoting other testimonies in which some of the words are used. I shall now follow the gentleman in an examination of the portions of the scripture he has quoted; one of which is found in the Acts of the apostles xiii: 41, "Behold ye despisers and wonder and and perish." Paul is here addressing himself to those who had been with the crucifiers of the Saviour, and he tells them that they were despisers and that they would *perish*. If you will simply believe that, we shall agree. I believe that the end of these people is that they will perish, "utterly perish in their own corruption," as Peter has said. My friend endeavored from this portion of scripture to impress on your minds that these people would not perish. Here were people who were to perish because they had killed the Prince of peace.

"Though our outward man perish, yet is our inward man renewed day by day." I have already shown you that the "inward man" is "Christ in us the hope of glory," or "Christ formed in you" (Gal. iv: 19). You remember I challenged my friend to produce a single text where the phrase "inward man" is applied to a wicked man. It always applies to the converted man, and it is Christ formed in character in the mind and heart. Therefore though our outward man dies, though our physical man perishes, yet the mind, the character, is being developed day by day preparatory to receiving the better body we shall receive by change to immortality in the ages to come. Now the question is, Does the outward man *perish*? My friend is here now to deny that even the body perishes. Paul says the outward man perishes, and my friend admits that is the body, and if the outer man perishes, why doesn't he believe Paul when he says so? I will say "bodies of men" now to accommodate myself to my friend's position just for the sake of the argument. I ask what has become of the bodies of those men Paul spoke about? They have gone down to dust, perished, gone out of existence, but these have not perished forever, because they are among those who will have a resurrection. "There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust."

II. Thes. ii: 9, 10, is where the apostle is describing the man of sin, "whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that *perish*, because they receive not the love of the truth that they might be saved." What is the result of the deception on these men? The result is they are now *perishing* and they will *perish*, because the "son of perdition" leads them into perdition. Hence the word means *perish*; it certainly does not mean that they shall be preserved. Consequently this use of the word does not help my friend in the least.

Our attention has been called to Job ix: 22, where Job says that the perfect and the wicked perish. The wicked and the good die, and die alike, but there is this difference, as Job shows, that while some will go down to the grave "and come up no more" (Job vii: 8-10); they perish forever; there are some of whom he

is speaking representatively when he says, "Thou shalt call and I will answer thee." Though worms destroy the righteous in the grave as well as the wicked, yet he says, "I know that my Redeemer liveth and that he shall stand in the latter day upon the earth, and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God" (Job xix: 25-27). But the others perish forever; they "shall come up no more." This is where the difference lies then.

Jer. xv: 7, "I will destroy my people, since they return not from their ways." Now you know the nation of Israel is called God's nation. Of them it is said, "You only have I known of all the nations of the earth;" therefore He punishes them in a special way because they are specially responsible to Him, having come under His law in a special way. Now He says in relation to this people Israel, "I will destroy my people." Does He say I will destroy all my people? No; He tells you whom He will destroy; for He says in Ezek. xx: 24, "I will bring you out from the people, and gather you from all the countries whither I have scattered you . . . and I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me." This shows that the rebels among them will be destroyed. Their carcasses will fall in the wilderness of the people as the carcasses of their fathers did in the wilderness of Arabia when they came out from Egypt on their way to Canaan. So it is true that he will destroy those of his people who have been rebels against him. Thousands of the Israelites, a people who are specially responsible to him, will come forth in the resurrection to judgment, and he will destroy them; then they will suffer the second death.

We are referred to Hosea xiii: 9, where it is said, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself," yet he says Israel is still alive. Israel here represents a nation. Here is a nation that was born in a day. They were organized into a nation and placed by divine appointment in a land flowing with milk and honey. They rebelled, and the result was the nation, as a nation, was destroyed. It died as a nation; it is nationally deceased. If you will turn to Ezek. xxxvii you will find this nation represented by a valley of dry bones, there they are in their nationally destroyed state; and in their resurrection bone is to come to its bone, and sinews and flesh are to be formed on them. Then the prophet says, "These bones are the whole house of Israel"—the twelve tribes. In the restoration from Babylon only two of the twelve tribes returned, but when this restoration shall be accomplished, it is the restoration of the twelve tribes, not of every individual, but the whole house nationally. When, therefore, the prophet says, "Thou hast destroyed thyself," he refers to their destruction as to the nation. But the time will come when he will restore Israel and make them one nation and they shall be no more removed (Ezek. xxxvii: 20-22). National destruction shall never again overtake them. But this national destruction was literal and complete; they were without a prince and without a sacrifice, and without all that constituted them an organized nation. Now the kingdom of Babylon was destroyed wasn't it? And after the kingdom of Babylon was destroyed some of the individual members that composed that kingdom of course existed until these members were destroyed as parts of another kingdom. You may destroy a nation without destroying every individual of the nation, you may destroy a kingdom without destroying the individual members of that kingdom. You do not destroy the component parts of a being in destroying the being, as we saw in the illustration of the atoms of matter. When you destroy a horse, the horse is destroyed but the atoms that composed his body exist in some other forms, but no horse is there; the horse is gone,

he is destroyed absolutely. After you closely examine the text you will see there is no difficulty there.

I come now to Job's expression, "Thou hast destroyed me on every side, and I am gone." How many of you have listened at a trial in which you were all interested; suppose a man is on trial for murder; you are waiting for the sentence; when he is pronounced guilty you say, He is gone. Is he actually gone? No, but he is just as sure to go as if he had gone. Legally he is dead, in a short time physically he will be dead and gone; hence you are speaking of what is to be as if it actually were so because of the certainty that it will be so. Hence when Job contemplated the sorrows with which he was surrounded, he despairingly, for the moment, gave it up, and said, "I am destroyed;" I am gone; there is no hope. But God redeemed him out of his trouble as he did Hezekiah, in whose case he added fifteen years to his life, when Hezekiah said, thanking God for adding fifteen years to his life—or according to my friend, thanking God for keeping him out of heaven fifteen years—he said, "Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption." So God saved Job, although to him it seemed he was gone, that surely he must die, and if he had gone, where would he have gone to? Job says, "They that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." He would have gone to the pit—the grave.

"Mine eye is consumed." What is consumed? the eye. When you destroy the sight, the eye may be said to be consumed. The eye does not always mean the organ as a material thing, but the sight as well; consequently when the sight is gone, the eye is consumed. But these words refer prophetically to the sufferings of the Saviour, and the terrible ordeal through which he passed when he sweat as it were great drops of blood in Gethsemane, and when he cried out on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" He represents that his eye is consumed, his tongue cleaves to the roof of his mouth; his heart is melted like wax. All this means death, and if he had been left in death's grasp, there would have been no hope; but "God raised Jesus of Nazareth from the dead," and therefore he did not "suffer his holy one to see corruption." Nevertheless he was dead while he was dead. This will explain the other portion which my friend has quoted in which occurs the word "consumed." My friend asks why some are raised to be destroyed the second time, while others are left to sleep on eternally. He ought to know why. In the beginning our first parents were on probation and stood amenable to judgment. They fell and were condemned, a condemnation which passed upon all men. "By one offense judgment came upon all men to condemnation" (Rom. v: 8). In this state man as a race is not on probation but under the sentence, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." To this condemned, dust-returning race God's love holds out the olive branch of life in Christ. Those who respond are blessed with reconciliation with God and thereby placed on probation for eternal life; and that privilege puts them in relation to the judgment seat of Christ. Therefore it is to this judgment they must come forth, all who under it have been faithful or unfaithful, to be rewarded every man according to his works judged by the law of this covenant under which their probation passed, while all who never came into relation to this covenant, but remain where Adam left them, die eternally under the Adamic sentence.

Now we come to that portion of II. Pet. ii., where we have these words, "Made to be taken and destroyed, they shall utterly perish in their own corrup-



tion." I cannot see how language could be plainer. My friend asks the question, Did God make them to be destroyed, as though God made them in the beginning for that purpose. Then he states that God made everybody; God is the direct creator of them all. This I deny. You may think, in view of popular sentiment, that is strange. But I am sure God never made an idiot in the world, nor a rebel, nor a sinner, nor a savage. You ask me to explain. God made a good man and a good woman, and produced a good creation, "everything was very good"; that is what God made. He imparted to man a moral power to choose good or evil, to preserve himself upright or to corrupt himself. If the man corrupt himself he is no longer God's workmanship. Show me an idiot or any other of the deformities of flesh and I will show you the result of sin and the fall of man in Eden. God's creation is in rebellion, and in these "natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed," you see only the result of man's perversion of God's law and not the workings of God's law, natural or revealed, in its normal state. Do you mean to tell me that God is responsible for the production of every human creature forced into the world in houses of prostitution? These are creatures of the lust of corrupt and fallen man and the offspring of such are corrupt creatures. God gave man power to propagate the species in a normal state, but by the abuse of this power there are forced into the world mentally and physically diseased creatures, idiots, and every kind of malformations. My friend wants to know if I have no regard for the infirmities of the flesh. I think my heart is as big as his and I know it is as tender as his; as tender for the poor idiot, as tender for any man or any creature stricken by misfortune in this world. But facts are facts. I think my friend's theory is this: there is only one way of salvation, and that is to believe the gospel, repent and be converted and then you can go to heaven. The idiot cannot do that any more than the heathen can. The heathen, he says, go to hell because they have never been converted. The idiot never can be converted; then, according to my friend, he goes to hell. There is where your doctrine leads you; it logically necessitates sending the poor idiot to hell to be tormented forever. Better let them go down to the dust and sleep there eternally! They know not that they have lost anything, for they never could appreciate the offer of salvation. He says God is going to change that poor idiot and make an angel out of him. In that case he will not know himself; he will be another man. Where will be your identity then, my friend? There is no moral merit in turning an idiot into an angel in such a way. It would be a mechanical operation, ground out by machinery, as it were. To make angels by machinery! Just fancy! These matters, from my friend's distorted standpoint, when weighed in the balance are always found wanting.

