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PREFATORY REMARKS.

It is thought to be an act of justice to the writer of the following letters, to apprise the reader, that they have not had their origin in the "hot bed" of acrimonious zeal, or from a martial disposition to carry "the war into the enemy's camp" without provocation. Early in the past winter, a "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth" was formed in this city; controverted texts of Scripture were discussed at their meetings, and the Rev. E. F. Hatfield, the individual here addressed, was probably induced from this fact, to give out notice from his pulpit that he would preach against the doctrine of Universalism. This is the conclusion from the fact, that when he did deliver his two lectures on this subject, he warned his hearers against "attending these meetings, and to beware of listening to the deceiver."

It is possible, however, that Mr. Hatfield's intention to lay open the "delusion" of Universalists, and expose their "cob-web hopes," may be traced to his abomination of the sentiment. For he affirms that "Universalist preachers and writers, (with one honorable exception,) are ignorant, depraved and corrupt; that Universalism is far worse than open infidelity, inasmuch as it puts on the garb of religious sanctity, the better to secure its deluded victims. That a wolf can prey upon more sheep, if he attacks the flock in sheep's clothing."

Premising these facts, and acknowledging Mr. Hatfield's standing in the Christian community, it was deemed advisable to give him some attention. The friendly reader will perceive, that in the following humble attempt, no "new thing" is brought to light to bear evidence to the doctrines of our common faith. The arduous duties of the writer in
another field of labor, will, it is hoped, be an apology for any want of strength or depth of argument that may be discovered in these epistles; and if the reader, in the course of the perusal, shall think that the "charity which thinketh no evil" is sometimes lost sight of, he is assured, that the writer has endeavored (whatever may be appearances) to be guided by the injunction, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you," &c. If he has "rebuked sharply," he has endeavored to be influenced by the spirit of his faith, which, teaching that God is kind "to the evil and the unthankful," includes in its embrace both friend and foe, and commits them to the all-wise disposal of Him who "hath concluded all in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all."

That a greater variety of topics has not been canvassed, such as the Atonement, Original Sin, &c. may be found owing to the fact of their not having been treated of in Mr. Huttfield's lectures.

Such as these letters are, they are submitted to the candid perusal of friends and opposers. Should the latter be led to inquire impartially, what Universalism is, and the former be encouraged to "add to their faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge," &c. an ample reward will be received for the labors of the

Author.

New-York, March, 1840.
LETTERS

to

REV. E. F. HATFIELD.

LETTER I.

Dear Sir—I have not the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with you, nor have I had all the facilities that I could wish, to obtain the whole matter contained in your late Lectures against Universalism. Considering the station which you occupy, and the reputation that you sustain as a scholar, I could wish that some abler pen than my own should be wielded to administer the justice which you deserve at the hands of the denomination to which I belong. With such notes, however, as I took of your lectures, I will proceed to notice your arguments and assertions, giving them, in substance, if not in the very words in which they were uttered by yourself.

Your text, Matt. xxv. 46, is an old one, and one which has been commented upon, and explained, again and again, in the periodicals, sermons and books of Universalists, ever since the days of Dr. Chauncey, whose authority you quote to show the "evil tendency of modern Universalism." If you have even sparingly read these publications and expositions, (which every sincere inquirer after truth ought to do,

1
in order to judge correctly of both sides,) you have seen that they contain arguments, and an array of facts and collateral texts, which fix the period of Christ's coming, mentioned in the 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew's gospel to that generation. See ver. 34 of chap. xxiv.: "Verily, I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." And Matt. xvi. 27, 28: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily, I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." See also Mark viii. 38, and ix. 1.

Now we shall see how you have met these sacred truths. Passing by what you said by way of introduction, which was uttered, if I do not greatly misjudge, to forestall the opinion of your auditors and enlist their feelings in your behalf, I proceed to notice one of your points.

"The text records a fact—'These shall go away into everlasting punishment.' Are these words of doubtful signification? Can there be any misapprehension as to their import? Who are these, and when were they to be driven away into everlasting punishment? There are some among us who tell us that the transactions related in these two chapters refer to the Romans, and the term everlasting does not mean never-ending duration. How great is the progress of error with those who have once listened to the devil. You might as well deny the whole Bible at once, as to put such a construction upon so plain a text."

Your first head, then, is, "The time when these are
to suffer everlasting punishment."  The time, you say, is specified in the 31st verse—"When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory," &c. This time, or period, you tell us, "must yet be future," and you proceed to your proofs.

1st. "The same body which was crucified and raised from the dead ascended into heaven; we must admit this or deny the whole christian scheme." You then quote Acts i. 10, 11: "And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven, as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." This you quote without comment, and go on to quote seven other passages of a similar character, as you think, to prove—what?—Why, to prove that the coming of Christ did not take place at the destruction of the Jewish temple and city, and the subversion of their state and polity, and he must therefore come in person, bodily, at the day of judgment, (in your sense of the term,) and the dissolution of this visible, material world! I believe your argument is fairly and fully stated.

You have told us that the time of this coming is specified in verse 31, which has just been quoted.—And as you contend for a personal, literal appearing of our Lord, in the same body that was pierced on Calvary and laid in Joseph's sepulchre, will you not also contend that he is to sit "in his glory" upon a literal, real throne, and that this literal throne will be fixed in the literal "clouds of heaven"? This you
must admit; and I call your attention to a few difficulties involved in such a conclusion.

1st. It presents an unsafe and false mode of scriptural interpretation. In Isaiah xxx. 27, we read—

"Behold the name of the Lord cometh from far, burning with his anger, and the burden thereof is heavy; his lips are full of indignation, and his tongue as a devouring fire," &c. Hosea vi. 3: "Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord, &c. and he shall come unto us as the rain," &c. In these, and kindred passages that might be presented, you must suppose that the Almighty was literally to come; yet this denies what is affirmed, 1 Tim. vi. 16, "that no man hath seen God nor can see," &c. I understand, by the coming of Christ in "the clouds of heaven," not the presence of his real body, but the display of his power in the judgments that came on the unbelieving Jews. As Kenrick very justly observes, "The great power and glory of Christ were as conspicuously displayed at the destruction of Jerusalem, and the other circumstances which accompanied that event, as if they had seen him coming upon the clouds of heaven to punish his enemies." All your quotations are not to the purpose, for they fail to prove what you designed they should, viz., that the coming of Christ, mentioned in Matthew, is yet future.

