

www.forgottenbooks.com

Copyright © 2016 FB &c Ltd.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

A BRIEF DEBATE

ON

Universal Salvation AND Endless Punishment

BETWEEN

JOHN WESLEY HANSON, D. D.,

OF CHICAGO, ILL.,

AND

REV. JOHN HOGARTH LOZIER,

OF SIOUX CITY, IA.,

HELD IN THE M. E. CHURCH IN WEST SIDE, IA., ON THE EVENINGS OF TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY, AND FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 19, 20, AND 21, 1879.

REPORTED BY MISS I. A. CUSHING.

Report Revised by Disputants.

CHICAGO:
THE NEW COVENANT OFFICE.
1879.

PREFACE.

The brief discussion reported in these pages was arnged by Rev. Mr. Brown, pastor of the West Side M. E. hurch, and Wm. N. Becker, of West Side, the former uggesting Mr. Lozier, and the latter naming myself, as the isputants. It is too brief to do full justice to the important uestions treated, but Mr. Becker and myself sought in vain o persuade the parties of the contrary part to extend it. t has, however, the peculiarity of being presented as delivered—most reported discussions are written out as the isputants would have them read, and are not published as elivered. This was caught from the lips of the speakers y Miss I. A. Cushing, of Aurora, and is printed from her otes with very slight verbal changes, made by the disputnts themselves. Mr. Lozier's words are almost exactly eproduced, except where the contrary is designated, but my wn, in consequence of the greater rapidity of my speech, re less fully reported, and for the same reason, they occupy ather more space than do Mr. Lozier's.

It is but just to both parties to say that the entire expense f reporting and publishing has been borne by myself, as Mr. Lozier declined to participate in the project of giving

his words a wider consideration than they had in t audience to which they were uttered.

The book is sent forth in the hope that it may contribu to the growth of truth, and help on the good time comi when all Christians shall accept the testimony of the apost that "God is the Saviour of all men, especially of them tl believe."

J. W. HANSON.

Chicago, June, 1879.

RULES GOVERNING THE DEBATE.

The following rules were agreed upon and signed by the disputants on the evening before the discussion began :

The Rev. J. W. Hanson and the Rev. J. H. Lozier hereby agree upon the following rules and regulations, by which they are to be governed in the discussion of the theological questions hereinafter stated:

1. **The discussion shall be under the direction of three moderators; one to be chosen by each party, and the third by the two so selected.**
2. **The discussion shall be held in the First Methodist Episcopal Church, of West Side, Iowa, commencing on the evening of the 18th of March, 1879, at 7:30 P. M., to continue four evenings, closing on the 21st of March.**
3. **The questions for discussion shall be:—*First*—Do the Scriptures and Reason teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind? Mr. Hanson affirms. *Second*—Do the Scriptures and Reason teach the doctrine of the endless punishment of any part of the human family? Mr. Lozier affirms.**
4. **The discussion shall continue two evenings upon each proposition, and the disputants shall speak alternately, occupying thirty minutes each; and each making two speeches every evening, and in closing the discussion on each question the affirmative shall be entitled to an additional speech of fifteen minutes, in which no new matter shall be introduced in the way of argument.**
5. **The books introduced into the debate by either disputant, shall be free for the use and inspection of the other.**
6. **Neither disputant shall interrupt the other while speaking.**
7. **No vote will be taken upon the merits of the discussion.**
8. **The debate shall be opened every evening with the Lord's Prayer, and be closed with the Benediction of the New Testament, by persons selected by the moderators.**
9. **The disputants earnestly request the audience to refrain from any manifestation of approval or dissent.**
10. **The moderators shall enforce the foregoing rules and regulations.**
11. **Should the debate be published in book form by either disputant, it shall not be done until the other has had an opportunity to revise and correct his part; and should any part thereof be published in any form by either party, and should the opposing party feel aggrieved, by the nature or substance of said publication, the party so publishing shall use his best endeavors to secure to said aggrieved party opportunity to set himself right through said medium of publication.**

Signed by

J. W. HANSON,
JOHN HOGARTH LOZIER.

THE DISCUSSION.

TUESDAY EVENING, MARCH 18, 1879.

Question—Do the Scriptures and Reason teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind? Mr. Hanson affirms.

MR. HANSON'S FIRST SPEECH.

Brother Moderators and Christian Friends—I think you will all agree with me, that we are assembled this evening to discuss the most important question that ever was or ever can be addressed to the mind of man. The question that is to be discussed by us, is, What is the final destiny of mankind? My opponent will argue that, while a portion of the human family will achieve a happy immortality, countless millions will writhe and wail in the most excruciating torments to all eternity, and address their Almighty tormentor in the words of the poet, Young:—

"Father of Mercies! why from silent earth
Didst thou awake and curse me into birth;
Tear me from quiet, ravish me from night,
And make a thankless present of thy light;
Push into being a reverse of thee,
And animate a clod with misery?"

It will be my delightful task to argue that death is but a step in man's progressive life. That the grave is only the low portico to a world where God's love continues just the same as here; where he will, as here, discipline his children, until he shall have eradicated sin and sorrow, and have caused holiness and happiness to prevail, finally and universally.

My friend and brother will stand and advocate a baffled Savior, a defeated God, a triumphant devil and a victorious hell. I shall stand here to advocate a triumphant Savior, a victorious God, and the triumph of good everywhere in the universe.

Now, I am conscious of laboring under one great disadvan-

tage in standing here. I suppose almost all of you have been reared, as I was, under or familiar with what I call false doctrines, that for fifteen hundred years have prevailed and poisoned the Christian mind. Certain ideas have been so long prevalent, that my opponent has only to utter certain words and passages containing these words, when a host of false associations and erroneous ideas will start up in your minds. And before I can hope to cause truth, as I understand it, to prevail, before I can sow the good seed of the kingdom, these ideas must be uprooted; just as before you scatter good seed in the soil you must first prostrate the forest and plow under the weeds.

But I have one great advantage which, to my mind, far more than compensates for the disadvantage and difficulty under which I labor. I have the wishes, I have the sympathies, I have the prayers, of every genuine Christian heart. Every genuine human heart hopes that I may be right. All who hear me hope that my opponent is mistaken.

He, himself, will advocate sentiments which his own heart is protesting against and wishes were otherwise. Not one of you desires him to be right, and all of you desire me to be, and the better you are, the purer your hearts, the more virtuous and kind, the more you hope my doctrine may be true. Now, without further preliminary, I proceed to present before you what I call my first argument in favor of the salvation of the human family, and that is

THE NATURE, THE CHARACTER OF CHRISTIAN PRAYER.

Every human being is under perpetual obligation to pray to God as the Father of all souls, to bring in his kingdom, fulfill his will and deliver from evil, and save from sin the whole human family; and that we are commanded to pray for this,—universal salvation—is evident from the language of the Apostle Paul in I Timothy ii:1-4:

"I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings and all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty; for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior; who will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth."

Thus God desires all men to be saved, and you and I and all

men are commanded therefore, to pray that all men may be saved. God does this. This prayer proceeds from the divine heart all the time. "Prayer is the soul's sincere desire uttered or unexpressed." All men must, when they follow the instincts of their nature, pray for the salvation of all men. I suppose my opponent in all private and public places prays that all men may be saved.

But the second feature in prayer is, that men, whatsoever they ask for of God, shall pray in faith, nothing doubting.

I Timothy ii: 8:—"I will therefore that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting."

It is wicked to pray for anything to God, unless we pray in faith, unless in our heart of hearts we believe our hopes will be answered. A faithless prayer is an abomination in the sight of God; hence the apostle says in Romans xiv: 23:—"Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

Now, then, a Christian must pray for universal salvation; if he does not, he does not offer Christian prayer; and if a man thus prays, but believes that his prayer will not be answered, then he cannot offer Christian prayer. Genuine Christian prayer comprehends the final salvation of all men, and as it is necessary to give it in full faith, nothing doubting, it demonstrates the final salvation of all, for certainly God would not command his children to pray for a thing and pray without doubting, unless in the divine plan that were to be the result. Hence Paul appeals to this ground of faith in I Timothy ii: 5–6:

"For there is one God and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time."

This is the reason why you are encourged to pray in faith, because God, having determined this, has sent his beloved son, our blessed Savior, a sufficient means to the result. Now, because God desires and because Christ has died for universal salvation, we are to pray for it in faith, nothing doubting; so we pray in faith, and in due time the result will prove that our faith was well founded.

I will conclude this point by saying, that the fact that we must pray in faith for universal salvation is a demonstration of the

truth of the doctrine. You all ardently desire, fervently pray for the salvation of all. If you pray in faith, nothing doubting, you must believe the prayer will be answered.

I pass on to the second point:

THE NATURE AND CHARACTER OF THE RESURRECTION,

as explained and revealed in the New Testament, demonstrates the fact of the final salvation of all men.

As the resurrection is revealed and explained in the New Testament, there is no sin, no sorrow beyond, whenever the final resurrection occurs. Whenever it is spoken of in the New Testament it always describes all men as participating in the resurrection being in holiness and happiness. You will find, if you read anywhere in the Bible where the resurrection is spoken of and there is any sin or suffering beyond, if you will scrutinize the language, that it is a national, a local resurrection. For instance, Ezekiel xxxvii: 8-12, in the case of the valley of dry bones:

"And when I beheld, lo! the sinews and the flesh came upon them, and the skin covered them above; but there was no breath in them. Then said he unto me, prophesy unto the wind, prophesy, son of man, and say to the wind, thus saith the Lord God, come from the four winds oh breath, and breathe upon these slain that they may live. So I prophesied as he commanded me, and the breath came into them and they lived and stood upon their feet, an exceeding great army. Then he said unto me, son of man, *these bones are the whole house of Israel*; behold, they say our bones are dried and our hope is lost, we are cut off from our parts. Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, O my people, I will open your graves and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel."

The prophet here perceives the valley of dry bones, and in this vivid description you can see the dead men's bones. He prophesied, and "they stood upon their feet in exceeding great army. Then he said unto me, Son of man, *these bones are the whole house of Israel.*" If you did not read this last verse, you might perhaps suppose this was an account of the final resurrection, but it was merely a national, local resurrection—in fact referring to the ascent and deliverance of the house of Israel from the Babylonian captivity.

The resurrection is very often treated as a figure, as you will

see, by carefully inspecting the language. But when you find the final resurrection described, it will embrace the whole human family, and you will observe that holiness and happiness are made the inseparable concomitants. In Mathew xxii: 30, in the Savior's conversation with the Sadducees, he says:—"They are as the angels of God in heaven." In Mark xii, we find similar language, and in Luke xx: 35-38 is a parallel description of the same conversation.

"But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him."

Now in this description given by the blessed Savior, two points are established. First; all men will be raised, and second, all who rise will be in equality with the angels, which certainly demonstrates their holiness and happiness.

And this is the only resurrection that any good man would hope for as Paul did in Acts xxiv: 14-15.

"But this I confess unto thee that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets, and have *hope towards God* which they themselves also allow, that *there shall be a resurrection of the dead*, both of the just and the unjust."

Now I submit a good man might hope for a resurrection of the just, but if he believed they were coming forth to unspeakable torments, to fry in liquid fire, who could say, Almighty God and Father, I hope for the resurrection of the unjust. He might say I believe it, I fear it, but when he says I hope for that, he means he desires and expects it, for hope signifies desire and expectation both.

With his great benevolent heart beating in his breast, Paul hopes that there shall be a resurrection of the just, but with the dreary thought before his mind of endless torment, how could he utter hope for the resurrection of the unjust? His ceaseless prayer would be, let the mantle of oblivion wrap them in its eternal folds. Let them never come forth with such a fate before them.

The apostle confirms in his language and demonstrates what your own hearts tell you. Could I say I hope for the resurrection of the unjust, if I believed as I did once, and as many of you do now? If your prayers could be heard to night, would you not ask that the unjust shall never come forth; but only the just may be raised from the dead?

Here is the resurrection Paul hoped for descibed in his first epistle to the Corinthians, xv: 22.

"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

Observe, all men are not to be made alive by Christ, but in Christ. All men have died in Adam, the same all shall be alive in Christ. All men shall be lifted into the altitude of Angels, into oneness with Christ, living again as divine angels. This is the character of those who shall come forth in the resurrection. "But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming."

I want to call your attention to one incorrect point in the 26th verse: if you will read it at your leisure notice the two words in italics. The italics signify that these words *that* and *is* formed no part of the original writing, and as Paul wrote it would be,—"*The last enemy shall be destroyed*, death," implying that there were no more enemies after this, death having been destroyed by the resurrection, which of course includes sin and sorrow, and "all the ills that human flesh is heir to," and the apostle continues,—"For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifested that he is excepted, which did put all things under him." "And when all things shall be subdued unto him,—that is, Christ,—then shall the son also be subject to him, that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

"So also is the resurrection of the dead, it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body."

Observe the description,—corruptible shall be incorruptible; dishonor shall be glory.

"There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living soul, and the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Behold I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep; but we shall all be changed. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written,—death is swallowed up in victory."

Observe the following points that are now clearly established:

1. All are raised, *the dead are raised.*
2. All the dead are *immortal*, neither can they die any more.
3. They are *angels.*
4. They are *like God* in character.
5. All must be holy and happy forever, as all are *immortal, godlike, angels.*

I call your attention to the fact, that when it was first promulgated by Christ the Savior, this doctrine astonished the people who heard it. Matthew xxii: 33:—"And when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine."

What was there in this statement of the resurrection that astonished the multitude? Let me tell you. His hearers who were astonished were of two classes:—first the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection; of course they were astonished to hear this doctrine set forth. Second, the rest of the people who made up the multitude were the Pharisees and Pagans, who, at that time, believed in the doctrine of endless punishment beyond the resurrection. So both classes were astonished at this statement of the resurrection from Jesus. You will easily perceive why the Sadducees were astonished, but tell me why Pharisees and Pagans were astonished, if it was only a partial salvation that he taught, for that was precisely what they all had believed always.

So the fact that this doctrine astonished all demonstrates that it was a different doctrine from that to which they had so long listened. There are but three possible opinions that could have been entertained by the auditors of the Savior.

The doctrine of no resurrection would not have astonished

the Sadducees; that of endless torment would not have astonished the Pharisees among the Jews, and the Pagans. The only supposable doctrine besides, is the one which I have endeavored to prove. Our Savior taught that the resurrection when it shall be finally accomplished, comprehends a life incorruptible in holiness and happiness. In the language of the Savior it will be "to an equality with the angels, and men will be made children of God, by being children of the resurrection."

You remember that our Savior denounced the doctrine of the Pharisees, Matthew xvi; 6-12:

"Then Jesus said unto them, take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees."

Now, if Paul taught the resurrection to a partial salvation, why was he so opposed by those who taught that very same doctrine? Acts xvii:32:

"And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter."

Thousands then believed in the views of my opponent. But the apostle taught the doctrine not only of the resurrection to *life*, but also of the ascent of all souls to a higher and holier state of being, the *anastasis*, immortal life not only, but also holy and happy as well. In brief terms and in Scripture language, Luke xx:35–36:

"They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage? Neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

And in the language of Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians xv:53-54:

"For this corruptible must put on incorruption and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."

Now, it is impossible for me, or any other uninspired person, to couch in more accurate and expressive and comprehensive language the grand truth which I advocate here this evening, of the

final deliverance of all souls from sorrow and suffering, the final salvation of all men into holiness and happiness, than is done in this language of the blessed Savior, and of the apostle Paul.

MR. LOZIER'S S FIRST REPLY.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—It has already been said, by my distinguished opponent, with great truth and force, that the question which we are here to consider is the most important question that could command our attention. And I need not say to you to-night that I, with him, desire most earnestly that the truth may be known and may be felt in the hearts of all who are to hear us, touching this momentous issue.

You are aware that there is a disadvantage under which the respondent, who advocates the doctrine which I advocate, is placed. I come before the people for the purpose of discussing this question with one who has made it the "business" of his life to discuss this issue alone. It is my business, and has been my business during all the years of my ministry, to preach the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ in its *entirety;* to stand before the people and present, not only the truths that are unwholesome to the tastes of men who are in their sins, but truths that are wholesome to the tastes of men who have given up their sins and are hoping for salvation, which I am here to-night to speak to you about. It is one thing to say that a doctrine is distasteful, and, therefore, a minister who would preach it must of necessity have something wrong in his heart. It is another thing to be as Paul told Timothy:—To go and preach the Gospel to people who would "not bear *sound* doctrine," who were ready to heap to themselves teachers who would yield to their own passions, to their own evil practices.

Now, my opponent has come to you to-night, my friends, and brings before you, as you discover, the results of his careful preparation in the form of a book, which you observe that he is reading, and whoever attempts to answer one who comes thus, must of necessity be embarrassed in his efforts to always and immediately

note every passage of Scripture which he may refer to. I will accord to him, when it comes his turn to follow me in the discussion, the same privilege which I take, namely: that of tracing the *connections* of Scriptures quoted, setting aside such as are manifestly foreign to the issue, and confining himself to an exegesis of those leading passages of Scripture which may be presented, and which may bear upon the points at issue. I understand this to be merely the course usually recognized as proper to be pursued.

If, upon this proposition, which he *affirms*, it *is* true that the Bible teaches that at last all men are to be holy and happy, all there is for him to do is to tell us, first of all, *where* the Bible teaches this doctrine, giving us *unequivocal texts* thereupon, and to tell us *how* the Bible teaches this doctrine. For I say to you to-night that if it be true, as he has affirmed, that "for fifteen hundred years the body of Christian believers have been in darkness and in error" touching this great issue; if this be true, then, indeed, the "clear" teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ, which he claims to have presented to you to-night, have been wasted upon the world! And we have come to the time at last when there has arisen one, who has come to teach us that the doctrine that is cherished in our hearts is necessarily erroneous. He would have us to understand that it is *not right* to cherish the doctrine that some creatures of God will be finally lost, but comes to teach you, dear friends, that this is a great mistake that we have fallen into, touching the matter of our future and eternal destiny, and to teach you that you can go on, if you choose, in your course of sin, which Christ warned the people against,—which the apostles warned the world against; go on in the course of sin until you die, and there will be *some* process, which he has not informed you of, and which I apprehend he *will not* inform you of, by which Christ will bring to pass, after all, your "final holiness and happiness" in this "resurrection" of which he has spoken to you. By this doctrine the sins of the soul against infinite justice are dissolved into trifling foibles, and every sinner, however vile and base he may be in this life, can enter heaven with the best of earth's saints, just as truly and certainly as if his course had been one of uprightness and purity, such as the Scriptures enjoin.

The first argument that my opponent has presented, as you

observe, was based upon the Doctrine of Prayer. It was with great propriety that we commenced these services with the Lord's Prayer. It is true that prayer is enjoined upon all men, as the apostle has stated in the language quoted, and also as enjoined by Christ himself. But it is a significant fact that when some people say the prayer, which Christ commanded us to say, when it comes to the point, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors," the matter of *forgiveness of sin* is utterly overlooked and omitted,* and men seem to presume that they will enter into heaven *unforgiving*, as safely as if they were washed in the blood of the Lamb.

In the Scriptures, I Timothy ii: 1-5, it is affirmed by my opponent that Paul declares that "God will have all men to be saved," and because of the use of the words—"will have all men to be saved"—we are to infer that all men of necessity *shall* be saved. Now, I think my opponent would not stand before you and affirm that the expression—"will have all men to be saved"—is intended to convey the idea that is the purpose of God, but it is the *wish* of God that all men shall "be saved;" just as it is your wish and mine, as he affirmed at the beginning of this discussion. We all believe that God does desire that "all men shall be saved"; that God has used every appliance consistent with man's moral freedom to the end that men *shall* be saved. We recognize and preach it. Orthodox believers admit that idea and act upon it. Nevertheless, why do you believe that it is God's will that man shall be saved? Christ came to teach men that they may be saved through his merit and atonement. Nevertheless, we believe that Jesus when he said to one and all, "Come unto me that ye may have life," when he said that he meant to say that God's whole act in the one direction, that sought to lead man to avail himself of the means it provided for salvation in this atonement.

What if he *will not* come to him—"to me," as Christ terms it,—"that he might have life"? Here is the whole point at issue. I shall maintain the doctrine throughout that the Lord Jesus Christ came into this world to be a sacrifice for the sins of mankind, and

---

*A young man, a Universalist, who had been invited to repeat the Lord's Prayer, in his embarassment omitted the clause referred to. This explains Mr. Lozier's allusion. J. W. H.

that he preached the Gospel that whosoever would come to him might "be saved." He was to be crucified and "lifted up," upon the cross, in order that man might be saved through his death and through his atonement. Nevertheless, Jesus Christ having thus suffered and died, *will not* save men who will not come to him *by their own volition* and accept of his atonement, seek his pardoning love, be washed in his blood, and be cleansed and purified by the grace which he imparts.

And, now, upon this point of the Resurrection:—I want to say to you that Dr. Hanson comes to you to-night with a doctrine of resurrection that is certainly novel to me; I don't know how it may strike my hearers. It is certainly *new* to us in these ends of the earth—a resurrection after which, as he terms it, "all shall be holiness and all shall be happiness."

Christ, God's eternal son, taught the world, after he had ascended to heaven,—Revelations xx: 6:--"Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the *first* resurrection. On such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." And in the 14 and 15 verses:—"And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Now, here is a "second death" that is spoken of in this text; and this second death comes *after* "the first resurrection." Now, the question that arises in my mind,—and the Doctor will be kind enough to give us an answer,—is:—Does he intend to teach us that there is to be a "resurrection" for those who are "cast into the lake of fire?" who are "not found written in the book of life," as revealed to us in this chapter? Again in Dan. xii: 2: is the declaration:—"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Now this resurrection, as you will all certainly perceive at once, differs from that resurrection; some shall come forth to shame and everlasting contempt. And yet, says the Doctor, in *his* "resurrection" there is to be everlasting holiness,—everlasting happiness! How is it, if there is to be a resurrection of all mankind unto everlasting holiness, that there is an "everlasting shame and contempt," which is to remain, concurrent with that "everlasting holiness and happiness?" Evidently, this holiness

and happiness is *not* to be enjoyed by "some" who are sleeping "in that dust of the earth," and are to "come forth" to that resurrection.

Now the proposition which my opponent is affirming is, that all persons are to be finally holy and happy; *all* persons; all human beings.

Holiness! The very idea of holiness implies moral freedom; freedom to act at will touching the great moral principles which are involved in holiness. If the Lord Jesus Christ purposes, after man shall have gone on through this life rebelling against him, and shall have died in his sins,—if the Lord Jesus Christ purposes in some future world, to so act upon that man's mind, and so surround him with environments, as to *compel* him to at last come to heaven as a pure and holy being, one of two things must be:—It *must* be based on *free will*, or else it will be impossible for him to be characterized by "holiness," even if he *is* brought to heaven. It is inconsistent with the *idea* of holiness to be brought to heaven *against* his will.

Now, the question arises, *where* does the Universalist go for this idea; this teaching that there is *another* "school of reform" beyond the present life? If God purposes to bring you and I into such a position and condition beyond this life, where is that teaching? If we will there become reformed, *if we go from life in our sins*, where do they find it? If God intends the great mass of sinners to be "reformed" in another world, *where* does he teach it? This is where he ought to give satisfaction *to you* in this matter. Where is the *Scripture teaching* touching this matter?

I tell you there is no evidence of any better principle than ours on the part of Universalists who stand before the people and hold up before them the delusive idea that they can go on through this life,—go to their graves,—go to the judgment, without making preparation such as we are taught to make, and as Scripture enjoins. It is no better evidence of "goodness of heart" than it is to stand before you and tell you plainly, that "*now* is the accepted time,—*now* is the day of salvation." In the word of God there is shown no *intimation* that beyond this *present* time is to be "the accepted time," the "day of salvation" for anyone who permits *this* golden opportunity to pass! If he can bring here and show to you, that there is evidence within the *Scriptures*,

such as we may safely risk our immortal being upon, that there *is* such an "accepted time," we shall all be glad to see that evidence. *We must see it!* We cannot take this, that our friend has given here to-night. His evidence in this case is no refutation of the *silence* of the Bible on the one hand, and as you perceive, the declarations of the Bible on the other hand.

He alludes next to I. Corinthians, xxv: 22, and to the passage in that chapter,—that familiar chapter,—"As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." Dr. Hanson did not tell you,—or if he did, I did not catch the point,—in what *sense* Adam "died." The *first* thing to be determined, it seems to me, in reference to this matter, is in what sense Adam *did* die in the event referred to; and, having determined this, we may then determine in what sense "all" will "be made alive."

The Doctor says:—"To life immortal." Very good, but how is he to spend that "life?" It is, then, only Paul's argument, or assertion, of the immortality of *all* souls, as opposed to the "soul sleeping" theory, as it is familiarly known. Now, couple this terrible fact with the resurrection, "to shame and *everlasting* contempt," spoken of in the prophecy of Daniel, and tell me where, when and how are they to be "as the angels which are in heaven," in the sense indicated by the Doctor.

You must reflect, that when Christ said that these people were to be as the angels in heaven, it was as touching the conjugal relations of that future state; not the question of the vital issue before us to-night. It was a question of "marrying and giving in marriage,"—nothing more.

We *are* to be as angels in the future world in just the sense indicated in the conversation had. There was brought before him the case of the person who had died, and another of the family had married the widow, and so forth; and the question was, whose wife was this to be in the future world? The answer had reference to that point, and our Savior only intended to teach that these relations were not known, as existing between husband and wife *there*. No principle of rational interpretation will warrant the Doctor's extraordinary exegesis. [Time.]

MR. HANSON'S SECOND SPEECH.

My friend and opponent informs you at the beginning of his remarks, that while I have no other business than discussing Universalism, he is a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ and preaches his Gospel in its *entirety*. Now, it so happens that this is only the third discussion I have ever held in my life, and I know that this is his second at the very least. I am sure he has had two, for I have here (holding up a book) a volume purporting to be a discussion between Rev. B. F. Foster and Rev. John Hogarth Lozier, and for aught I know, he may have had several besides. And then I demur, when he says he preaches the Gospel in its entirety, for that includes the whole Gospel, and it is a great ways out of the way for an advocate of a partial God, a partial Savior, and a partial heaven, to reproach a Universalist minister with not preaching the Gospel in its entirety.

I can truly say that of all the arguments I have ever heard advanced, this one with which my brother closes his speech is the most lame and impotent. That immortal fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians, which describes the position of man in the immortal world, parallel with that Gospel of the Lord Jesus in which men are "equal to the angels," and "children of God by being children of the resurrection," we are told by him simply teaches whether men are to be married hereafter! Can it be possible that the Savior is thus accused of spending his breath and employing those sublime terms to describe, not the universal resurrection—its nature and character—"equal to the angels and children of God, being the children of the resurrection," but only to show that men will not find their wives and women will not find their husbands hereafter! I think, on reflection, my brother will never again venture on that exposition.