My friend says the idiot will come forth to bless the father and the mother who watched over him. *This is mere sentiment without reason.* His theory provides for the possibility of the poor father and mother being cast into a burning hell to writh in torture eternally. Will the idiot, made into another man, who therefore will not know himself, bless his father and mother in that burning hell? Then, again, he declares that all the heathen go to hell because they never hear and believe the gospel, but all idiots in the same predicament, he now says, will be transformed into angels. Could not heathens be mechanically transformed into angels as well as idiots?

He says the wicked are not preserved but reserved for the day of judgment; yet he has them all now writhing in the torments of hell. They are reserved for

judgment, but where are they reserved? They are reserved in chains of darkness where the fallen angels are—those fallen messengers which were the twelve messengers, or angels, sent to spy out the land, as you will see by the context. Chains of darkness! The grave is dark enough! In bondage to the power of the grave till the judgment of the great day, until Christ shall come to raise them up and judge them. These men are reserved till then; after that what? Are they preserved then? God is going, according to my friend, to introduce an element into their nature so that they cannot die and thereby preserve them in writhing torment through countless ages.

*Tartarus* occurs only once in the Bible, and its use there shows its meaning (II. Pet. ii: 4). The wicked messengers were cast down to *tartarus*, and delivered into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment. They have not been judged yet, and surely God would not punish them before they are judged. They are not reserved in a fiery hell, but in "chains of darkness," a very fitting phrase to signify the grave.

That picture of hell, the valley of Gehenna, which my friend drew, gives the worm as the victim writhing in the torturing flame that never dies. Now my friend has been calling us brutes in a kindly way, he says, kindly because he called me brother, at the same time he has been hinting that we are brutes, and yet appears greatly shocked because we say certain men are no better than brutes. Now he comes to the conclusion that all these "immortal souls" and "immortal spirits" that are in hell are worms writhing in the torments of hell. I never said anything so strong as that; I did not get even the man of the dust down to a worm, to say nothing of an "immortal soul." You know "where the worm dieth not" is in the valley previously described where they threw the carcasses on which the worm that never dies fed upon the continuous supply. The undying worm insures the devouring of the carcass on which it preys.

The language of Mark ix: 44 is *opou o skoolox anton ou teleuta kai to pur ou obennutai*—literally, "where the worm of them not dies, and the fire not is quenched." This is in *Gehenna*. What was it that did not die and what was it that was not quenched in Gehenna—the valley of Hinnom? It was the worm that did not die, not the victim of the worm. It was the fire that was not quenched, not the victim of the fire. My friend says the worm was the victim. As well might he say the fire was the victim. The deathlessness of the worm and the quenchlessness of the fire are proofs of and a forcible way of declaring the certainty of the utter destruction of the victims.

Yes, *asbestos* is the Greek word for unquenchable, but "unquenchable fire" is fire that cannot be quenched, but will surely burn up its victim, not preserve it. The fire the Romans kindled in Jerusalem, Jeremiah says, "it shall not be quenched," but it went out when it had "devoured the palaces thereof" (Jer. xvii: 27.) The fact that the word *asbestos* occurs in Matt. iii: 13 and Luke iii: 17, where it is said "He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire" is proof that the Saviour's use of the word was to emphasize the certainty of the devouring of the wicked—the chaff—in *Gehenna*; surely not to prove their preservation.

My friend now admits that sheol or hades do not mean a place of punishment, that it is the state of the dead with two departments for both good and bad. Yet his theory is that the bad are in torment there. Now suppose it to be such a place, with one good department for the happiness of the good, what is to become of this department, with its good and happy inhabitants, when

"death and *hades* are cast into the lake of fire"? (Rev. xx: 14.) This will leave my friend's heaven and hell in the lake of fire at last.

My friend, in his reference to the text (Rev. xxii: 14), asks who are on the inside and who are on the outside of the glorious city there, as if that referred to his hell and heaven. He has forgotten that he has put them all in sheol or *hades*, the only difference is, that one is in one department and the other in the other department. So with him they are all on the inside and there is no outside about it. But this is no picture of *hades* nor of his heaven or hell.

He says there is no destruction of the human body. I wonder if my friend believes one could destroy the body of a horse. The parts that compose the body will exist, I grant that. After you destroy the horse will it exist? The atoms of matter of which he is composed go into other elements; now where is the horse? Is he destroyed, consumed, annihilated as a horse? Certainly.

Then he asked me about the potatoes I was speaking of as an illustration. I was not using that argument at all with reference to the immortality of the soul; I was simply making the point that the word hell was used in the Anglo-Saxon sense for covering over, burying. He wants to know if the potatoes were dead. Very likely some of them were dead. In the case of the word hell, those people did not apply it to the burying of potatoes only. If you are not satisfied with that illustration; if a horse or a dog were dead, they would say, Take the body and helly it. Now is the horse dead, or the dog dead when it is helled or buried?

My friend finds a germ in the potatoes and says that the germ answers to his "immortal spirit." I want to know if I am to understand you to mean, according to that, that when you bury the body you bury the "immortal spirit" in the body as you do a germ in the potato? No, he has the immortal spirit leave the body and return to God. You farmers, try an experiment; you cut the germ out of a grain of corn or a potato and then plant it, do you get any crop? Why no. Very well, then, there is nothing in that, my friend, for you at all.

We are referred to Matt. x: 28. He says that Gehenna represents his hell. Who told him that? Where did you find it? It simply says that God is able to destroy both soul and body in—where? In Gehenna. So it is simply my brother's—or my friend's, we are not brothers yet; I hope we will be sometime—assumption. Here we have the body and soul *both destroyed* in the valley of Gehenna. Whatever the soul is, whatever the body is, both are DESTROYED in Gehenna, not preserved nor reserved.

It ought not to be necessary for me to tell my friend that *aion* means age and *aionios* age-lasting. As to whether the word applies to limited time or unlimited time must be determined by the context, as all scholars declare. When men were made "servants forever" it meant their age or lifetime. When the Aaronic priesthood was termed an "everlasting priesthood" it meant the priesthood of the Mosaic age. The "everlasting punishment" of Matt. xxv. that my friend harps upon is literally, "the punishment of the age"—the age set apart to purge the wicked out from those fit to live in the millennium; and the word for punishment is *kolasin*—cutting off. The punishment of the wicked of that age will be a cutting off from life. So with "everlasting fire," it is the fire of the age. The "eternal life" given to the righteous is literally the "life of the age," that is, the life to be imparted for the age, the "age to come"; but the nature of that life is shown to be immortality by other scriptures, and therefore we do not depend upon the word *aionios* to define its duration. The Hebrew word *olam* has the

same meaning as the Greek word *æon*, and its use shows that it does not necessarily mean endless time. When Christ is called the "Everlasting Father" in Is. ix: 6 it does not mean that he was a Father from and to all eternity; but that he should be the "Father of the age"—to come, the millennium. In all these words a comparison of their use in Scripture will explain their proper meaning. When Paul says Christ "appeared in the end of the world—*æon*—to put away sin," any one can see that he meant the end of the Mosaic age; and so instead of the word meaning "ever-existing" here you have an *æon* that you know came to an end.

Our friend's eyes are so dazzled with his hell-fire that he overlooks the facts in the case, as illustrated by his reference to Rev. xiv: 11. He could see the smoke of torment, but could not see that if this was his hell, then the holy angels and the Lamb were there; for the previous verse says, "And he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone *in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb.*" Surely this is not the hell my friend is fighting for. It is a picture of the fall of modern Babylon, when there shall be a time of trouble such as never was on the earth, inflicted by Christ and his holy angels upon a wicked world. When Babylon and her children go down to oblivion, as did literal Babylon, they go down, not by natural death, but preceded by dreadful torment during the age. "Forever and ever" means the age of the ages, and that will be age of all previous ages, in which justice will be meted out. The picture of ascending smoke is to show the total and everlasting destruction of Babylon and all her children, surely not to show their preservation.