2d. Another difficulty is this—"There is a natural body, and a spiritual body." 1 Cor. xv. 44. If Christ ascended to heaven, the spiritual body, is he to come at the final judgment, as Mr. Hatfield contends, "with the same body that was crucified"? And when Christ prays, John xvii. 5, "Glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee
before the world was,” am I to understand Mr. H. that our Savior had this “literal body” before he came down from heaven? I ask for light on this subject. That Christ came at the destruction of Jerusalem, the end of the world, or the end of the age, is clearly taught in the 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew’s gospel. On the phrase, Matt. xxiv. 3, “What shall be the sign of thy coming,” &c., Whitby thus writes—“When wilt thou come to destroy the temple, and to put an end to the Jewish church?” Dr. Doddridge remarks, “What shall be the sign of thy coming, when thou wilt execute thy vengeance upon thine enemies, and the end of the present age or dispensation?”

Now, sir, permit me to cite your attention to Heb. ix. 26, where the phrase “end of the world” occurs, and in which this event is represented as already past, and then bear in mind that this is the same in the original as “the end of the world,” Matt. xxiv. 3, on the former of which Prof. Stuart thus writes: “But now at the close of the Jewish or ancient dispensation, he has once for all made his appearance.”

It appears evident, then, my dear sir, notwithstanding your array of texts, and your bold assertion, that Christ came in his glory, before all to whom he spake had tasted death—before that generation had passed away. You tell us the time when these are to go away into everlasting punishment, is the time that Christ is to come from heaven with his real body, at which time this material, mundane globe is to come to an end. Of this latter sentiment you have not adduced a single text in proof, nor do I believe you can; and as to the doctrine that Christ is yet to appear in
his literal body, you know that there is no proof in either the 24th or 25th chapters of Matthew's gospel.

I have already noticed your quotation from Acts i., and if all be granted that you desire to prove from it, does it establish the doctrine of endless misery, or a "general judgment"? How was Jesus to "come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven"? I think the context throws light on this subject. In verse 4, the apostles are commanded not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, &c. and even at this stage of the glorious scheme of christianity, the disciples were not divested of the Jewish notion that Christ was a temporal king—verse 6: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?"—verse 7: "And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you;" &c. An assurance is here given to the apostles who were to go forth and preach "Jesus and the resurrection," that the "Comforter" should be with them—"Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world;" Matt. xxviii. 20—not in person, not in a visible body, but in the "demonstration of the Spirit and in power." The events which took place on the day of Pentecost, will justify, I think, the language which you quote to prove the coming of the "literal body" of Christ; and so fully convinced were the apostles of the resurrection of Jesus, which constitutes the foundation of christianity; so certain were they of the aid and presence of the Divine power, that to them it was like the actual person of him in whom "dwelled the fullness of the
Godhead bodily.” Paul, in alluding to his miraculous conversion, affirms that he saw Christ, and granting that this was a view of the “literal body” of Christ; granting, moreover, that Christ is yet to appear in his glorified body, you did not refute the position at which you gave an unholy sneer, viz., “that the transactions related in Matthew 24th and 25th refer to the Romans;” or more properly, to the end of the Jewish hierarchy and the introduction of the spiritual kingdom of the Messiah.

As time and health may permit, I shall continue the series of letters now commenced.

Yours, respectfully, B. B. HALLOCK.

---

LETTER II.

Reverend Sir—I am not willing to believe that you are so little acquainted with the general moral character of those who profess, and advocate what is called “the Abrahamic faith,” in this city, as not to know that the remark in the introductory part of your first lecture, was altogether uncalled for and unmerited.

I allude to that in which you associate this class of believers with that name which conveys to your mind the opposite of all good, and the essence of all that is malignant and wicked in the universe. If you had reflected a moment on the fact, that some who are now rejoicing in hope of the universal conquest of Christ over sin, have left the bosom of your fold, and who yet “hold fast their integrity,” glorifying God
"by well ordered lives and godly conversation," it appears to me this sentence had not been spoken.

While you did not conceal from all your hearers the motives which induced you to treat on the subject of your lecture at this particular time, you did not keep from their view another fact well expressed by Steele—"The more restless and opinionated the partisan, whether in religion or politics, the more ready he is to deal in invective." I intend no incivility or unkindness, when I remind you that it was to a people closely infolded in the robe of self-righteousness, and their minds grossly darkened by prejudice, to whom the words were applied with the majesty of truth—"Ye are of your father the devil."

Whether the sect called Universalists, whom you unblushingly charge with "throwing off from young men all moral principle and responsibility," sustains the character just alluded to, remains to be proved. It should not be forgotten that a large proportion of professing Universalists have broken away from the bonds of early education, and the influence of preconceived opinions, the charms of popular feeling, the proffered allurements of wealth, and the sympathies of kindred spirits, to embrace and avow a faith spoken evil of in every city. Nor are they ignorant of the vigilant watch of their eagle-eyed accusers, who are always ready (whatever the Bible may say of charity) to identify their withdrawal from the popular church, with a departure from all that is holy, magnanimous, virtuous and christian.

Here are motives presented to such as believe that "God will have all men to be saved," which operate as efficiently as the same kind of influences do, on
other christians; but there are still higher, and nobler considerations appreciated by those whom you consider "the dupes of the devil, and heirs of hell."

"The love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again." 2 Cor. v. 14, 15.

I might ask you here, sir, what obligations rest upon those to obey Christ who are of the non-elect? for I find in your "Confession of faith," chap. 3, § 6, "Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only." The ground of obedience and godliness, named by the apostle, was, that Christ died for all—this is the reason why they should live to him, or in other words, "follow him."

I can not but think, too, while you cautiously endeavored to hide the blade which you intended should wound a former class-mate of yours, a preacher in this city of "another gospel, which is not another," you knew that instead of "taking off the edge of sin," as you tauntingly affirmed, his professional character, in precept and example, is without reproach, and can compare with your own, devoid of loss in the comparison. I am constrained to believe, that with the full, glaring facts before you, as palpable as the sun at noon-day in the unveiled heavens, Universalist preachers do insist on godliness, and warn their hearers to beware of sin, that their church members hold that "good works are profitable unto men," and that sin is odious, to be avoided, and will most assuredly be punished; you made the assertion, "they take off
the edge of sin, throw off moral responsibility from
the young, and that the oldest Universalist preacher
is about 6000 years old." "Neither can they prove
the things whereof they now accuse me." Acts xxiv.
13.

I proceed to notice more fully the first division of
your first lecture. "The time when the coming of
Christ is to take place." That it was at the destruc-
tion of Jerusalem, seems to you almost an unpardon-
able error, the device of Satan to deceive souls, "it
smells to heaven." But, sir, did you disprove the po-
sition at which you thus railed? The sequel will
show.