My friend wants me to be very particular to explain what became of those persons in Revelations, a passage of which he quoted, of whom it is said that they passed the first resurrection, and his query was:—"Is there holiness and happiness there?" Now, I am not talking of the first or the second resurrection; I am talking of the final resurrection.

He quoted from the book of Daniel (xii: 2) as being parallel

in description with the language in Revelations, and asks me to explain, if the final resurrection be one of holiness and happiness to all mankind, how "some are to come forth unto shame and everlasting contempt." It will appear further on in the course of the discussion, that these terms everlasting, forever, are equivocal, and are applied to all degrees of duration, from three days to longer periods. The prophet Jonah says:—"The earth with her bars was about me FOREVER," when he had been in the fish but three days. I'll not dwell longer on this, now. only to say that it does not signify endless duration.

My opponent asks when this resurrection found in Daniel twelfth took place, or when it will take place. I will tell him, in the language of the Savior himself. Describing this very occurrence, he says:—"When ye see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet.—Verily, I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away until all this be fulfilled."—Matthew xxiv: 15, 34. The resurrection unto "shame and contempt" spoken of in Daniel, took place before the generation in which Jesus lived passed away, namely: at that dreadful time when the people of Jerusalem were overwhelmed. This, certainly, was not the final resurrection—*that* I described in the beginning,—but a local or figurative resurrection.

The language of the book of Revelations is obscure, full of enigmas and puzzles, and, in the passages pointed out, it seems to be a spiritual, figurative use of the term, nothing whatever to do with the final resurrection. It includes only a part, but the final resurrection includes all mankind.

I am accused of making careful preparation for this discussion. I admit to you that I have taken a great deal of pains in preparing my arguments. My opponent does not like this little book, from which I quote my Scriptural citations. About all there is in it is a few Bible references which for convenience sake I have prepared, that they might be applied without loss of time. I think if my brother here were more familiar with the Bible than he seems to be, he would be better able to treat the subject. My little volume is like the book spoken of in Revelations (x: 10)—though bitter in one place, it was found to be very sweet in another. I plead guilty to having prepared for this occasion, for I confess to you I would not come unprepared before an intelligent audience, such

as I always find in Iowa,—speaking off-hand, leaving one question, going to another, dodging back and forth, and hitting everything but the point. I did not come here for that purpose. I submit to you, it is not a proper way to treat the Scriptures, to fly from one end of the Bible to the other without system or plan.

And here I must complain that he has put a construction on my quotations concerning the nature of prayer, that I have not placed on them. I did not say because it is the will of God that all men shall be saved, therefore they will be saved. I did not say a man was to be saved if he did not pray in faith, nothing doubting. What I said was, in few words, If one offers true Christian prayer—for all men and in faith,—he is a Universalist; if he does not pray for universal salvation, in faith, he does not offer Christian prayer.

Again, as to the resurrection:—I am willing to rest the whole question upon that. The Bible does not demonstrate that all mankind, in *any* resurrection described, whenever and wherever it is found, will be holy and happy. I have conceded that point. But it does teach that at the *final* resurrection all will be. My brother wants me show when, and how, and where, the final resurrection will occur. I am not curious to know. It is enough to know the supreme fact, that in due time it will come.

Freewill does not have anything to do with our discussion, whether I do or do not believe it, though I will say, that true to the name I bear of John Wesley, I do believe in the freedom of the human will. No soul will be saved, except of its own free-will and accord. Mr. Lozier is a Methodist now. He believes in the freedom of the human soul in this world, but when he comes to die he will be a Calvinist, and compel men to go to hell, whether they will or not! I am a Methodist now and for all time so far as that feature goes. The same freedom as now will always, exist. The same God, unchangeable, will always exist. It is for him to show that the gate shuts down at death, and deprives man of his freedom. Yes, I am a believer in freewill, now and forever. No Calvinism for me, here or hereafter.

I believe I have noticed all his questions, and will pass on to my *third* point.

GOD'S WILL, PLEASURE, PROMISE, PURPOSE AND OATH,

as revealed in the Bible, demonstrate the final salvation of all

mankind. Of course, a being like God must have a will concerning the welfare of mankind. He could not have created a race in his own image, without having invested in that race a will of desire. Accordingly we read the Scriptures on this point, and find this idea expressed:

It is the will of God that all men shall be saved. I Timothy ii: 1-4.—"I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty; for this is go od and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, *who will have all men to be saved* and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." John vi: 37-40:—"All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out; for I came down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father's will, which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

But you say if men are arbitrarily raised it will not make them holy. Of course, holiness is not an arbitrary, mechanical process. No one can be holy without becoming so voluntarily. I believe in universal holiness only because I believe God can find out means to melt the most obstinate heart and bring it into voluntary acquiescence with himself.

But his will is not one of mere desire; it is a *will of purpose.* My friend doubtless knows the meaning of the Greek word *thelo,* which is translated *will* in I Timothy ii: 4. Let me give you two or three illustrations of its use:

John v: 1:—"For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom *he will.*"

He quickened whom he wished and whom he desired to. It was a will of purpose.

Matthew viii: 3:—"And Jesus put forth his hand and touched him, saying, *I will,* be thou clean, and immediately his leprosy was cleansed."

My friend cannot say that it was only a mere desire, that the leper should be cured, for immediately the leprosy was cleansed. It is the will of God that all men shall be saved. *Thelo* is the word the Savior used while curing the leper,—"*I will* be thou clean."

In addition to the point that it is the *will* of God, let me show that the *will of God is finally to be accomplished.* I agree with my friend and opponent, that man is a free agent. He does resist the divine will to a certain limit, but it is revealed that ultimately the will of God is to be accomplished. The weaker, finite will must yield to the supreme, infinite will. Thus:

Job xxiii: 13:—"But he is in one mind, and who can turn him? and *what his soul desireth, even that he doeth.* Proverbs xix: 21:—"There are many devices in a man's heart; nevertheless, the *counsel of the Lord that shall stand.*" Daniel iv:35:—"*He doeth according to his will* in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay his hand or say unto him, What doest thou?"

Of course, we must harmonize these passages, and not set them to contradicting each other. We claim that God's will *must* be accomplished, and that our wills must harmonize, sooner or later, with the divine will, which will shall prevail.

Psalms cx: 3:—"Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power."

Matthew vi: 10:—"*Thy will be done.*"

The time is coming when all human wills and the divine will shall harmonize. It is not the attitude of a Christian to stand contemplating some act of man in defiance of the will of God, and say if God's will is not accomplished now, it never will be. God does give us power for a while to traverse his purpose, yet sooner or later he will melt the obdurate will—convert the stubborn heart.

It is God's pleasure that all shall be redeemed. I have shown you that it is the *will* of God that all shall be saved. I now say it is God's *pleasure*:

Revelations iv: 11:—"For thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." Ezekiel xviii:—"As I live saith the Lord God, * * * I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." Ephesians i: 9–10:—"Having made known unto us the mystery of his will according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together *in one* all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth; even in him."

This pleasure of God shall be accomplished.

Isaiah lv: 11:—"So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my

mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but *it shall accomplish that which I please*, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." Isaiah liii: 10:—*The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his (Christ's) hands.*

It is the pleasure of the Lord that all shall be saved, and the Lord's pleasure shall be accomplished. Thus my proposition is twice proved under this head.

It is the purpose of God to save all men, and I will read to you on this head:

Ephesians i: 9–14:—"Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which *he hath purposed in himself*, that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one, *all things* IN CHRIST, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him, in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will; that we should be to the praise of his glory who first trusted in Christ, in whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation; in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy spirit of *promise* which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession unto the praise of his glory."

Prof. Stuart, a noted "orthodox" commentator, says that the phrase *all things*, here used, denotes *the universe*, and Archbishop Newcome says it means "all intelligent beings." The apostle, therefore, says, that God *purposes to unite all intelligent beings* in Christ, and this *great purpose will be executed.*

Isaiah xiv: 24, 27:—"The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying, surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass, and as *I have purposed so shall it stand*, for the Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it; and his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?" Isaiah xlvi: 11:—"I have spoken it, I will also bring it to pass; *I have purposed it, I will also do it.*" II Timothy i: 9:—"Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began."

My friend says that sometimes this will and purpose can be resisted, and gives in support of his proposition Matthew xxiii: 37–38:

"O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have

gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your house is left unto you desolate."

But when my friend reads such a passage as that, why don't he read the next verse?

"For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say *blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.*"

This language shows that there are limits placed on the ability of man. "Thus far and no farther," God has written upon every human being's course. Hence God's will, and purpose, and pleasure shall be accomplished.

We have no escape, it seems to me, from this conclusion, that somehow, sometime, somewhere, all men will be brought to the sublime fate for which I plead. It shall sometime be accomplished; God has pledged his word. And here I'll take a moment to answer his question—"How did Adam die, and how do men die in Adam?" The Lord told the first-born:—"*In the day* thou sinnest thou shalt surely die." Adam did not die bodily or eternally, but he died in trespasses and sin in that day. All men die in Adam because all men sin as Adam sinned, and all men are made alive in Christ because they are to partake of the nature of his life. They are to die after the similitude of Adam's death in trespasses and sins, and they are to live after the similitude of Christ's life of purity and holiness.

And, now, about the *promise* given to Adam. From the very dawn of creation, God the Father has promised in the Bible, all the way down, his purpose to effect this grand result—the destruction of sin. "And I will put enmity between thee (the serpent) and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." What is the serpent here meant? We have it described in James i: 13–15:

"Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God, for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man. But every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death."

Now, the serpent here, which led away Adam, is the lusts of man—his sinful passions, and when we read here that the serpent shall be wounded in the head, while man shall be only bruised in

the heel, as the head of the serpent is its vital part, *we should understand that the serpent is to be destroyed* by the seed of the woman, which is Christ. The serpent would succeed in wounding man, not vitally and finally,—only a wound from which he would recover,--while the seed of the woman shall destroy the serpent by bruising its head. This sublime promise is repeated over and over again:

Genesis xxii: 18:—"And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my voice."

And so on, repeated over and over in similar language, down to the apostle, who says:

Acts iii: 25:—"Ye are the children of the prophets and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed."

Referring to the wicked Jews, the apostle adds:

Galatians iii: 8:—"And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, *preached* before the *Gospel unto Abraham saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed.*" Galatians iii: 16:—"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not and to seeds as of many, but as of one and to thy seed, which is Christ."

Thus all nations, families and kindreds of the earth, *all* mankind are represented as being turned away from iniquity.

Will these *promises* be *fulfilled?* I will read Numbers xxiii:19:

"God is not a man that he should lie, neither the son of man that he should repent. Hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken and shall he not make it good?" Romans iii: 3, 4:—"For what if some did not believe, shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid. Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar."

II Corinthians i: 20:—"For all the promises of God in him are, yea, and in him amen."

Now, this promise has been confirmed by an oath.

It is a universal promise, consisting in Christian salvation and a Gospel blessing, and Jesus is the appointed means of its fulfillment.

John iv: 34:—"My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work."

My time is at end, so I'll, therefore, sum up this branch—"God wills universal salvation;" the *will* of God *shall be done.* His *purpose* is to *save* all men; his purpose shall be fulfilled. He

promises to *save* all men; he will *fulfill* his promise. He makes an *oath* that he will save *all* men. "I have sworn by myself; the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear, surely shall say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength."—Isaiah xlv: 23–24. [Time.]

MR. LOZIER'S SECOND REPLY.

MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—The Doctor bases his first proposition in this branch of the discussion upon God's *will;* returning to the proposition made in his former discussion, and cites John vi: 39, that all which he hath given me, I should raise up again at the last day.

As we understand this utterance of the Savior, the point of controversy is upon this question, Whom has the Father given Christ, and what is meant by the expression, "given," in the citation? Did Christ mean that all mankind were "given" to him? that they were to be raised up and *glorified* in the last day? This is the issue upon this text. If such is its meaning, a text of Scripture which is parallel in much that is uttered by the Savior in reference to his disciples, must be sadly at fault. See John xvii: 12. The twelve apostles were among his chosen ones. The twelve were his, certainly, in a very conspicuous sense at the time he chose them as apostles, or after that time. Otherwise Christ is convicted of the folly of selecting a person for a disciple,—of taking him into his school of apostleship,—one whom God had not given in *any* sense, and whom God knew, and he knew, was to be *lost*,—if there is any meaning in his expression, concerning Judas, that he was "a devil" and that he was "the son of perdition."

Upon the proposition that my friend makes, Judas, of whom Jesus said, "Woe unto that man, by whom the Son of Man is betrayed, it had been good for him that he had never been born."

Judas, a character of this sort, is saved!—saved upon the proposition that the Doctor has presented before you. He who betrayed our Savior for thirty pieces of silver is exalted to stand abreast with all these apostles who devoted their lives to martyrdom, and died as witnesses to the faith that Jesus had sent them to declare!

I hold, then, touching this quotation, that the persons "given" here are persons who are Christ's in the sense in which you, who are Christians, are classed as Christ's to-night.

And under the proposition with reference to the *purpose* of God, "I will, be thou clean," is quoted as an indication of the kind of will that God has touching this matter. "It is not mere *desire*, but it is *purpose*," says the Doctor.

Now, if this kind of will is the *controlling purpose* of the Almighty, touching the matter of human salvation, then the argument upon the "will" must be substantially admitted. That will, sovereign, absolute in its character, will *compel* man to salvation, whether *he* "wills" to come to heaven or no. This is the proposition as I understand it.

Now, I affirm,—and it cannot be denied,—that "holiness and happiness" in heaven are *impossible* to a person who is brought to heaven, or may be brought to heaven, contrary to his will. It is impossible for man to be holy in heaven who has been brought there without the leading principles of fealty to the government of heaven, and has been brought there against his will.

The next passage alluded to in reference to the people in God's kingdom is Psalm cx: 3. There is nothing in this when you come to observe the persons who are indicated. "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." Who calls this in question? But are *all* people "thy people" in this saving sense, where this language is used? This is the point at issue. It does not say that *all people* "shall be willing in the day of thy power"; there are limitations implied; there are those who are *not* God's people; there are those who are "aliens from God,"—who have sustained in a sense a relationship that was once nearer to God than it is now, but they are "aliens," "without God and without hope in the world." They are of the devil. Is it true, do the Scriptures teach you that those who are "of the devil," and who

are *enemies* of the Lord Jesus Christ, and who will utter derision and hurl defiance in the face of Almighty God, are "his people" in this sense and are to be saved and made finally holy and happy by the *will* of the Almighty?

If so, we have all failed to understand the meaning of the word of God. The distinction between "thy people,"—God's people,—and the people of satan must not be lost in this discussion.

Now, Christ is to do the "pleasure" of God in this matter, we are told by the Doctor, and it is the "pleasure of God" to save *all* mankind, if *they* will to be saved. There is no question about this. But who *is* it, when he comes to the "pleasure of God," *who* is it that is to be saved according to the quotation? Does the Bible declare the seed of the devil and the seed of Christ to be identical? We do not so understand it.

This is all there is of the argument in reference to this matter—those who *first trusted in Christ* shall be saved, to "final holiness and happiness," as the Doctor has termed it. But what of those who do *not* trust in Christ, first or last, as many men do not? Of those who reject Christ and declare him to be an impostor; who cover his name with vile, disgusting epithets; who declare that they see nothing in Christ to trust in? What of those who are traveling over the earth, as Robert Ingersoll does, saying that they "have no respect for any one who will accept the superstitions of the Christian religion"? What of those enemies that are "*anti*-Christ" in every possible sense of the word, are these among the number who are to be saved under the clause that he has quoted?

In reference to the weeping over Jerusalem by the Savior, the passage in which was uttered that touching lamentation, which the Doctor quoted, said truly:—"Ye shall not see me henceforth until ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Does that imply that men are to be equally and eternally saved, and to be holy and happy in heaven? Because Jerusalem shall say thus, is no argument that all mankind are to be happy eternally in heaven. On the contrary, Jesus himself, in the very familiar parable to you, in which he speaks of some who shall call upon him, saying:—"Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast out devils, and in thy name done

many wondrous works?" he goes on to say that these shall go into everlasting punishment, or words to that effect.

Does this indicate, I ask you, that all that have done this "in the name of Christ," that have said "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord," shall enjoy final holiness and happiness?

Surely, it is not much that we have to do, to become holy and happy, if all the men who spurned Christ and clamored for his blood can be at last brought to holiness and happiness by simply uttering that exclamation. Then, indeed, we who have had nothing to do with those transactions at the betrayal and crucifixion, we can very easily slip into heaven, if *that* is all there is in the matter of salvation.

Returning, now, to the proposition in reference to Adam dying: The Doctor tells us, "That they die in sin." He tells us the apostle affirms this. So in Christ shall all be made alive. What is the signification of the expression? Man died in same sense in Adam, in which he should be "made *alive*" in Christ. It does not say, however, that he shall be made finally *holy* and happy in heaven, though it may be said that he is made alive. It is true that in Adam a sort of spiritual paralysis came upon the race. Without Christ there is no evidencc that Adam's race could have lived and could have enjoyed even the *probation* that we enjoy.

All orthodox believe that Christ gave himself for the redemption of the *world*, and extended the benefits of his atonement to the world. He spread the wing of atonement over that infant, that you left at home to-night, and if that child dies before it commits any overt act of sin, it is saved eternally in heaven, by virtue of Christ's death. So we all believe.

But after we have passed beyond that period of moral irresponsibility, without our full, unrestrained obedience to the Lord Jesus Christ, can we hope for the blessing of his salvation? The Bible does not so teach, and the passage cited does not teach that *all* shall be made eternally holy and happy.

Returning to the proposition in reference to the transaction in the garden of Eden, the Doctor tells us, that the serpent in the garden of Eden was man's lust, or, using his own words, "the lusts

of man." I wonder if that *is* the kind of devil, after all, that we are contending against, and that is contending against us!

Let us paraphrase the language of the account given in the garden of Eden; let us use the words, "lusts of man," instead of serpent. How would it read? Run through it in your mind:—"'The lusts of man' was more subtle than any of the beasts of the field, and 'the lusts of man' said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of the fruits of the garden. And the woman said to 'the lusts of man' (man was not *there*, you know!), Of the fruits of the garden we may freely eat, but of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And 'the lusts of man' said, Ye shall not surely die," etc.

Now, take that history and trace it on through, and see if you can *rationally* conclude what the Doctor's "lusts of man" was.

Again. In Job, on a certain occasion, the sons of God came together and "the lusts of man" came also. We are not informed how, by the Doctor, but his "lusts" managed to be there somehow or other, and figured in various and conspicuous afflictions upon Job. They sent forth the Sabeans to destroy his oxen, the Chaldeans to kill his servants and to take his camels, and the winds to strike the four corners of his house and cause it fall upon his sons. "Lusts of man" covered Job with boils. "Lusts of man" told God that Job was a hypocrite. "You cannot find out his true character, because he is so pampered and so peculiarly favored of thee." Thus the "lusts" argued with God.

Then when Jesus went into the wilderness. He was out there, according to the Doctor, "led by the spirit into the wilderness, tempted by 'the lusts of man!'" Whose lusts? Had the holy Jesus these lusts? The Doctor will not tell you that Jesus was pursued by the "lusts of man," as the term is used here. Nothing of that sort!

Yet, under the Doctor's exegesis, these "lusts" led Jesus about. "The lusts of man" said, "All these things will I give you, if you will fall down and worship me!" The argument is absurd in the judgment of some of us at least, who think we understand something of the Scriptures.

Now, returning to the matter at issue. One of the funda-

mental propositions of the Doctor is this:—God, because of his purpose to have all things harmonize with his own character, will bring about this final and eternal salvation of mankind. This is his "purpose," hence the Doctor's argument that he will do it.

Now, the question that we first make upon this proposition, is this:—If the love of God would lead him to will the holiness and happiness of mankind *without reference to man's moral agency* in the world *to come*, why could not the love of God lead him to will and bring about the same in the *world that is?*

Why, it is useless to say that the "love" of God will not let man suffer in the world to come, while yet the "love" of God lets men suffer in the world that is! If his absolute will can save us there, and he does not respect man's moral agency, why doesn't he save us *here?* If the love of God is acting on this plan, unless he has colder heart than yours and mine, he would not permit any of us to suffer here. Would we let the little one die, as the little one has died in your arms? Yet God has greater love for that offspring than we have.

If you were going to argue on simple, abstract "love," and if God loves as man loves, that love ought to have arrested the sufferings of this life, checked the tide of evil sweeping over mankind, and not have permitted it to go on into another state.

Now, upon this point, concerning which the Bible seems to be so silent:—Why did not God so declare, if it is purpose to give man another probation? I ask the Doctor to tell us, and I hope he will tell us where the Bible teaches the doctrine of another "reformatory school" beyond the reformations which we may have in this life. Let him point us to the chapter and text in the Scriptures which teaches a "purgatory" beyond this life, in which men are to be made holy and happy, and prepared for heaven. *Why* is the Bible so silent, if it is a fact, that it is the purpose of God? This is the question which you would like to have answered.

The Doctor would say to you or might say to you:—If it had been revealed in the Bible it might interfere with the plan of redemption now going on in this life. It might interfere with getting people to reform here, if they were to know positively by the Bible, that they were to have a reformatory hell beyond this

life. If that is the policy of God, and that is the reason why God has been so silent upon this subject in the Bible, we are in a very queer kind of a dilemma. The Bible was kept silent upon the subject of man's future reformation, because it might interfere with plans of the Gospel as they are now being wrought out in the world, and God did not *intend* the world to find it out, but God has made a slip somehow and it *has* leaked out, and Doctor Hanson has got this secret and he has published it in his paper!

I do think though, that if God had purposed anything of this sort, he would not have permitted even Dr. Hanson, with all his research and his exhaustive labor, to have discovered the fact. He would not have let Dr. Hanson know it, because Dr. Hahson lives in Chicago, and if he tells it in Chicago, with the evils that are abroad there now, where three thousand saloons are doing their deadening and damning work, that every one of these saloon keepers is bound for salvation somehow or other in the time to come, as we may suppose, and those communists of Chicago go into that future state without any reformation,—we all *must* believe that the regions of hell will be so terribly polluted that it will be impossible for any power less than omnipotence to affect those who are sought to be reformed in that "sulphurous reform school." The Doctor would have us believe in such a divine plan and purpose, however. If God purposed a reformation for man in the world to come, and purposed that man should have this salvation,—that "sure probation,"—spoken about to-night, could he have entertained such a purpose as that, and kept it silent from the world? Would he have left us without a passage of Scripture indicating it? If he could have done so, and purposed so to do, then the next question is, is not the purpose being violated and traversed by the Doctor while he stands here and preaches to you to-night?

Had he not better wait for a thousand years or so, until God's present purpose shall have been executed through the Gospel as it is now to be preached to the world? Would he not better teach men to live according to its teachings, until the time when this new policy of God shall be revealed, namely, in eternity? [Time.]

MR. HANSON'S THIRD SPEECH.

MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I feel like congratulating you all, at the very pleasant character of the interview between Mr. Lozier and myself, thus far, and I take this early opportunity to wish that the same fraternal spirit may characterize the continuance of the discussion.

I ought to say, however, in the beginning, my friends, that I have two or three things to complain of. Let me define my position.' My opponent does not seem to understand it in one respect, and I will take the trouble, once more, to explain what he misapprehends. Of course he has done so unintentionally. I have, as you will bear me witness, given Scripture to demonstrate that the will of the Almighty God is omnipotent, and will be finally triumphant in every human soul. But I took very great pains to add, that it would be in harmony with the entire freedom of the human will; that no soul can ever be forced into obedience. Certainly a soul forced into heaven would be a contradiction of terms. But my friend's statement, if true, that I forced them into heaven, does not come with a very good grace from a professed advocate of the freedom of the human will who yet would have countless millions forced into hell! If I should advocate such forcing, a Methodist ought not to blame me. A Methodist pot ought not to call the Universalist kettle black. But I am more of a Methodist in that respect than he, inasmuch as I teach the freedom of man on earth, and in heaven, and in hell, now and forever. Is not that enough to explain my position and preclude any further charges from him that I deny human freedom?

An argument was adduced by him to show that the will of man can contravene, and prevent the will of God, in the language of our Savior, where he says, "O Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered you together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wing, but *ye would not*," and I reminded my friend, that the very next verse says, "Ye shall not see me *until ye shall say, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.*" This was but

a temporary adjournment, but by no means a defeat of the infinite will of God. My friend misapprehends me in thinking I said universal salvation was true because of this verse. I argued nothing of the kind. I only replied to his proposition, and showed that there could be no permanent obstacle and final defeat of the will of God.

And now in reference to a point which he raised and discussed at considerable length last evening, I desire to make one or two remarks. You know I said the original promise given to Adam was that the seed of the woman, Christ, should bruise the serpent's head. That signifies the destruction of death and evil. I stated it on the authority of Saint James:—"*Every man* is drawn away of his own lusts and enticed," and every man includes Adam. Adam was drawn away and enticed, and the serpent in the garden of Eden stands for the lusts of the flesh. He at once begins to deal with the idea humorously, but he does not realize that he is dealing with Saint James, and not with me. Doesn't he realize that this is the language of James? How ridiculous, he says, that the lusts of the flesh tempted Job. He prefers a joke where the only thing required is an argument. Wherever it occurs, and whatever it stands for, the serpent is always spoken of as to be destroyed. To treat this Biblical fact jocosely, will not do. A joke is in excellent taste sometimes, but where it is substituted for an argument it is always of questionable taste. Instead of meeting Scripture by Scripture, to go off on a laugh is not a legitimate mode of treating such a subject.

He instances the case of Judas. Now having proved the final salvation of all to holiness and happiness, by irrefutable argument, my friend, instead of meeting and replying, comes in here with an argument that belongs to his affirmative, and says that I cannot be correct, because Judas is going to be damned. I shall not pay any attention to that now only to say, though, that as my opponent expressly admits, that true repentance saves any sinner, however gross and great. If a sinner repents, he, as a Methodist, is bound to believe in his salvation. It is fully recorded in the history of Judas he "repented." It was his duty to bring this in his affirmative argument, and if he does

that, I will give it all the attention it deserves, at the proper time.