He refers us to Sodom and Gomorrah, which are suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. In connection with this my friend has quoted one text, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." He says the punishment must be as long as the life of the righteous. But it does not say "These shall go away into everlasting torment." Who shall be punished with everlasting *destruction* from the presence of the Lord." Everlasting punishment is everlasting destruction. Suppose you had power to punish a man with death; death would be the punishment. Suppose you had power to punish a man with death for a week and then bring him forth from that death; he would have been punished with death for one week. Suppose you had power to punish him with death for one year; that is punishment with death for a year. Suppose he is punished with everlasting death, that is death that never ends, that is everlasting punishment. Consequently to go away into everlasting punishment is to go away into everlasting death, and that is the end of the man, surely

Now about Sodom and Gomorrah. Fortunately my friend stumbled into the idea of a picture in his talk about Sodom and Gomorrah. Suppose you wanted to give a picture of, say the destruction of Pompei, what would you do? Paint a picture of fire and smoke ascending; and you would look at the fire and the red glare and the dark, dismal smoke ascending and say, It is the picture of the fall of Pompei. Does it mean that the city still exists? No; it means that the city has gone into oblivion. Suppose you say that the fire and smoke shall ascend eternally; what would that picture teach you? It would teach you that the city has gone down no more to be restored. The picture of ascending smoke and flame simply shows you that Pompei has gone down into oblivion. So with the pictures of the Bible in regard to Sodom and Gomorrah and the destruction of all the wicked. [*Time called.*]

## FOURTH PROPOSITION—TWELFTH SESSION.

(Mr. Hall's First Half-hour Speech.)

BRETHREN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I appreciate the fact that my friend is struggling with a very heavy load; that he is in need of your sympathy and I trust he has it. I assure you he has been pulling against the stream. He appreciates the fact that the very foundation of the structure he undertook to build in your presence this morning has been destroyed; it has dropped out; if it has not become practically *extinct* it is right close to it.

Before I proceed with a review of what he has said in this speech, there is one thing to which I wish to call attention. The brother suggested this morning that it is out of all proportion for God to punish the wicked throughout all eternity, for the sins of this short life. I want to call attention to the fact that men continue to sin after they have gone to hell; and they sin from then on during the ages of eternity. A man that is a sinner and is sent to perdition never stops sinning. That is the reason his punishment is eternal. I do not want you to take my mere statement. I am going to prove it by the word of God, as I have everything else.

Rev. xxii: 14: This scripture speaks of a time after the resurrection, and after the blessed have entered the city. They have done gone in, and a blessing is pronounced on them. Now what have we on the outside? "Without are dogs and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolators, and whatsoever loveth and maketh a lie." The same people are doing the same things they always have done in the same spirit, though they are in hell.

Rev. xxii: 1, "He that is unjust let him be unjust still." This is the case after the resurrection and the judgment. In the twentieth chapter we read of the resurrection and judgment, and this is in the twenty-second, and the new city has come, and the final decision has been made. Here are the righteous on the inside, and the wicked on the outside. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still, and he that is filthy let him be filthy still." Men have a character. It has done been made, and they carry it through eternity. The holy go on one side, and the bad on the other; the one to serve God, the other to serve sin forever.

Further than that! II. Pet. ii: 14 speaks in no uncertain tones to the same effect. These are false teachers, reserved for eternal darkness, "having eyes full of adultery that *cannot cease from sin*. That is their *nature*. The reason they suffer forever is because they sin forever. That is what God says about them.

Still further: Rev iv: 20, "And the rest of the men which were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands . . . nor of their murders, nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornication, nor of their thefts." Their wickedness continues as a matter of madness toward God. Solomon says that men are mad in their hearts against God while they live, and mad against him after they are dead. God sent chastisement and affliction on them, and still they did not stop. Their eternal punishment will be on account of their eternal sin.

Let me suggest a point that occurs to my mind: I want to know if God does not have just as much repugnance to sin today as he will have in the judgment. Is God any better pleased with sin now than in the time coming? If he is going to destroy the wicked then to keep them from sinning any more, why

don't he destroy the wicked now to keep them from sinning? The same principle holds good for time and eternity. Now I come to a review of the speech you have heard. This whole matter has got to be settled on three words. My brother undertakes to base the support of his whole system on three words as foundation stones, "perish," "destroy," "consumed." If these three words do not essentially imply the idea of *extinction*, then his proposition is not true. If I find in the Scriptures where these words are employed with reference to men who are *not extinct*, then his system is gone. Let us look at the argument he made in trying to save his case.

In the Acts of the apostles I found the word "perish" used as follows: "Behold, ye despisers and wonder and perish." Here are the people who hated Christ; and put him to death. Paul stood up and said, "I am telling you about the Christ you put to death. The prophets talked about your treatment of him when he should come. Behold, and wonder, and perish. I am telling you a fact that ought to excite your wonder, and bring to you a most distressed condition of soul, and it would if you realized the utter hopelessness of your lot. Look at the man! "Behold, and wonder and perish!" My brother says they were to wonder now, and *by and by* to perish; but, if there is any meaning in language they were to wonder and perish *on the spot*. On the day of Pentecost, in the anguish of their hearts, they cried out in despair. The idea of perishing conveys trouble, some great calamity.

Then about Paul's outer man perishing day by day. He says the inner man is Christ. If I were to grant it, then what is the outer man? The brother did not deny that it was the body. It perished day by day. Was it extinct? No, Paul did not go to the grave every day, in the sense of becoming extinct. He carried about bonds, and stripes and scourges, and a thorn in his flesh that he prayed God it might be taken away. He had sorrow and affliction. That is what he meant by "perishing." He didn't mean *extinction* and the Lord doesn't mean it in the passages my friend quoted.

I quoted from Job that the perfect and the wicked perish together, and the brother said, "I admit it in a sense, in a sense that they both die." Is that extinction? Has the good man become extinct by dying? If death is an extinction, there must be a new creation and not a resurrection. The brother admits there is a sense in which the good man perishes at death. But, does it mean extinction? That is what he says it means when applied to wicked people. Now let him apply it to himself and to all the righteous. It makes no difference to me. If perish means to die then that is what becomes of the wicked and the good all alike, and the theory of the brother is beyond any possibility of redemption, gone.

The same thing is true in reference to the word "destroy." "I will destroy my people," said God. That meant the wicked among them, and not the good; my brother says. How does he know? God does not make any discrimination. If he will read the prophecy he will find the prediction was that God was going to send the *whole nation*, a people, into Babylon. They were destroyed as the kingdom of Israel, and after that they were restored again. The kingdom of Israel had not been "destroyed," and will not be in the sense of utter extinction.

It is also said, "Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself." In what sense? In the sense of becoming extinct? But Israel is not extinct, for it still exists, and will continue to exist until the glorified state comes.

There never will be a return of the Sodomites, though they are not *extinct*. When Ezekiel referred to the matter of the return of the Sodomites, he said whenever Sodom shall return and be gathered together, then thy people shall return and be gathered together. He meant to say that neither they nor you will be gathered together. You are both gone from the earth.

Job said, "I am destroyed on every side; I am gone." Does he mean he is extinct? My friend tells us that a man has a trial, and the verdict is rendered, and after we read it we say, "He is gone," but we do not mean he is dead. Is that what Job means? He said, "He has destroyed me on every side; I am gone." Is the man he tries destroyed? No; he is still here in person, alive, and my brother selects him as an illustration of Job's case. You only used the word "gone." Job said, "I am *destroyed* on every side; I am gone." If this man in prison has been *destroyed*, as Job was, is he still in existence? The brother cannot, to save his life, escape the force of God's word.

"Mine eye is consumed within me," David said. He said that David personated Christ in this language, and it represented the fact that Christ's life had gone out. Very well. Did Christ become extinct? The declaration was, "Mine eye is consumed within me." He says it applies to "Christ." But to "consume" does not mean to extinguish; if it did we should not have any Christ.

Then he turned to Peter. The brother got that down wrong. I did not say Peter's expression was poetical, but that the brother depended upon the poetical expressions of the Old Testament; that those writers in the exercise of their poetical license used many extravagant expressions. I turned to this and said, "Here is the only passage in the New Testament" he did quote. Here is something real. I turn to the 17th verse of the very same chapter, and there I find that they are 'reserved to the mists of darkness forever.' "What are the mists of darkness? "You shall be cast into outer darkness," said Christ. What is the difference between outer darkness and the mists of darkness? Is anybody out there? Listen! "And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. "For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and whoever loveth and maketh a lie."

My brother says he denies that the Lord made idiots. But does he deny that children are a gift from the Lord? Does he deny that a divine providence shapes all our fortunes and all our destinies here? I want to tell you a statement made by some of the ancient worthies at the birth of their children; "I have gotten me a child of the Lord," those good women of olden times would say. I believe the divine providence of God manifested itself in the birth of children. He does not permit a sparrow by accident to fall to the ground, nor leave the hairs of our head unnumbered. God's word teaches this special providence over all. In the minutest details of this life I look up in the face of the omnipotent Father and feel like David did when he said, "Not one of my steps shall slide; thou knowest my going out and my coming in." Everything comes from God. I recognize him as the divine Father of every child born on earth, among savages, colored people or white. Of one blood he made all nations to dwell on the face of the earth. And every one of us are going to return to him. The apostle Paul declares that he is the Father of our spirits. *There isn't a human being on this earth into whose body he has not put a spirit.* There is coming a time when that spirit is going to be manifested in the land of light. The brother said that the poor idiot would not know himself. Neither will the wisest of us know ourselves.

Listen to what John says: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it does not yet appear what we shall be." We do not know yet. We will not know ourselves. That is true of all this fallen humanity. When the day of redemption comes we will look on the hosts of the redeemed, the like of which we never saw before, and we will not know ourselves in our glorified immortality.