I have already cited your attention in my first let-
ter to the fact that the words of our blessed Lord fix
the time of his coming to that generation, and the life.
time of some to whom he spake. On Mark ix. 1,
Matthew Henry thus writes:

"A prediction of Christ's kingdom now near approaching
would come, and would come so as to be seen; the kingdom
of the Messiah shall be set up in the world by the utter de-
struction of the Jewish polity which stood in the way of it;
it came with power, when vengeance was taken on the Jews
for crucifying Christ, and when it conquered the idolatry of
the Gentile world. It would come while some now present
were alive. Matt. xxiv. 34. 'This generation shall not pass
till all these things be fulfilled.' Those that were standing
here with Christ should see it, when the others could not dis-
cern it to be the kingdom of God, for it came not with ob-
servation."

Dr. Adam Clarke says:

"The destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish economy
which our Lord predicts, took place about 43 years after
this; and some of the persons now with him, doubtless sur-
vived that period, and witnessed the extension of the Messi-
ach's kingdom."
Bishop Horne remarks:

"Jesus Christ foretells, that on his ascension, he would go into a distant country, to receive the kingdom from his Father; and that he would return at the destruction of Jerusalem, to take vengeance on those that rejected him."—See his note on the parable, Luke xix. 12—27.

I might enlarge the number of eminent commentators who confirm this view of the subject, and yet you tell us "they who teach that Christ's coming took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, must deny the whole Bible." You did not attempt to show that the coming mentioned in Mark ix. 1, and Matt. xxv. 31, are two distinct and different comings, and if the first relates to the subversion of the Jewish polity, the destruction of their temple and city, by what rule of interpretation does the latter allude to the time when this material world is to be wrapped in fire, the dead raised, the righteous welcomed to an eternal heaven, and the wicked sentenced to an eternal hell? It was not enough to satisfy my mind, whatever may have been the effect on the rest of your auditors, for Mr. Hatfield to affirm "that these words, Matt. xxv. 46, must refer to the last judgment, and to deny this, is to deny the plain declaration of Christ, and to fall into the snare of the devil."

I beg you to compare Matt. xvi. 27, 28, with the 31st verse of chapter xxv., in the last named of which passages you say the time of Christ's coming is specified. The first cited texts are as follows: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then, he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."
Matt. xxv. 31. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." I ask in your own words, "To what period does this coming relate?"

Matthew, it is true, does not add the words to this verse on which I rely to limit this coming to that generation; but he mentions them in the 24th chapter, 34th verse, and in the one already quoted; and it appears to me there would have been a tautology in the mention of them in this place. Luke, in the 21st chapter, seems careful to fix the period of this coming to that generation, to which chapter I refer the reader.

In the 21st chapter of John's gospel, at the 22d verse, are these words: "Jesus saith unto him, if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me." This was spoken in reference to John, who is called "the beloved disciple," and the coming to which our Lord alludes, is the same as that mentioned in the 31st verse, on which you rely as the time specified when he was to come in his glory. According to Eusebius, the apostle John died at Ephesus in the year 99 of the Christian era, so that he must have lived nearly thirty years after the fulfillment of the prophetic words of our Savior, "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

On the passage above cited, John xxi. 22, Dr. Hammond thus writes:

"This surely was fulfilled in John's seeing the famous de-
struction of the Jews, which was to fall, in that generation, Matt. xxiv; that is, in the life-time of some of those present, and is called the kingdom of God, and the coming of Christ; and by consequence, here most probably, the Son of man's coming in his kingdom is, his coming in the exercise of his kingly office, to work vengeance on his enemies and discriminate the faithful believers from them.

From the Epistles we derive the same fact, that the coming of Christ was then "near at hand, even at the doors." I refer you to 1 Cor. i. 7, 8, and Rom. xiii. 12; the latter text reads thus:—"The night is far spent, the day is at hand," &c. In James v. 8—"Be patient, stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." Dr. A. Clarke, on this passage, thus writes:

"Because God is coming to execute judgment on this wicked people, therefore be patient till he comes. He seems here to refer to the coming of the Lord, to execute judgment on the Jewish nation, which shortly afterwards took place."

Dr. McKnight says:

"By the coming of the Lord, James meant his coming to destroy the Jewish commonwealth, and this coming at the time of writing this epistle was very near."

Now, sir, I wish you, with due candor, to weigh the evidence presented in the case before us. On one side, we have the declaration of the Son of God, as recorded by his evangelists and apostles, fixing the coming mentioned in the chapter containing your text, to that generation, the life-time of some who heard him; and on the other side, is presented the bare, presumptuous assertion of the Rev. Mr. Hatfield, that "it must mean his coming at the dissolution of this visible world, and the last judgment"!!

It is true, that you quoted forty-five texts in the course of your lecture, (and they shall be noticed in due time,) many of which you intended as proofs of
your declaration; but they answered you no purpose at all, inasmuch as you failed altogether to prove that the coming mentioned in Matt. xxv. 31, is simultaneous with the event of the resurrection of the dead.

I have been thus particular (and perhaps, to some, rather prolix,) in ascertaining the time of Christ's coming, for at this time, these, "the goats," were to go away into "everlasting punishment." You will not deny that this punishment was to be inflicted at the period of our Lord's coming; and if it has been shown that he came on this side of eternity, your assertion, that "the word everlasting can not be of doubtful meaning, but must signify endless duration," falls to the ground. Yours, &c.

B. B. HALLOCK.

LETTER III.

Reverend Sir—I now come to your second proposition, which you state as follows:

"The same body of Christ which was raised from the tomb ascended into heaven."

I must confess that I was puzzled to divine the bearing which this position would have in the refutation of a sentiment which you consider subversive of all the principles of morality and godliness. Nor can I now see in what manner the truth is invalidated by your position, the truth, so clearly stated, "that God will have all men to be saved"—that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world," &c.
That Christ arose from the grave, "led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men;" that he did not see corruption, nor could the grave have dominion over him, are truths, about which, it is presumed, neither myself, or any individual of my despised and persecuted sect, will dispute with you for a moment. We believe, with you, sir, that the resurrection of our Lord constitutes the solid basis on which rests our holy religion. "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." 1 Cor. xv. 14.

While we agree, then, as to the fact of the resurrection of Christ, I am at a loss to determine why so much time was occupied, and so many quotations cited in your first lecture, to establish this truth. Did you suppose, sir, that in attacking Universalists, you was arraying yourself against a Sadducean sect, who deny the resurrection? Did you mean to have your hearers believe that we hold to the doctrine of the philosophic Greeks of Paul's day, and view it as "a thing incredible that God should raise the dead"? I can not conclude that you are so ignorant of the prominent features of our faith, or that you would thus offer an insult to the knowledge (imperfect though it may be) which your hearers had respecting our views on this subject. As profusely as you hurled "the bolts of war;" notwithstanding you dealed so largely in "well rounded periods" of assertions, and "hard speeches," becoming the catechumen, rather than "the stature of the fullness of Christ;" you did not have the audaciousness to affirm, that we deny the resurrection. Whence then, this labor to prove it? Why such an array of texts in a lecture against Universalism, to substantiate a doctrine on which the
hated sentiment rests, as one of its imperishable pil-
lars?