But the most serious complaint I have to make is relative to the very humorous effort he made in saying that I had come all the way from Chicago with the great secret of Universal salvation. It is just as much a secret to those who are willfully or ignorantly blind as is light to the seared eye-balls of the blind, or music to the ears of the deaf. But this is no secret to the careful reader of the Bible. We are informed by the apostle in Acts iii: 21:—"Whom the heaven must receive until the times of *restitution of all things* which *God hath spoken by the mouth* of *all his holy prophets since the world began.*" And if it be a secret to any, it is only because they have shut their eyes and closed their ears against it. He begs me not to tell the three thousand saloon keepers of Chicago, this *secret.* Do you see what a fearful blow he has given his own cause? He acknowledges that they do not know this secret. In other words, they are believers of his own doctrine. It is true. From those well-dressed men who in saloons, frescoed and gilded, deal out liquid damnation from crystal and cut glass, down to the wretch who stands in some low flue-hole of Tophet, and pours out rot-gut and red-eye from a junk bottle corked with a corn-cob, into a tin dipper,—these men are without exception unbelievers and disbelievers in the doctrine I am advocating, and most of them believers in his. He don't want me to proclaim my *secret* to these men. Would God I could, for with that truth, complementary and supplementary to it, is the doctrine of the sure and certain punishment that must follow every act of wrong doing. My opponent argues that the saloon keeper, or any sinner, if he repents a moment before death, is saved, but the sequel will show to everyone that there is a God who here or hereafter judges men, and who will not permit a single act to go unpunished. I would to God my secret were known to those men, to convert them from their vile business.

Having touched on such points as were made the other evening, I will now proceed to frame an argument on the main question, and I call your attention in the first place to the fact, amply proved in the Scriptures, that

CHRIST'S REIGN AND GOVERNMENT OVER THE HEARTS AND IN THE SOULS OF MEN IS ULTIMATELY TO BE UNIVERSAL.

First, *Christ died for all mankind.* Under this proposition consider the language recorded in the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel of Luke, tenth verse:

"For the son of man is come to seek and to save *that which was lost.*" John iv: 34:—"Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the *will of him that sent me,* and to finish his work." Hebrews ii: 9:—"*He tasted death for every man.*"

Secondly, under this proposition, *Jesus Christ was endowed and possessed power to do everything that he undertook to do*:

John xvii: 2:—"As thou hast given him *power over all flesh,* that he should give *eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.*" Matthew xxviii: 18:—"And Jesus came and spake unto them saying, *All power is given unto me* in heaven and in earth."

Thus, he came to *save all,* has sufficient *power* to save all, and, thirdly, *he will succeed in saving all,* which I demonstrate from Isaiah liii: 10–11:

"*The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.* He shall see of the travail of his soul, and be SATISFIED."

Now, the reason of every man before me here, will tell him that, inasmuch as Jesus came to accomplish the salvation of the entire human family, he never would be satisfied if he were defeated. If any of you undertake an enterprise, and get beaten, you never can say you are satisfied. Our Lord is to "see of the travail of his soul, and be *satisfied.*" Inasmuch as he came for the purpose of accomplishing universal redemption, it is demonstrated that he will succeed, because he will ultimately be satisfied.

The apostle John says:—"The Father loveth the son, and hath given all things into his hand." In John iv: 42:—"This is, indeed, the Christ, the Savior of the world."

Now, if much of the theology of the world be correct, this is the being who only made it *possible* for the world to be saved, if the world will only accept of his offers of salvation. But the declaration is that he is actually and absolutely THE SAVIOR OF THE WORLD. Jesus himself said, contemplating the result of his great work:—"It is finished."—John xix: 30. You see by this language

that failure is impossible, unless you disbelieve the plainest, clearest declarations of Holy Writ.

Language more universal and positive it is impossibe for human speech to frame, and it is our duty, when we find passages of Scripture, even if apparently contradictory, to bring the minor proposition into harmony with the universal fact, which is not to be rejected because of some imaginary case that would seem to contradict it. Instead of adducing passages of Scripture to contradict what has been said, my opponent should show that my quotations do not meet the issue; otherwise he will give currency to the idea that the Bible is full of contradictions, and the skeptics will go away, and say:—"One man came out and proved his proposition, and the other came out and proved his. I guess it is about six in one and half a dozen in the other." It is our solemn duty to show the harmony of the Bible, by showing that the promises and the threatenings harmonize.

I will continue to quote, John xii:32:—"And I, if I be lifted up from the earth will draw all men unto me." This was a conditional promise, the condition of which was fulfilled in his resurrection. Now, if the Savior died to save all men, all must be saved, because nothing is clearer than the declarations of the Bible to the effect that what Jesus undertook, he will accomplish.

Thus David says:—"Ask of me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."

And this is my answer to the question asked by my friend last night. "What is meant by Christ having all things?" "*The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands.*" The idea is perhaps, more fully expressed in John and in Hebrews i: 1-2, by the apostle Paul. "Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his son, whom *he has appointed heir of all things*, by whom also he made the worlds."

Now after these declarations, is it Christian, does it show Christian faith to stand here and say that God, by his illimitable power, hath appointed his Son to be the heir of all things, and yet that the puny hand of man has cheated him out of his inheritance? It is rather the duty of the Christian to accept God's

promise as Abraham did, and have it accounted to him for righteousness.

I call your attention to another passage from the same apostle. Phil. ii: 9-11:—"Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at *the name of Jesus, every knee should bow*, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that *every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord* to THE GLORY OF GOD THE FATHER." The expression "things in earth and under the earth," says the German commentator, Bretschneider, denotes "things infernal" and is equivalent to all mankind. The gospel shall reach at last the unrepentant sinners and bring them into obedience to Christ. A willing confession that is to be to the glory of God, the Father. This obedience is to be voluntary, not forcibly extorted. It is to be to the glory of God; and no man can glorify God without worshiping. He cannot glorify him by his rebellion and sinfulness; he cannot glorify the Father unless the confession is a voluntary confession of the converted soul.

I will further call your attention to Hebrews ii: 8-9:—"*Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet.* For in that he put all in subjection under him; he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor that he by the grace of God should *taste death for every man.*" What is the import of this language? Because we now see men in rebellion, is no reason that they should remain so. Here we have the language, "We *see not yet* all things put under him, *but*" we see the means established by the infinitely wise and powerful, who has endowed Christ with the spirit without measure, at work in the great task, and we see him crowned with glory, the glory, that is of success, for there is no glory in defeat. I ask the special attention of my friend to this language in I Corinthians xv: 27-28:—"And when *all things shall be subdued unto him* then shall the Son also himself be *subject* unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." The Greek word *hupotagee* occurs three times in different forms in these verses,—"Subdued," "subject" "put under"—the same word in all cases; that is to say, the

Son himself is to be subject to God as the sinner is to be subject to Christ. *The sinner's subjection to Christ is the same as Christ's subjection to God*; that is, it is a willing, loving service; it is a voluntary, moral subjugation and does not consist in Christ standing with his feet on the neck of prostrate sinners, like some ancient gladiator, nor denote that God will forcibly confine millions in an eternal prison house, with his foot forever on the lid of torment. The subjection under which the sinner is to Christ, is just the same subjection as that under which Christ is to God, the Greek word occurring in these verses meaning subjection, is the same in all cases, and the only kind of subjection of Christ to God is a willing and loving acquiescence,—which demonstrates that the subjection of all things to Christ is a spiritual one; and so the apostle continues:

Romans xi: 25–26:—"For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits that *blindness in part* is happened to Israel *until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in*, and so all Israel shall be saved."

Therefore, I repeat, that all these verses demonstrate the proposition under which I have made these last remarks, namely:—That all things are to be subject to Christ, all men are to be subject to the dominion of Christ; his reign is to be universal, demonstrating his moral reign and government, a spiritual government and control, the same control he exercises now over those who acknowledge allegiance to him, which is ultimately to reach all. Christ's reign is proved in the New Testament, when it shall be complete, to be a universal one.

I will try, in the few moments remaining, to present another point under this head:

THE ENTIRE MORAL UNIVERSE IS TO BE DELIVERED FROM SIN, AND MADE HOLY AND HAPPY.

The propositions I name are somewhat akin to each other, and the Scriptures quoted under the different topics present phases of the same subject.

Romans viii: 21:—"*The creature* itself, also, *shall be delivered* from the bondage of corruption *into the glorious liberty of the children of God.*"

Dr. Macknight, who is a very learned Scotch Presbyterian

commentator, says that the Greek word here,—"*ktisis*,"—creature, signifies every human creature, and Prof. Stuart gives its meaning the same as in Mark xvi: 15, and Col. i: 23:—"Mankind in general"—so we have the accumulated testimony of orthodox commentators that EVERY HUMAN CREATURE IS

1. SUBJECT TO EVIL.
2. HAS HOPE OF DELIVERANCE.

Hope never having died out of the human heart. God never having left man without hope.

3. SHALL BE DELIVERED.
4. THE DELIVERANCE CONSISTS IN THE LIBERTY OF GOD'S ANGELS, GOD'S CHILDREN.

Though not yet accomplished, we see this grand result in part accomplished, and I contend that is the province of Christian faith, when this glorious declaration is given to us, to enjoy the blessedness of faith, and thus by faith be able to eat celestial fruit on earthly ground. [Time.]

MR. LOZIER'S THIRD REPLY.

MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—My friend, Dr. Hanson, has been kind enough, in the beginning of his remarks to-night, to direct my attention to some "mistakes" which he alleges were made by me last night; and I shall be under the necessity of returning the compliment to him, and calling his attention, and yours, to some mistakes that the Doctor made last night in his readings.

You will remember that he made what seemed to be a very telling point in reference to the requirements laid upon all Christian people to pray for the universal salvation of the people, and to pray in faith for this; and made the statement that every person who prayed according to all the requirements of God, was a Universalist if he prayed sincerely. And in support of this proposition he quoted First Timothy, second chapter, and two or three of the first verses:

"I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving of thanks be made for all men."

He stopped there as if there was a period. I will complete the sentence:—"For kings and for all that are in authority that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty."

That is a very good thing to pray for. I think we all do that, and can most sincerely do so. I don't think that necessarily involves the matter of ultimate universal salvation; though I do not deny that Christians do pray for the salvation of the world, in accordance with the plan of salvation. He proceeded to say, then, upon the subject of the *will* of God:—"For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth."

Now, the Doctor told us that the Greek "*Thelo*," (as I understood him, he will correct me at the proper time if I am mistaken), meant a *will* involving *purpose*. Now, I wish to ask the Doctor if he affirms that the verb "*thelo*" involves the Greek word for purpose in all its various forms? Involves, of necessity, the idea of purpose wherever it is expressed in the Bible? And I affirm, here, that "*thelo*" does not, of necessity, imply unchangeable purpose.

Before I pass from this proposition, I wish to ask another question in reference to this matter of *will*. The Doctor has told us to-night in his argument that man was to be "finally and eternally saved," in accordance with the divine will and purpose, but not at variance with his own will, nor in violation of his own freedom. I wish to ask the Doctor this question, and I hope he will make a note of it:—Does the *law* of God express his will? His "*will*," as the term is used in the passage quoted, and his idea as indicating "the will of God that all men shall be saved." Does the law of God express his "will?"

Now, in reference to this matter of prayer and the assertion that all persons who pray for the salvation of the world are Universalists, and all who don't pray for the salvation of the whole world cannot be Universalists, but are "partialists," I want to say that he places the orthodox churches of the land in very good company, to say the least of it,—if he means to say that all prayer necessarily involves this, and that it is not possible to make

prayer in reference to the world, without involving the idea of the eternal salvation of all. I'll quote John xvii: 9, in particular. Jesus says:

"I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine."

That is what I think we may take for a very good model for *our* prayers. If we fail with this model before our eyes, I don't think Christ will hold us to a very strict account for the failure. Christ says in John xvii: 12-14:

"While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name; those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the Scripture might be fulfilled. I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world."

So that Christ *could not* have been a Universalist, judging by this prayer, and it is the last prayer that is on record, before he closed up his ministry!

Then I must correct a mistake in reference to that matter of "marriage," because it involves a little criticism that was somewhat personal,—as it will be remembered. See Matt. xxii: 30-33. I remarked last night, in reference to the question by the Sadducees, touching the character of the relationships to come, that Christ's answer here referred to the matter of marriage, and the conjugal relations in the world to come, when he said:

"They neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven." That was his answer to that question about whose wife the woman should be. I read right on:—"But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. And when the multitude heard *this*, they were astonished at his doctrine."

What doctrine were they "astonished at? He told you last night they were astonished that *everybody* was to be "as the angels in heaven." I tell you the "doctrine" they were astonished at was, that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were *not dead*,—not sleeping the "soul-sleeper's" sleep in the grave, but are still alive some place now, and were waiting for the day of his coming. That is what "astonished" the Sadducees.

Now, see Luke xx: 34–36. The Doctor told you it was similar—when he explained this passage of Scripture,—in reference to the angels in that connection:

"And Jesus answering said unto them, The children of this world marry and are given in marriage. But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage. Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

Who are the people who are to be "equal unto the angels" that are here spoken of as being children of the resurrection"? "They that shall be accounted *worthy*." Are the whole multitude of people to be scooped up from this world by some sweep of the divine power, without reference to their worthiness or unworthiness, upon the authority of this Scripture? I simply call attention to these points because of the mistakes the Doctor was kind enough to point out to me, and to show that we are all liable to a "mistake," now and then.

Again, in I Corinthians xv. This "resurrection" the Doctor talks about is the resurrection of the *just*. The very first sentence in this chapter indicates this:—"Moreover, brethren, [Who were the "brethren"? Why, the Christians!] I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received and wherein ye stand; by which ye are also saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain." There is a chance for them not to have part in this resurrection even yet, but if they "keep" these things "in memory" they are to be "saved." These are the persons who are saved in this resurrection, upon which the Doctor waxed so eloquent last night.

Then the declaration, "By man came the resurrection of the dead," and in the twenty-second verse:—"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." We do not deny that. Everybody believes that "as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." We all believe that. But, mark you, "Every man in his own order." There seems to be an "order" about this thing that has been overlooked by the Doctor. "Christ, the first fruits, afterward they that are in Christ at his coming." This is the resurrection of the just.

As I am open to the chapter alluded to in the Doctor's quota-

tion, I find another point in Scriptures, which I may refer to again hereafter, in reference to Christ. He quotes:—"For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." The Doctor has cited this verse, and would have you believe that because, in a succeeding verse it is affirmed that Christ is to be subject to the Father, that it implies the same *kind* of subjection upon the part of Christ, who has always been in every essential sense a part of the Godhead, as all orthodox Christians believe; the same kind of subjection that is meant by "putting all *enemies* under his feet." Even death itself is to be "destroyed"! Who is to be destroyed? I do not believe we people are ready to accept propositions of that kind. It does not look like giving them "final holiness and happiness" when Christ's *enemies* are put "*under his feet.*"

Now, let us see in reference to Revelation xx: 6, to which allusion was made last night:—"Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." "But," says the sentence just before this, "the rest of the dead lived not until after the thousand years were finished," and in the twelfth verse of the same chapter appears that thrilling view of the last judgment. It says:—"And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, and the books were opened, and another book was opened which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books according to their works."

Now, mark you, it is the *last* resurrection that is meant here. The last resurrection that has in it the least shadow of anything like happiness. The "blessed and holy" are raised in the resurrection that is spoken of here. The "second death" *follows* this, is *beyond* this, is the *concluding* scene in "the lake of fire." Then comes the description of the "new heaven and the new earth," and *outside* of that new heaven are "the fearful and the unbelieving," so firmly sealed in their final doom by the declaration,—"He that is filthy, let him be filthy still." This is a *fixed* condition after the resurrection indicated in this chapter.

We hasten, now, to the arguments that have been presented by the Doctor to-night. Before I proceed to this, just a moment

in reference to the allusion that was made by the Doctor to the "Chicago case," that I referred to in my little pleasantry last evening. He tells you that the men who are doing the wrong and harm in Chicago, to whom I alluded, are the men who believe in my doctrine, and who hold to the tenets that are entertained by the orthodox people of the land. Now, I think the Doctor must know that that is not the fact. The people who are doing this terrible work—making drunkards and desolating the homes of the people throughout the land—are not the people who listen to the Gospel as it is preached in the orthodox churches; are not the people who read the Bible, who study the great question of man's accountability to God.

Now, medicine is a very good thing for disease, *providing you take it*, but people in that kind of practice do not like to take orthodox medicine. They would not take it. "The entrance of thy words giveth light." They would not have the word enter,—do not want the word to enter. They are consoling thousands all the time with the thought, that "sometime or other I will escape the final penalty of these doings; I will go on and make money, and have a good time; I will make my escape *some* way." And so they go on making drunkards, and cursing hearts, and destroying homes; and I will venture to say they sell their whisky to the tune of the Doctor's theory. No matter what they are doing, they can sell their whisky, and do their gambling, and find consolation and hope in that paper that the Doctor publishes. With THE NEW COVENANT before them, they can feel comfortable while they do their work of damnation! They take his doctrines with their whisky, when they take it "straight" even, or any other way, and are consoled with the thought that they shall be saved *somehow!*

Who comes before you to teach that they can repent and be saved at the last moment? Who teaches it? I do not believe that kind of theory, where the *purpose* is to go on deliberately defying God, and then at the last of life to have salvation by a "death-bed repentance"! I do not preach it; I do not believe that is the meaning of the word repentance; therefore, I deny the Doctor's remark touching this matter and that Judas "repented," and according to my theory is to be saved.

What kind of repenting did Judas do? What was his repent-

ance? That is the question. Was it repentance in the sense that repentance is required of a person in order that sins may be forgiven, or was it remorse after he had discovered that thirty pieces of silver was the price of blood, and that he had brought calamity upon himself? And if he even *did* repent, in the Gospel sense of the word, he went out and committed *suicide* afterward, and that landed him in hell, where he belonged.

Now, the proposition of Christ's universal reign. "Christ shall be satisfied," says the Doctor. "He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied," and that Christ cannot be satisfied unless he *sees* universal salvation,—witnesses the salvation of the world. The quotation is from Isaiah liii: 11:—"He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied, by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities." Now, what is the *satisfaction* that he is to have? "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin he shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied." Just the doctrine that we preach; just the doctrine that Christ taught—"Whosoever believeth in him," that portion shall "have everlasting life." We preach that if you believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and confess your sins and repent heartily of them, and give your life to Christ by an act of consecration with a purpose to do his will in the future, that with *such* repentance God shall be "satisfied." These quotations cannot be tortured into any other meaning than that. He will be satisfied when those sinners are saved who "make his soul an offering for sin." [Time.]

MR. HANSON S FOURTH SPEECH.

MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:--The New Testament doctrine of prayer, Christian prayer, as I have proved very clearly by the Scriptures is, that "all men may be saved and come unto a knowledge of the truth," and the prayer must be made in faith in order to be genuine Christian prayer. My opponent, with his usual tactics, undertakes to show that Christ did not mean to command prayer for all men, though he confesses that he does pray, himself, for all men! He finds *one* prayer of the Savior where he does not pray for all men, and inasmuch as the Savior prayed especially for his own flock then, therefore, he says, it is not proper to pray for all men, previously having said, though, that he himself, as a Methodist, does pray for all men! Of course, the Savior did not always pray for all mankind. We pray for our children, and, in trouble, we pray for ourselves; the Savior for his church, and so on. But there is another prayer of the Savior, including all mankind. In his petition, John x: 16, he says:

"And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them, also, must I bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be *one fold and one shepherd.*"

This declaration of the Savior shows that he included all mankind, although on the special occasion referred to by my opponent, he did not pray for all men. He only prayed for his church then, but at other times he did pray for all men, and the apostle expressly commands us to pray for all.

But my friend did not quote the verse containing the reason why we should pray thus. *Because it is God's will*, and "good and acceptable" in the sight of God our Savior. It is the divine will to save all men; we cannot escape that as the reason why we should pray for universal salvation, and when men pray thus they must not pray without faith. My opponent prays for all men, he admits, and then comes down here to prove that the doctrine he prays to be true is false, demonstrating that he does not pray in faith, and proving to you, therefore, that he does not offer Christian prayer! Yes, though he does pray for all men, he does not

believe a word of his own prayer. The only true, comprehensive Christian prayer is for all men, and it must be offered in faith.

Now, as to the word *thelo*. I showed you the passages where the Savior cleansed the leper, you recollect,—"I *will* be thou clean,"—and showed by that text how the word is used where it is said, God will have all men to be saved. I have demonstrated that it is a will of purpose. Is it possible to believe that the Almighty, who hung the stars in heaven and guides them in their orbits unerringly, so that not one ever fails to fulfil God's purpose, could create *man* without a will of *purpose?* I have shown by the use of the language that it is a *will of purpose.*

My brother is astonished at the statement of the resurrection which I have given here. He is consistent. He is astonished for precisely the same reason that the Pharisees were astonished when Christ announced the same doctrine. I am trying to preach to him the same doctrine that Christ preached. So he is consistent to be astonished, for he is in the same attitude toward me that the Pharisees were toward Christ. He says what astonished the people who heard Jesus was, that Abraham and Isaac were then living and not dead. He says the multitude were astonished and the Sadducees and the Pharisees because Jesus told them that Abraham and Isaac were alive. But the Pagans believed that all the "dead" were then living. The Sadducees were astonished at Christ's announcement of the resurrection, and the Pharisees and Pagans were astonished because they believed in a partial resurrection. And the only possible doctrine that could have been preached, and astonish all those classes, was that of the final resurrection of all mankind to holiness and happiness. This shows you that the citation in Daniel does not refer to the final resurrection. It was the first resurrection, on which some rose to "shame and everlasting contempt." This is explicitly taught in the words of our Savior, Matt. xxiv: 15-16:

"When ye, therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel, the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth let him understand). Then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains."

Why, this must have been a local, temporary affair. What was the use of running into the mountains if this were the final judg-

ment? Whenever or wherever it occurred, observe that that generation should not pass away until all was fulfilled. It was the first resurrection. If the Savior told the truth it occurred then. I cannot spend my time on expositions that I am not called upon to make. It is enough to show that it was not the final resurrection but the first resurrection, which Daniel describes.

Now, then, we have a most original exposition of the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians,—the only statement of the kind that I have ever heard, and if the world should want to be enlightened it had better resort to Sioux City, for this new exegesis. Paul, in this chapter, we are told, only describes the good. Let us see how it would sound, according to his interpretation. I'll read three or four verses:

"For since by man came death (to the good), by man came, also, the resurrection (of the good), as in Adam all (the good) die even so in Christ shall all (the good) be made alive. (The good) are sown in corruption; they are raised in incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery. (The good) shall not all sleep, but (the good) shall all be changed," etc.

If the good only die in Adam and are raised in Christ, what becomes of the rest of mankind? You will never raise the dead, only believers, if this theory be correct. Why, my opponent is worse than the Pharisees, for they raise *all* men and he only raises the good on this new theory. He must make these random statements without seeing where he is going to land. Nobody but the good will be raised, according to his exposition. I don't believe that the world is ready to think that only the good are coming forth. A resurrection of the good! Where have we any proof that the resurrection is to take place for nobody else? Paul does not say the *good* dead, but *all*, *all* the dead are raised.

Now, in this matter of the saloons, in our little mutual pleasantry, without crimination. My friend did not want me to enlighten the saloon keepers; does not wish me to tell my *secret to them*, thus admitting that they do not agree with me, but do agree with him. I would not have stood up here to charge his doctrine with inspiring the saloon keepers of Chicago, but he said my doctrine was a secret to them. I believe that, for it is a notorious fact that the Roman Catholic believers furnish ninety-nine out of one hundred of the saloons in Chicago. This charge rests upon his

doctrine; these men are mostly believers in the doctrine of endless punishment. I don't know how it is in this town, perhaps you haven't any saloons, [voice in the audience,—"We haven't any Catholic saloon keepers"]. I am glad of it, but almost anywhere else his admission would be true. I leave this subject for the present, and admit with my friend that my doctrine is a secret to most rumsellers.

Now, as to Judas. I do not feel quite so severe toward Judas as my brother does. The famous Dr. Clark says, that the word translated "hang" should be "strangle," and in one account we read that he "fell asunder and his bowels gushed out." I quote Dr. Clark, the Methodist commentator, to the effect that Judas did not commit suicide, but died in horror of mind and grief and distress, and Dr. Clark says that Judas was not damned.

But my friend insists that he is. It is fearfully hard to say that of any particular person. One would hate to think that his child, or his wife, would not be saved. This doctrine of partial salvation is good on general principles, but very difficult to apply to special cases. There is no evidence that Judas committed sui cide. The Greek word may signify "strangled," "choked with anguish."

Before I proceed with my further argument, I wish to say, that in consequence of so brief a time I have been compelled to present you with but five or six arguments out of many I had prepared. I was in hopes the discussion would continue during the evening and afternoon, or that we would prolong the time. I have only given you a meager portion of what I have before me; many things press upon me, but I find it impossible, in the limited time allotted to the discussion, to produce the arguments that I might.

I should be glad to continue the debate in some larger place, where we can have larger audiences; some place that shall suit Mr. Lozier's convenience, where we may have more time, and be able to do better justice to the subject.

Had I more time I should go on to prove—

I. The final salvation of all men from the nature of God's punishments, which all through the Bible are said to be reformatory.

II. The divine justice which is pledged to accomplish universal righteousness.

III. The mercy of God which will accompany the sinner forever, never withheld until it shall accomplish the happiness of its object.

IV. God, as the creator, would not create a child whom he foresaw would be a damned sinner. You would not bring a child into existence, if you knew it would experience eternal torment, if you possessed a spark of feeling, and the mere fact that God has brought into being his family of children shows, certainly, that sometime, somehow, somewhere, he will bring them all into harmony.

V. God's Omniscience. God has wisdom to accomplish his desire.

VI. God's Omnipotence. He is omnipotent, and, therefore, triumphant over all opposition. He *can* do what he will. He *will* do what he can. He desires the salvation of all men, and is all-powerful to accomplish, and he has made Christ the means to success. To say that God can save all men and will not, does not wish to, is to say that he is *bad*. To say that he desires to save all men and cannot, is to say that he is *weak*. To say that he cannot plan what he wishes, is to say he is not *wise*. The Arminian has a weak God, but a good one. The Calvinist a strong God, but a bad one. The Universalist takes the goodness of Arminianism and the strength of Calvinism, and combines them to form one perfect system, the omnipotent, omniscient and loving God, who will do the best possible by all his children. I would demonstrate that God *can* and *will*, *will* and *can* accomplish his purpose with his children. I present these points briefly, that I would be glad to enlarge upon; and, now, in the few minutes that remain to me, will proceed to another point in my affirmative, to the fact revealed in the Scriptures in so many ways. That

ALL THE LOST ARE TO BE SAVED.

We admit, as all Christians admit, that mankind is in a lost condition,—lost is the best word with which to define the sinner's attitude. While there is no such language as "finally lost" and "finally impenitent," and the like, in the Scriptures, the Gospel

everywhere assumes that the sinner is lost. And Jesus was sent for the purpose of seeking and saving those who *are* not only, but shall be, lost. "The son of man is come to save that which *is lost.*" —Luke xix: 10.