The brother has referred twice during this debate to the marvelous outrage it would be against heaven to allow the little children, born in our houses of prostitution, to be saved! I look in the faces of those little children, and in the face of God, and say, "My Father in heaven, are these little children to be blamed for what their fathers have done? If the fathers have eaten the sour grapes shall the children's teeth be set on edge? Shall we hold them responsible when God's word declares, "Let the children in?" They are not guilty; I do not care where they come from, they are a part of the human family. They partake of the same flesh and blood, and they are brothers to me. That is the reason I call him brother. He is a fellowman; he is of the same blood; we belong to the same race. If we are not akin in *Christ* we are akin in *Adam*. He is my brother and I have respect towards him to recognize it; so I have toward any other man or woman on earth, and toward any children, whoever their parents may be.

According to my theory infants and idiots will all get into heaven, because there is only one plan of salvation; and that is through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. To those capable of hearing the gospel it comes to them on the condition of faith. To those incapable of hearing the gospel, Jesus Christ, the all perfect Saviour, will be a Saviour irrespective of anything else.

He says the fallen angels, reserved in chains of darkness unto the judgment of the last day, are the twelve messengers sent to spy out the land. How did he find that out? Where do we read of such a notion in God's word? But, if it be so, it does not modify my argument, for those spies are in chains of darkness; and are not extinct. Such a dodge does not relieve his difficulty in the least.

He refers to the fact that I called him "brother." Yesterday he had quite a little fun, at my expense, because I call him brother. I think I remember reading in history that Romulus had a wolf for a brother. He says I do worse than to call men brutes; that I call them worms. There is a state of existence in which the worm becomes a type of the man. The worm in the valley of Gehenna is a type of the suffering of the wicked in perdition. We are not going to be literally consumed like worms; but our punishment in the future life is going to be like the worm writhing in the fire that cannot die, writhing in the fire that cannot be quenched. We are going to be in a state of sin after we go there. A man who is wicked here will be wicked there. He will have madness in his heart while he lives, and after he goes to the dead. There is no opportunity to change the character there. As death leaves you the judgment finds you; eternity will also find you; for you never will have an opportunity to change after you die.

He wants to know if I can destroy a horse as a horse. Yes; but I cannot destroy a man as a man because man has an immortal spirit that no one but God can destroy. And for man's body there is a resurrection.

I showed you the nature of the punishment God would inflict from these words of Christ: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." This language shows that the punishment of the wicked will be as perpetual as the joys of the righteous. But he says, this punishment consists of natural death. All right! Let's try that. Suppose I had



power to sentence a man to death for a week; would he be *punished* for a week? The man would remain in the *condition* of death for a week, but he would not be punished but for the single moment while he was dying. A man is not punished that is not conscious. I remember seeing my little grandchild whipping her cart. I came on her and said: "Mary Mott, what are you doing?" "I am whipping the wagon; it threw me." Did the wagon have any idea of punishment? No. It takes *consciousness* to make punishment. A man is not punished when he is not alive. When the Catholics dug up the body of Tyndall, the great translator, thirty years after he was buried, and took the bones and burned them, and then cast them into the Tiber, was that punishment to Tyndall? It was only an exhibition of the foolish spite of the people. The idea of "punishment" without consciousness is absurd. That is the idea of this brother.

Now I want to call attention to some other scriptures. But how many of the passages I quoted have passed without particular notice? I quoted a whole line of passages to show the use of these key words, and not a word of reply. If these words as I gave them to you have been given the correct definition, the position of my friend could not be established to save his life. If the words *ou-teleton* and *aion* mean endless, and I proved they did, they fix the duration of the punishment of the wicked. This is the end question, and there is no chance to get out of it. Let us listen to what God says a little further.

Matt. xxv. This is the passage the brother talked about with reference to the kingdom. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations." They are all going to be there. My brother thinks these are the living nations. I admit the living nations are all going to be there; but John sees the *dead* come up, and they are going to be there also. What happens then? He separates those on the right hand from those on the left, and he says to those on his right hand, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." And to those on the left he says, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared"—for what? "Prepared for the devil and his angels," for the wicked and fallen angels already in *tartarus*, down in the bottomless pit, the place prepared for them. Now, said Jesus to certain persons on his left hand, you go into the fire, the place of torment. God never prepared a place for the torture of men. He wants all men to be saved. But many men deliberately prefer death. It is their choice. So God is obliged to send them to the furnace of fire prepared for the devil and his angels. Because they have decided against God, against right; their aspiration is to do wrong; they walk in the way of unrighteousness. These go away into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into life eternal. Now, the punishment of the wicked is co-equal with the life of the righteous. The brother insists that the punishment is death. But punishment has got to be inflicted on a conscious being. There isn't any other punishment of any sort. He called attention to II. Thes., "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power." Do you believe the wicked are going to be destroyed. I do. What kind of destruction? Everlasting. How can they be everlastingly destroyed, if destruction ceases the moment it is accomplished? But if destruction means a conscious condition of separation from God, we can then understand how they can be punished "with everlasting destruction"; and that is exactly what the

passage says, "from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power." God says, "I am going to banish him from my presence; I am not going to drive him into non-entity, but to take him away from my presence." But that does not mean the extinction of his being.

In Jude 13 and II. Pet. ii: 17, we have this statement about false teachers: "These are spots in your feasts of charity, . . . to whom is reserved the blackness of the darkness forever"—*eis tou iona*. In this statement we have the preposition *eis* to express a continuous punishment, and the strongest possible phraseology to express eternity, and conscious persons to endure the "blackness of darkness forever." There can be no total extinction in such language, but there must be endless, conscious punishment.

This language agrees with the strong words of John. Rev. xix: 3, "And the smoke of her (spiritual Babylon) torment rose up forever and ever" (*eis tous aionas tou aionan*.) Here there can be no mistake that the punishment is continuous, and eternal. The ever-ascending smoke bespeaks the ever-burning, but never-consuming worm, that dieth not, in the fire that is not quenched. These fearful representations of suffering, as set forth in God's word, are for our admonition and warning.

But, as this is the only speech in which I will be allowed to introduce new argument, I take this occasion to state some objections to the doctrine the brother has been teaching us.

1. It minimizes the importance of human life. If a man is persuaded to believe that at death his being will become extinct, and he will cease to exist in any form, anywhere, he at once feels that life is not worth living, and has no care for the future.

2. It contributes to the ideas of mere materialism, or animalism, and makes of man a mere brute.

3. It makes creation largely a blank, because it leaves in a state of utter annihilation the immense majority of that portion of creation that was made in the divine image.

4. It puts a premium on sin, because it teaches that the punishment for sin will last but for a moment and then end forever.

5. It lessens human responsibility, because a man is left to feel that no eternal issues hang upon his conduct. If he desires to sin through all his life, let him do so, knowing that one-half minute of pain will pay the entire debt forever.

6. It debases the character of man and puts him on a level with brutes; because it denies to him a God-given immortality.

7. It makes sin triumphant over God's purposes. God made man to glorify his maker forever. He gave him a likeness to his Creator. By breathing into his nostrils God made him a living soul. But if the sinner is punished with extinction of being, then man's sin triumphs over God's purposes, for even the punishment of the wicked will magnify God's inflexible justice.

8. It makes God cruel (I say it reverently) in permitting to live, and preserving in life, a class of unfortunate victims of disease and deformity, who are a burden to themselves and all others, but, if they have no deathless spirits, would be better to be dead, like the brutes.

9. It nullifies the idea of infinite justice, by making such impossible.

10. It consigns to oblivion the purest of our race—infants.

11. It declares God's justice to be cruel in not saving those who trust in

Christ—just because they happen not to be Christadelphians.

12. It renders forever impossible the salvation of *anybody* because all sin must be punished, and all sinners must be burned—and all of us are sinners.

13. It contradicts man's *innate* desire. He craves life—even in a prison—rather than death.

14. Body and soul are both indestructable. Such a doctrine as he teaches contradicts philosophy and scripture both.

15. The only support it can wrench from God's word is from the recognized, extravagant, poetical figures of speech in the Old Testament.

16. It contradicts the plain statement of God's word, as I have shown you in many passages.

17. It is a direct charge that the God of all the earth will not do right.

18. It is a backward move toward barbarism, a making of us the companions of beasts.

19. It is a doctrine that curses man, and disgraces the Almighty God.

20. It has neither the good of man, the glory of God, the majesty of law, the support of common sense, nor the teachings of the Scripture to uphold it.

It is the gospel of dirt.

[Time called.]

#### FOURTH PROPOSITION—TWELFTH SESSION.

(*Mr. William's Second Half-Hour Speech.*)

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, RESPECTED FRIENDS:—As our time is short on this proposition we have both agreed that we will devote the entire time this afternoon to speaking instead of questioning. So now we will take up the subject and examine what our friend was talking about a little while before he left the stand; he was saying that to be destroyed from the presence of the Lord was simply to be removed from the presence of the Lord. I want to read a few testimonies on this point.

Gen. vi: 13, "And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and behold I will *destroy them with the earth.*" In the margin it reads "destroy them *from the earth.*"

Let us get the meaning of this. "All in whose nostrils was the breath of life"—see chapter vii: 4—we read, "And *every living substance* that I have made *will I destroy from off the face of the earth*." Then in verse 21, "All flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl and of cattle and of beasts, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man; all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died, and every living substance *was destroyed* which was upon the ground, both man and cattle and creeping thing, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were *destroyed from the earth.*"

Now the idea my friend wanted to impress upon you was this that to destroy from the presence of the Lord was to send them down to hell and keep them alive there. Are you willing to believe as reasonable men and women that every time you have left these grounds during this debate you have been destroyed from these grounds? Would it not be absurd to talk about living men and women being destroyed from these grounds simply because you have left the grounds

and gone to your homes? But if you were blotted out of existence, then you can see, inasmuch as there is no other existence contemplated, why it is said that they were destroyed from the face of the earth. Mark the words here; the same word *destroy* is applied to cattle and creeping things and the fowl of the heavens and man; "I will destroy them all from the earth." Does it mean he will remove man and beasts from the earth to a place of continuous punishment and not destroy the cattle nor the men? What folly!