In all that you did on this point, the words of Abra-
ham to Lot were forcibly presented to my mind—
"Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and
thee, and between my herdmen and thy herdmen;
for we be brethren." Still there is a wide, an awful
difference, in our opinion on this subject. While you
believe that the resurrection of Christ assures us that
the dead, at some future period, will be called forth
by the irresistible power of God, some to receive the
sentence of "death eternal," in soul and body; we
believe, that "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ
shall all be made alive;" that he is the first fruits of
them that slept, and if the first fruit be holy, the lump
will also be holy.

I can not avoid calling your attention here to a
quotation from "Bishop Horne's Introduction to the
study of the sacred Scriptures," vol. ii. p. 120.

"The presentation of the first fruits was a solemn and
festive ceremony. At the beginning of harvest, the sanah-
дрin deputed a number of priests to go into the fields and
reap a handful of the first ripe corn; and these, attended by
great crowds of people, went out of one of the gates of Je-
rusalem into the neighboring corn-fields. The first fruits
thus reaped, were carried with great pomp and universal
rejoicing, through the streets of Jerusalem to the temple.—
The Jewish writers say, that an ox preceded them with
gilded horns, and an olive crown upon his head, and that a
pipe played before them until they approached the city. On
entering it, they crowned the first fruits, that is, exposed
them to sight as much as they could, and the chief officers
of the temple went out to meet them. They were then de-
voutly offered to God, in grateful acknowledgment of His
providential goodness, in giving them the fruits of the earth.
These first fruits, gave notice to all that beheld them, that
the general harvest would soon be gathered in. How beau-
tiful and striking is St. Paul's allusion to this religious ceremony, in that most conso-
mary and closely reasoned chapter, the 15th of his 1st Epistle to the Corinthians; in which,
from the resurrection of Jesus Christ, he argues and estab-
lishes the certainty of the general glorious and universal
harvest of all the sleeping dead! 'Now is Christ risen, and
become the first fruits of them that slept.'

"Consolatory," indeed, is this doctrine to those
who are looking forward "with lively hope" to this
glorious ingathering of the human family. But what
consolation, I ask, is there in the sentiment preached
by Mr. Hatfield, and recorded in his creed in the fol-
lowing language?—"The wicked shall be cast out
from the favorable presence of God and the glorious
fellowship with Christ, his saints, and all his holy
angels, into hell, to be punished with unspeakable
torments both of body and soul with the devil and
his angels for ever."

With this sentiment, the illustration just given has
no fellowship. Paul certainly gives no countenance
to this article of your creed in this 15th chapter to the
Corinthians. The first fruits were not tares; the
coming harvest was not to be tares. If Christ was
raised a spiritual and immortal body, and he is the
first fruits of them that slept, I call on you to prove
that any will be raised from the dead, the enemies of
God, and immortal sinners! This you will not at-
tempt to do from the chapter above alluded to; but you
will say that, "the resurrection to damnation," John
v. 29, proves it. This text shall be attended to in its
proper place, but I would remark here, that your
views represent Paul and Jesus Christ as much op-
posed to each other in their respective declarations,
as any two opposites of which we can conceive in the
universe.
The difference in your language in reference to the resurrection from that of the apostles, is also worthy of notice. You say—"We may be foretelling the eternal anguish and torment of our dearest friends, a destiny which awaits the ungodly." Did ever an apostle of Jesus use such language as this in speaking of the resurrection of the dead? Was it possible for Peter, if he entertained your views, to say that "the Father had begotten him and his brethren to a lively hope (living hope, according to McKnight,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead"? "Jesus and the resurrection" seems to have been the burden of Paul's preaching. This was the theme of Peter's preaching on the memorable day of Pentecost. The resurrection was to them and to the believers of their time, a subject of joyful hope, and not a word do we find about any fears entertained by them that their "dearest friends" would be made infinite losers by the resurrection from the dead.

But I must proceed to notice your proof texts. The first has already been examined, and the second is found in Acts vii. 55, 56. "But he (Stephen) being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, Behold I see the heav-ens opened and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." You leave this unexplained, and go on to quote the following additional passages, Eph. i. 20, "Which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places." Col. iii. 1, "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God."
Heb. i. 3, viii. 1, x. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 22 which speak of "the right hand of God," &c.

Now I am wholly unable to discover what all these passages have to do in refuting the position, "that the transactions mentioned in Matt. xxv. relate to the Romans." Can any person of a moderate share of discernment, discover in them any evidence that "Universalism is a delusion of the devil"? Let it be granted, sir, that these texts prove your position, "that the body of Christ ascended to heaven," what then? The doctrine of the resurrection of all mankind to unsaging glory remains unharmed; for remember, "if the first fruits be holy, the lump is also holy," and if the first fruit is garnered up in heaven, I have yet to learn that a fearful portion of the harvest is to be blasted forever in the murky regions of hell. Certain I am, dear sir, that all these quotations afford you no aid in the destruction of a sentiment which your acrimony and servile zeal have described as a monster let loose from Pandemonium, to desecrate the temple of virtue, and blight the moral universe with crime and death.

As you left the foregoing texts with your auditors, for them to draw their own deductions, do you not fear, sir, that some of them imbibed a notion which reason and common sense, and even your creed itself would blush to sanction? Is the literal body of Christ now at the literal right hand of God? You may think this a "foolish and unlearned question," but common minds would receive this impression from the subject as presented in your lecture, and if you are true to your creed, you will answer in the affirmative.
Now let us see how this agrees with your "Confession of Faith," Ch. ii. §1, "There is but only one living and true God, who is infinite in being, and perfection, a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts or passions, immutable, immense, eternal, incomprehensible, almighty," &c. Which, sir, is true, that the Almighty is "a most pure spirit, invisible, without body or parts," or that he has a "right-hand," and that Stephen literally saw Christ at this right hand? I cannot believe that the Infinite Spirit "whose centre is every where, and whose circumference no where," is possessed of bodily organs. Hence, the phrase "right hand of God, right hand of the Majesty on high," &c. must not be understood in their literal, but in an accommodated sense; and yet if there be any irreverence in the assumption that Jehovah sitteth in the heavens clothed with a "body" and all the "parts" of a human being, this impiety lies, not at the door of that system which you call "a cob-web hope," but at your own.