It is not a part of mankind, but all the lost that Christ seeks to save, and now the question is, will he succeed? To show that he will ultimately succeed in saving all the lost, I ask you, as a special favor to yourselves, to take some convenient time when you are at your homes, and read the fifteenth chapter according to St. Luke, where the lost sheep, the lost silver and the lost Prodigal are spoken of; where the shepherd lost one from his flock, and the woman lost one piece of silver out of the ten, and where the Prodigal Son wanders away. He is a portrait of a lost soul; but did you ever think of it,—lost after death! Hear the language:—"For this, my son, WAS DEAD and is alive again; he was LOST and is found,—LOST AFTER HE WAS DEAD!

All these terms in the parable are intended to represent the lost soul,—lost here or hereafter, in time or in eternity.

What I call your attention to is this:—If the parable had been written to teach the doctrine of my brother and friend here, it would read something like this:—A man having a hundred sheep, lost ten, and looking a good while found five, and giving up the other five said:—"O, let them go, they are not worth finding." And the story of the woman who lost a piece of silver, would have read, if my brother had written it, A woman having ten pieces of silver lost seven, and finding six, said:—"Well, it is only one piece, anyway, I'll let it go;" and the story of the Prodigal would read:—A man had five or six sons and lost three, and hunted around and at last found two of them, and he thought if the other one wanted to wander off, why, he would let him go. He was incorrigible. The language is the same in all these parables. No matter how many were lost, no matter where they were lost, no matter in what sense they were lost, the Bible shows that all the lost were to be saved, that when the searching was over, there was nothing left to look for.

The Bible is a great book, and as its meanings unfold, the world finds something new in the words of the blessed Redeemer every year. Former ages saw something in them, but they are

richer in meaning now than ever before. They are like some miracle of the brush which the hand of the Master has placed upon the canvas. A child sees something of its beauty. The eye of the connoisseur detects more, and the longer it is possessed the deeper and richer the vistas of beauty that stretch out before the mind. So it is with the words of Christ. As John Robinson, of Leyden, said:—"God has more light yet to break out of his holy word." The Christian world formerly read only as far as the word *lost*, overlooking the word *until*,—the emphatic word in these parables,—and consequently has not until lately reached the great fact of restoration, which is beyond all loss. This word, *until*, in the parables, is the keynote of the Gospel. The idea of restoration to which it points, runs like a thread of gold from Genesis to Revelations. Loss is temporary, and the good shepherd shall continue his search until he shall succeed, and find and restore all.

I charge you, friends, to read prayerfully, on your knees, this fifteenth chapter of Luke; read these parables, divesting your minds of preconceived opinions, and you will find in these stories that beyond all loss is the finding by the blessed Savior, the recovery of the lost treasure and its restoration to the image of its Maker; the recovery of the wandering and the Prodigal child. [Time expired].

MR. LOZIER'S FOURTH REPLY.

MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I desire again to correct my friend, the Doctor, in reference to his mistake in his interpretation of that portion of the prophecy of Daniel which I quoted touching the resurrection. The Doctor has told you that the resurrection spoken of by Daniel is the "first resurrection," to which I have referred as "the resurrection to the holiness and happiness," involved in the question before us. The Doctor tells you that this resurrection alluded to by Daniel, in the words:—"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,

some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt," occurred at the destruction of Jerusalem; and in support of this declaration cites the words of Jesus, in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, in which he says:—"When ye shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by the prophet Daniel," etc. Now, the Doctor ought to know that the paragraph in reference to the resurrection spoken of in my quotation, *ends* with the fourth verse. Let me read on:

"But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words and seal the book, even unto the time of the end. Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased."

That *ends* the prophecy of Daniel in reference to the matter of the resurrection, and not until you have proceeded to the eleventh verse, and are in a new paragraph entirely, do you find Daniel speaking of "the abomination of desolation" standing in the holy place. And the declaration of Christ in Matthew xxiv: 15 had no reference to the resurrection, but only to the matter of which Daniel spoke in the paragraph which *follows* that referring to the resurrection. Furthermore, Christ was asked three questions in Matt. xxiv: 3. Of these questions the first was, When shall these things be? And "those things" which Christ said shall "come to pass before this generation shall pass away," are the destruction of the temple and the destruction of Jerusalem; and not the second coming that he treats upon in other parts of the same discourse.

Another correction in reference to this remarkable fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians,—this "Psalm of the Resurrection," as the Doctor calls it. What I said concerning this fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians was this:—The glory of that "Psalm" consists in the fact that it treats of the resurrection of the *just*. It is true that allusion is made to *all* men being made alive, but this is not the burden of the discourse of the apostle. In the very introduction of the chapter he speaks to his "brethren," as I said to you before. "Behold I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep." He means *we*, the Christians, "*we* shall be changed," he means the same persons; and so on. And you cannot reconcile the closing verse of this great "Psalm" with any other interpretation. It begins with the words "brethren" and concludes thus: "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know

that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." "Therefore." What does "therefore" allude to? I reply, to this glorious resurrection of the *just*. But suppose that they are *not* "steadfast." Suppose they are not "unmovable;" suppose they are not always "abounding in the work of the Lord" but, on the contrary, in the work of the devil? Suppose that they, instead of laboring for the Lord, and laboring to a purpose, are laboring for the devil, and laboring to a purpose,—and that purpose the overthrow of their fellowmen, and the destruction of their rivals? Are we to assume, on the hypothesis of the Doctor, that they are to join in the same glorious resurrection? Are we to believe this, I say? If so, then indeed Paul labored in vain, and so does everyone labor in vain who works for the Lord, because it amounts to nothing. Men are to be saved anyway. It is impossible to perish. Why could Paul bear his "forty stripes, save one," his ship-wreck, imprisonment, and final martyrdom? Why all this, if he believed,—as he must have believed, upon the hypothesis of the Doctor,—that, after all, the whole race of men was to be swept into heaven, and be made finally and eternally holy and happy?

Now, this "secret," upon which the Doctor and I have had this little pleasantry and some sincere talk, withal: I did not say the Doctor had this secret from God, but said, if this secret purpose to give man another probation,—and, by the way, I asked the Doctor in my very first speech, if I remember rightly, *where* is the chapter and the verse, within the lids of the Bible that teaches this doctrine that there shall be another probation beyond this life? I have insisted on this request all the way through. The Doctor has failed to cite it to you, and if he does not before his concluding remarks, you will begin to suspect he can't find it. I said, if there were in the mind of God a purpose to give man another probation beyond this life, he has kept it within his own divine counsel, a profound secret,—as far as his word indicates, and the Doctor comes and speaks to you as one who has discovered this secret! I say I do not believe he *has* discovered it, because the Doctor would be the last one that the Lord would permit to know that secret, if it were a secret.

Then, in the allusion to Chicago, the Doctor says, that the great bulk of these people, who are doing this work of damna-

tion in Chicago, are members of the Roman Catholic church, and are not believers in his doctrines. Why, my brother, what difference is there between the doctrine of the Roman Catholic church upon this subject of "purgatory" and *your* doctrine of purgatory? The great damning doctrine of purgatory comes here in another garb, it is true, upon the lips of our brother from Chicago, in the form of "restoration" out of hell and beyond this life; and I tell you, friends, although the Doctor has clothed it with the beautiful rhetoric and phraseology used in your presence, there is scarcely a boy or girl—not to say elder person—in this audience, who has not seen through this outer covering.

Now, he tells you, upon the authority of Dr. Clark, that Judas "strangled," and the Doctor thinks "he strangled with grief"! Well, Dr. Clark is like all the rest of us, perhaps. He is fallible in his judgment sometimes; but if the Doctor is pleased to accept Dr. Clark as authority, I can give him all the Dr. Clark he can get away with. And Judas was so grieved that he strangled to death in the throes of his agony, and so he was saved! If that was true, what did Jesus mean when he denounced him, and said, it would have been better for him had he never been born? *Would* it have been "better" if he could get into heaven thus easily, and make a smooth sail of it? Strangulation is not such a terribly hard death. People who have almost strangled by drowning, say it is not so *very bad.* If the few moments of his strangulation and agony of mind saved him, he escaped easily, for he went straight up to glory, and beat his Master by about forty days, more or less.

Now, I mention the Doctor's proposition that God would not have *created* man,—that no intelligent creature would have created man, if he had not purposed to bring him to final holiness and happiness. I will only say, that upon this hypothesis, and as a legitimate, inevitable result of that logic, God must save the devil and all his angels at last. He *must* do it. The angels are above man. Man was made "a little lower than the angels"—just a little lower,—and if God loves man well enough to save him, whether he will or will not obey the Gospel and avail himself of the means he has ordained, does not he love those who were *nearer* the throne than man, well enough to do the same thing for

them? The logical deduction is, that the devil, who is a fallen angel, must be saved in heaven, and all his angels with him. All the subordinate fiends of hell must be saved, by the same logic. They can repent and get out of hell, the last devil of them, as soon or sooner than can their victim, man.

The Doctor teaches you that the recognizing of God's power is to be an element in this redemption from hell. Devils *have* "recognized God's power" eighteen hundred years ago. For it is said, that the "devils also believed."—James ii: 19. "Believed" something or other. They belived in God's existence and in his power. They believed that Jesus Christ was divine. Why, more, they believed and "trembled." When a *man* believes and trembles he is pretty near salvation. At least the Philippian jailor was when he came trembling and fell down before Paul. He believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, and was saved before breakfast-time the next morning! If the Doctor is correct, who knows but the devil has been in heaven for the last two thousand years? Logic leads you to that conclusion. Maybe the first person you will meet in heaven will be the one you have the worst grudge against! The Doctor ought not to go there, for the "serpent" will be there—those serpents who are "the lusts of men," and under the curse God pronounced are to go on their bellies all the rest of their days! We shall not pursue this thought further, however, on the present occasion.

The Doctor has said concerning the declaration that Jesus came "to seek and save that which is lost"—referred to in Luke—that it means to seek and save the whole *world*, and, therefore, he will accomplish that purpose. Now, whatever may have been the purpose of Jesus Christ, the teaching of the text the Doctor alludes to does not legitimately prove Universalism, because he alludes to Zaccheus, who had climbed up a sycamore tree to see him as he came by. He was "a son of Abraham," and consequently one of "the lost sheep of Israel," and he preached to him and offered salvation to his people—"the house of Israel"—before anybody else.

In reference to the Prodigal Son. Is it true, as the Doctor affirmed, that the parable of the Prodigal Son has reference to the salvation of all sinners from the condition that awaits them in

the *future* world? Is it truth? Did Christ mean to teach that? It puts things in a very ridiculous light if it does! The Prodigal went into a strange country and began to "feed swine." Well, that is a comforting doctrine to me in one sense, because I confess that I never did like a hog very well, and I know that these swine into whom,—what is it you call it? O, the "lusts of man" went,—when they were driven out of that man in Gadarea, "ran down a steep place" and were drowned, but I did not know they went to hell before! These were probably the ones this Prodigal Son was feeding! And after the Prodigal got tired of feeding the swine, he said:—"I will arise and go to my father." Well, suppose he did say it! Here is this "repentance beyond the grave," the Doctor would have you believe in. He arises and starts, but if Christ understood himself, he does not go far until he comes to that impassable "gulf" which is "fixed" between him and the Father. It is these who are in that region who "cannot pass" over. Or, if they can, Jesus did not understand *how*. When Almighty God has "fixed" or made that "gulf" impassable, and Christ so declares it, who will risk his fate upon the Doctor's argument?

And when this Prodigal gets there, his father runs out and meets him while "yet a great way off,"—runs with all the "love" the Doctor has indicated. But while this is going on, on the part of the father, and they come in, and the "fatted calf" is killed, and there is "music and dancing," (pretty good authority for dancing, for you dancers, if they are to keep it up in heaven)! While the music is going on in the father's house (I would remark that this "dancing" spoken of, is nothing resembling the performances that are prevailing now-a-days); while this is going on in "heaven," here comes the "elder brother," and he takes a spell of pouting. He would not go in—would not have anything to do with these joys. He sits out on—on the back porch of "heaven," it is to be presumed, and pouts, and says:—"Here I have been all this time working hard on the farm and helping to keep everything up, and never had so much given me as one little kid. Here you have killed the very calf I had intended to exhibit at the county fair." Perhaps he said, the best calf we had is wasted on this profligate! And here is some one pouting. Who is there to pout over re-

deemed sinners in the final heaven beyond all possible darkness and sorrow and sin, or anything of the sort? They are there, according to the theory of the Doctor. Here is somebody in heaven playing "baby," according to the practices of a good many children of men; and many a father and brother would have given him a drubbing in correction, or something of that sort.

Now, upon this searching for the "lost sheep," of which the Doctor has spoken; it was not a *goat!* Christ talks about "goats" somewhere in the Bible. You will find it in this twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, this account of the "lost sheep" and the "piece of silver" that the diligent search was made for. I believe if a sinner would *stand still* and want salvation, it would not take long for the Lord to save him. Upon the terms of the Gospel he would be saved. But the piece of silver did not go dodging around and defying all efforts to find it, and the sheep was a "*sheep*" when it went astray—not a "goat."

Now, the fallacy lies in leaving out of the proposition the *obduracy of the sinner* who *resists* God's offers of mercy. Orthodox Christians think Christ will save those who are willing to be saved. The declaration that we made is that God's will, will not contravene the will of those who are determined in their own minds to reject the Savior. That is the proposition we have assumed touching this matter, and I read you in its support Proverbs i: 24–26:

"Because I have called and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded: but ye have set at naught all my counsel, and would none of my reproof; I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh."

Thus God's declaration, wherein he says,—"I would" and "ye would not." God the Father did want to save them, and was contravened by their determination not to be saved, or else God is playing the hypocrite. "Because ye would not," is the God-given reason why the sinner is not saved.

And, now, upon this matter that is to come in the "sweet by-and-bye,"—this sulphurous reformatory school that the Doctor knows about. Perhaps in his next reply he will give you the chapter and verse, that we have been waiting so long to hear about, that will justify our hazarding our immortal being upon

this promised escapade from hell. And I suggest in reference to this reformatory school,—this place of discipline,—that anything which can have the effect to hasten the departure of the sinners of this world into that place of "reform" would be a beneficent thing in the sight of Almighty God and all sensible people. God ought to make a new commandment like this:—Thou shalt not kill anybody but *sinners*. Go out and kill them off just so fast as possible. My brother here had better take these teachings of his church and carry them out to their logical sequence,—take his revolver in his hand, and go to killing all those who are doing that work of desolation in Chicago. And this whole church that believe in this thing should go to work killing obdurate sinners, and send them to this better school of reformation that awaits them in the world to come. [Time.]

MR. HANSON'S CLOSING SPEECH.

MESSRS. MODERATORS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—If my friend were as good at an argument, as he is at a joke, he would be perfectly unanswerable. It seems to me, however, the very poorest attitude that a Christian minister, who believes that one-half or two-thirds of the human race are shivering on the brink of endless perdition, ought to occupy, is to stand and perpetrate jokes and squibs and quips, while affirming the endless damnation of countless millions of immortal souls. Nero is said to have fiddled while Rome was burning, but his act was the act of a saint compared with the conduct of a Christian minister, who can joke and laugh at the prospect of myriads of souls suffering endless torment. But when he has not an argument to bring, what can he do? He has a half-hour to fill out, and so he jokes for want of something *more* appropriate. Joking seems to be his vocation.

He undertakes the argument called the *reductio ad absurdum*. He says I ought to go about killing the people I think to be wicked, as this world would be better off without them, and that they will be put where they will be improving. I ought to enter

on the employment, therefore, of killing saloon-keepers, etc. But you remember that he told us last night that "the wing of the atonement covered every infant cradle," but that a large portion of the infants that become adults will go to hell. When he says this, does he not say that infanticide is a Christian virtue? Reason and Scripture teach the final salvation of all men, is the question before us, and what does he bring forward here? Why, if the resolution under discussion had had small-pox, his remarks would not have caught it; they were not near enough. If buffoonery and jokes, while standing on the verge of perdition where men are tumbling off by the million into eternal damnation, accords with his taste,—well, I suppose it is a matter of taste. To reply to his saloon argument let me say, that, on his theory, every mother ought to pray that her child may die in infancy; pray that she may close the eyes of her child in death, rather than let it grow to a sinful adult, and go to hell as the penalty for not having died a babe,—and I will close with his proposition to me, to go about killing saloon-keepers, and for every baby he will kill to secure its salvation, I will kill a rum-seller. In the school of future discipline, of which he speaks, who will get the worst of it, he or I? This style of argument is a two-edged sword, but my friend here seems to have taken hold of the blade, instead of the hilt.

The gentleman read a passage of Scripture in Proverbs, where he represents the dear Father in heaven as looking on the torments of the damned, laughing and mocking as if he were saying,—"O, you are catching it now! I gave you a chance, and you did not improve it, and now you are roasting." Is it our Father who thus laughs and mocks, or is it the gentleman's God? Talk about enlightening the heathen; the one who needs enlightenment is the gentleman who has spoken here to-night. No Pagan ever had a God as bad as his. Search Paganism through, and you will find no such horrible representation of Deity, and how can you so misrepresent the Bible? It is not God that says that, --it is *wisdom*,--the personification of wisdom by the author of the Proverbs. When people are not wise they reproach themselves for their folly, and wisdom seems to mock them. Mr. Lozier has entirely misrepresented the word of God in this quotation. He has

attributed a character to God which is not found between the lids of the Bible.

As to the parable of the Prodigal Son, the younger brother was in heaven, in the Father's house. The elder brother was outside, and the Father went out and entreated him to come in. My opponent misrepresents the parable, and he is a blind leader of the blind, if that is the way he presents the Bible to his hearers. The elder brother here is shown as a self-righteous person, who could not enter heaven till after the publicans and sinners. He says to his father:—"These many years do I serve thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment, and yet thou never gavest me a kid that I might make merry with my friends." He says:—"I never transgressed," and, yet, to show how mistaken self-righteous people can be, he told a lie the next minute. His father came out and entreated him to go in, and he refused and in the next breath says:—"I never transgressed thy commandment at any time!" He had the spirit of envy and anger in his heart, and was not admitted into heaven. My opponent says he does not want to go to heaven with certain people. He need not trouble himself,—he will never go there with such a spirit in his heart. He is like the man who was swearing, to whom the Quaker said:—"That is right, swear away; get it all out of thee, thee will never go to heaven with that stuff in thee." The elder brother refused to go into the Father's house; he had envy in his heart, and remained outside, and must remain outside until converted to a better spirit.

My brother wants me to tell you the chapter and verse that shows another probation beyond this life, and I will answer with the chapter and verse, when he will cite the chapter and verse showing where this life is said to be probationary to the next. I am a Yankee, born in Boston, and I'll answer your question by asking another:—Where is the chapter and verse that shows this life is a probation to the next? Every moment is probationary to the next, and will be to all eternity.

He still seems to want to know *how* all men are to be saved hereafter. I have told him before this, that men are going to be saved by *penitence, reformation* and *voluntary obedience.* Is that a hard road to travel? It is the only one possible. I am sure my brother has tried it. I shake hands with any Methodist on this,

that salvation will always be voluntary. There can be no one forced into heaven, as I have told him several times.

Now, in reference to Judas. Because it is said of him, "It were better had he never been born," we are told he never can be saved. Did my brother ever read the book of Job? Job wishes he had never been born. Jeremiah, the prophet, says precisely the same thing of himself. And if he reads his own commentator, Dr. Clark, he will find this was a common Jewish proverb uttered in time of trial and calamity. But he says: Judas was called a devil. So was Peter called satan and devil; therefore he was damned according to this style of reasoning. Finally he says, Judas was called the Son of Perdition and therefore went to perdition, when he died. Then I suppose as John was called the "Son of Thunder," when he died he went to thunder!

I have one serious complaint to make of a misrepresentation of facts that he gives. I will have the charity to suppose that he is ignorant of the nature of the Catholic purgatory. If he is, let me tell him that purgatory is not for sinners,—no sinners go there. The Catholic purgatory is only used for venial sins, slight defections from duty, on the part of the good and pious Catholic. If he did not know it, I am glad to enlighten him. If he did know it he ought to be ashamed to try and confuse his hearers, by accusing me of advocating the Catholic purgatory. The purgatory of the Catholics and future discipline for sinners are no more alike than light and darkness.

But I have not time to notice any more of his points, and will recapitulate some of the more important positions that I have established. I have endeavored to argue in the brief space of time I have had here, in favor of the proposition, "Reason and the Bible prove the final salvation of the human family," and I want to call your attention, (though I am afraid my time will expire before I can finish), to the points which I have made.

In the first place, I have proved,—(I submit to you, who have heard all my arguments),—that the nature and character of Christian prayer absolutely presuppose the final salvation of all men. We are commanded to pray for the final salvation of all men, and we are to pray in perfect faith that our prayer will be answered, and thus the doctrine must be true, since God never would have

called upon us to believe a lie,—that is, to pray in faith for what would never be fulfilled. And now, I ask you, if my opponent has refuted these two cardinal propositions? The first one he admits. He prays for all men,—that he confesses.

The second fact is, that we are commanded to pray in faith. Now, if he does not always pray in faith he does not fulfill one essential condition of Christian prayer, and if he does pray in faith for universal salvation, I shall ask him what business he has in the Methodist church? We must pray for universal salvation, and all the declarations in the Bible show, beyond any possible mistake, that the two essential characteristics of prayer are, that you pray for all men's final welfare, and pray in faith, nothing doubting.

The *second* point I have made is relative to the final resurrection. I am willing to rest all upon the nature and character of the resurrection as explained in the New Testament. I have presented a great array of Scripture,—a large number of passages, all of which bear directly upon the point. I have shown that, although there is a first resurrection, and other resurrections spoken of in the Bible, there is one universal, spiritual, *final* resurrection after all these, that describes a condition of things in which sin and sorrow are forever banished and eradicated.

To offset these proofs my opponent darts off and finds a passage of Scripture here and another there, that he thinks proves something else. If he is correct he arrays the Bible against itself, and damages his influence as a Christian minister, instead of showing the perfect harmony that exists between all the parts of the Bible. He will leave the impression upon skeptical minds that the Bible contradicts itself. But I believe that every promise, every passage of Scripture, harmonizes with every other, and I take great pleasure in showing that all these resurrections spoken of harmonize perfectly, and all are preliminary to the final resurrection. I have shown that all the dead will be raised, and that all will be raised to glory,—not only to immortality, but to an equality with the angels, and being children of the resurrection, become God's children.

And *third*,—the *will*, *pleasure*, *promise*, *purpose* and *oath* of God, are all pledged to produce this final condition of holiness and happiness, in which all moral beings shall be obedient to the

divine behests. Because God's will is not done now, we have no right to suppose that it never will be done. We must believe that it will be done, for his promises are unequivocal. The quotations that I have made are so full and explicit, that no human language can add to their force or power. [Time.]

THURSDAY EVENING, MARCH 20, 1879.

Question—Do the Scriptures and Reason teach the doctrine of the end less punishment of any part of the human family?

MR. LOZIER'S FIRST SPEECH.

MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Before proceeding to the discussion of the affirmative of the question that is now before us, it seems to me proper that I should say a word or two of a personal character.

At the conclusion of the discussion last evening, my friend, Dr. Hanson, found it convenient to animadvert rather harshly upon my practical joking, as he terms it, over this very grave and solemn question. And he proceeded to say that Nero was a saint, compared with the minister of the Gospel, who could do such a thing as I was doing. Nero fiddled, says the Dcctor, while Rome was burning. Nero set Rome on fire in order to get another pretext for the persecution which he was waging against the Christians, and while Rome was burning he did "fiddle," I suppose. I beg to say that I do not think the cases are exactly parallel, however. If Nero had a number of subjects, who were in very great danger of having their houses all burned, and were pursuing such a careless course with fire, or the like, as to render almost inevitable that result, and if Nero had earnestly cautioned them about it, and they had heedlessly gone on until fires were already beginning to kindle; and if just then some person had arisen, and undertaken to teach his subjects that there was no danger of the city burning, as the result of the carelessness against which Nero had warned them,—if he and they had gone on and done *this* thing, then Nero might at least have been excusable for some ridicule toward the man who had used such silly persuasions and had led them to this terrible catastrophe. This is about the Doctor's treatment of this case, as I have understood it. Now the talk about buffoonery and all that, is gra-

tuitous in this case. No one knows better than my friend, the Doctor, that what he termed "buffoonery," in that language which you all understand to be the *argumentum ad absurdum*, is a legitimate form of argument, and is so recognized in every system of polemics. More than that, it is a Scriptural form of argument. I don't know how he will interprete the language of the prophet Elijah at Mount Carmel, unless he calls that "buffoonery." The prophets of Baal were praying to their God to send fire and consume the sacrifice which they had placed upon the altar; and Elijah cried out to them to "cry louder! Your God is asleep," or "on a journey" somewhere! "Cry, why don't you cry!"—that is the idea. The argument was the *argumentum ad absurdum*" that the Doctor frets about. "You say you can bring this fire by calling upon your God. Now, why don't your God send the fire?" and the suggestion that he was asleep or on a journey, was an argument from the absurdity of the proposition. I want to say to you, good friends, I am not joking over this serious question of sinners being "on the verge of perdition," as my friend the Doctor seems to think. Far from that, I have never uttered an intimation of a "joke" in reference to that solemn and important fact. The matters I have treated with lightness and ridicule, are of another sort altogether. I have been showing the *absurdity* of the arguments of one purporting to be a Doctor of Divinity, who is holding up before the people the false light,—the "Jack o'lantern" of the promise and the prospect of another probation beyond this life,—though he simply *guesses* it is so, as we must conclude, after his omission, for obvious reasons, to find the passage of Scripture that discloses the doctrine. The absurdity of his position and arguments is the point I have treated with ridicule, and nothing more.

Now, the question before us is, Do the Scriptures and Reason prove the doctrine of the endless punishment of any portion of the human race? Not, Does the perverted human sympathy of some person or persons desire to prove the doctrine of endless punishment of any portion of the human race?—that is not the question. Not, Does the false analogy that men seem to draw, or profess to draw, from Scripture or from reason, teach any such doctrine?—

that is not the question; but the question is, Do the *Scriptures* and *Reason* prove this?

And, now, I might say to you, good friends, that this proposition that I am to discuss to-night, is a proposition made by a Universalist preacher, with whom, as the Doctor has told you, I held a discussion in the city of Indianapolis, a dozen years or so ago. It is his phraseology. He added that term, "*and reason*," as if *it* were of very great importance, if the Scriptures are believed to be the word of God.

Then that word "endless" which is such a "sugar-stick" with the Universalists. You know that word *endless* is a word he particularly desired to have put in the question, in order that it might be used during this discussion. Doubtless my friend will attempt to so use it. Now, so far as "*reason*" is concerned, let me simply say that the Doctor has admitted, and gone upon the presumption all the way through, that the Scriptures are the revealed will and word of God.

If the Scriptures teach this doctrine, we may not have any controversy as to its being reasonable. Admitting that the Bible is the word of God, reason bows before its averrments. There is no further controversy on that point. It is the province of reason in these interpretations to harmonize the word of God, and to bring every sentence into harmony with the whole word, so that each part may utter the teachings of the Bible in its entirety, and may concur with it. But reason is not to harmonize the Bible with the idiosyncrasies of any man that may undertake to pervert the word, and "wrest the Scriptures," either to the destruction of his neighbors or the destruction of himself.