Ez. xxx: 13, "Thus saith the Lord God, I will destroy their idols; and I will cause their image to cease out of Noph." Was the destruction of the idols simply their removal to another place? or their utter destruction?

Num. xxxiii: 52, "Then shall ye drive out all the inhabitants of the land before you, and destroy all their pictures and destroy all their molten images." Did that mean the preservation of their abominations? He took the cities at that time and utterly destroyed men and women and little ones, and left none to remain. Deut. ii: 34. There was destruction utterly of all in those cities.

Job says, "Though after my skin worms *destroy this body*, yet in my flesh shall I see God." I refer to these simply to show you the use of the word *destroy*, and of the phrase "destroy from the earth."

I will now examine my friend in regard to the quotation from the prophecy of Daniel. All through this discussion my friend has been misquoting this passage, making it read, Many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to everlasting shame and contempt. Now it doesn't read that way, but it is, "Some to shame and everlasting contempt." They stand before the judgment seat of Christ; they come there and are stricken with shame and what is the result of their condemnation? Everlasting contempt. The Sodomites may have been ashamed when the angels went there to destroy them, but after they were destroyed were they ashamed? No; but they were looked back upon with contempt by future generations. So it will be after the resurrection of the dead; those who come forth and find themselves unworthy will be stricken with shame and shall be destroyed, and will be looked back upon with contempt because they were unfaithful servants.

Our friend has referred us to those who are cast in outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. What is *outer* darkness? Is it to be cast downward into a burning eternal hell? You remember the Saviour likens his people to a city that is set on a hill whose light cannot be hid. When Christ comes he will summons into his presence all his people for judgment, the just and the unjust, and so when all the lights of the world are gathered to that congregation, without will be "outer darkness." Who are those who will be left outside upon the face of the earth? All the ignorant, wicked and dark nations will be left there, but his people will be gathered together to one place of judgment. All the lights of the world are therefore brought before him. Therefore when the judgment seat is inaugurated all the world outside is in "outer darkness." But here are some unworthy ones at the tribunal, and he says of them, Cast them out into outer darkness, out among the nations, "the hypocrites and unbelievers" on the outside; and just then there is a "time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation" (Dan. xii: 1). Outside there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. The ultimate end of those cast out is they shall be punished with everlasting destruction. "Behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven and all the proud, yea all that do wickedly shall b

stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch; and they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this"—M.t. iv: 1, 3.

Now my friend tells us that the wicked sin all the time they are in hell the same as they do here, and quotes Rev. xxii:14—"For without are dogs," etc., outside the glorious city, as if his hell were just outside of it. That is the way he excuses God for tormenting them forever. I thought he wouldn't be satisfied in believing that men are to be tormented eternally for the sins of this short life, so now he begins to patch it up to suit himself; after they go to hell they sin there continually. Now, look here! According to my friend, God first puts them in a place where they cannot help sinning, and because they sin on Monday and cannot help it, and it would do them no good if they could, he punishes them on Tuesday, and because they sin on Tuesday and cannot help it he punishes them on Wednesday, and asks you to accept this as a just reason why God keeps them in a place where they cannot do anything else but sin and groan and swear and curse and suffer through the untold ages of eternity.

My friend gets back to the brute question. It is said in history that Romulus had a wolf for a brother. That is fiction, in which my friend finds relief. If my friend is Romulus I suppose I am the wolf and he is willing to acknowledge the relationship. I do not know that he has made it a bit better by another attempt to patch it up.

Now I will take a dog as an illustration. My friend owns a dog; here it is; this dog has been very offensive to my friend; he has killed his sheep and bitten his children; what must we do with this dog? First my friend will obtain a chemical and infuse it into this dog so that he cannot be destroyed, he cannot die. Then he proceeds to make a bonfire, red hot and raging, and then my friend takes this wicked dog and throws it into the flames and fastens it there so that it can never escape its doom of torture; and my friend stands by and hears its shrieks and its howls and watches it writhe in the agony of the torment. I will ask you, my friend, how long will you stand there and see that dog suffer so? I know my friend has a tender heart. A man could not talk as he did about his children without having a tender heart, and I tell you now and here this moment, that I do not believe he would stand there five minutes and see that dog suffer. He would say, Kill the poor creature and put him out of his misery. Now, my friend, is your God worse than you are? Are you preaching and worshipping God who infuses into the nature of wicked men that which keeps them from dying so that they might be preserved in writhing torment, and, as Dr. Benson says, that "God is himself in hell exercising all his divine attributes to make the pains of the damned cut intolerably deep"—Is that your God? If you would stand for an hour and look upon that poor dog in torture—who would be the brute in that case? But you could never be such a revengeful brute; and again follows the question, Is your God worse than you are? Will he do with thousands and millions of men and women what you would not think of doing with a poor dog? Perish forever such a savage thought.

I must now deal with the case of the rich man and Lazarus, yet before we come to that, we have been referred to the book of Revelation, where "the smoke of their torment ascends up in the presence of the Lamb and of the holy angels? or in the presence of Christ and his saints. What smoke of torment is that?"

When Christ shall come to punish the nations of earth and the unworthy ones the smoke of their torment shall ascend up forever and ever. Does that word forever always mean without an end? No, no; it means what is meant in the case of the servant who choose not to go out free; they bored his ear with an awl and he became a servant *for ever*; that is as long as he lived. There you have the word forever; it is the duration of his life, the age of the man. "Forever and ever" means for the age of the ages. There is to be an age, a period of time; I believe it will be about forty years, which is to be the age of punishment for all previous ages; and the smoke of their torment ascended up during this age of ages.

There is another sense in which this symbolic expression may be used which I have already explained in another speech; just the same as in the picture of Pompei where the picture of the ascending smoke showed the absolute destruction, the annihilation, if you like, of the city an object lesson which teaches that Pompei went down in smoke and fire. The smoke of their torment ascending forever and ever in a symbolic picture for Revelation is a symbolic book, shows you their utter and everlasting destruction in the devouring flames.

In regard to the rich man and Lazarus, I must devote a little time to that. My friend says he doesn't believe it is a parable. If you will look in verse 14, it says the Pharisees derided and to them he spake the parable. How do you know it was a parable? you may ask. Because it says that "without a parable spake he not unto them." Why? "That seeing they might see and not perceive, and hearing they might hear and not understand." These men came before him believing in the theory my friend believes. History tells us that the Jews did not believe in the immortality of the soul until they went to Babylon. Now after their return from Babylon they had come to believe in the immortality of the soul; that in the death state there were two departments; one they called Abraham's bosom and the other they called hades. That was the belief of the Jews which they received from pagan sources, and the Saviour draws this illustration from their pagan doctrine, just as he did when he said, "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?" Not that the Saviour believed in Beelzebub the fictitious god of the fly, but he meets them on their own ground. He did the same with this parable of the rich man and Lazarus. He says, I will take your own theory; we will put the rich man in your hell in hades on the one side, and Lazarus in your fictitious "Abraham's bosom." Is this your literal heaven and hell my friend? If so here are your mothers in Abraham's bosom who can look across to hell and hear their children pleading for a drop of water to cool their tongues! Fathers and mothers have to stay throughout eternity in sight of their children writhing in torment and listen to their groans and cries of anguish and they cannot help them. Do you think you can be happy if you get there? If you can, then you will be worse there than you are here, for you could not endure it here.