Look at the proposition which you was endeavoring to establish; consider the manner in which you disposed of the above passages, and then ask yourself whether you gave that explanation which every "workman who needeth not to be ashamed," ought to do, to be approved of God and his own conscience? Why did you not tell the people whom you were addressing, the whole truth in this matter? Why not inform them that by "the right hand of God" is meant his protection and favor, the delegation of his power, his authority and blessings; not literally his hand as one of the members of a corporeal frame. I fear, Mr. Hatfield, rather than come in collision with a fa-
vorite creed which you are determined to support,
you chose to leave your hearers uninformed, and lia-
ble to embrace an error, at war with reason and rev-
elation.

To a similar cause do I attribute the ebullitions of
invective which you uttered against a sentiment that
you either will not, or dare not, manfully meet, (as
Dr. Beecher has said, "in an open field and fair
play.") David declares, Ps. xci, "I will say of
the Lord, He is my refuge and my fortress, He shall
cover thee with His feathers, and under His wings
shalt thou trust." Who does not know, that it would
violate common sense, to understand this literally?
Ezekiel viii. 1, says, "the hand of the Lord God fell
upon me," Exo. xxxiii. 2, "From His right hand
went a fiery law," &c. The granting of blessings,
dignity, power, and authority, was signified among
the Hebrews by the right hand being placed on the
head. With these few texts (and more might be
cited to the same point) I proceed to give my views
of your proof texts; this is all that I need do with
them, as it must be evident that they do nothing to-
wards disproving Universalism, any more than if
you had selected the same number of texts to prove
the existence of God.

There are two prominent features presented to the
mind of every one who has read the four Evangel-
ists with care, viz. The resurrection of Christ and
the subsequent effusion of the Holy Ghost, or the
Divine power. After his resurrection, on one occa-
sion, he appeared to the disciples, they were terrified
thinking they had seen a spirit. He assures them,
"Behold my hands, and my feet, that it is I myself;
handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Luke xxiv. 32.

I might here ask Mr. H. whether he means by "the same body" this one of "flesh and bones" as the one which ascended into heaven, but I pass on. Again Jesus appeared to his disciples, "breathed on them, and saith unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghost," &c. John xx. 22. After this, on the day of Pentecost, Peter, having received power agreeably to the promise, declared that Christ had been exalted by the right hand of God, therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ Acts ii. 36. This agrees with what Christ declared of himself, that "The Father had given him power over all flesh, and put all things into his hand. All power is given to me in heaven, and on earth." In accordance with this, is the declaration of Christ to Caiaphas, "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven," Matt. xxvi. 64.

By the phrase "Christ sitting at the right hand of God, and the right hand of power," I understand the divine blessings, the favor and love and protection that the Father bestows upon him, and which flow through him as "the Mediator between God and men," to the children of humanity. David says, "I have set the Lord always before me; because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved." The period at which Christ was to sit on "the right hand of power," has been shown in a former letter; it was not a personal appearing, but an extraordinary exhibition of the Divine power and glory in the subver-
tion of the Jewish state, and the more extensive diffusion of the blessings of Christ's spiritual kingdom.

The passage from Eph., which you quote, may be understood as referring to the power and authority conferred on the Son, without supposing that "the same body which was raised from the tomb ascended to heaven." Paul says to the Eph. 1st chap. of the Father, "who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ," and in ch. ii. "And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." You will observe that this phraseology is the same as that quoted by you, with the exception of the phrase "set him at his own right hand." We have just seen that the Psalmist affirmed, "the Lord is at my right hand," by which is signified not the literal visible appearance of the Almighty, but His preserving care, His protection and favor. By "heavenly places," says Dr. McKnight, "is meant the christian church, represented under the character of a kingdom which the God of heaven would set up, and which shall never be destroyed." On the phrase "set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places," Dr. Clarke observes—"gave him as Mediator between God and man the highest honors and dignities, in which state of exaltation he transacts all the affairs of his church, and rules the Universe. The right hand is the place of friendship, honor, confidence, and authority." "Right hand," says Horne, "signifies great protection and favor."

I think an exposition of the texts which you quoted, similar to the one just given (a better one, it is true) ought to have come from yourself, and the hearers
should not have been misled, as they were, in two particulars; 1st, To imbibe the notion that Universalists do not believe in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, and 2d, To infer that the real body, "the same body," &c. is now in heaven at the literal right hand of God.

"Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe you with the wool, ye kill them that are fed; but ye feed not the flock." Ezekiel xxxiv. 3.

Christ has indeed been raised from the dead, and "exalted by the right hand of power," endowed with authority and might to carry forward the glorious scheme of human redemption, "nor will he fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law." I beg you to look at the context where your selections were made, and as you peruse the truth that shows Christ to be "the heir of all things," let the question be asked—Will Christ share his inheritance with the devil, whose works, he the Son of God, was manifested to destroy? See Heb. ii. 14, and 1 John iii. 8. I ask you, also, my dear sir, to view well the contrast between yourself and Stephen. He, "full of the Holy Ghost," dragged along by the infuriate mob, and stoned to death by the cruel enemies of the cross, prays for a blessing on his murderers, and imprecates no wo, no implacable vengeance; while you, in cool blood, and in preaching, good news, glad tidings of great joy, "foretell the ceaseless torments of your very friends!" Stephen could "see heaven opened," but no yawning hell with its deathless miseries for his tormentors, and Mr. Hatfield can foresee "hell's inexorable doors" unbarred to receive some of his "dearest friends."
"Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." Yours respectfully,

B. B. HALLOCK.

LETTER IV.

Reverend Sir—Your third position is stated in substance as follows:

"Having disposed of the body of Christ, and shown that it is set at the right hand of God in heaven, this body must remain in heaven till the enemies of Christ become his footstool; till the gospel shall be preached in the whole world."

The texts which you quote to establish this are admirable. 1 Cor. xv. 25, "For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." 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." You did not tell us whether "the same body which was crucified and raised from the dead," is to effect the desired consummation alluded to in the above texts, or whether "the Comforter, the spirit of truth," is to conquer and subjugate all the enemies of Christ. You labored so hard to make it appear that the body of Christ went to heaven, it may not be thought altogether an idle question to ask, whether he is now subduing his foes, clothed in a literal body, or whether the spirit and power of the truth, the doctrines which he inculcated and died to defend, are advancing the conquests of his reign, and that "God in Christ is reconciling the world unto himself."
But I must again express my conviction that your position has no bearing on the main scope, and declared object of your lecture, which were to refute that faith which you call "the doctrine of the devil, false philosophy, a fatal error cloaked in the sanctity of religion," and other hard names which are easily uttered, and which are spontaneous in some minds. As the rankest weeds are frequently found in a soil where nothing else will grow, so may we find assertions and epithets, sweeping and invidious, from men who disregard the apostolic injunction—"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."