And, at this point, it is proper that I should define the word *endless*, and say that it means everlasting. Webster so defines it. The Doctor will tell you that "endless" does not occur but twice between the lids of the Bible, and not in either case in reference to future punishment. I will tell you that in advance, and I will tell you that these two words, *endless* and *everlasting*, are synonymous, and the Doctor will not question that. Endless and everlasting are words that mean exactly the same thing, and every child in the house knows it. "Everlasting," Webster says, "means

endless." The Bible says:—"They shall go away into everlasting punishment;" therefore, the Bible teaches "endless punishment."

In reference to the word "punishment," Webster, defining punishment, says it means "*to pain, to afflict with pain, loss or calamity for crime or fault.*" And the whole question fully and clearly stated is this:—Do the Scriptures and Reason teach the doctrine that any part of the human family shall suffer endless "pain, loss or calamity" for any crime or fault?

The Doctor has had a great deal to say about my teaching that millions of souls are to "fry in hell" (a favorite expression with the Doctor—it is a question of *taste*, of course) to all eternity. He will *tell* you all this, but am not to prove any such doctrine. My affirmative in this case is, that they are to suffer *endless pain, loss or calamity* in some form. If I prove this the case is gained.

The doctrine of a future and éternal state of rewards and punishments is taught by the Bible, as I shall attempt to show, in every possible form of words, and as clearly as the Bible can teach anything it teaches that this *must* be so in the nature of the case, if God is dealing justly with us. It would be unjust in God himself to leave us in the dark touching the question of another probation beyond this life.

God, if he deals justly with us must tell us whether or no now is the accepted time and day of salvation. And, if he has not told us this, then it is not proven it cannot be—that there is not another probation. And, now to the argument in the case. I affirmed, in the first place, that *probation* logically underlies all divine government. The idea of probation, I say, is held by orthodox churches, and taught by the Scriptures, as underlying *all* divine government in earth and in heaven. Happiness depends upon holiness. Holiness involves in its very nature free choice. God has so constructed the mind of my brother that he cannot conceive of the idea of holiness independent of free choice. The very idea of constraint destroys completely the idea of holiness. The very essence of all freedom is the idea of choice to do or not to do. Essentially freedom involves the risk of apostasy. A man cannot be free if he *cannot* err in the matter of moral action, and here is where, in the counsels of the Almighty, the supreme difficulty

must have arisen,—if we might presume that this problem was a difficult problem to the All-wise God. The problem was this:—God, as he stood alone in the immensity of the universe, must do one of three things. He must either create intelligent beings with a possibility of their sinning, or else he must create beings like machines and control them as beasts are controlled, or else he must forever stand *alone* in the universe. He must not have created intelligences at all. Now, God resolved to create, and here arises the first issue between the Doctor and myself.

The Doctor says he would not have created *human* beings, without first of all determining that they should all be finally and eternally holy and happy. I affirm that God did create intelligences, human and angelic, without determining this; and I hold that I am in good company, in my "authorities" at least, touching this matter. For the Doctor will not deny the authority of his own Dr. Bellows, who said, in the *North American Review*, of March 8:

"We do not see how men can be made holy against their wills or be less than miserable so long as they will not be holy." Further on, speaking of future punishment he says:—"I can not think that it will be forcibly terminated by a fiat of Divine benevolence at any future date."

There is Dr. Bellows on that subject. Now, I have said:—God created intelligences knowing that they would not be holy and happy.

I reason by analogy in reference to this matter. Could a just God who has created beings lower than his angels, subject us to the trials of a probationary state such as we are undergoing now and at the same time fix and forever fasten beings who are superior to us in intelligence, in a state from which they could not fall, without probation being required of them also?

I say a just God could not do so, and I say it is evident from the word of God that he *did* not do so.

I will read Jude 6th verse:—"And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day."

Do you suppose that these angels were in a state from which

they *could* not fall, that they were not in a state of probation at that time? Do you suppose that these angels were in their *final* home, with God in the holy place?

Satan was the "Prince of the powers of the *air*," but he was not in the final heaven of the blessed. He was in his "first" estate, from which he fell. He was in the probationary state, and having failed to serve out his probation, he, and the angels who went astray with him, are cast down and reserved until the day of the revelation of the wrath of God Almighty. This was God's policy in reference to Satan. This is God's policy in reference to all. In the second chapter of Genesis 16th verse, you hear God saying to Adam:—"Of every tree of the garden thou mayst freely eat—but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shall not eat," and then proceeded to pronounce the penalty which was incident upon his disobedience.

And we are not to discuss now, what kind of death he died. He was put on probation in the Garden, and he fell from his probation there; this is all that needs now be proven. And the Scripture abounds in such laws and precepts,—no one calls that in question. About the sum and substance of the Bible and the ten commandments, that you learned all of you, when you were children, proceeded on the presumption I have laid down. Man is a free agent. God says thou shalt, and thou shalt not. These expressions were utterances of God's will. Now either God's will has been done by man ever since he uttered the ten commandments, and man has kept the ten commandments, or else man has contravened the will of God—one of the two. Which do you think is true? Let God answer.

In Ezekiel xxxiii: 11, God declares:—"I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." Such is his declaration. He pleads with them and asks them, "Why will ye die?" His "will" was that they should *not* die. Their will was *to* die. And lest it be said that this doctrine is only found in the Old Testament I'll give you the words of Jesus himself in John v: 39-40. Christ addressed the Jews, just as my friend, the Doctor here. "They think they have eternal life." That is the trouble they are in—that is the error *you* are in. "And ye will not come to me that ye may have everlasting life," says Christ to these Jews. Here we have the declara-

tion of Christ that man's will contravenes the very purpose for which he came into the world to die. And now in reference to God's will, a little more authority that God will have all men to be saved, from Dr. Hedge:

"God will have all men to be saved in the same sense, in which he wills that all fruit germs shall become fruits, and all human embryos well formed, healthy men and women, but this destination is not always accomplished. Resistance, defect in the stuff, collusion of forces, or what not, produce abortions in the one case; and defects or contradiction of the will may produce them in the other. The world of souls may have its failures as well as the world of forces."

That is the sentiment of Dr. Hedge, whose authority he will not attempt to gainsay in reference to the matter of the will.—[*Christian Examiner, July, 1859. p. 122.*] (Time.)

MR. HANSON'S FIRST REPLY.

MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I have never more deeply sympathized with a man in my life, than I do with my friend here, in his terrible effort to explain his own dreary attempt at wit. It makes me recall the story of the boy who drew a picture on his slate, and wrote under it,—"This is a horse." He had better do that, a great deal, than to spend a full quarter part of the half hour allotted to him in attempting to explain his jokes so that his hearers can see what he meant. On so solemn a subject a man ought to weigh every word, as though it were gold, and speak as one on the verge of eternity, lest he might cause lightness and irreverence in the hearts of his fellow-men and jeopard their eternal welfare. He ought to try to speak as though his words might plunge his hearers into these awful horrors he describes as pending. Had he done that he would have saved all his talk about matters that were as remote as the Chinese on the other side of the world are from us. If he is correct, that souls are damned endlessly, the fate of Judas ought to draw tears from

his eyes, instead of laughter from his lips; and, yet, he talks about a God who jeered, as though it were a good joke that Judas was damned forever. No wonder he took nearly a quarter of an hour to get out of the dilemma his own words have placed him in.

Now, he says this resolution he is discussing is the composition of a Universalist minister, as though he would apologize for its present shape. Let me say that my friend here (Mr. Becker) thought of leaving out the word reason, and Mr. Brown (the Methodist minister) insisted upon inserting *reason*, so that this form is the work of a Methodist minister and not of a Universalist. I mention it to the honor of Mr. Brown, or any other Methodist, who is willing, as any Christian ought to be, to acknowledge the divine light of reason as a guide to right and duty, and, also, to show you how sure my opponent is to blunder. Every time he opens his mouth, as the Irishman said, he puts his foot into it.

In reference to the last part of my friend's speech here, I agree with almost every word of it, and I appeal to you, if I have not insisted that this life is probationary. I say it is not a probation to the next life as a whole, but every moment is probationary to the next, and will be to all eternity. He goes on to say that you cannot force men into heaven. Good heavens! have not I said so myself, over and over again. He has been spending his time proving to you what I admitted in advance. I believe in freedom now and freedom forever, of the human will. He has spent a large part of his time in trying to prove to you what I admit, almost every word of. Is it because he has not anything else to say?

Now, as to the authority he quotes here from the Unitarian denomination. I have less sympathy with them than with his own denomination. These men reject the Scriptures; Dr. Bellows not receiving the Bible as authority, and Dr. Hedge being a destructionist and believing in the annihilation of the incorrigibly bad. He brings this testimony for the sake of prejudicing you and making you think I am condemned by my own authority. I would sooner accept the views of the theologian from Sioux City, even after his exposition of the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians, and that is saying a great deal. We did not bring the people here to hear us discuss the merits of the

Unitarian denomination. If his remarks in this connection are relevant, this proposition should read,—Do the Unitarian denomination and Reason prove the endless punishment of any portion of the human race?

He has gone through his half hour, without having attempted to take a single position in favor of his proposition! But every man to his own taste; let him treat his proposition in his own way. I have nothing to answer further. It is fearfully hard work to mow where there is no grass. Did you ever try to kick at nothing and hit it? Were it not that I have a right to introduce negative arguments I would be obliged to sit down for want of something to reply to.

Now, if the doctrine of the endless misery of a single human soul be true, and found in the Bible, it ought to be everywhere declared. God, the Father, presiding over the destinies of the human family, would have it everywhere written and spoken. The thunderings of the sky would reverberate the dreadful tidings; the peals would never cease in human ears. The lightnings flashing through the sky would be incessantly embroidering the awful tidings in letters of fire from zenith to nadir. The Bible would utter it from the first verse of Genesis to the last verse of Revelations, and the people who believe the doctrine, ought to give neither sleep to their eyes, nor slumber to their eyelids until they succeed in impressing the fearful news on the ears of all men, and the ministers of the Gospel, instead of good-naturedly enjoying their dinner and their joke, happy in spite of that fearful doctrine, ought to incessantly thunder it in the ears of their fellow-men. But I give them credit for not really believing what they preach. Ralph Waldo Emerson says, "Few men *believe*; most men believe that they believe." My friend may *think* that he believes it, but if he *believed* it he could not be happy. He could not enjoy life. It would, as the French theologian Saurin has confessed, "render life a cruel, bitter," and with him he would say "I cease to wonder that the fear of hell hath made some men mad, and others melancholy." If true, it ought to run reverberating in thunder-peals from Genesis to Revelations. But what is the fact?

We have no hint in the law as originally revealed to men, of eternal punishment. God stated in the very beginning what he

meant, in terms so clearly expressed that they could not be misunderstood by any reasonable or rational man. And I desire in my negative argument to say that

ENDLESS PUNISHMENT CANNOT BE TRUE, BECAUSE OF THE SILENCE OF GOD ON THE SUBJECT FOR FOUR THOUSAND YEARS.

The Almighty Father of the human family certainly would not fail, in the very beginning of human history, to show to every man the penalty of the broken law. To conceal such a doom as endless woe from the very first being to whom he promulgated that law, would be certainly cruel treachery to those whom he had created, and who would have the right to expect that he, as a good Father, would disclose the consequences of disobedience.

If you will take the Bible, and beginning with the first chapter of Genesis, read the promulgation of the law to Adam revealing the consequences of disobedience to sinners all the way down, you will find this to be true, (leading men in the gentleman's own church confess it to be true) that the doctrine of endless punishment was not intimated for 4,000 years.

Look at the first transgression,—Adam never was told if he violated the law, that he had incurred, or should receive endless woe. Read Genesis ii: 15, 17:

"Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt *not* eat of it; for in *the day* that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Adam died in the day of his sin as the penalty of his transgression. My friend slid over this very gracefully, as though it were not worth while to dwell upon it; but that is just exactly where the shoe pinches. After his violation of the law, Adam did not die in the body; he lived a long time after that, as a man But he died *in the day* that he sinned,—died a moral death. Paul describes it:—Eph. iv, 18:

Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their hearts."

He died a moral, spiritual death. Every man dies in the same way, when he sins after the similitude of Adam's transgression. Is there anything else in that penalty than temporal consequences? Can a double-convex magnifying lens of Methodistic

prejudice conjure endless punishment out of that penalty? If God intended the endless torment of Adam what kind of a God and Father was he, to conceal it from him, and give him no hint of the awful fate before him? And after the sin was committed, how was the penalty described? See Gen. iii: 17–19:

"Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return."

If the gentleman had been there beside Adam he would have said, "After you go to the dust you will pitch off into hell, and be damned forever." But after the sorrow of this life, "dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," is the full penalty of the broken law, as God declared it. The penalty is temporal tribulation and then "you shall return to the dust." You cannot find any other penalty, and the silence of God as to any other is an unanswerable argument against the theory of my opponent. God did not intend to inflict so dreadful a doom upon his children, or he would have explicitly announced it.

Read along a little further to Cain's punishment, in Gen. iv, the penalty of the law after Cain had committed his crime:

"And now art thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand. When thou tillest the ground it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be."

Where? In eternity wandering in fire forever? Not at all. "A fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the *earth*." And Cain said unto the Lord, "My punishment is more than I can bear." Where do you find anything about endless punishment here? Do you suppose God meant to bring a snap judgment, and not tell Cain beforehand what his doom was to be? The gentleman would not do this by a child of his. He would not take his boy and throw him into the fire and burn him up, after merely threatening to keep him five days on bread and water, and yet that would be tender mercy, compared to telling a man he shall be a "fugitive and a vagabond in the earth," and all the time intend to pitch him into eternal fires.

I say that the *silence of God* in these first transgressions

shows that he never intended, then, to inflict the dreadful doom that my opponent is setting forth to-night.

We will follow the transgressions to the account of the antediluvians, and of the people at the time of the flood. Noah, the "first great preacher of righteousness" (Titus ii:5),did not threaten the people with endless sufferings. Can you believe that God would describe to Noah just how long it was going to rain, and all the little particulars of the flood, and leave entirely out of sight this fearful fact, that millions were going to be punished forever? Keep this all back from the people, and tell them multitudes of minutiæ? It is preposterous. Read what the account says in Genesis vi.:

"And behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth to destroy all flesh wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven; and everything that is in the earth shall die. * * "Every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle and the creeping things and the fowl of the heaven."

Now, my opponent might say, and some may think that I teach that these people were drowned and went right to heaven. I don't believe those drowned people, who did not repent, would go right to heaven. Right here, in reference to Judas, my opponent says, according to my faith "Judas beat his Lord into heaven by about forty days." Don't he remember (John iii:13) that his Lord was in heaven all the time. "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the *son of man* WHICH IS IN HEAVEN." He believes Christ was God himself. I believe he was a divine being. Judas went to heaven a long time after the son of God was in heaven, for he was always there. I do not believe Judas went to heaven until his fearful sin was thoroughly atoned by discipline and repentance. When God takes the soul out of this world for purposes wise and good, the processes of correction will be continued until reformation is assured. But to resume:

Read the account of Sodom and Gomorrah, Genesis xix: 24–28:

"Then the Lord God rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah, brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven, and he overthrew those cities and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of he cities, and all that which grew upon the ground. And Abra-

ham got up early in the morning, to the place where he stood before the Lord, and he looked toward Sodom and Gomorrah, and toward all the land of the plain, and beheld, and lo, the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace."

Now, you see, the fire and brimstone were here in this world; and it was limited. It was *here*, not *hereafter*. And pay special attention to these words in Lam. iv: 6:—"For the punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people is *greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom*, that was overthrown as in a moment and no hands stayed on her." If Sodom was punished *forever*, how could the punishment of the Lord's people be *greater* than the punishment of Sodom? And you will find in Ezek. xvi: 55, that the punishment of Sodom is limited, and Sodom is to be restored.

"When thy sisters, *Sodom and her daughters shall return to their former estate*, and Samaria and her daughters shall return to their former estate, then thou and thy daughters shall return to your former estate:"

Now, Mr. Lozier quotes to you that Sodom is suffering "the vengeance of eternal fire," and tells you that *eternal* means *endless*. How can that be, when Jerusalem suffered even greater punishment than Sodom or Sodom's daughters, and Sodom is to be restored? You see by this account of Sodom that the *endless* suffering of some of the wickedest of mankind is not proved in the Bible. These instances all show that punishment is limited, and so you will find it all through the Old Testament. You will look in vain for 4,000 years for a single word declarative of endless punishment.

Paul tells us, in Hebrews ii: 2, that under the law, "*Every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward.*" The punishment of all these persons is fully explained as temporal and limited, and it is expressly declared that this temporary, limited punishment is a "*full recompense of reward.*" I submit that the Old Testament demonstrates that God never said one word on the subject of endless punishment for 4,000 years. And now to corroborate this, I call your attention to the views of eminent scholars. Warburton, in his Divine Legation, says:

"Both the rewards and punishments promised by heaven are temporal only, such as health, long life, peace, plenty, and dominion, etc.; diseases, premature death, war, famine, want, sub-

jections and captivity, etc. And *in no one place of the Mosaic Institutes, is there the least mention, or intelligible hint of the rewards and punishments of another life.*" Jahn says:—"We have not authority, therefore, decidedly to say that any other motives were held out to the ancient Hebrews to pursue the good and avoid the evil, than those which were derived from the rewards and punishments of this life." Dr. Campbell:—"It is plain that in the Old Testament the profoundest silence is observed in regard to the state of the deceased, their joys, sorrows, happiness or misery."

This is the summing up of this line of thought, and I submit it is worthy of your candid consideration. I do not imitate my opponent and ask you to plug up your ears lest what I may say shall peril your immortal souls. I would not if I could, and thank God, I could not if I would. I ask you to read the Scriptures without trembling, look upon the evidence with all the candor that a child should have when reading the will of God, his Father.

These considerations show that the penalties of sin are of limited duration, and that alone will explain the reticence of God on this great subject, even if the penalties shall continue in the future state. But did God mean all the time when he told the Jews they were going to have fever, and itch, and brief, temporal calamity, that they were to suffer endless torment, and never mention this supreme penalty? You can only say this on the ground that God was the cruelest of the cruel, if all the time he was talking about these minor details, he had this fearful fate in store for them.

I desire to impress upon your minds the fact of the silence of God for four thousand years. I challenge my brother here, to deny it. If he attempts to question this, he puts himself against the ablest men and commentators of modern times. And if endless punishment was not then impending, under the severe dispensation of Moses, it certainly would not be found in the milder message of the Prince of peace:

> "God's servant, Moses, quaked and feared,
> When Siniai's thundering law he heard,
> But Gospel grace with accents mild,
> Speaks to the sinner as a child."

And yet though Moses gives no hint of it, it is claimed that the milder gospel comes and breaks upon the ear of the world the awful intelligence of the endless ruin of a portion of mankind!

I REPEAT THAT THE SILENCE OF GOD FOR FOUR THOUSAND YEARS, IN REFERENCE TO THIS MATTER, IS AN UNANSWERABLE DEMONSTRATION THAT GOD DID NOT MEAN TO INFLICT ENDLESS PUNISHMENT THEN, AND IF HE DID NOT THEN, HE NEVER CAN INTEND TO INFLICT IT. [Time.]

Rev. Mr. Brown here arose and observed that he did not *insist* on the use of the word *reason* in drawing up the proposition under discussion. He had the proposition and submitted it to Mr. Becker, and decided if it was considered proper, and accepted by the parties in the discussion, it would be all right He added, but did not "insist" on the introduction of the word reason.

Mr. Becker replied:—"Perhaps the word *insist* is a little too strong, but the original proposition was without the word reason, and after it had been submitted to Mr. Lozier the word *reason* appeared. I do not know that he *insisted* upon it, but it was his production."

MR. LOZIER'S SECOND SPEECH.

MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—In reply to my friend, the Doctor, this much further may be said in reference to the form of this question:

I did *not* care anything about the "form." If I had, I should not have consented to it. The proposition framed by Mr. Becker came with his challenge to me. That challenge entitled me to be the respondent, according to the usual order, in the opening of the discussion; but Mr. Becker not only wanted to name the question, but wanted me to open the fight, which is contrary to all custom. When a man is challenged he is not expected to take the "lead" in the discussion. I objected to his putting me *first* in a controversy of his own choosing. That I should discuss his affirmation at the "start" was all I objected to. I want "*reason*" there, just as it is written in the questions under consideration, for whatever is revelation must accord with the highest reason.

The Doctor has been kind enough to invite us to correct him

if he has misled us in any respect. I shall not intimate that he has done anything so bad as he seems to think we suspect him of doing. He told you last night that God had pledged himself "by his oath" to the final salvation of the race—and, as I remember, gave in support of this Isaiah xiv, beginning with the twenty-fourth verse. I want to read you this "oath" that God there records:

"The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely, as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand. That I will break the Assyrian in my land, and upon my mountains tread him under foot; then shall his yoke depart from off them and his burden depart from off their shoulders."

That is the "oath" the Doctor gave us upon which he was going to "save everybody, finally and eternally in heaven," as I understood it!

Now, in reply to about all the Doctor had to say in his expressions of "pity" for me, and in relation to these words of Christ concerning Judas:—It is a common expression to be sure. I do not claim any originality for it, but some one has said, "I am responsible for the *argument*, and not responsible for the *capacity* to understand it." So say I in this case. My friend has wasted his sympathy and your time.

The Doctor left us with the proposition that if I would show where the Bible taught "probation" then he would show us—(that which he did *not* show us in his affirmative argument)—where the Bible taught that man shall be "finally holy and happy;" and he would give the chapter and verse. I was arguing in support of the proposition that all created intelligencies are "on probation"—angels as well as men. I proceeded on the assumption which can not be questioned—that man is on probation, as shown in the case of Adam, and that was all I was undertaking to do. The Doctor will get tired of this distortion and perversion of my arguments before he gets through—see if he don't. See if I am not able to cure him, so that he will be well before he gets back to Chicago. I want to say further, in answer to his sophistries regarding the alleged "silence" of the Old Testament Scriptures upon the subject of the eternal punishment of man, if the Bible were silent and had been silent through all the 4,000 years of Old Testament history in reference to that matter, the reason might be

given thus:—God has always dealt with mankind with reference to their condition and the *light* that they possessed.

And I am here to say most frankly to the Doctor and to this audience, that I don't believe that God dealt with these people in the infancy of their being as he will deal with us who have the light and the influence of the Gospel as we possess it in this day. The poet has said:—" We are living in a grand and awful time." We are living in a blaze of light—in a day of terrible accountability.

The Doctor knows the teaching of the Scriptures relative to to the policy of the Almighty toward the people in those days of darkness and ignorance. Paul announced that policy to the Athenians in Acts xvii: 30, where he speaks thus:

"And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent."

The question is not, what was the policy of God at the beginning, with these " infants " he had in his hands, who had no more light than your little boy. The question is,what will God do with enlightened sinners of the present? He is not going to damn people if they don't *know* what are the moral results of offending. And this light came, and as the race grew older, accumulated. The Doctor has himself admitted that these people destroyed by the flood did not go to heaven. They went to the place where Judas has gone, according to the Doctor's theory.

The Doctor brings Scripture citation to show that God warned these people of what was coming; and yet God did send that penalty upon them. He will not inflict penalty upon men of which he has not forewarned them, according to the Doctor's own assertion.

We proceed with the "argument," which the Doctor is so anxious I should give you. It is conceded that man is in sin—is in sin by his own free will, having failed to keep his probation; failed to obey God in the probation which God has allotted man.

And now I make this broad proposition as the foundation of all further argument that I intend to make upon this question:

Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, will alone prevent eternal punishment of any human being to whom Christ is intelligently presented.

And upon this proposition I want to say once for all, that the

soul-killing sin is the rejection of that Savior whom God found it necessary should come to the earth, and suffer and die that man might be saved. The soul-killing sin is the rejection of this Christ. And, I repeat, whoever, having had Christ presented to him for his acceptance, rejects him, suffers the penalty of eternal death and destruction. Observe, I do not mean the heathen, or infants, or idiots. I don't believe that sort of slander against the Almighty. Remember, I say those to whom the Lord Jesus Christ is intelligently presented.

I defy the Doctor to furnish a passage of Scripture intimating that any one who rejects the Lord Jesus Christ shall be eternally saved. It is a *necessity* that men shall believe on him in order to be saved. Our Lord Jesus Christ himself so declares in these words:

"For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."—John iii.: 16.

To provide salvation through believing in the Lord Jesus Christ was the object that God had in presenting Christ for man's redemption. He came to die in order that men believing on him "should not perish, but have everlasting life."

And now I will offer some Scripture additionally in support of the doctrine of the endless punishment of the wicked. The Doctor has told you there is nothing in the Old Testament Scriptures on this subject. But I will call your attention to the closing words of the last chapter of the prophecy of Isaiah lxvi: 24:

"And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh."

And there is much the same language, or rather the same thought in Rev. xiv: 10–11, showing a marked coincidence between the close of the prophecy of Isaiah and the close of that of the Apocalypse:

"The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb. And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever, and they shall

have no rest, day nor night,who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name."

Now the Doctor will tell you, I have no doubt, that this has reference to the "destruction of Jerusalem," or that this punishment occurred before Christ came, or something of the kind. If he attempts to so dispose of this prophecy, I want to ask the Doctor to explain what is meant just back in the twenty-second verse by the "new heavens and the new earth" that the prophet speaks of, that God intended to create in connection with the event here set forth.

Now, in reference to this expression, "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," I presume the Doctor will have some light for us on that subject, and we are all glad to have any light that he is prepared to give us, but we will take an exposition upon this subject in advance, from Christ himself. See Mark ix: 43-48:

"And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off. It is better for thee to enter into life maimed than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that shall never be quenched. Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off. It is better for thee to enter halt into life than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched. Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out; it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched."

"If thy hand offend thee cut it off." Now, the Doctor will tell you, perhaps, that these expressions argue nothing,—that Christ is talking about entering into the present life, and that they are already in the life that is meant by the Savior when entering into life.

It is the same "life" that the Savior refers to, when he declares to these people,—"And ye will not come unto me that ye might have life,"—John v: 40. It is this life they are to enter into, the eternal life that Jesus spoke of in his declaration to Nicodemus, when he used the words that I quoted a little while ago:—"Whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." The life that he speaks of here is the life he was speaking of in the former part of the chapter.

Now, turn again to Daniel xii: 2. The Doctor did not make us clear on that subject last night, and as long as he has taken occasion to say that the doctrine of eternal punishment is not taught in the Old Testament Scriptures, you must beg his pardon, and ask him to explain this phrase in Daniel,—this declaration that "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

Now, the question simply is, Does that have reference to "the destruction of Jerusalem?" Who were these "many that sleep in the dust of the earth," who came forth "to shame and everlasting contempt," at the destruction of Jerusalem? Who were they?