Listen! The rich man *died*. He is dead now. What do the Scriptures say happens when a man dies? "His breath goeth forth; he returns to his earth: in that very day his thoughts perish." "And he was buried." We have him buried now. If ever that man who is dead and buried lifts up his eyes to see will he not have to be brought out of the grave? That will be the way by which he will lift up his eyes when he awakes in resurrection. "I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness," says the psalmist. It is when he is raised from the dead

that he lifts up his eyes. We see the man dead and buried and in hades. When the resurrection comes he lifts up his eyes; he is in torment there when "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." When will the angels be sent to gather the elect from the four winds of heaven? When the Son of man comes. Christ is coming to send his angels to bring the Lazarus class to Abraham's bosom. Will Abraham be there? Yes; "They shall come from the east and the west and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom." The angels have brought all the elect, and Lazarus has been carried by angels into Abraham's bosom, into the kingdom of God. The rich man is outside where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. I am now showing that even if you read this as a literal statement it establishes the very doctrine I have been setting before you. If it is a parable, which I believe it is, it shows the Jews their destiny. How many tribes were there in the land of Judea? Two. How many tribes in all? Twelve. Suppose I paint a picture before you. The Saviour here painted a word picture. Here is a rich man clothed in purple and fine linen to represent the Jews—the representatives of the two tribes—because the Jewish priesthood, the Jewish rulers were clothed in purple and fine linen; and for the rich man in the picture to be clothed in purple and fine linen was to make him represent the rulers of the Jews. Now when this rich man died, it meant that the Jews should die shortly as a nationality at the hands of their foes, when came the destruction of Jerusalem, where a million and a half perished, and left the rest in torment everywhere. There you have the fulfillment of the parable so far as the Jews were concerned. Here is one man painted in the picture to represent two tribes. This one man says, "I have five brethren." What can that mean? There were ten tribes. If one man represents two tribes, as one is to two so are five to ten; therefore five brethren in the parable represent the ten tribes. What is Abraham made to say? "They have Moses and the prophets; if they will not hear them neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." Lazarus in Abraham's bosom shows that the call of the Gentiles to become children of faithful Abraham by symbolically dying in baptism would take place when the apostles would turn from the Jews. There you have the history of the case in brief. Instead of teaching that fathers and mothers have to go to heaven where they can see their children writhing in the torments of hell through the countless ages of eternity—I do not believe there is a man or woman here who would want to go to that kind of a heaven. I believe if he could choose, he would rather take the "orthodox" hell than its heaven. You cannot persuade me that God is a God who could prepare such a place as that, where I would be able to see my wife, my child in hell through all eternity. I could not believe in such a God as that! With all due reverence to the God of heaven whom I fear and worship, the God of heaven is not such a God as that! It is a pagan myth handed down through the centuries of the past. It does not belong to civilized intelligent men and women as you are. I know my friend will admit that he would not torment that poor dog. Then do not worship a God worse than yourself.

My friend asks the question, by the way, did Christ become extinct when he died? If Christ had not been raised from the dead, you would not have any Christ today. That is the truth in the case because Paul said so. "If there be no resurrection from the dead, then Christ is not raised; then your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins;" you might just as well "eat and drink, for tomorrow we

die." Therefore I say that since Christ died and was buried, if he had not been raised all would be gone. When he died, he was dead; when he was buried, he was in the grave, in sheol. Therefore it says, God raised Jesus of Nazareth from the dead. When he was dead his life was extinct.

There is one point in which my friend has misrepresented me. He will excuse me for going back to the last proposition; he will, I have no doubt, grant me the privilege of going back. He said he preached a Christ that was not a sinner, and intimated that I preached a Christ that was a sinner. Now he knows that I believe that Christ "was holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners." He concluded that I believed Christ was a sinner because I preached that Christ had to die to save himself. I quoted a text which said that "God brought again the Lord Jesus Christ from the dead through the blood of the everlasting covenant" (Heb. xiii; 20). I argued from that that if the blood of the covenant was necessary to raise Christ from the dead, the blood of the covenant was necessary to his salvation; salvation from the state in which he was born by reason of Adamic sin, in which all men are born, but in his case not from personal sins. Therefore it is said that "in the days of his flesh he offered up prayers and supplications with strong cryings and tears unto him that was able to save him from death" (Heb. v: 7). He needed to be saved, didn't he? Do not say that I have preached unto you a sinful Christ. I have only preached to you Christ born as we are all born, under the law of sin and death. I have preached to you a Christ that redeemed himself out of that condition, and hence became our forerunner practically out of the fallen state to immortality.

Now in the few minutes I have I want to recall to you what I have been over. I have proved to you that the transgressors shall be destroyed. My friend has been trying to make you believe that I have been depending upon words, three words, for the foundation stones of my argument. I am not depending upon mere isolated words in themselves; I will allow for the various meanings of the words; I depend upon their obvious use as determined by the context and connection.

"For yet a little while and the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place." The town is there, my friend said. He didn't get my point after all I said. What I said was this: If there is no place for the wicked, the wicked will not be found. There is no room for them, because we have come to the time when God has destroyed their very name and there is no place for them. How then are you going to try to persuade yourselves that that means that the wicked will still be in existence? God is going to be all and in all. You must believe with me that God will first eliminate from the universe every form of wickedness, every wicked one; then God will indeed be all and in all, and he cannot be all and in all till all the wicked are out of being.

My friend quoted the text, "Beloved now are we the sons of God." We are if we have been converted to Christ, "And it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him for we shall see him as he is." There is nothing in this to prove that we shall not know ourselves, when we are made like him immortal.. "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." Will the sinners be consumed out of the earth? Will the wicked be no more? Answer—"These as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed . . . shall utterly perish in their own corruption." There we have the matter before us; how does it stand



with you? Here is the word that we have presented before you. We have shown that all that have lived without law shall perish without law; that "man that is in honor abideth not, he is like the beasts that perish. Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them." They go down into death, to corruption, that is the end of them.

My friend wanted to know why the Lord did not kill them all now. Simply because there are some that stand amenable to law, to the judgment God has ordained in the future winding up of present affairs at his set time. He does not kill off men until they have filled up the measure of their iniquity. So the Saviour said to the Jews, "Fill ye up the measure of your fathers," and not until they had filled up that measure did the destruction of their city and nationality overtake them. He is waiting until the nations fill up the measure of their iniquity. Then Christ shall come, and while the nations will be left outside in the "outer darkness," the two classes, "just and unjust amenable to the judgment by the gospel," shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ, and those who are found worthy will be crowned with life and immortality; while those who are unworthy shall be cast into outer darkness where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, where ultimately, after the "few or many stripes," according to their just deserts, they shall be destroyed from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power, and at last when all enemies are destroyed the utter destruction of the wicked and the preservation of only the righteous will bring the time when, in a grander sense than in Eden at the beginning, paradise will be restored in all its beautiful and majestic splendor, and "everything will be very good." [*Time called.*]

---

#### FOURTH PROPOSITION—TWELFTH SESSION.

(*Mr. Hall's Second Speech of One Half-hour.*)

---

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I am now before you for the purpose of closing this very pleasant debate. I wish to call attention to what the brother has said in the last speech, because it is my business to follow wherever he may lead. He calls attention to quite a number of scriptures which have the word "destroy" in them in order that he may evade the force of that idea of "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord." In this passage, we both have quoted from Thessalonians, the apostle Paul is contemplating the final separation between the impenitent and their God. After they are banished from his presence they turn to the left hand, and the Saviour says to them, "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting punishment, prepared for the devil and his angels." Daniel said they go into "shame and everlasting contempt." I stand corrected if I quoted it as you said. "Everlasting contempt" would not be possible if there were not conscious beings, and the very reason he could say it of the Sodomites is that they are yet in existence. That is the reason they are suffering "everlasting contempt." A man cannot suffer contempt; or shame, unless he is alive. You have got to have conscious being or there is no shame. Shame and contempt is to be the punishment and it is to be inflicted on a people raised from the dead. When Paul is talking about everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord he does not mean extinction

of being, but their destruction is their *punishment*, and it is everlasting; it will never end.

The brother quotes several scriptures, and asks, Does this mean extinction? Does this mean separation from God? The end of all flesh had come and it follows that all were destroyed. They were separated from God, but there was no extinction of their being, because there will be a resurrection from the dead.

Ezek. xxx: 13, "Destroy the idols." Were they really destroyed? As *idols* you can destroy them, but these are not comparable with men and women. The idols are not conscious beings. They have eyes, but they see not. They are not in any sense responsible or conscious. Their destruction consists in the fact that they are thrown aside, and burned up. But they do not go into non-entity, except as idols. As the brother has intimated once or twice of any material; it cannot be utterly annihilated. With men and women there is no such thing as utter extinction. We read of the destruction of men, women and children in every city. They simply put them to death, just like the brother said about Job. To destroy Job's flesh was simply to let him die, but in the very next verse we read, "Though after my skin worms *destroy* this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." Here we read that worms "destroy" this body, but there hasn't been any extinction of being even in his flesh, for in his flesh he is going to see God. His body is going to be devoured by worms, but God will raise it up again. It has not been extinguished.

He says that "outer darkness" means to be thrust out among the nations on the outside, when God's people are collected together at the last day, and the multitude of nations, who know not the gospel, are going to be condemned and destroyed, and this is "outer darkness." But God's word says these nations are going into "everlasting punishment," where the "smoke of their torment will ascend up forever and ever." My brother says that "forever and ever" does not mean "forever." It does not mean any more than concerning the man who had his ear bored through with an awl, and thus became a servant "forever," which means that the man is to be a servant as long as he lives. If this is so, then we have no ever-living God, as this very same word is used in reference to him *forty times* as a declaration of his eternal and divine character. The expression "forever and ever" is the strongest possible sentence to be employed in the Greek language to indicate eternity, while in the sense in which it may be employed, figuratively, with reference to the binding of the servant, it does not cease from the time of its beginning, on as long as he lives. The instant the awl is bored through the ear, the man becomes a servant "forever"—so long as he survives he will be a servant. So the moment man enters the condition of punishment he becomes a "sufferer," and he will suffer "forever" as long as he has being, and he will have being as long as there is a God, for the declaration of God's word is that the "smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever."