Were I to proclaim in the streets, and on "the house-tops," that Presbyterianism is an abominable heresy, the same delusive charm which was insidiously whispered in the ear of Eve six thousand years ago; were I to write on "the door posts," and proclaim in a voice which would "shake the earth and the heavens," that this doctrine "is throwing off all restraint from the vicious and unprincipled youth in the community"—What then? What would you reply? What ought you to say? You might indeed give me the credit that it was my trumpet, but that it gave a very "uncertain sound." Perhaps you may think that my letters (if you read them) are too much characterized by the spirit of rebuke and recrimination, and that men "who persuade you there is no devil as well as no hell," (to use your own words) can be influenced by the spirit of both, in your sense of the terms; still I endeavor to adopt and exercise the principle laid down by the apostle—"being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat."
Permit me to inquire, before I pass to the general subject, whether the allegations made against Paul, as being "a pestilent fellow, a mover of seditions," &c. were true, merely because the reigning sectarians and religionists of his day uttered them? Surely not. Neither will I admit that similar charges made in the nineteenth century are true, because they come from one who boasts that "nearly ninety-nine in every hundred of the good and pious believe the doctrine of endless misery." I sincerely wish that you had suspended your judgment in relation to the licentious tendency of Universalism, and the "false philosophy, the cob-web hope, and the infidelity" of its advocates, till you should have weighed them both in the balance of truth and candor, and found them wanting.

But let us see how your proposition opposes and confounds "the faith once delivered to the saints."—"The body of Christ must remain in heaven, till his enemies become his footstool," &c. This appears to my mind about as good an argument to refute the sentiment which you affect to despise, as that of Cardinal Bellarmine, who affirmed that "he could prove the supremacy of the Pope from the three first chapters of Genesis;" or as that of a certain Calvinistic divine, who, to prove the doctrine of "election and reprobation," selected for his text, Ezekiel i. 16—"A wheel in the middle of a wheel."

If either of the passages which you quote is at variance with the sentiment of universal salvation, I can not discover it, nor did you attempt to show that this is the fact. They do not even prove your own position, much less do they disprove the doctrine in question. The first one declares that "he [Christ]
must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet;" not that "his body must remain in heaven" till this consummation; and the second, "Whom the heaven must receive till the times of the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began," is very far from proving to my mind, that "the same body which was crucified and raised from the tomb is now at the right hand of God."

I have shown in a former letter my understanding of the phrase "right hand," which is well expressed by Dr. Clarke—"It implies the possession of the utmost confidence, power and pre-eminence." Or, as Dr. McKnight suggests—"We are not to suppose that the Deity is possessed of bodily members, because in Scripture he is represented as having ears, and hands, and eyes, and feet." He then quotes Exod. xv. 6, "Thy right hand, O Lord, hath dashed in pieces the enemy," meaning his power, or his justice.

We agree, sir, as to the fact of Christ's resurrection, of his exaltation as a Prince and Savior. What then, let me inquire, are we to understand by your first cited text? Does it oppose what you call the Serpent's doctrine? Christ "must reign till all enemies are put under his feet," and verse 26, "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death;" or as it reads without the words added by the translators, The last enemy shall be destroyed, death. We shall not disagree as to the fact that death is to be put under the feet of Christ by the resurrection; in other words, it is to cease or come to an end. But according to your views, there is to be a formidable enemy left; that which brought death into the world, and "all our
wo;" that which alone can satisfy the fiendish de-
sires of "him that hath the power of death, that is the
devil." It is that enemy whose ravages first called
aloud to heaven for the infinite and harmonious dis-
play of Eternal wisdom, justice and mercy; it is that
malignant and reckless foe, Sin, which with ruthless
and demoniac hand, sundered the chain of immor-
ality, and left a world of countless millions to make the
universe of God a howling wilderness of unspeakable
misery. This enemy is to continue for ever. Sin,
with its direful consequences, its weeping victims, its
eternal trophies, its endless and ineffable pains, are
to remain through eternity, the fearful spectacle to
saints, to angels and to God!

Is this the subjection, the spiritual reign of "the
Prince of Peace"? If this is the meaning of "all
enemies being put under the feet of Christ," then I
say, the damned are as much under the feet of Satan,
as they are under the feet of Christ; and so far from
the fact is it that "all enemies" are destroyed by the
resurrection, some are placed for ever beyond the
reach of the Savior of men, and yielded up to that
inexorable and malignant being whom you invidi-
ously call a "Universalist preacher"!

The nature and extent of this subjection are clearly
exhibited in the context from which your quotation is
made. See verse 28—"And when all things shall
be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself
be subject unto him that did put all things under him,
that God may be all in all." The subjection here
mentioned is not the servile and forced submission of
defeated and prostrated rebels, but the obedience of
the Son to the adored and adorable Father. The
same kind of subjection to which the "all things" are
to be brought, the Son himself is to yield, that "God
may be all in all." And observe, there is no excep-
tion in the universe, but Jehovah himself who did put
all things under him [Christ.]

You are ready to admit that Jesus Christ is now
reigning, and has been reigning, since his exaltation
"at the right hand of God," and that he will do so
till (as you assert) "the gospel shall be preached in
all the world, and the Popish apostacy shall have run
its race." What is the nature of this reign, if it be
not to turn the hearts of the children of disobedience
to the service of the living God? What is it but to
awaken in the soul of man a sense of the duties which
he owes the Author of his being, and the Giver of all
his blessings? What is it but to subdue the grosser
passions of humanity, and implant in the moral na-
ture of man, those living principles of virtue and char-
ity which reflect the image and impress of the Di-
vinity?

I see not how it can be shown, that at some future
period, the government and reign of Christ are to be
so changed as to assume the terrible aspect which
your views present of his kingdom. To be sentenced
to an endless hell of sin and wretchedness, is not the
subjugation contemplated by the apostle in this text.
You did not attempt to show that it is, and I think
you will not, by an appeal "to the law and the testi-
mony."

The nature of this subjection may farther be shown
by parallel passages. I refer you to Eph. i. 9, 10—
"Having made known unto us the mystery of his
will, according to his good pleasure which he hath
purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the 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;” and in Col. i., the same sentiment is expressed, in which the phrase “to reconcile all things to himself” occurs, showing that this subjugation is tantamount to moral obedience. It is the reconciliation of a universe to God, not the groaning vassalage of wailing millions beneath the iron rod of merciless despotism.