And if somebody *did* come forth, he'll have to tell us another thing:—What became of those who came forth "to shame and everlasting contempt?" If this "shame and contempt" isn't *punishment*, and everlasting punishment, then the Doctor has gained his case. We come now to the New Testament; John iii: 36. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." The Doctor will perhaps give you a quibble upon the word "abideth," such as, "Abiding, or to abide, does not indicate everlasting."

Now, friends, the question is about *life*, and not about the word abideth. The unbeliever "*shall not see life*,"—hence the abiding wrath. That word "abideth," conveys the idea of the wrath of God remaining upon him, or hanging over him and falling upon him. That is the way Jesus and the people understood the word in the Bible. "Abideth" means the opposite of anything *transient*. Thus in Psalm xci: 1,—"He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide in the shadow of the Almighty."

That, however, is not the point at issue. The quibble, if he makes it, must be made upon this word, *life*. "He shall not see life." It is not this physical life, for he sees that before God Almighty asks him to believe. It is another life, the "everlasting life" that he speaks about in the beginning of the verse,—"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." And your intelligence will not naturally accept any other construction.

Now, lest the Doctor might be disposed to quibble over that, let us see how Christ interprets it. John iii: 14–16:

"And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness even so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life."

Now, mark you—"perish" and "everlasting life" are placed in *antithesis* all the way through. On the one side, *everlasting life*, and on the other side, *perish*, conveying the very thought that they would not all accept of everlasting life. And Christ unquestionably intended the people should so understand it. So much, then, with reference to the question of *life*.

We come now to another matter, and the next case I want him to look into is not about everlasting life, but about everlasting *punishment*. In this case, the Doctor will make you a splendid quibble, I have no doubt. I refer to Christ's utterances in reference to the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

The Savior, himself, says in Matt. xii: 32:—"And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come."

So says Christ in Matthew upon that subject, and in Mark, iii: 29, he says:—"But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation."

Now, the point is simply here:—The Doctor told us Christ ought to have given fair warning on this matter. Here it is. The Jews had been saying that Christ cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils, and had blasphemed against the Holy Ghost. Now, Jesus says that this blasphemy against the Holy Ghost can never be forgiven, in this world or in the world to come.

The Doctor will say Jesus meant "this *age*," or something of that sort. Christ repeats:—"He hath *never* forgiveness, but is in danger of *eternal* damnation." Now, if the Doctor can prove that this does not mean everlasting punishment, well and good. It must be *shown*, not, as in some other cases, dismissed with a mere verbal quibble.

One thing further. The Doctor will say he don't believe it will be forgiven. He will tell you it will not be forgiven,—that they are to *pay* the penalty of it, and then receive everlasting reward. Are they to pay it without *repentance?* Are they to be brought

into heaven without repentance? Is he ready to say that? If so, I want him to reconcile *this* passage, which I leave him to grind over until you are satisfied as well as himself: Hebrews vi: 4–6:

"For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh and put him to an open shame."

What led to this note of warning? It appears that some of them were backsliding over their discussions. Paul did not want people to be running around the country debating this question of eternal punishment. He tells them so in the preceding verses, —exhorts them to let such things be and "go on to perfection," concluding with the solemn warning cited above.

Now, Paul says by inspiration, it is *impossible* to *renew* the people *unto repentance*, who sin against the Holy Ghost, and are putting Christ to open shame. They can not be renewed to repentance; the Doctor does not claim that they can escape without it. Now, let the Doctor get them out of hell if he can. I must beg him to do this, and to take care of his friend Judas that he has so much sympathy for, or he will lose his case. The Doctor thinks we "ought to be in tears over it." Christ did not shed many over Judas. Jesus said concerning him, in his prayer, "While I was with them in the world I kept them in thy name: Those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled."

Jesus says Judas was "lost." The Doctor says he was *saved*, but I believe I'll take Christ's word on that point, even if the Doctor did "come from Boston." The Doctor don't believe in any levity on this subject,—none from this side. Yet the Doctor, with all his gravity and dignity, has ventured to make a play on this solemn subject; has ventured to make a play on my words about Judas, and the play was, that because I said he was the son of perdition, therefore he must go to perdition, "so, John was the son of thunder, and he must go to thunder."

If we accept the Doctor's proposition, it will take some folks to hell, after all, for the sons of Eli and others were called the sons of Belial, and they'll "go to Belial," and the children of the

devil, of whom Christ spoke, will "go to the devil," under the same rule.

As soon as he gets his friend Judas taken care of, I would furthermore like to have him fix up this matter about the Prodigal Son, that he left in a bad fix, last night. Look at it. Jesus represents the father as saying to his son:—"Thou art always with me." He had been at home with him in heaven. The Doctor tells us the Prodigal came out of hell and came into heaven.

And now the Prodigal Son has come to heaven, and the other son *won't go into heaven*, according to the Doctor's theory, and yet he is not in hell. He was neither in heaven nor in hell! How about this new doctrine he has given us; this new doctrine of the next probation; about this new heaven that the elder brother is in, where he is "always with" the father, and has all the father has, and yet is not in heaven? [Time.]

MR. HANSON'S SECOND REPLY.

MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—The first remarks of the brother who has just taken his seat, were to this purport:—I had shown that the purpose of God is to save all men, and then, after proving that, in direct terms from the Bible, I quoted several passages to show that the purpose of God, wherever referred to, any and every purpose, will be accomplished. I quoted several passages of Scripture in which God speaks of his purpose, as in reference to the Assyrians, etc. Now that purpose was accomplished. Divine inspiration records the fact that every purpose of God has been or will be accomplished. My opponent, instead of replying to the point made that God purposed this, and therefore it must be accomplished, found it convenient in reference to the Assyrians, to say that I had quoted this passage in connection with the salvation of *all* men. If his ears were attending to me, he knows that I did not quote it for that purpose. He misrepresents me. But his advantage with you is only tem-

porary,—it is no longer in your minds. God says he purposes, ultimately, to save all mankind, and the account in reference to the Assyrians shows that the accomplishment of his purpose is certain. Thus we have the assurance that the purpose of God, wherever given, will be accomplished.

I solemnly aver that my opponent has not produced one single, even temporary advantage in your minds, unless he has first misrepresented the Bible, or my position, as he has done in this instance. He seems to be afflicted with a mental strabismus that makes him look cross-eyed at every position of mine. I hope it is not intentional, though it certainly is actual.

And then he keeps reiterating concerning the probation of man beyond this life. But he has not, and cannot produce a single proof that the condition of eternity hinges on this life. Every moment is probationary, one moment to the next. Where is his proof that eternity is determined by human conduct here? He has given none,—he can give none.

I am very glad that he admits here, virtually, that in the Old Testament, certainly for a long time, men were not aware of the penalty of endless punishment. God, he says, will not judge men harshly, but will deal kindly with those who have never heard of Christ. According to this, Jesus Christ is the greatest calamity that ever came to man, and his Gospel, that is announced as good news to all creatures, is really the worst possible tidings to men. My friend says that those who never hear of Christ and never reject him, will not be damned forever. Now, what an awful calamity for ministers of the Gospel to go and preach Christ when, if a man happens to reject him, his immortal soul is to be damned, while if he had never heard of him he would be saved!

He says the heathen who never heard of Christ, are not going to be subject to the same laws that we are. The heathen are not to be damned forever, because they have never heard of Christ. The idea then of sending money to the heathen, if by enlightening them we secure their damnation! Why, it is the greatest, the awfullest cruelty that ever was thought of by man. How can any one, believing as he does, send a missionary to enlighten the ignorant and thus secure their immortal woe? He laid down the proposition with a great deal of force, that faith in Jesus Christ

alone will prevent eternal punishment, and those who intelligently reject Christ, and those alone will be damned forever. Now, then, I would say, if you, believing as he does,—if you have a child, you ought to immure that child somewhere, so he shall never hear of Christ, for fear he shall do what the majority of men have done so far,—reject Christ. To secure ignorance, under the light of this doctrine, becomes a cardinal obligation, solemnly incumbent on all.

After these preliminaries he comes at last to the Bible, and says there are some passages in the Old Testament that do teach the doctrine of endless punishment, notwithstanding the quotations and testimonies I made and gave you. What does he do to prove it? He does not begin at the beginning of the Bible; does not show you where the law is originally announced, but goes almost to the New Testament, and all at once stops at Isaiah ixvi, and reads a part of the account where somebody is going to be damned forever and ever. Now I am going to read you the whole:

"And it shall come to pass that from one *new moon* to another, and from *one Sabbath to another*, shall all *flesh* come to worship before me, saith the Lord."

If he had read all the words of the passage he would have shown you that the whole transaction is one in this world, and limited.

"And they shall go forth and look upon the *carcasses* of the men that have transgressed against me, for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto *all flesh*."

Do you suppose there are carcasses festering in the eternal world? By no stretch of the imagination can the language be applied to the eternal world,—surely there will be no new moons and Sabbaths, and carcasses festering with worms hereafter. The scene is in this life.

As to the words the "fire is not quenched," and so on, they should not be literally understood,—the word that is rendered unquenchable all through the Old Testament, as well as in profane Greek literature, and in the New Testament, does not denote a fire that never goes out; but a fire that will not go out until it accomplishes the purpose for which it was kindled. We find similar language in Jeremiah, vii: 20:

"Therefore, thus saith the Lord God; behold mine anger and my fury shall be poured out upon this place, upon man and upon beast, and upon the *trees of the field*, and upon the *fruit of the ground*, and it shall burn, and shall *not be quenched.*"

Here is the unquenchable fire, not only for man but for "beasts" and "trees" and "the fruit of the ground." The unquenchable fire means simply a fire that cannot be quenched until it accomplishes its purpose. The idea is given in Jeremiah xvii.:

"But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem, on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof and it shall devour the *palaces of Jerusalem*, and it *shall not be quenched.*"

And what is the use of the language that my brother quotes about "the worm that shall not die?" In Parkhust's Lexicon we have the authoritative explanation:—"Our Lord seems to allude to the worms which continually preyed on the dead carcasses that were cast into the valley of Hinnom, Gehenna, and to the perpetual fires that were kept burning to consume them."

We are told that near Jerusalem at the time of our Lord, the valley of Hinnom had been turned into a receptacle for refuse and seweage, and that the bodies of criminals were cast there till it became very loathsome, and a fire was kept constantly burning, and the allusion to the fire burning had reference to that place, which was made an emblem of the punishment that should come upon the sinner. The unquenchable fire, Hammond says:—"Is a fire never quenched until its work has been done." Dr. Clark, on the passage, Matt. iii: 12:

"Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with *unquenchable fire.*"

"It will burn with a fire that cannot be extinguished by man." Bishop Pearce says:—"It signified utter destruction of the Jews. In the whole verse the Jewish state is expressed in the terms of the husbandman. This was a common expression among the Greek writers in the time of Christ." And in describing the martyrdom of several Christians at Alexandria, Eusebius says:—"They were carried on camels through the city, and in this elevated position, were scourged and finally consumed or burned in *puri as-*

besto, (Greek rendered) unquenchable fire," and yet these bodies were burned in a few hours.

The *unquenchable fire*, wherever found in the Old Testament, in reference to carcasses of men, or in reference to tree and plant, means that it shall burn until it shall accomplish its purpose. You will find it used exactly so by Plutarch in his biographies. He says the fire in the temple is "unquenchable," but that fire has long since gone out. Our Lord and Savior says the same thing, but that unquenchable fire has gone out. The fires sent upon man and beast and plant were *unquenchable*, though they have gone out long ago.

And now, I ask you, reasonable men and women, what right has my brother to stand up here and say that the blessed Jesus meant something entirely different from the uniform usage of the term in the Greek? I wonder if he feels as though I have explained the matter of the meaning of *unquenchable* fire, as he has kindly requested me to do?

But, he asks me what life they go into when they go into life maimed; and I'll ask him if it means endless life in heaven? Do souls enter the realms of endless blessedness maimed? No; this is the idea of the language:—It is better that you have one foot or hand and go into life maimed, than to have both feet and hands and be cast into unquenchable fire. The meaning of the language is that a person should cut off an offending hand or foot which represents some worldly advantage, rather than to forego the enjoyments of the Christian life. This is as true now, as then. In the light of Christianity, it is better to surrender any worldly advantage, if it be necessary, in order to enter upon the Christian life.

Now, he wants me to give some more light on that verse in Daniel. I have given him all the light the Bible has. He wants me to explain all the particulars. All that I am called upon to do I have done. This everlasting shame and everlasting contempt were to be experienced before some people died, who heard our Savior. His words were:—"This generation shall not pass away until all these things shall be fulfilled." Christ refers to that resurrection of which Daniel speaks, showing that it shall come to pass immediately, before some persons die, who hear his words.

In reference to "eternal judgment," in Hebrews, vi: 4–6, he

says it means that people should not be going around the country challenging others to debate; but if he is willing to accept a challenge, why may it not refer to him? It may mean those who accept as well as those who give challenges.

He says that it is "impossible," after certain persons have accepted Christ and then rejected Christianity, to renew them to repentance. Now, he ought to know, as a student of the Bible, how that word "impossible," is used. Do you not recall that passage of Scripture where our Lord said:—"How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom. It is easier for a camel to enter into the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." The disciples said:—"Who then shall be saved;" and the Savior answered:—"*With man it is impossible*, but WITH GOD ALL THINGS ARE POSSIBLE." In the sense indicated, these persons who were apostates, were more difficult to renew than if they had not apostatized.

One little point I have overlooked, and I will allude to it—it is a very curious phenomenon presented here. My opponent and myself seem about to have changed sides, and, for once in his life, he is advocating a doctrine that seems more merciful than mine. Those who were drowned in the deluge, were immediately saved, he says, because they did not know any better. Now, I say, they did not go to heaven at once, and he certainly ought to compliment me for teaching a doctrine that is more like his than his own belief. If the deluge swept millions into heaven in all their sin, his hell is of little use to him. According to the teachings of my opponent, Christianity is the greatest calamity of modern times, inasmuch as it renders hell certain to millions of people who, if they had never heard of Christ, would have gone to heaven and been saved, notwithstanding their sins, while millions of people, far better, are damned!

I believe I have touched upon all the points he has mentioned, and now I want to say that the real point, the real question between my opponent and myself, turns on certain words in the Bible that denote duration, rendered *everlasting*, *eternal*, *forever*, etc. These words do not, in any instance, themselves alone, unless they derive additional meaning from the subject to which they are applied, mean *endless*; and I will proceed to show, in the little

time I have left this evening, that *everlasting*, *forever*, and the like, from the beginning to the end of the Bible, are used to signify limited duration and never endless duration, unless they are connected with some subject that gives them additional meaning. To illustrate:—I say a great apple, a great dog, a great house, a great horse, a great mountain. Great is an elastic word. A great dog does not mean a dog as big as a house. Just so the word everlasting applied to different subjects has different meanings; and where it seems to mean endless, in connection with a passage, a careful examination will show that it means nothing of the kind. I will give you, the first of all, the definitions given by the lexicographers of the day, which teach that the words *everlasting*, *eternal* and *forever*, do not mean endless, intrinsically. Then I will show you their usage in the Old and New Testament, and in the writings immediately following Christ, to prove that the meaning is not endless usually, and, having shown that, will 'quote passages referring to everlasting punishment. Everlasting, applied to punishment, derives its meaning from the word punishment, and must be limited. Applied to God, the everlasting God, then it means *endless*, because it derives its meaning from the infinite God. Applied to the hills, everlasting hills which will one day go away in smoke and vapor, the meaning is limited. So you perceive it must be used in a limited sense, when connected with punishment.

I will call your attention, in the first place, to the opinions of critics and lexicographers. The oldest lexicographer known, Hesychius, who wrote between the years 400—600, gives the meaning of the word rendered *forever*, and the like,—"life of man," "time of life,"—a limited meaning. Theodoret, another lexicographer, says:—"An interval, denoting time, sometimes infinite, when spoken of God; sometimes proportioned to the duration of the creation, and sometimes to the life of man." John of Damascus, in 750, says:—"The life of every man is called *aion*." Phavorinus, another lexicographer, in the sixteenth century, gives:—"*Aion, time;* also *life, habit,* or *way of life. Aion* is also the *eternal* and endless, *as it seems to the theologian;*" thus admitting that the theologians had then incorporated a new meaning which the word did not have up to that time. Next, I'll quote

Schleusner, one of the most eminent and learned writers on sacred literature:—"Any space of time, whether longer or shorter, past, present and future, *to be determined by the persons* or *things spoken of.*" Donnegan, a well-known lexicographer, says the word means "*time, space of time* and *life*, ordinary period of man's life, *age of man, man's estate*, long period of time, *eternity; aionios*, of long duration, lasting *permanent, eternal.*" Dr. Taylor, who wrote the Hebrew Bible three times with his own hand, says:—"*It signifies eternity, not from the proper force of the word*, but when the sense of the place or the nature of the subject requires it, as God and his attributes." McKnight, Scotch Presbyterian, thinks the words "being ambiguous, ought always to be understood according to the nature and the circumstances to which they are applied." He thinks the word sustains endless punishment, but adds:—"At the same time I must be so candid as to acknowledge that the use of these terms, *forever, eternal* and everlasting in other passages of Scripture, shows that *they who understand those words in a limited sense, when applied to punishment put no forced interpretation upon them.*" And this is the language found in the writings of different commentators—Jones, Alexander Campbell, Whitby, Pearce, Scarlett, Prof. Stuart, and various others; and I will close the list by giving the words of Prof. Tayler Lewis, a most eminent Greek scholar and Presbyterian clergyman. He says the word means, pertaining to the world to come, in the passage, Matt. xxv: 46, "They shall go into everlasting punishment," (and I commend it to my dear brother, not as coming from me, but from a strictly orthodox scholar):—"*The preacher, in contending with the Universalist and the Restorationist, would commit an error, and it may be, suffer a failure in his argument, should he lay the whole stress of it on the etymological or historical significance of the words* AION, AIONIOS, *and attempt to prove that of themselves they necessarily carry the meaning of endless duration.* These shall go away into the restraint, imprisonment of the world to come, is all we can etymologically or exegetically make of the word in this passage."

And, now, I will sum up this branch of the meaning of the word everlasting by saying, that I have before me the definitions of seventy lexicographers and commentators, and that nearly

all of them show that the word usually denotes limited duration, the signification of endless always depending upon the nature of a special suject to which the word is sometimes applied, as God or heaven, when the word derives a meaning not inherent in it. [Time.]

MR. LOZIER'S THIRD SPEECH.

Before I proceed to advance any further argument in the question at issue, I must again beg your indulgence and call the attention of my friend, the Doctor, to his very unfortunate habit of overlooking the particular point at issue. I do not say the Doctor does this intentionally; but it is his misfortune that he does not happen to see the point. You are aware, he has confessed his infirmity in this direction several times. Notice his treatment of the citation which I gave in the last chapter of Isaiah. I particularly called his attention to the 22d verse, and to the "new heavens" and the "new earth;" but the Doctor found it convenient to begin with the 23d verse and read on from there, instead of the 22d verse. I may remark, however, as I pass, that this is the Scripture to which I alluded, in which the prophet spoke of a time when there was to be a new heaven and a new earth, and in which he used the figures alluding to the "new moon" and "Sabbath," and concluded with the expression, "Where their worm dieth not," etc. Now, the Doctor attempts to ridicule the idea of this having reference to the eternal state, by raising the question if there are to be moons and Sabbaths, etc., there. The Doctor knows, and we all know, that in many utterances, in reference to the heavenly estate, there are allusions intended to convey ideas to the minds of the people, which may be poetical in themselves, but which never fall below the reality. And then he asks the question:—"You don't imagine there are going to be carcasses, and worms crawling on the carcasses; you don't imagine *that*, do you?"

I want the Doctor to understand, that he is not ridiculing me; but he is ridiculing the exposition that the Lord Jesus Christ him-

self gives in reference to the "worms," as well as "the fire that is not quenched." He is the person who did not want anything like "lightness or trifling," or anything of that sort! He would have you believe it was only the Valley of Hinnom, outside of Jerusalem, to which reference is made. I call your attention to the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ, in exposition of this very expression, uses it in reference to the place, "Gehenna," and, I want to say to the Doctor, (and he knows it, very well; I don't know whether he will tell you so, or not); that "Gehenna," which is here translated "hell," is not used by any other person than the Savior, except once by Saint James, in the New Testament. In every instance, where it is used by the Savior, it was intended by him, and understood by the people, to have reference to the place of final and everlasting punishment of the wicked. Now, the Doctor knows that, as he knows a good many other things that he does not tell you, about the meaning of these terms. But I admit that the *figure* that is used, has reference to Hinnom. I admit that the word "Gehenna," means Hinnom; the very place that he will tell you about. That valley had come to be so obnoxious, so terrible, so low in the estimation of the Jewish people, that it came to be a synonym for hell itself. Just as we use that word "crookedness," in these times, for stealing or fraud, or anything of that kind; and "bulldozing" is a synonym for attempting to override or "beat" somebody in some improper way. These terms give an intensity of meaning that cannot be expressed in any other way. There was additional force in this word "Gehenna," in the minds of those people, over and above what any such word could have in our minds.

I will just notice in passing, this citation which the Doctor gave us, upon the subject of "punishment." I do not allude, now, to his citations in the case of Adam and in the cases of those "Antediluvian sinners," whom he did n't take to heaven, although God would never punish anybody without giving them warning in advance. He did not send them to hell, or dare to take them to heaven, on his own logic. I refer to his citation concerning Sodom and Gomorrah, and to the lamentation made by Jeremiah, to the effect that the punishment that his people suffered was greater than the punishment that Sodom and Gomorrah suffered.

Now, all I need to say in reply, is simply this:--If it were true, as he affirms, that this punishment was all over long ago; if that were true, it would avail nothing for his argument, because the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the punishment of Israel, were national punishments, inflicted for national crimes. Such punishments must, in the very nature of the case, be inflicted in time; for, as such, nations do not go into eternity, and do not very often last through long periods of time. That is the reason why, and such is the punishment alluded to by the prophet. I would have the Doctor to understand that the punishment of individual sins; the punishment of the *inhabitants* of Sodom and Gomorrah, has not come to pass yet, unless there has a day of judgment come to pass, like this "final resurrection" of the Doctor's, which we have not been able to discover as yet, nor he, either. Jesus said, on a certain occasion:—"It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city." So, if he *has* punished them before the day of judgment, he is going to give them another round after the day of judgment.

It takes them a long time to get through, considering their limited light, if the Doctor is correct in saying that their punishment began before Jeremiah prophesied; unless their "reformatory hell" is a more comfortable place to wait in, than we have any evidence of in the Bible. Now, I want to call attention to another expression of the Doctor. He wanted me to write down that citation about Sodom. I did so, and have answered his argument. I want the Doctor to now make good *his* declaration. He said, last night, "God says he purposes to save all mankind." I wrote down his words, and I ask again *where* he *says* he "purposes to save all mankind?" That would be "light," right upon his point, and the dear Lord knows he needs light on that particular point, and he ought to give you all he can spare on that point. *Where* does God *say* he purposes to save all mankind? Do not let him dodge out with some other word as he dodged on the "unquenchable fire." Because *I* did not use the phrase, "unquenchable fire," at all, he found it convenient to use it for me, and then annihilate it! and he proceeded to play upon the missionary work and to sneer at the missionary work. To sneer at

the cause whereby millions were enlightened and saved, is to sneer at the commission that Christ gave to his disciples; Matt. xxviii: 19-20. I discover now why the Universalists are not more in favor of missions. The Apostle Paul did this work, and the Doctor sneers at the best man this world ever knew, when he ridicules missionaries. In reference to the heathen—to the work of sending missionaries to the heathen:—There are millions of good heathen worshiping in ignorance, and bad heathen worshiping in darkness, and we are to come to them and say, as Paul said to the Athenians who had erected an altar *to the unknown God*:—"Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you." Acts, xvii: 23. Surely the heathen need to become enlightened in their worship, because you know that the heathen used to use "vain *repetitions*" in their prayers; that is, say the same thing over and over, unless they are enlightened on this point. It is possible that they do this in order to have a portion of their prayers "date back to cover accidents."

Now, I want to ask you, if the women who, in obedience to the requirements of their religion, cast their infants to the crocodiles, or used to do so until the British government interfered; if, while feeling out in the dark after God, that mother, who loves her child as fondly as you love yours, will thus sacrifice the treasure of her heart, how should she sacrifice her means, labor and time, were she properly enlightened, for the promotion of the work of Christ? And that is the reason why we go to give them Gospel light and Christian civilization. Why, they will put to shame the devotion of many church members in this civilized land! There is danger of their having done it already, for people who can flippantly ridicule missionary enterprises.

The Doctor was in a great hurry to go at the "Greek root"-ing business, last night, and omitted some of the points I made. I suppose I understand the reason. It is the old saying, you know:—"Root, H————H————Hanson, or die." And I want to do like the folks do out on these prairies—put a ring in the nose, when there is danger of the "rooting" business being run too fast or too far. And the "ring" that I want to put in his ecclesiastic nose is, that he be careful with his attempts to dispel the force of *aionion*, and all similar terms. While he is trying to "root" up hell, that

he be careful that he does not root up *heaven* as well; that when he roots up everlasting *punishment*, he does not root out the "everlasting" God.

I want him to be careful while he is engaged in this "rooting." He will delve among these Greek roots and give us what he has written on "*Aion*;" he will befog the minds of the people, and do harm, although I do not intend he shall do very much of it, except as I shall endavor to *undo* it, by talking in the dialect that you were born in,—as clearly as I can do so. I will say to the Doctor it is not because I don't understand the dialect that he uses, for I think I can convince him if he wants me to.

Aion is equivalent to the Hebrew *olam*, which means, in the Septuagint, *eternal*, (the root of the word in dispute is "*aion.*")—and its Latin synonym is *semper*, everlasting. These words are synonymous,—they all mean the same thing:—*olam*, Hebrew, *aion*, Greek, *semper*, Latin, and *everlasting*, English.

Thus according to Aristotle,—and the Doctor doesn't want any higher authority than Aristotle,—"The word *aion* is composed of *ai*, *always*, and *on*, *being*. The critical meaning of the word is:—*always being*, *always existing*;—still running *on*, but never running *out.*"

Now, the Doctor said he had some seventy authorities he could present on this subject, and cited a number of them.

The majority of those he quoted made the word to mean,—among its *earliest* meanings—"*always*, *everlasting.*" His own authorities declare that to be the case. But, for that matter, I will say to him, that for every good authority he can bring who will declare that *aion*, or any of its derivatives, means anything less than what we are accustomed to attribute to it in our ordinary understanding of the Bible, I will bring *two* equally good authorities affirming that *everlasting*, *eternal*, and *without end*, are its primary meanings. I'll bring these in *addition* to more than two score of the most eminent men of this day, who have given their views of the scholarship of the period in which the translation was made.