My brother objects to God sending men to hell where they continue sinning. God does not require them to go into hell, nor desire them to do so. He takes no pleasure in the death of any. This is the reason he comes to the people of Israel and says, "Why will ye die?" He says, "I set life and death before you;" if you choose death it is your own choice. Even the heathen are without excuse, Paul says. They know the distinction between right and wrong, and yet they prefer the wrong. If there is a solitary heathen on the face of the earth that does right,

and loves right and wants to live right, God says, "All right, you shall have my blessing." If they prefer death, God gives them an opportunity of doing it. Where then shall they go to sin? They are determined to sin. They choose it. Shall it be done in heaven? My brother makes as his only answer, that God has confined them where they cannot help themselves, and then he gives the comparison of the dog. We have been hearing a great deal of dogology during this debate. It is a favorite hobby with our brother. His Bible should have the word dog written large. He says, "Brother Hall looks on the poor dog in the bonfire with a feeling of sympathy, and says, 'Turn him out.'" Yet it is possible I might *not* have that kind of feeling for that kind of dog. Suppose I was looking into the face of a dog whose essential nature was savage and cruel, whose spirit was of such a nature that it could not be tamed, which was so vicious, that even in the fire he would snap, and snarl, and growl with a desire to break forth and do us all the hurt he could! Away out in Texas they took a negro who had committed an outrageous deed upon a little girl, and the assembly of the people, civilized people, burned him alive; and the people who stood by and knew the outrageous attack of which he had been guilty, applauded the act. This was their feeling in the matter. The savage character of the man made it possible for justice to punish without a shudder. God does not take pleasure in the punishment of the wicked. He does not look on with a feeling of gratification, He says, "I take no pleasure in the death of the wicked." The brother spoke of God's people standing and looking on with a degree of delight, as if it were our pleasure to see them thus suffer. Do you not think if I were indifferent to the fate of humanity I would not go home and stay with my family, and not spend so much arduous labor trying to persuade men and women to turn from sin and accept of Jesus Christ? God does not want men to die. He sent his Son; his only child that they might be saved. Do you see that dog he mentioned rolling in the flames? Do you think I could have pity enough on that dog to send my child into the flames to save the dog? Could I have the sort of pity God had to try to save these fallen lost victims of sin? In the baptism of blood under which he went down, Christ made provision to save the race of mankind. God loves mankind and wants them saved. But they choose death for themselves.

My brother says that Christ did not go into non-entity, but he died. Then to die is not to perish. Jesus Christ was not *consumed*. Jesus Christ died as to his body, but his body was not extinct. In the very dying hour he looked up in the face of his Father and said, "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit." The spirit of Jesus Christ survived the grave. There was no destruction of his body or his spirit, yet his body died. Death does not mean extinction of being.

My brother asks the liberty to make a correction in what he charges as a misrepresentation, in the discussion of a previous proposition. He understood me to represent him as saying that Jesus Christ was a sinner. I asked the question, brother, if Jesus Christ did not save himself, would he have died like a sinner? Did he not take the place of a sinner? If Christ had been disobedient he would have been lost; if he remained good he would have been saved. I do not misunderstand the view they entertain concerning Christ; you understand that his belief is that Christ was a mortal man; that he had to obtain immortality just like any human being; that he was born again at his baptism. If that does not make Jesus Christ very close to being a sinner, I do not understand the

subject. That is not my view of Jesus Christ. I look on him as God, manifest in the flesh; as the Divine One, through whom all things were made, and without him was not anything made that is made. When I bow my knee to him I am worshipping the God of heaven. That is the Christ Baptists believe in, and that Baptists preach. If the Christadelphians have nothing but a man, a mortal man, I am exceedingly doubtful as to the result of their faith.

We come to the question of the rich man. My brother says he knows this is a parable because it says, "without a parable spake he not unto them." That statement has got to be taken in a limited sense, because there are some times when it is apparent from the connection that he did not speak in parables to them. But I do not care a whit whether you make it a parable or a reality. God does not call it a parable; Christ didn't call it a parable. I therefore believe it to be a real story.

My brother says that according to my idea of the subject you have got people on the other side of death, some in hell and some in heaven, close enough to take a look in on each other; then Christian people in heaven could look on and see their children writhe in torment. I do not believe that such is the case, or that this was intended to represent such a fact. Jesus Christ simply illustrated the condition of the two states. I do not believe that communication is going on between these two conditions in the spirit world. I am going to accept my brother's theory of it for the sake of the argument. He says it may possibly be a reality, and if it is, it refers to the resurrection of the dead, and is represented as taking place after the resurrection of the dead, that Jesus shows them what becomes of the rich man, and what becomes of the poor man, *after* the resurrection of the dead. Very well, for the sake of the argument I accept it. After the resurrection of the dead, then, there is still a *conscious existence*; both these parties are there, and they are *still in communication*. But he would still encounter the same difficulty. I would like to inquire, is not the resurrection due to come at the end of the world? Yet here is a man, conscious in hell, after the resurrection, and praying for his five brethren still in the world! That is a strange absurdity to which his reasoning drives him. But the brother says the real idea of this is that it represents the Jews and Gentiles, and is intended to convey the idea that the Jews would die as a nation at the destruction of Jerusalem, and, I suppose their spirits all go to perdition. He charges that Jesus used a pagan tradition which the Jews had from the time of their captivity in Babylon; that there they learned the dual nature of man; they got that in captivity. That is a mistake, the same as when he said something about Solomon obtaining his ideas on the same subject from Plato—

(*Mr. Williams:* I said the doctrine came from Egypt, where Plato received his education. Plato wasn't alive in Solomon's time.)

The statement to which I wish to call attention is this: the Jews understood that in the creation of the world God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul. Zechariah states that God formed a spirit within man, and Solomon taught that when men died the spirit returned to God who gave it. The Jews had believed this doctrine all the time from the very start; all of God's people had always believed it. There never was a contradiction of the doctrine. There is not a line of any sort in the Bible or out of it that contradicts it from the creation until twelve hundred years after Christ. The statement made by the brother that it was a pagan notion is, of course, entirely

gratuitous. He says that Jesus not only failed to contradict this doctrine, but he selected this for the purpose of taking home to them the idea of their true position. This rich man represented the Jew; one rich man represented the two tribes, the five brethren represented the ten tribes, and the six men represented the twelve tribes of Israel! That is a pretty nice theory. One objection to it is that it is purely imaginary on the part of the brother, but for the sake of the argument I am going to accept it as valid. How many people does Lazarus represent? He is in this too; he is a party to it. If we have a right to represent the twelve tribes by a rich man and five brethren, how many does Lazarus represent?

(*Mr. Williams:* The body of Christ.)

The body of Christ! Are the Gentiles the body of Christ? Lazarus represents the body of Christ, he says, and because all nations stand identified with the body of Christ, we have got *one man* to represent *all the nations of the earth*, while it takes *six men* to represent the *twelve tribes*! Who does Abraham represent? Really he should be on the Jewish side of the subject, but he has got over on the Gentile side with Lazarus! Here is a rich man down in hell. He says that is the Jews pleading with the Gentiles for a drop of water, pleading with the church, the people of God, the body of Christ! for a drop of water that is denied him! That poor fellow begging and pleading the church of Christ—is that the Chrisadelphian church? They announce here that they are going to the Jewish tabernacle in Henderson, tomorrow night to show that they *are* willing to give the drop of water to the poor, dead Jews!

Look a little further into it. Who does Abraham represent? Lazarus represents Christ's body, and is on the side of the Gentiles. Abraham said, I cannot send you into hell. There is no communication between the rich man and Lazarus is there? No communication whatever between Jews and Gentiles! Are we not Gentiles and don't we recognize the Jews in this country? Don't we have social intercourse with them? Don't they marry our women and don't we marry their women? Don't we trade with them, and they preach in our churches? Do we have anything to do with them? Of course we do. Did this rich man and Lazarus have anything to do with one another? I want to tell you that this is the most presumptive dreaming any man ever did with his eyes open. Has my brother had his eyes open this afternoon?

[Mr. Hall claiming that the stenographer omitted part of his speech, substituted the following numbered propositions when revising this speech. Mr. Williams thinks Mr. Hall mistaken as to the omission, and wrote Mr. Hall that he might add anything he pleased to appear in an appendix, on the condition equal space be allowed for reply. Since Mr. Hall ignored this offer, and added to his last speech, Mr. Williams thinks it but fair that he should answer each of the numbered questions; and that the reader may see the relevancy of each answer to the question, it directly follows the question.]

Please note these points in the case of the rich man and Lazarus. If the rich man represented the Jews, as my friend said, and Lazarus represented the Gentiles (or church of Christ) as he said, then notice these points of dissimilarity.

1. (*Mr. Hall*) The Gentiles (or church) were never laid at the gate of the Jews.

1. (*Mr. Williams*) The Gentiles were called dogs by the Jews and considered fit only for associates with their dogs outside their gates (see Mark vii: 27, 28).

2. (H) The Gentiles (or church) never had any sores on them any more than the Jews had.

2. (W) The Gentiles before they were given opportunity to enter the church had sores enough, surely, so have Gentiles now before they become Abraham's seed (Gal. iii: 29), or are (parabolically) received into "Abraham's bosom."

3. (H) If the Gentiles were represented by Lazarus, and the Jews by Dives, then who were the dogs that licked the Gentiles?

3. (W) Pagan priests of the Gentiles then and all false, deluded and deluding teachers now.

4. (H) Was the "purple and fine linen" the material, or religious riches of the Jews?

4. (W) When "Uncle Sam" is seen in cartoons everybody recognizes him by his dress as representing the United States. So a rich man is painted in this parabolic picture to represent the Jews, the "purple and fine linen" being a mark of identity. See Exod. xxviii: 5, for a description of their national priestly garments.