You are aware, also, that the same word in the original which is rendered “subdued,” has the signification throughout the Scriptures, for which I am contending. It means, says Prof. Robinson, “to subordinate, to make subject, to submit one’s self, to be obedient.” See Luke ii. 51, where Jesus is said to have been “subject to his parents.” Eph. iv. 24—“The church is subject to Christ.” James iv. 7—“Submit yourselves to God.” I need not enlarge on this point, but I pass to notice the extent of this subjection.

It is the subjugation, or obedience, or submission, of “all things”; all sentient beings; the whole intelligent creation. I anticipate your objection to this view, having been brought up “after the straitest sect,” a Presbyterian. It is found in the “Confession of Faith,” pp. 16, 52:—

“By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore can not be saved; much less can men not professing the Christian religion be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they never
so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may, is very pernicious and to be detested."

After this, I need hardly say, that the "all things," to your mind, must mean "the elect and them only." I will not stop to inquire what effect the above sentiments have in "warding off the edge of sin and divesting vicious young men of moral restraints," or to notice the cruelty and partiality which they ascribe to Him "who is good unto all and whose tender mercies are over all His works," but let us see the conclusions to which such an explanation must bring us. Paul affirms, Rom. v. 18, "As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." If the all who were condemned, mean the "elect only," then I beg you to expunge that section of the "Confession of Faith" which says, "All mankind by the fall lost communion with God," &c. When Paul says, "As in Adam all die even so in Christ shall all be made alive," we must conclude he meant "the elect only." shall be raised. And when he affirms, "All Israel shall be saved," it must be contended that he meant a part. And when it is said Christ has all things put into his hands, and that he is the heir of all things, we must understand such "elect" ones as would most certainly have been saved without faith, without works, without a Savior, without an "atonement," as the eternal decree of Jehovah before the world was, is sure.

On the phrase, "all things," Dr. McKnight makes this remark:—"Here, as in other passages of Scrip-
ture, *ta panta* is put for *tous pantas*—all men." The passage under consideration, then, may be read thus: "When all men shall be subdued," &c. The one which you select from Acts iii. 21, appears also to favor the sentiment which your lectures were designed to overthrow. That speaks of the Restitution of all things, or all men, which can not signify endless sin and torment.

The word rendered restitution, says Dr. Clarke, "signifies to establish, or settle any thing in a good state, and in this passage it implies that the good state in which it is settled, was preceded by a bad one from which the change is made to a good one." According to Prof. Robinson, the word signifies, "restoration, restitution to a former state." This restoration, the apostle affirms, "God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets," and I had designed to call your attention in this letter to some of the promises and predictions uttered by them in confirmation of the views which I have advanced, but its length admonishes me to draw to a close.

If I have shown by the texts which you cited to establish your position, that the whole Adamic family is to be subdued to Christ, restored, and saved from sin and misery, whether your position be true or false is of no consequence, inasmuch as the main question at issue between yourself and Universalists is not affected by its truth or falsity. But granting that my remarks are supported by the word of truth, then it follows that the words "everlasting punishment" must be explained in a manner similar to the phrases "everlasting mountains" and "everlasting priesthood." As your second lecture was devoted chief-
ly to a consideration of these terms, "eternal, for ever," &c., I shall reserve a more particular notice of your arguments on the subject, till the proper time.

Having shown that the coming of Christ took place as he had stated, during "that generation," it must have been at that time that the wicked, those on "the left hand," "the goats," or the unbelieving Jews went away into this punishment. By consulting the prophets, it may be seen that great temporal judgments and national calamities and punishments are spoken of under the figure of a "fire that shall not be quenched," as becoming an "everlasting reproach," as being "laid waste for ever," &c. in which no allusion is made to future endless misery. The term "everlasting punishment," then, may have been used with the strictest propriety in reference to the destruction, and captivity, and miseries of this devoted people, without necessarily involving the assumption expressed by yourself, "it must mean future endless suffering, or words can not express it."

The last part of your proposition requires a moment's attention—"Till the gospel shall be preached in the whole world." You quote this from Matt. xxiv. 14. In Mark xiii. 10, it is "all nations." You need not be told that the word rendered "world" in the above text does not signify the whole earth in its broadest sense. It may mean "Palestine and the adjacent countries." See Prof. Robinson; and Luke ii. 1, where it is said "a decree went out from Cesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed." See also Rom. x. 8.

That the phrase "all the world and all nations" was used and understood in this restricted sense, is
seen from the words of Christ, "ye shall be hated of all nations," &c. Also from the testimony of Eusebius, who tells us "the holy apostles and disciples of our Savior being scattered over the whole world, Thomas according to tradition, received Parthia as his allotted region; Andrew received Scythia," &c. In accordance with this view is the declaration of our Lord, Matt. x. 23, "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come."

The apostles went forth and proclaimed the gospel to all nations throughout the whole world, and then came the end, the conclusion of the Jewish state and polity, the utter prostration of their revered temple, and the overwhelming desolation of their far-famed city. Then was accomplished the prediction of the Son of God, "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be accomplished." Then, were "the sheep divided from the goats."

Then, was "great tribulation, such as was not from the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." Yours respectfully,

B. B. Hallow.
LETTER V.

Reverend Sir—Your fourth proposition is this:

"This body of Christ which ascended into heaven shall come from heaven at his coming to execute the final judgment."

To prove this, you quote Acts i. 10, 11, which I have already noticed; but I would add here a few remarks. The paragraph in the above, on which you rely for your proof, is as follows—"This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."

He was to come in the same, or a similar manner, to that in which he disappeared from the anxious gaze of the disciples. Do your views agree with this fact? Your "Confession of Faith" contains them, I suppose, chap. viii. § 4. "On the third day he arose from the dead with the same body in which he suffered; with which also, he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth on the right hand of his Father, maketh intercession; and shall return to judge men and angels, at the end of the world."

How did Christ go away from his disciples? There were but two angels present at his departure, and but a small band of his saints. None were called from the silence of the grave to witness his egress, or to be judged and sentenced to ceaseless torments. No flaming fire was seen as the premonition of a future universal conflagration; no archangel's trump sounded the death-knell of time; there was no gathering of the
nations "before the judgment seat;" no "God in anger, and a world on fire."

The Son of God had finished the work which his Father had given him to do; the Divine power had been with him to sanction his deeds of mercy, grace and love, to attest the truth that "he came from God and went to God;" the tongue of slander had been silenced; the hope of the hypocrite exposed in its deformity; the scorn of the Pharisee turned upon his own head, and unbelief itself subdued, and constrained to confess "truly this was the Son of God."