The Doctor said, last night, that I did not place any arguments before him, and that he "hadn't anything to kick against,"—that it was "very hard to kick at *nothing.*"

"Placed no arguments before him!" I confess to an oversight. I forgot that man was the only kind of being that could "kick" *before him.* I did not place the arguments in the position that is most convenient for some animals to kick at. So, if he finds it necessary to turn his back to the audience in order to "kick" at my arguments hereafter, you must excuse him.

Where was my argument in regard to the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost? Now, I want him to "kick" at *that.* And this declaration of Christ in Matthew xiii — this whole parable where he declares the tares to be children of the wicked one, and that they will be burned up.

And I'll call his attention to the tenth chapter of Matthew, twenty-eighth verse, where Christ tells his disciples that they shall not fear them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul, but fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell—this "everlasting" hell.

And I will direct the attention of the Doctor to the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, and the whole parable of the "sheep and the goats," particularly the declarations that are made at the conclusion of that chapter, concerning which he has been firing off his amunition a little in advance:—

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."

Then, I want him to be careful and not again overlook the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and direct his attention to Phil. iii: 18-19:—"Whose end is destruction." Your "final resurrection and happiness" must come *after* this "end"—*that* is the point I would have you remember.

I will direct your attention to Thess. ii, where the Apostle says, beginning with the 7th verse:

"For the mystery of iniquity doth already work, * * * and then shall that wicked be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming."

Then I want to direct your attention and the attention of the Doctor to Rev. xiv: 9–10:

"And the third angel followed them saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast with his image and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture

into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb."

I present these passages of Scripture to the Doctor, hoping that he will not, with all his anxiety to befog you concerning the plain meaning of the word of Christ,—the plain meaning of the Bible as you have always understood it,—in reference to "endless" and "everlasting punishment,"—fail to define the "forever and forever" that is spoken of here.

While he is endeavoring to do this with his extraordinary profundity on the subject of *aion*, *aionios*, etc., I would have him remember that he himself has affirmed that the Lord Jesus Christ "ought to make this matter *plain*." It ought to have been written everywhere, and especially in the word, not only from the beginning of the Christian era, but back, back through the ages before; back to the time where he dodged the prophesy of Isaiah; back to Daniel, where he repeats, in spite of all I can say to him, that the resurrection "to shame and everlasting contempt," that Daniel speaks of occurred before that generation died, who lived at the time that Jesus was speaking.

I have told him, and you have heard me tell him, that there is another paragraph relating to the "abomination of desolation." He knows it as well as he knows that he is in the Methodist church at West Side, Ia., to-night; and along to the very last, the same thing is repeated. According to his logic, the whole Christian world is in darkness upon this great question, up to this very moment. [Time.]

MR. HANSON'S THIRD REPLY.

MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I do not suppose there is a person here, not one of these children on the front seat, who mistakes the last part of my friend's speech for argument. He refers me to passages of Scripture, which I know are there as well as he does, without once taking the trouble to read them.

and asks me to give an exposition of a large number of passages of Scripture that I could scarcely recite in the whole evening! There is hardly time for me to read the words. He surely does not think that passes for argument, or is anything that I am called upon to answer. There is not a man, woman or child here who does not see the absurdity of the idea. I told you I would answer every *argument.* I can not stop to give an exposition of the parable of the sheep and goats from our point of view, or of the many passages he has referred to. Why should he bring such absurd propositions before intelligent men and women? I am afraid it is something like his "*argumentum ad absurdum;*" like most "arguments," of his, in fact,—the *absurdum* is very apparent, but you must wait a good while before you find the *argumentum.*

He asks me to give you an exposition of a passage in Daniel, but I shall do nothing of the sort. I have shown you already that the "everlasting shame and contempt" is a thing of the past, and to ask me to go into that exposition and take up my time in that way, though a shrewd trick on his part, will not avail. You yourselves see the absurdity of my undertaking to explain forty or fifty passages of Scripture unless the debate should be prolonged beyond what he is willing to continue it.

He appeals to the word hell now, as to the origin of the word *Gehenna.* I agree with him, and all Christians agree with him. The word Gehenna is the Greek name of a place, which was in Hebrew the valley of Hinnom, a valley just outside of Jerusalem. We are agreed upon that, and that it came to be in process of time a symbol of severe punishment, just as he said the word *bull-dozing* is used at present. I agree with him; but it is for him to prove that Gehenna means or ever meant *endless* punishment. I will here, however, prove a negative. I will prove that it does not mean *endless*, on the authority of Jewish writers and scholars themselves. I have before me selections from Jewish authors showing just what the word *Gehenna* meant at the time of Christ. One Jewish rabbi says:—"The Jews do not teach endless retributive suffering." Dr. Deutsch declares "There is not a word in the Talmud (which is the only authority in existence, giving the meaning of the word at the time of Christ), that lends support to the damnable dogma of endless

torment." Dr. Dewes, in his "Plea for Rational Translation" says, that "Gehenna" is alluded to four or five times in the Mishna thus:—"The judgment of Gehenna is for twelve months. Gehenna is a day in which the impious shall be burnt." Bartolocci says that "the Jews did not believe in material fire, and thought that such fire as they did believe in would one day be put out." Rabbi Akiba said:—"The duration of the punishment of the wicked in Gehenna is twelve months." Some rabbis said Gehenna only lasted from Passover to Pentecost. A passage in Othoth, attributed to Rabbi Akiba, declares "that Gabriel and Michael will open the forty thousand gates of Gehenna and set free the damned." And in Emek Hammelech we read:—"The wicked stay in Gehenna till the resurrection, and then the Messiah passing through it redeems them."

Now, why does he stand here, if he knows these facts, and say that Gehenna meant endless punishment? The Savior must have used Gehenna as the Jews did, as an emblem of suffering, and all then unanimously considered Gehenna a place of *limited* suffering. If he has the evidence to show that it means a place of endless punishment, let him bring forward his passages. What is the unavoidable effect upon your minds, after hearing these quotations from Jewish literature, showing how the word was understeod at the time of Christ? The Jews of course, used the word exactly as it is used in the Old Testament, that is, denoting limited suffering. Now, it is for him to prove that it subsequently meant endless, and thus had a construction that the Jews did not give it, and when he does that,—which he cannot do,—he gains his case. Where is the evidence that Christ gave to Gehenna a meaning entirely different from that which it had with his hearers? In giving these accounts of how Gehenna was understood at the time of Christ, I have been reading from Canon Farrar's recent work, "Eternal Hope," in which he recites these and a great many other Jewish authorities, that Gehenna always denoted a place of limited suffering. That is all the attention Gehenna requires.

He asks me to do another thing, and there is also a trick in that. He wants a single passage that declares the purpose of God to save all mankind. I have already given several, and I

have also given you proof that the purpose of God will be accomplished, and I do not really want to do it again, as it will take my time; but I do not want him to go away and say I did not answer his request, and so I refer him to the first chapter of the letter of Paul to the Ephesians, 9–11:

"Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which *he hath purposed in himself*: that in the dispensation of the fullness of times *he might gather together in one, all things* IN CHRIST, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him. In whom also we have obtained an inheritance being predestinated *according to the purpose of him who* WORKETH ALL THINGS AFTER THE COUNSEL OF HIS OWN WILL."

It is the purpose of God to gather together all things in one. We (the apostles), already have been gathered, and the fact that God's purpose has been accomplished in us, assures us that the whole purpose will finally be accomplished. I have said all that before, and I do not know but he will want me to repeat it. I shall not, however, accommodate him again.

He says I have sneered at missions. I have sneered only at the absurdity of his position; I have sneered at the folly of sending missionaries among people whose salvation is secure without hearing of Christ and who are damned by hearing of him—the absurdity of making known Christ when whoever rejects him, is sure of damnation as the price of the knowledge. I say he had better burn every dollar that he would give to that work, sink every ship that starts for Africa or Asia, and let every missionary be drowned, rather than that the Gospel shall be made known to the heathen, whose salvation is secure without it, according to his views, and who are sure of damnation in consequence of sending the Gospel to them. I am sneering at the inconsistency of men who will be guilty of such folly. But he tells us that in the East the poor mother casts her child to the crocodile. Had not she better cast her babe to the crocodile and let the monster eat its body, and let its little soul go up to heaven, than send a missionary to the child to tell it about Christ, and thus damn its soul forever? Give me crocodiles every time!

In his exposition of the words *olam* and *aion*, there was one little touch of originality in giving the etymology of the terms. He cannot produce one authority on the face of the earth that the

Hebrew word *olam* means *endless*. I defy him to produce a single Hebrew lexicon, commentator or writer that will give any such definition of the Hebrew *olam*. The exact meaning of it is to *cover* or to *conceal*; this is the only meaning ever given. It literally means *hidden, unknown, indefinite.*

Now, I have not said very much about Greek and Hebrew. He accuses me of going into this and seems to think it is deep water, but it is not because it is deep, but because he has made it muddy that he cannot see bottom. His floundering makes it muddy, so he gets out of sight in very shallow water.

The blasphemy of the Holy Ghost. I will give a very brief exposition. I went to him at the close of the meeting last night, telling him that I had inadvertently overlooked this subject in my notes, but would refer to it this evening; and you observe he was very particular to call my attention to it again, as though I had intentionally omitted it; but this has been his style all through the discussion. The blasphemy of the Holy Ghost, instead of being against the doctrine of Universalism, is most harmonious with it. What he thinks is against us is perfectly satisfactory to us. In reference to that passage there is something that he does not seem to take into account. He told you last evening that only those persons should be damned who had had the offer of Christ and rejected that offer. I offset his declaration with this language:—"*All manner of sin* (*all* sin) SHALL BE FORGIVEN unto men, and all manner of blasphemy wherewith they blaspheme."

If this language be taken literally, then the theory he has laid down here, that by rejecting Christ the soul becomes lost, is false, for this declares that *all sins shall be forgiven*, except the sin against the Holy Ghost. This sin consisted in saying that Christ's wonderful acts were performed by the devil; and all sins, except calling Christ's acts works of the devil, *shall be forgiven.* That is, drunkards, profane swearers, every sinner of every kind and every grade whatever *shall be forgiven*, all except those who say the works of Jesus were done by the devil.

Now, he does not believe that you must take *this* literally. Very well, if you don't take it literally, how shall you take it? The idea is that the sins of man are comparatively light and small compared to the one sin of ascribing the works of Jesus to the

power of the devil. But if the first part of the passage is not literal, then this word *never* is not literal. These terms are all used figuratively. It shall never be forgiven, that is, with greater difficulty than any other sin. Let me show you how the word *never* is used in the Bible. I call your attention to Leviticus vi: 12–13:

"And the fire upon the altar shall be burning in it; it shall not be put out, and the priest shall burn wood on it every morning, and lay the burnt offering in order upon it; and he shall burn thereon the fat of the peace offerings. *The fire shall ever be burning and it shall never go out.*"

But that fire has been out eighteen hundred years. We have another passage in II. Sam. xii: 10:

"Now, therefore, the sword shall *never* depart from thine house."

The sword should *never* depart from the house of David. This word *never* is habitually used in this way as a strong expression, not to be taken literally. In this passage the never is not more literal than the first part of the sentence—shall not be forgiven in this world or in the world to come. This expression, as it reads in the Scriptures, is a very strong one, not to be literally taken.

Having shown how the word *never* is applied, I will speak of this language " in this world or in the world to come."

I have here before me the words of Dr. Adam Clarke, from whom I have quoted so many times. Giving the translation of the phrase in Hebrew rendered "world to come," he says, that "*world* should be *age*. This world and the world to come mean the Jewish *age*, and the *age* to come." That is literally the meaning of the word *aion* in Greek; the Greek word meaning world is *kosmos*. The phraseology should be " *this age* and the *age to come*," that being, says the Doctor, the common language of the Jews in the Savior's time,—"the *reign* of Moses and the *age* of Messiah."

And then what is the whole meaning of this passage concerning the man who ascribes the works of Jesus Christ to the devil? That this sin is a less forgivable sin than any other. But there is a passage of Scripture to which I wish to call my friend's attention, which proves that this language cannot be taken literally:

" The blood of Christ cleanseth from *all* sin."

Does my brother believe that passage? If he does not, he does not believe in the sheet anchor of the Methodist church, in the great text of the camp meeting, the main stay of the Methodist circuit rider. Wherever he preaches, whether in the remote outposts or in the metropolitan pulpit, he always insists that the blood of Christ cleanseth from *all* sin. If this be true, then it can not be true that the blasphemy of the Holy Ghost shall *never* be forgiven. It is an intense expression not to be taken literally; if it were, it would destroy the force of the strongest passages to be found in the Bible relating to the divine forgiveness of human sin.

Another point:—I want to show that Hades, one of the words rendered hell, whenever it is spoken of in the New Testament, does not imply endless duration. This is the term employed in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, and I want to show you that this is a place of limited punishment. It is recorded in several passages that Hades is to be destroyed. First, it is to deliver up its dead, and then to be destroyed. Hades will deliver up its dead. My opponent got some one into hell and wanted me to get him out. How is he going to get him back into hell after he is once delivered from it, and the place itself destroyed?

Hosea xiii: 14: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave, (Hades) I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, (Hades) I will be thy destruction." I. Corinthians, xv: 55:—"O death, where is thy sting? O grave (Hades) where is thy victory?"

Hades is to be destroyed, and deliver up its dead. But I have another authority here, which I am very glad to be able to present in this connection, concerning the hell into which Lazarus was cast. Just before coming away from home, I received a package in which was this little book, "The New Testament Idea of Hell," written by this gentleman's own Bishop Merrill, one of the finest scholars in his church, and a man whose statements, on a matter of fact, I will not question. In regard to Hades, the hell into which Lazarus was cast, in this "New Testament Idea of Hell" the author says, "There is no disagreement among scholars." Possibly ordinary Methodist ministers may disagree. I forget what you call the circuit preacher,—the proper name—(circuit rider,—) well, never mind, one who occupies the

same position as my friend here. He (Merrill) says there is no disagreement among scholars as to its meaning. Its duration is limited. Bishop Merrill says of the hell of the rich man in the parable:—"Its duration is limited so far as humanity is concerned, to the period of this world's history, or to the time of the existence of souls in the disembodied state. In the resurrection it will give up its dead, and pass away, at least so far as we are concerned, therefore THE PUNISHMENT IN IT IS NOT FOREVER." Now, the gentleman talks about authority, and I want him to put this in his pipe and smoke it. Here he has the declaration of one who talks so familiarly about the regions of the damned, that one would almost think he had a telephone connected with the place. We may believe that some of those who hold my opponent's belief, are approaching the kingdom, when this fine and candid scholar gives this opinion.

Now, I have shown you that hell, when translated from Gehenna, is a place of limited punishment. I have also shown and been corroborated by this scholar, that Hades is a place of limited duration, and these are the only words translated hell, except in one place where the word Tartarus occurs, and as Tartarus is a department of Hades, it goes into the lake of fire with it. He wishes me to give an exposition of all the passages he has quoted, but I cannot accommodate him in the short time I have here. I have invited him to discuss the matter when we can have a week or two to devote to it, and in that case, will try to give a full exposition of these points. I have given all that need be said concerning hell in the New Testament, and now I will allude to a remark,—[Time.]

MR. LOZIER'S FOURTH SPEECH.

MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I will take a little of your time just at the beginning, to refer to an item in the matter of "authorities," speaking in reference to the Hebrew word *olam*, and the Greek *aionios*, and the Latin *semper*. I said these were

terms that in their signification were synonymous. I did not say the *primitive* form of the word, but I meant the word with its various forms as used in Scripture.

I have not denied that Hades was a place of, in a sense, temporary imprisonment,—I'll take back the term imprisonment,—a place of temporary location of the departed of this earth. It is a generic term, and comprehends both the abode of the good and of the bad after their departure from this life.

It is a place which comprehends within its territory (if I may use that phrase) both the "Elysium" and the "Tartarus" of the ancients,—two phrases that were anciently used in reference to the place of happiness and the place of punishment, and the character of the punishment or happiness of the inhabitants of that region was determined by their conduct here, and their relationship to Christ on their departure from this world. That character (and the Doctor does not deny that, of course), determines the nature not only of the relationship in this intermediate world, comprehended by the term Hades, but it determines that relationship *beyond* this intermediate world. It is "a half-way place," if you choose so to call it,—the half way place where they meet on the road to the everlasting happiness of the saints and the everlasting punishment of the sinners.

Now, Dr. Hanson has read you Bishop Merrill on the duration of that "Hades." Dr. Merrill expresses just the same idea that I have expressed already, upon which I make no quibble, and have not entertained any diverse thought. As Dr. Hanson has quoted Bishop Merrill on the duration of Hades, we will hear him in another matter:

"Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."—Matt. xxv: 43.

Here is what the Doctor has been "rooting" over for the last half hour. Bishop Merrill thus comments:

"We think that there can be no doubt that this 'everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels,' is the same and means the same as the 'everlasting fire' and the '*Gehenna fire*,' in the passages above."—New Testament Idea of Hell, p. 230.

Now, the "Gehenna fire" that he speaks of in the passages above is the fire that "*shall never be quenched*," and to which Christ added the significant allusion to the valley of Hinnom,—

"where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." That is, he says that Christ, when he spoke about the worm that dieth not and the fire that is not quenched, spoke about *this* "everlasting fire," the same "everlasting fire" that the Doctor has been trying to put out with his "*aion.*" So Bishop Merrill's "sauce" for the poultry is good on both sides!

In reference to all this newly discovered authority that he has given us, let me call your attention to the fact that the authority—the rabbis that he bases his proof upon that "Gehenna did not mean everlasting fire,"—these authorities are *Jews*, who have not happened to be very friendly to the Lord Jesus Christ ever since about the time of that transaction on Calvary, and before it for a while, and if you can not bring any other testimony than that of his crucifiers and vilifiers, and of those who would do it again, you have a pretty bad case on your hands, in my judgment.

He goes on "eternally" quoting these "authorities." After quoting that it was the valley of Hinnom, and it was not a place of eternal punishment, but a place of six months or a year, he cites another authority showing that all this *is to come* yet, when the "forty thousand gates of Gehenna will be opened, and everything will be purged," and all that sort of thing!

My dear brother, you must make your quotations *agree*, or you are going to have trouble with them the next thing you know. Here is some more "authority" that is about as good for him as Bishop Merrill is for Bro. Lozier.

I quote from T. B. Thayer, who is one of the most thorough and best recognized divinity authorities of the school that my brother belongs to. He says:

"It was the popular doctrine of the day in the time of the Savior—that doctrine of everlasting punishment."

"*Endless* punishment" is the term he uses. It was the popular doctrine in that day and he asserts that "Christ maintained and urged it," and that is stranger still.

Perhaps we may as well here have Dr. Clark, as he is good authority with Brother Hanson. It may give him a little help in the case of his friend Judas:

"Woe unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed.

It had been good for that man if he had not been born."—Matt. xxvi: 24.

"Can this be said of any sinner in the common sense in which it is understood if there be any redemption from hell's torments? If a sinner should suffer millions and millions of years in them and get out at last to the enjoyment of heaven, then it was well for him that he had been born, for still he has an *eternity of blessedness before him.* It would have been well for that man if he had never been born! Then he must be in a state of conscious existence, as non-existence is said to be better than that state in which he is now found."

That is Clark. That is the best lift he gives you on Judas, and if that don't help you save him, I guess he is *in.* He turns again and declares that " ninety-nine hundredths of the heathen are to perish if the Gospel is taken to them," and he is the man who declares that the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ is the power of God unto universal salvation, and yet it is going to bring about the damnation of ninety-nine hundredths of them! He would take his child and throw it to the crocodile rather than take the chances of that salvation which I believe in. I will say to you, dear friends, one and all, that instead of throwing your children to the crocodile, or shutting them up in cloisters, you would better train up your children " in the way they should go," and God stands pledged that they shall be saved. They may wander far away, but I affirm on authority of God's own covenant, if you train your children in the way they should go, God will see to it that they are saved, and you will see them in heaven. And if you don't do this, it is not to be wondered at that God takes them away into heaven in their infancy. It is not strange that they are taken away from the evil certain to come to them. I suggest to the Doctor to try this with his children in preference to " immersing " them.

In reference to the teaching of Christ about all sins being forgiven, except sins against the Holy Ghost, the Doctor says:— " If we take it literally, all sins are to be forgiven except this one sin." Now, we hold that all sins *are* "to be forgiven" through repentance and Godly sorrow for sin. That is orthodox doctrine, and by that we stand,—we stand or fall. We believe all sins will be forgiven by the appliances of the Gospel, where they turn to God and seek his loving favor.

The Doctor admits that sin against the Holy Ghost is certainly

involved in a good deal of doubt, to say the least. Christ announces possible forgiveness for every sin but that. Taking the language of the Savior at its probable meaning, that sin shall not be forgiven.

"But when the Pharisees heard it they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils."—Matt. xii: 24.

Much as if they said, "This spirit in him is that of the prince of devils." Christ clearly intended to teach that such contempt of the Holy Ghost is blasphemy that shall not be forgiven, either in this world or the world to come. That means forever and forever. So the Doctor has got his foot in it again. He has let these Pharisees, who thus sinned, fall into hell when they said that thing.

I cited passages of the Scripture to the Doctor last night in reference to the impossibility of those being forgiven who, having been made partakers of the Holy Ghost apostatize and utterly fall away. [Heb. vi: 4–6.] It is impossible because they have grieved the Holy Spirit by speaking against him. Impossible because they have despised the blood of Jesus Christ, and crucified the Son of God afresh. It is impossible because God will not save men without the interposition of the Holy Ghost, through our Lord Jesus Christ. And this class has sinned against the Holy Ghost and defied both of these persons in the Trinity. The Doctor says the "blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sins." Amen to that! That is the doctrine of the Methodists. Christ's *heirs* to that blood will be cleansed by it, but not those who despised Jesus Christ and the "blood that bought them." Where Christ is intelligently presented, if they do not repent and find forgiveness in Christ, then forgiveness can not come and the blood can not cleanse. Such is the end of these people who sinned against the Holy Ghost. Now, Doctor, you take care of your Pharisees, who slipped into hell under that head, if you please.

The Doctor says that he wants me to explain a difficulty in reference to this last citation, which I made about the "smoke of their torment ascending up forever." Revelation, xiv: 11. He cites the context:

"The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which

is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation, and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels. And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever and they have no rest day or night."

He wants me to help my suffering people out here a little; says it will be harder for me to get these people back into hell than it would be for him to get his people out, whom, he says, I put into hell,—his grief stricken Judas and those unfortunate Pharisees. I will just read the description of the great white throne and the last judgment, in Rev. xx: 13–15:

"And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them, and they were judged every man according to their works. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire."

That sets them back into hell again, and there the curtain falls upon them forever.

I now want to review, just as hurriedly as I can, some of the fallacies, and to show you the dilemma in which the Doctor has placed himself during this discussion.

In the first place, he has admitted that man is in sin,—and he is in sin either *by* God's will or *against* God's will. And I wish the Doctor would just take one of the horns of this dilemma. They point in opposite directions, and we cannot find the truth by looking *both* ways. He says "man has always been free," and yet he is in sin *by* God's will, if God's will is what brought him into sin. What then becomes of the Doctor's declaration that "man is free now and forever?"

Then again, if he is in sin *against* God's will, what becomes of the Doctor's other declaration that "the will of God is omnipotent?"

Now, I want to say to the Doctor, he may take either horn of the dilemma and it will pierce him just like "the sword of the spirit which is the word of God," which has pierced him, and is piercing him through and through. If the "will" of God *necessitates* human action, then there *is* no sin, and no sinner, for he is only God's "tool" in the matter. *God* is the sinner, and God is the *only* sinner in the universe, or rather the only sinner that *could* be, were sin *possible*. And if man is in sin *against* God's will, then, Doctor, how are you going to "restore" him? Is man the

sinner a kind of a "colt" that has got loose from God accidentally? Is he like a frisky, *unreasoning* colt? And is God chasing around after him, but *unable* to catch him, with all his omnipotence? And is hell some kind of a place where he is going to "corral" the sinner and halter him up by and by? And after he *has* fastened him, why can't he get away *again*, if he is going to contravene God's will in that way? Let us take a *reasonable* view of this "omnipotent will" that the Doctor is talking about. God "willed" to make man *free*. He "willed" to give man a *probation* in this life, just as he gave the angels a probation, from which the devil and some of his angels fell.

God shows and sets before him "good and evil,"—the Doctor admits it in the case of Adam in the garden of Eden. God shows his *love* by the precepts he affords to man, and by his promises,—by providing for him salvation through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; by the agency of the holy spirit which God has sent forth to bless man through this life; by warnings as well as by precepts and by entreaties, and everything that God can do with a free agent, everything he can do except by *compulsion*. God says to man, "take your course and take the consequences." He sets the choice before all, as you know it is before *you* to-night. *You* are free; take *your* course, and take the consequences. *Life* molds the character of your future destiny. Death *cools the molds!* The tree falls; and "if the tree fall toward the south or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth there it shall be." [Ecl. xi: 3.] Man's probation ends when he passes from this life. The Doctor will say:—"Then man's *freedom* ends—the very thing I have been contending for." Not so; I am here to say in reference to the future of the soul, while it is naturally possible for the glorified saints to fall from their blessed estate, it is *morally* impossible that they should do it.

And this is the very thing we are coming to. In this life we have the Gospel, which "is a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death." We go through this life, and at the end of it our reception or rejection of the Gospel will have brought about a condition of things which *fixes* this possibility of falling or being reclaimed, either. And yet this is compatible with free

will. For though it is *morally impossible* to fall, it is *naturally possible.*

I will illustrate my meaning:—[pointing to a lady in the pew before him.] Here sits a mother with her little child lying asleep on her lap. Suppose that woman were to take a razor, and carefully feel the edge of it, and then deliberately draw that razor across the throat of her child and end its life. Do you imagine that a woman,—a mother, in her right mind,—would do any such a thing as that? Still, it is *naturally* possible for her to do that very thing, though very far from being morally possible for her to do it. Do you understand? It is *naturally possible*, yet *morally impossible.* She *can* do it, if she *will;* but we know she "can not will" to do it while in her right mind.

Now, the question is, *Will* man fall? Will he fall out of heaven when once in there? I answer, that there is a *moral impossibility* of man's falling, for the reason that there, in heaven, he is with God,—God manifest in Christ Jesus. He is with him, and the wounds on the Savior's hands are still there. He can look upon the very wounds that cost the Savior the suffering whereby he he was brought to glory. The victim of the cross is there before him, and Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob,—those who gave the early church the emblems of the sacrifice of Christ, in the period during which they were on the earth, are there with him also. Job is there, rejoicing that he did not yield to those "lusts of the flesh" that "went forth from the presence of the Lord," after they had tormented and afflicted him in the manner in which they did. David is there, still singing and rejoicing over the kingdom having been given to Christ for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession. They *have* "kissed the Son," and have been saved by him.