5. (H) At the time of this parable the Jews were not *materially* rich.

6. (H) At the time of this parable they were not *spiritually* rich, either, for Christ called them very wicked.

5-6. (W) The richness was to show how the Jews had been favored in their "life time" (verse 25), which favor they had forfeited and were about to receive their national punishment for their unfaithfulness, which punishment came in about thirty years, when the destruction of Jerusalem took place.

7. (H) They *both* died—both the Jews and the Gentiles (or church). Who, then, was left alive?

7. (W) The Jews died a national death at the hands of the Romans, and the scattered subjects have been in "torment" in all the world ever since. Before a Gentile can become the seed of Abraham (Gal. iii: 29) or be received into "Abraham's bosom" he must die as a Gentile, for the promise was to Abraham and *his seed only* (Gal. iii: 16), and Gentiles as such are aliens, strangers, without hope, without Christ and without God (Eph. ii: 11, 12). When a Gentile is baptized into Christ to become Abraham's seed (Gal. iii: 26-29), he (symbolically) dies and is buried and raised. Then he is a "new creature" (II. Cor. v: 17), a seed of Abraham, and no longer a Gentile (Eph. ii: 19). This death is referred to in Rom. vi: 3. and Col. iii: 1-3. The words "Ye are dead" (verse 3) should be "*Ye died.*" See R. V.

8. (H) If the Jews, as a people, died, so did the Gentiles, as a people.

9. (H) They not only *died*, but they were also *buried*.

8-9. (W) The Gentiles die as Gentiles and are raised from the watery grave (baptism) as "children of Abraham" (Gal. iii: 7)—in "Abraham's bosom."

10. (H) But, more marvelous than that, two nations, Jews and Gentiles, were *both* still alive after they were dead and buried.

10. (W) The Jewish nation *as a nation* was not alive after it was buried. See the valley of dry bones in Ezek. xxxvii, and believe Paul in Rom. xi: 15.

11. (H) I must insist in asking who was Abraham? He seemed to be separate from the rich man (the Jews) and also from Lazarus (the Gentiles). Who, then, was he?

12. (H) The Bible represents him as the father of the Jews. How then did he happen to be on the side of Lazarus (the Gentiles) and against the Jews?

11-12 (W) Abraham was and is the father of the Jews according to the flesh. Hence the words "Father Abraham," and in the reply, "Son," etc., (verses 24, 25). Abraham was and is also the "Father of the faithful" (Gal. iii). Read the whole chapter.

13. (H) Why couldn't he help the Jews, if the rich man represents them?

13. (W) Because they had had their day or good things, natural and spiritual, and now they are cast off in the "blindness in part which is happened to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in" Rom. xi: 15-25. See also Acts xiii: 46.

14. (H) Don't we help the Jews, now?

14. (W) Individually, yes, but nationally the "gulf" (of unbelief) is between them and Abraham and the Abrahamic faith and they cannot cross that gulf till "the fulness of the Gentile be come in."

15. (H) Is not the church (Lazarus) now sent to the Jews? Paul said the gospel was "To the Jew first, and also to the Greeks."

15. (W) Yes, it was offered to the Jews first and forbidden to the Gentiles (Matt. x: 5) but they are now "tormented" and Lazarus, not as a Gentile, but in "Abraham's bosom" is "comforted." The rich man does not represent the Jews individually, but nationally.

16. (H) Do not the Jews and the Gentiles have dealings with each other? Haven't they always done so?

16. (W) Not the kind of "dealings" separated by the gulf between Abraham and his seed according to the spirit and the Jews who for the time being are "cast off."

17. (H) Where is any impassable gulf between the Gentiles and Jews? Is it in religion? In politics? In business? In social life? In marriages? In all these the two peoples mix continually.

17. (W) The impassable gulf is that Christ has become "a stone of stumbling and rock of offense," which has caused the Jews to be "blinded" on the wrong side of the gulf. Even in the matter of politics, etc., they are still a people within all people, marked and separated—"A byword and reproach."

18. (H) Who do the five brethren represent? If, as he says, they represent the lost ten tribes, then how does he know but that these lost ten tribes are not the Anglo Saxon, or Gentile race of today?

18. (W) In answer to the question, Whom do the five brethren represent? I would say that parables should be governed by consistency: Of the twelve tribes of Israel only two were in the land at the time in question—Judah and Benjamin. They constituted the nation to whom Christ came and whom he addressed in this parable. In this parabolic picture he painted the two tribes as *one* man; consistency would therefore require that the other ten tribes be painted in the same picture as *five*. There is not another people upon the face of the earth who could be called brethren of the Jews to whom the Saviour spake, except the ten tribes; and to them had been "committed the oracles of God" (Rom. iii: 1, 2). Therefore "they had Moses and the prophets" (verse 29). So far as our issue is concerned it does not matter whether the Anglo Saxons are the ten tribes or not. If I were discussing Anglo Israelism I could tell you why one is not the other. If the Anglo Saxons are Israelites they are not a "Gentile race."

19. (H) How could *one* man (Lazarus) represent the hundreds of nationalities among the Gentiles, while it took *six* men to represent the Jews?

19. (*W*) The one man, Lazarus, does not represent "the hundreds of nationalities among the Gentiles." He represents the Gentiles who became the Israel of God in "Abraham's bosom," as before explained.

20. (*H*) If all these things took place with these two nationalities while they were *dead*, then were they not still alive?

20. (*W*) That is to ask, If all these things took place with these two nationalities while they were *dead*, then they were *not dead when they were dead*? Israel when she was *alive* as a nation was *alive* and *not dead* as a nation. Now she is dead as a nation and, therefore, she is not alive as a nation. While she is dead as a nation, her scattered children are in "torment." When Gentiles die as Gentiles in the sense we have explained, they are not alive as Gentiles. Having been "born again," and become "new creatures," they are alive as such, but dead as Gentiles.

*Mr. Hall:* There is a point here I must not overlook; that question about the burning day in Mal. iv: 1-3, "For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven and all the proud, yea all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." Now my brother assumed—he did not make any remarks, he merely quoted the passage—that this was a kind of consumption, a destruction that was coming on the people. I want to call attention to the fact that there is a contrast drawn here between the faithful, and unfaithful; we have the result of the burning in I. Cor. iii: 12, where Paul says, "Every man's work shall be manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire."

*Mr. Williams* (rising): I rise to a point of order; if this is introduced we must reply. Hedge's Logic provides that if either introduces a new argument in his last speech, the man on the other side has a right to reply.

*Mr. Hall:* This is not new argument, as it is my reply to the argument he introduced. But, I will go ahead and the brother can reply.

*Mr. Williams:* I will not claim my right.

*Mr. Hall* (resuming): If the argument refers to all wicked people, then it is figurative, for we have read of some wicked ones who were consumed and were yet alive. If it is not a total destruction of the wicked we can find a parallel passage that shows the same fire will devour our Zion. Lam. iv: 11, "He hath poured out his fierce anger; he has kindled a fire in Zion, and it hath devoured the foundations thereof." If you make "destruction" and "burning" absolutely literal, and extinction to be the result, then you have got to destroy all the wicked, and destroy all the foundations of Zion at the same time.

Let me call attention briefly to some things I have said. *Tartarus* is a department of *hades*, the under world, where the fallen angels are confined. My brother explains the fallen angels to refer to the twelve messengers; I called for his authority and he forgot to give it. I showed you also that *Gehenna*, the valley where the decaying carcasses were thrown, where the undying worm and the unquenchable fire were found, was the picture the Saviour selected as a type of the punishment of the wicked; but he forgot to reply. I have given you the Greek word *telutao*, meaning end, and with the prefix *ou* before it, *ou-telutao*, it means *absolutely endless*. So when he speaks of the undying worm, we have the idea of *endlessness*—and we had no reply to this. I said that the word *aion*, translated "forever," is the strongest word in the Greek language to convey the idea



of duration. It is the word God uses to express the duration of the punishment of the wicked. Their condition is one of sorrow and distress, and it continues day after day, age after age. It is the word that expresses the eternal happiness of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked. To all this no reply was made.

In Jude vi. 7, I find that the angels which kept not their first estate are reserved in chains of darkness, in the pit; and the Sodomites and Gomorrahites are both of them in the pit, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire; the spirits in prison Peter spoke of were also bound in chains of darkness.

I find Daniel and John both telling us of the resurrection of the dead, the righteous unto life eternal, and the wicked unto a resurrection of damnation, to shame and everlasting contempt.

I find Judas suffering such a punishment as it could be said of him that it would have been better if he had not been born. I find some people saved, and some people lost; some going into the city, and some without, sorcerers, whoremongers, murderers, idolators, and whatsoever loveth and maketh a lie. Also I find in Rev. xxii: 11, where he that is unjust is to be unjust still.

I turn to the results of such teaching as the brother advocates: I find that it lessens the dignity of human life, and debases the idea of moral responsibility. It makes sin triumphant over God's purposes. It makes God cruel in permitting methods of unfairness. It consigns to oblivion the great majority of our race.

Now I want to say that I have set before you the plain truths of God's fearful judgments. He is the judge; we are the criminals. We have no right to pronounce judgment on Deity. He has set before us life and death, and he calls on us to repent. Choose life and repentance: call on His Name and you shall be saved. *Time called.*