The Apostles will be there, who went out on missions, notwithstanding what the Doctor thinks about missionary enterprises. A vast multitude "of all nations, and kindred, and people, and ongues," are there "before the throne and before the Lamb." The infants who have died are all there,—that comprises more than half the race;—more than half die in infancy, as your bills of mortality will show. The good heathen are all there, and not "one in a hundred" of the heathen, as the Doctor would have you

understand will be the case under the Gospel. The idiots and imbeciles are all to be there, (let us take comfort, Doctor,) and then the *Christians* are all there, and they are legion. And if we start out with more than half the race saved in infancy as to moral accountability, the proportion of the lost, after all, in the infinite annals of eternity, will not be anything like what the Doctor would have you imagine.

Jesus Christ prepared the way for you, and people have been finding it. The way is being found, notwithstanding those who have diverted and are still trying to divert the attention of the people to another way unknown to this Bible. I'll leave *this* question simply adding, in reference to the saints falling in heaven, that it is *morally impossible*, surrounded as the glorified saints shall be by all those warnings against apostacy in the vision of the "prison house" of the devil and his angels and victims, as it shall be seen beyond the "gulf," which from analogy will doubtless extend beyond the judgment and on through eternity. It is morally impossible to fall in heaven. I make this argument now, for fear the Doctor may say I am robbing people of "free agency" after they go beyond this life. [Time.]

MR. HANSON'S FOURTH REPLY.

MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I am very much amused, indeed, at some of the features of my opponent's argument concerning the rich man and Lazarus. He says I contradict Christ because I say there will be freedom in the future world, and now he has affirmed the very thing I have been arguing. He says there will be *natural* freedom, and illustrates his idea of freedom by referring to this lady here in the front seat, saying she could, if she chose, do a certain thing. Then he went on to say that she could not do it. I agree that she cannot do it; she cannot do that which he so cruelly implies, for it is *naturally*, *humanly*, and every other way *impossible* for her; and yet, when he says it is possible,

he contradicts his own version of the rich man and Lazarus, for the record says that they *can not* go back and forth. I deny his application of the parable; but when, in his version, he says they cannot go back and forth, he knocks down his own theory of the freedom of the human will.

But how about this "gulf" that was "fixed" in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus? He has told you that he "knew all the time" that the gulf was temporal. So that he confesses that he tried to palm off an argument here that he knew was false! He says I may take either horn of a "dilemma" which he declares he has presented. I have carefully examined what he calls a dilemma, and tried to get hold of the "horns," but I find on examination that what he pretends to be horns, are nothing in the world but a pair of remarkably long ears!

My friend has given up his case entirely, by confessing that the Hebrew word *olam* is exactly equivalent to *aion*. I have shown that *olam* means *concealed, hidden, indefinite*—nothing more. I will not go to work to prove that *aion* and everlasting are limited, because he concedes they mean the same as *olam*, and all authorities agree that *olam* means nothing else, except what I have told you. I could cite fifty passages where *aionios* means limited duration; that is the usual meaning of the word, according to the authorities. At least six out of eight give the word the sense of limited duration; that is, "*a life,*" "*life-time,*" "*space of time,*" "*indefinite time,*" and once in a while *eternal* is given, but not an average of three out of ten times is eternal brought into the lexicon. It never means eternal or endless except when it *acquires* that meaning from the subject with which it is connected, as, for illustration, the character of God.

My brother has given up the rich man and Lazarus, but he will continue to use the parable, I have no doubt, time and again, to prove endless punishment. He agrees with Bishop Merrill, and admits that Hades is limited; therefore, the "fixed gulf" is not fixed, but is to pass away, so that his admission lets the rich man out.

He complained because I used Jewish authority to prove the meaning of Gehenna. Who else can tell us what the views of the Jews, contemporary with Christ, were? Nobody else is com-

petent to testify. It has been a disputed question as to how Gehenna was used at the time of Christ, until within a few years; but now Jewish literature has been exhumed, and we *now know that the Jews, to whom Jesus addressed the word, regqrded it as denoting a place or state of limited duration.* And about the lake of fire: what does that amount to? He does not find any word meaning endless, attached to it.

He cites Dr. Thayer to show that the Jews, at the time of Christ, believed in endless punishment. But, if he will consult the *Universalist Quarterly*, 1878, since these new authorities in Jewish literature have been found, he will find a statement which modifies that opinion, and which holds that the Jews never believed in the doctrine of endless punishment. Gehenna meant a place of limited punishment to the Jews to whom Christ spoke, and, of course, he used it as they understood it.

I will now proceed to point out some of the proofs of what I am endeavoring to establish. He has conceded my main position in this matter, that *olam* and *aionios* are identical. The meaning of these words, which are rendered everlasting, according to all the authorities, is not *endless* but *limited duration.* Now, where do the lexicons get their authority? Let me give you some of the passages of Scripture on which they found their definitions:—

Genesis, xiii: 15:—"For all the land that thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever." Exodus, xii: 17: "And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread; for in this selfsame day have I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt: therefore shall ye observe this day in your generations by an ordinance forever."

That forever has long since passed away. Then in Genesis xvii: 8:

"And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession."

Here *olam* and *aionios* are clearly limited.

A very important point is made, he thinks, when he refers to that verse in Matthew, where the same term is applied to punishment and to the happiness of the righteous:—"And these shall go away into *everlasting punishment*, but the righteous into *life eternal.*" Now he says the word *aionios* must mean the same in both places. Not at all. I will give him a parallel passage in Hab.

iii : 6:—"He stood and measured the earth; he beheld, and drove asunder the nations and the *everlasting mountains* were scattered; the perpetual hills did bow; *his ways are everlasting.*"

Here we have the same word used as in Matthew, in two different senses in the same sentence. Of course everlasting was used in a limited sense in reference to the mountains, for they were scattered, but the *ways* of God are unchangeable; and, hence, the word applied to God denotes unlimited duration. Apply his logic to this passage. If God's ways are eternal, then the mountains must be eternal, and if the mountains are temporary, then God's ways cannot be eternal. This is in harmony with Greek usage. Even in the same sentence the word has different meanings, according to the subject to which it is applied. Applied to God, it means endless; applied to man's affairs, it is limited. And then take the passage where Jonah says, when he came out of the fish:—"Earth and her bars was about me *forever.*"

Thus he says everlasting means endless, according to Webster. Everlasting is applied to punishment in the Bible, therefore it means, according to his logic, endless punishment. Let us apply his reasoning:

Everlasting, in the dictionary, means endless; it is applied to punishment, therefore the Bible teaches endless punishment, he says. The Bible says Jonah was in the whale's belly forever. "Earth with her everlasting bars was about me." Then Jonah will forever remain in the whale, on the authority of Webster and the Bible and the gentleman's logic. Is Jonah swimming around in the fish now, and will he swim on to eternity? Either that or the word does not mean everlasting. It strikes me that those horns of my brother look more than ever like ears.

Take another strong case. Webster says everlasting means endless. The Bible says the priesthood of Aaron and the Mosaic institutions will be *everlasting.* If this be true, then Christ is an impostor, Christianity is a delusion, and, on the gentleman's logic he has no business to be a Christian minister. The gentleman makes himself a Jew, and he might make himself a Hottentot by such logical processes as these. It is the easiest thing in the world.

I will not dwell longer on the Old Testament, but will quote some passages from the New, teaching the same idea. For instance, there are many places where the kingdom of Christ is called *aionios*, or everlasting, and yet Christ delivers up his kingdom unto God the Father, that "God may be all in all." Christ's kingdom is temporary though "everlasting," and in that passage which is so often quoted, where the apostle says a "far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory;" the word eternal cannot mean endless, because the glory EXCEEDS *aionios*. The word *aionios* does not usually mean endless duration. And so it can not be understood thus in this passage,—Matt. xxv: 46.

I am conscious that these, my last words, are too brief, and I hasten to say that *the Christian fathers, immediately after Christ, used this expression, everlasting fire.* Origen, a Universalist, used the terms, "everlasting fire," "everlasting punishment." Some of the Christian fathers repeatedly used the words everlasting punishment to express their ideas of future punishment, and yet they believed in universal salvation. Origen taught that the wicked will be punished with everlasting fire, but he taught that the fire is of a purifying character, and will end with the reformation of the punished. Those right after the time of Christ who believed in universal salvation, and in the annihilation of the wicked, used everlasting and applied it to punishment, showing that the meaning of the word at that time was not endless duration.

I desire here to adduce proof that the word denotes limited duration, because of the meaning of the word punishment with which it is connected. The word *punishment* in Matt. xxv: 46, is rendered from the Greek word *kolasin*, meaning chastisement, and therefore it demonstrates that the passage "these shall go away into everlasting punishment," means that those thus sentenced will be purified, corrected, chastened, improved.

The Greek word *kolasin* rendered punishment is defined by Greenfield to mean *chastisement, punishment,* trimming of the luxuriant branches of a tree to make it fruitful. Donnegan says it means clipping, pruning, restriction, restraint, reproof, check, chastisement. Liddel, "pruning, checking, punishment, chastisement, correction." Max Müller, the greatest of linguists, says:—"Do we want to know what was uppermost in the minds of those

who formed the word for punishment? The Latin *pœna* or *punio*, to punish, means to cleanse, purify; not mere striking or torture; but cleansing, correcting, delivering from the stain of sin." And the Greeks thus understood *kolasin.* Plato uses the same word which is rendered punishment in Matt. xxv: 46, (Protag, Sec. 38., Vol. I., page 252,) in addressing Socrates:

"For if, O Socrates, you will consider what is the design of punishing (*kolazein*) the wicked, this of itself will show you that men think virtue something that may be acquired, for no one punishes (*kolazein*) the wicked, looking to the past only, simply for the wrong he has done, that is, no one does this thing who does not act like a wild beast desiring only revenge without thought; hence he who seeks to punish (*kolazein*) with reason, does not punish for the sake of the past wrong deed but for the sake of the future, that neither the man himself may do wrong again, nor any other who has seen him chastised."

Now, here is the very word found in Matt. xxv: 46:—"Go away into everlasting punishment" (*kolazein*). Thus I have shown by an overwhelming weight of testimony that the word means limited duration. The Christian fathers who were Universalists and who wrote in Greek used precisely the same terms that Jesus uses in Matt. xxv: 46, showing that the word translated *punishment* in the Greek meant to correct, chastise, to improve. These shall go away into long continued correction, chastisement, improvement, is the exact meaning of the verse; that is, God will do with the wicked just exactly as you would do—punish them for their good; for love could not dictate any other form of punishment. My opponent admits that Hades is a limited place of punishment. He confessed it, for I extorted it from his lips. I have shown that Gehenna means a place of limited punishment. I have shown you that the word *punishment* means correction or chastisement, and must, therefore, be limited, and nothing further need be said upon that point. These positions cover and refute all his assumptions.

The great array of testimony I have given of the pleasure, purpose, promise and oath of God declared in a multitude of instances, to save all mankind, harmonizes perfectly with the threatenings of the Bible, as I have explained them. These threatenings harmonize on my theory, but if his idea of the character of God be correct they never can be reconciled. Look at the char-

acter he gave of God, a God who is going to laugh over the torments of men! If his view be correct, a Sioux Indian dancing around his shrieking captive would be his fittest emblem. If this be the kind of God they worship in Sioux City, we had better send the missionary there rather than to foreign lands, for you may ransack the annals of Paganism and you won't find a God to be compared with this, any more than a speck of dust could be compared with Chimborazo.

I will devote the rest of my time to noticing a few of the points my friend made in his last speech.

He read a quotation showing that Bishop Merrill's views as to the future were in conflict with my views. Merrill gave the *fact* in reference to Hades, but *he* gives Merrill's opinions in regard to the lake of fire. So with Dr. Clark. Dr. Clark gives reasons for the statement I made. His facts are valuable; his testimony as to a matter of fact is entitled to great weight; but his *opinions* are to be weighed, like any man's opinions, and taken for what they are worth. Bishop Merrill's facts are valuable. His opinions are worth—what they are worth. I have given him something he will have to swallow,—that Bishop Merrill proves that Hades is a place of limited punishment. This "gives away" the popular construction of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. I do not care about the opinions of Merrill on the lake of fire. I have no interest in them.

Another remark of his:—He says that God's will is not done now, and wants to know how I know it ever will be, inasmuch as the sin of man is contrary to the will of God. I have explained over and over that man is free, and he wants to know how it is that God can be triumphant hereafter, if man is not doing God's will now. I take God at his word. When he threatens I interpret those threatenings by the character of the divine love. When he tells me of that great purpose of his, for which he created man, for which he endowed him in his own image—that he has willed that all his children shall come unto himself—I take him at his word, and believe that what he says is true. What is the will of God in reference to man? His will is seen only in man's final and perfect condition, and not in man's present condition. We contemplate a building in process of erection. It is surrounded

by brick, mortar, rubbish, etc. You come and ask what is going on. "I am building a house," is the reply. "What kind of a house?" "Oh, a handsome building." "Why don't you have it now? It is your will to make a building, you say. If it is your will to have it, why don't you have it now?" It is the will of the architect to build, and the plan of the architect is seen in the complete edifice, and not in the half quarried stone. Just so the great temple of humanity is being erected. We have seen the adjusting of the corner-stone, which is Christ, and the building is going up slowly We see the plan of the divine architect in the Word of God, and we do not refuse to believe that this building will be completed, because we do not see it standing now. We see the great work advancing, and wait for its completion. Only a skeptic or an atheist should say it never will be done because he does not see it finished now. I tell you to-night that these prairies shall smile with flowers, and wave with grass and grain. You say, "Why don't they grow here now?" Wait until the time comes. There is a promise of Spring in the earth; first we must have rain and snow from heaven to water the earth and make it bring forth and bud, before we can have the seed to the sower and bread to the eater. God did not mean we should have grass and grain and flowers in March; we must wait till June. So the great work is going on in the moral world, and the plan is on the chart of our salvation. "God will have *all* men to be saved." That is the plan. He endowed Christ with the spirit without measure. He promises over and over that the great work shall be done. I say, a man who don't believe it, who cannot reconcile the sins of men and all punishments of wrong, and all evil, with these promises, arrays the Bible against itself and denies all the positive declarations of the Almighty, and he is a doubter—such a doubter as Thomas, when he had not seen the nail marks, and would not believe. If the will of God is not done now, we must not say it never will be, for the Apostle, himself, says:—"He who denies that God will accomplish his purpose, makes God a liar." [Time.]

MR. LOZIER'S CLOSING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Replying to the points the Doctor has suggested in his closing remarks, I have to say, that in spite of the earnest cautioning that I have given him, he has insisted upon "rooting"; and, upon rooting out the eternity of God and heaven, and everything else, with that *aionion*, and its cognate terms; in spite of all that could be said to him in expostulation and entreaty, that he should not undertake to blind the peeple with his sophistries, upon the words concerning which they—almost all of them—have not had the opportunity of investigating, he has gone on and has determinedly *refused* to answer the propositions I have made and the arguments I have offered. And yet, I have proceeded in just precisely the manner in which he has offered his Scriptures all the way through his argument,—by reading one passage of Scripture, and giving citations of Scriptures of like import. And what is this last fallacy that he has been trying to cram down the throats of you people? He says that the mother could not *naturally* take the life of her child. Anybody who has brains enough to be allowed to run out, knows better; and the Doctor has mistaken the crowd he is talking to, when he makes such a foolish proposition as that.

Now, the Doctor has said that *aionion*, when it related to God, meant eternal; but that when it related to man,—when eternal is applied to man,—it does not mean *endless*. Then, it is just as I said:—If it does not mean endless in reference to man's *punishment*, it does not mean endless in reference to man's *reward* in heaven. That is why I said he had been rooting out the eternity of heaven; for, in the original, the same word applies to both. The terms in the very citation in question, are identical:—Matt. xxv: 46:—"These shall go away into everlasting (*aionion*) punishment, but the righteous into life (*aionion*) eternal." These are the words, and if any one doubts the correct use of these words, I will show the original. I will do so for any one who chooses to call on me after the debate, if he has doubt of the correctness of my quotation. If the rewards of the redeemed in heaven be eternal, the punishment of the damned in hell will be eternal. And that is

the end of the argument, so far as it relates to the endless punishment of the wicked, and we leave the Doctor to get through it as best he can. He told you that the Greek *kolasin* does not mean *punishment*, but it means "purifying," or something or other equivalent to that. I want to show the Doctor the difference between him, on that subject, and our Savior, and Saint Luke, and others. Now, in Acts iv: 21, in reference to the apostles, Peter and John:—"When they had—." [Here Dr. Hanson objected to the presentation of the text above cited, on the ground that it was new matter and in violation of rule IV of the articles of agreement. Pending a decision of the point of order by the Moderators, Dr. Hanson said he would consent that Mr. Lozier proceed with the testimony, if he might have ten minutes at the close of Mr. L.'s speech. Mr. Lozier said he was willing, provided that he had the closing of the debate after the Doctor was done. Here the Moderators decided Mr. Lozier in order; but Mr. L. declined to consume the remnant of his time in examining the passages in detail, and proceeded as follows]: *I was only going to give passages showing the difference of opinion between him and Christ, and Saint Luke, upon the meaning of the *kolasin*—punishment. He has said it meant "cleansing," "purging," and the like; that it does not mean *punishment* in the Bible. I was going to read Saint Luke, in Acts iv : 21, in which the word "punish" is used, and to cite a passage from I John, iv: 18, in which the same word is rendered "torment," *substituting* the Doctor's deffinition of *koladzo*. And I was going to cite II Peter, ii: 9, in which the phrase "to be punished," is used; but let it go as it is. This audience will be satisfied to know that the dread of my proposed application of his interpretation of *kolasin, in every case where it is*

---

*NOTE. The passage in brackets is not from the notes of the reporter, but is interpolated by Mr. Lozier. It differs entirely from the actual occurrence, which we here give, from the published report of Mr. Becker, in the *Christian Leader*. It conveys my understanding, exactly. J. W. H.

"He was called to order for bringing in new matter, contrary to one of the rules of the discussion, and persisted in talking several minutes after his time was called by the moderators, bringing in points that had not been even alluded to throughou the entire discussion, and exhibited a temper that ill became a professed minister of Jesus Christ. The unanimous and unsolicited verdict of the moderators accorded Dr. Hanson the right to speak so long after Mr. Lozier had concluded, as he had transcended his time, after time was called. Mr. Lozier protested violently against the verdict of the moderators, and Dr. Hanson merely said that he would prefer that his opponent should continue, for every effort he made reminded him of",—etc. See concluding paragraph of report.

used in the Bible, caused the Doctor to *break his own rule*, and to "squeal" about as loudly as did those pigs that had "the lusts of man" in them, when they "ran down a steep place" into the bottomless pit, and fell through, as we may suppose, and came up the "Poland-Chinas" that we have now-a-days! Before I go on, let me say to the audience, that no one was to be interrupted during the discussion; that is one of the rules the Doctor *especially insisted upon*, and it was read in your hearing by the Moderators. Now, I will show another fallacy of my friend, in his argument about the "house" being built. How can we tell when the architect has completed his work?

The Doctor confesses the very thing he has been denying all the time. For the timbers and materials of the "house" have no *volition* of their own. Suppose the "timbers" were running about and *resisting* the process of construction? Then the cases would be parallel. It must be "wooden" heads that the Doctor expects to accept the theory he is indicating here. It may apply to "wooden men," not to free agents. The Doctor ignores man's moral agency, and I hope you will keep it in mind, if he wants ten minutes after I am through. He has refused to observe the point that I made in my argument about those who shall be *counted worthy* being "as the angels of God;" and he keeps harping on that argument about "the new heaven and the new earth." He dodges the matter in controversy. He has been playing the part of the "artful dodger" all through this discussion. He dodges the *impossibility* of renewing the apostate again into *repentance* that I urged him to answer. He dodges the comment of Dr. Clark in reference to Judas. He dodges the Scriptures that I have read from John iii: 36, about everlasting life,—said it was not everlasting life, but "Gospel life" that was meant. Dodges about some sinners' "end" being "destruction." I read the Scriptures and wanted him to answer; and now he says I did not read them, or something to that effect. He dodges the question of "everlasting destruction." Dodges the description of "the smoke of their torment,"—ascending "forever and forever." And yet he stands with brazen effrontery,* and talks about "consistency."

---

*What Mr. Lozier really said, in place of "brazen effrontery," was much coarser than what appears, but when he returned the reporter's notes "revised," he had substi-

So much sympathy has been elictited from his breast because of the fact that "no arguments have been presented." I wonder if he thinks his audience are a pack of fools when he talks such nonsense as that? What has he done except this dodging? Well, he has told you that "the will of God was to bring people to heaven;" but "in perfect accordance with man's free will." He has gotten you up a "reformatory" hell. I call it Dr. Hanson's *new* "sulphurous reformatory school,"—an institution that is not read of, or heard about at all, in the Bible.

He has told you about the wicked who are to be "cast" into that hell, and tells you it is a "prison." In Bible times many prisons were *pits*. The Bible speaks of hell as this kind of a prison. What *pit* of this kind is there out of which a man may come, whenever he says,—"I will arise and go to my father?" He has talked about "reformatory punishments." Reformatory punishments in time, he argues, "logically imply a continuance of them in eternity."

There is a logical defect in that argument. He leaves out one of the *premises* in his logic. He ought to show that reformatory punishments in time *accomplish their purpose*; but he leaves out that premise. His "logic" is:—"Reformation in time is God's policy, hence it will be in eternity." I might reply:—God's "policy" don't avail in time; hence it will not avail in eternity. What else is he going to do? How are you going to get them out of hell? You say, "The Gospel is going to be preached to them." Then the question is:—Will the Holy Spirit enforce that Gospel? If not, it won't do any good to preach to them. Are there going to be any preachers there? Yes, there *will* be some "preachers" there! The old "boss" will be there himself, who began preaching universal salvation in the garden of Eden. He will be the boss preacher there. The "false prophet," who hides the truth away from this world, will be there. I do not think the Doctor is going to be there, because the Universalists are abandoning their errors so fast. I think he will not be there.

---

tuted the former phrase. He characterized his opponent as possessing "the cheek of a government mule," but he took the liberty of erasing the offensive terms from the reporter's language, without any right to make such a change. This evidence of repentance would have been accepted, and no reference made to the language employed but for the spirit of what follows, and we allude to the temper of our opponent in debate, that the readers of the discussion may understand his exact method.

I opine that before that time the Doctor will have abandoned his theories of *aionion*, and will be ashamed to be called the father of the new belief,—that the probation of man does not end at the judgment day. Just as modern Universalists are ashamed of the theories of the elder Ballou,—that "Christ came with all his holy angels" at the day of Pentecost, and that the "goats" that were sent away into everlasting punishment at the "destruction of Jerusalem" because they did not visit the sick, them that were in prison, were "*the angels of the devil,*" and that sort of thing.

John Winchester believed in literal "fire and brimstone," and believed that the shortest possible period of punishment would be the enduring of six thousand or four thousand years of fire and brimstone in hell; and he believed in no *future* judgment at all.

[Time was called and Mr. Lozier observed, "Under our arrangement, I have a little extra time, as the Doctor had in his closing speech."]

The question is, Who will do the preaching there? The Universalists will not be there to preach, and the Doctor, in particular, will not. And if he were disposed to go and preach to them there *he could not find any text* to prove that they could escape from there. He could not find one here; and if he wanted to preach his "Hell Redemption" doctrine to them in that country, they would say:—"That's the doctrine that got us into this place, and we don't want any more of that in ours!" He might attempt a discourse upon "God is going to put all enemies under his feet," and tell them that that *means* that they are all to be taken into heaven. But they will say:—"Then the devil is going to heaven, too, because he is one of his enemies. God says so, and if that is the case, we are going to *stay out* with that 'elder brother' of the Prodigal Son! He is *out*, according to your teaching, and enjoying his father's inheritance at the same time." So they will say,—"We will stay out with the Prodigal Son's brother, and have a good time where there is no devil to trouble us!" No, Doctor, don't undertake to preach to them, but just send them each a copy of "THE NEW COVENANT" and in the first issue print the Lord's Prayer, "with the variations." I have not time to pursue this argument upon the Doctor's absurdities. I want to conclude, my friends,

by saying:—Fear God and strive to do his will, then you need not fear the future. Do right to-day, and have no fears in reference to the end.

In the day when God shall settle the destinies of our souls, after all the "judgments" the Doctor has talked about; on that "pillar of cloud," that shall settle down between heaven and hell —(for the "impassable gulf" shall extend on through eternity)— on the light side of this cloud hanging between God and his enemies, will be written:—"He that is holy let him be holy still." And on the dark side will be written:—"He which is filthy, let him be filthy still."

Now, I will conclude this discussion with Lincoln's story of the man on "Sugar Loaf Ridge" who was a great bully, and who heard of a man who had recently moved into another part of the country, who was a great bully, and determined that he would go down and whip him. So he went over into that neighborhood, declaring he could whip any man on "Sugar Loaf Ridge." Finding the new-comer, who was supposed to be a pretty heavy man, out in the corn-field, and riding up to him he told him he came down on purpose to whip him. The stranger said, "I don't want to fight." But he insisted upon whipping him, anyhow, and, finally "sailed in." And then the man went to work and thrashed him most egregiously. And getting through with thrashing him, he pitched him over the fence into the road. After a while, the fellow slowly got up, and brushing the dust off of his clothes, looked around a little bit, and said, "My friend, if you will throw me over that mule, I believe I'll go home."

The orthodox, being challenged to do so, agreed to find a man who would meet any Universalist preacher that could be found in the *State of Iowa.* They agreed that the Northwestern Iowa Conference would produce that man. After that agreement I was produced by the orthodox, and then their Iowa "champion" failed to appear, and this discussion was supposed to be abandoned, until the gentleman who is conducting the Universalist interest here, wrote me and challenged me to meet the Doctor. I did so, simply because I would not refuse after the former agreement.

I don't want to run around the country accepting Universalist challenges, but I accepted this because the Scriptures enjoin us to

resist the devil, and to oppose evil of any sort. I have tried to do so in this case, and now, if my friend, the Doctor, will be kind enough to take this half dollar from me, and send me THE NEW COVENANT—until his report of this discussion is over, at all events, I will be glad. And now, I give him my hand, and say that I think him a very clever gentleman, indeed, and bid him good-bye.

Moderators grant Dr. Hanson five minutes after Mr. Lozier's address but there is objection, and calls for Dr. Hanson, who declined, simply saying that he would give him ten dollars if he would continue ten minutes longer in the same vein, for that during the last part of his speech, his course was like that of a pig swimming. Every stroke he made cut his own throat deeper and deeper, as must be perfectly evident to the audience.