The voice of Omnipotence, He "who hath the issues of life," 'who only hath immortality,' calls him from the grave, and he appears to his disciples; he converses with them; he comforts them; he eats with them; he points out the path of their duty; he assures them of the Divine protection and presence, "and a cloud received him out of their sight." The "second coming" which you tell us of, sir, surely has no similarity or likeness to the pleasing and tranquil scene which occurred on Mount Olivet. The Savior of men left the world crowned with the olive branch of peace, with blessings dropping from his lips as "dews distilled from flowers," and you tell us he is to come "in like manner," in vengeance—the inexorable judge of saints, angels and wicked men, clothed in terror; "hell is to tremble before him;" the dead are to be raised, the world, with all its appendages, is to be burned up, and time is to give up the ghost, amid the wide-spread dissolution of all earthly things, and the final passing away of the heavens and all their glory.
"Behold the Judge descends, his guards are nigh, 
Tempest and fire attend him down the sky."

Whether this be coming in a "like manner as he went into heaven," I leave for your candor to decide. In the ascension of Christ, "a cloud received him," and thus, it was declared by the angels, he was at some future period to come again. Now if we can decide, by an appeal to the Scriptures, and by "reason, their great Commentator," what is the time alluded to by these angels, something will have been done to arrive at the truth.

Dr. Clarke remarks, "Some think that his coming again to destroy the Jewish nation is what the angels refer to." That he came during the generation in which he lived, and diffused the blessings of the gospel, while some whom he addressed were living witnesses of his coming, I think has already been shown in a previous letter, and as you gave no proofs that the coming referred to in Matt. xxv. is to take place at the resurrection, and the "final judgment," I pass to your next cited texts.

"I saw in the night visions and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days," &c. Daniel vii. 13. Your next is in Matt. xxvi. 64, "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven." Rev. i. 7, "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and all kinds of the earth shall wail because of him."

Will you contend that these passages show that Christ is yet to appear in person in the literal clouds.
of heaven? To execute a judgment yet future? This remains to be proved; your assertion is one thing, and the word of God is another.

On your second quotation, Dr. Clarke thus writes:

"Hereafter in a few years, ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, fully invested with absolute dominion and coming in the clouds of heaven, to execute judgment on this wicked race. See ch. xxiv. 30."

On this last passage to which he directs the reader, he comments as follows:

"The plain meaning of this is, that the destruction of Jerusalem will be such a remarkable instance of the Divine vengeance, such a signal manifestation of Christ's power and glory, that all the Jewish tribes shall mourn, and many will in consequence of this manifestation of God, be led to acknowledge Christ and his religion."

The meaning of the phrase "He shall send his angels," says the Dr., is "his messengers, the apostles and their successors in the christian ministry."

Matthew Henry thus writes:

"Coming in the clouds of heaven." This refers to another prophecy concerning the Son of man. Dan. vii. 13, 14, which is applied to Christ, Luke i. 33, when he came to destroy Jerusalem; so terrible was the judgment, and so sensible the indications of the wrath of the Lamb in it, that it might be called a visible appearance of Christ."

"Clouds (says Bishop Horne,) sometimes mean in the Scriptures, multitudes and armies."

I understand, then, by Christ's coming in "the clouds of heaven," not a visible, literal appearance of his body, but the display of his power and glory. At the transfiguration of our Lord, "a bright cloud overshadowed" him, and those who were with him, and a "voice out of the cloud which said, This is my beloved Son," &c. Here were exhibited the presence and approval of the God of the universe; not a per-
sonal, bodily appearance, for "no man hath seen God at any time nor can see Him." The Psalmist declares, "The Lord maketh the clouds his chariot and walketh upon the wings of the wind." It affords you no proof, as I humbly conceive, therefore, of your position, that Christ is said to come in "the clouds," &c.

It appears to me that our Savior himself is the arbiter to settle the question as to the time of this coming and judgment. I refer you to Matt. xvi. 27, 28, "He that hath ears to hear let him hear." "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

Prove to me, sir, that here are two distinct and separate comings, one at the subversion of Judaism, and the other at the destruction of this material world, the resurrection and "the judgment," and you will be the means of saving one soul from what you call "a fatal delusion and a cob-web hope."

"Produce your strong reasons," obtain the evidences, and let me have them I pray thee. Come to my house with them, you shall have a christian's welcome, a heart overflowing with gratitude, and a solemn pledge that neither my pen nor my tongue shall oppose your sentiments while I have my being.

You will admit that at the time of Christ's coming, he was to sit in judgment, or reward every man according to his works; then show us that he did not come while some to whom he spake were alive. To assert that "Universalists teach there is no hell and no
devil; that they deny the Scriptures; that they take off the edge of sin, and their most ancient preacher seduced Eve to believe a lie," let me remind you, reverend sir, is not argument. We might use the same weapons and with as much propriety. But I proceed to your other quotations.

"Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart, and then shall every man have praise of God. 1 Cor. iv. 5. "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come," xi. 26; "So that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. i. 7, 8; xv. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 19; iii. 13; iv. 15; v. 23; 2 Thess. i. 7, 8, 9; ii. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 4, which speak of the coming of Christ.

It would appear that here is a sufficient number of passages to establish your position, if the weight of evidence is to be ascertained numerically. Joined to an admirable dexterity at quoting passage after passage, you have a summary method of disposing of them. You say, "all these show clearly, that the coming of Christ was considered as very distant, and they can not possibly have any allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem."

I beg you now to retrace your steps to the chapter which contains your text, Matt xxv. and the preceding one, which make the chain of discourse (so to speak) in which our Lord was engaged. Here the disciples are admonished to "flee into the mountains" when
this coming shall take place. It is said that "two shall be in the field, the one taken and the other left." "Now learn a parable of the fig-tree, (says our Lord) when his branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, when ye shall see these things, know that it is near even at the doors." He then adds, as if to make the truth doubly sure, "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." However sincere you may be in your allegations that we "deny the Scriptures, and preach a fatal delusion," I can not, I dare not, in the face of Jesus Christ, and in defiance of the truth of heaven, assert that "this coming is very distant, and that no allusion is made to the destruction of Jerusalem."

The apostles spake of this coming; they alluded to it in some of the passages which you cited, but there is no proof in one of them that they viewed it as very distant. On the contrary, positive evidence can be produced from their epistles, fixing the period of Christ's coming (as he did himself) to a time "near at hand, even at the doors." In the passage which you cite, 2 Thess. i. the apostle declares that God will recompense to those who are troubled, "rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed," and the time of this revelation may be seen Luke, xvii. 20, to the end. In the 2d chapter following your quotation, the apostle prays that the believers may be "directed into patient waiting for Christ."

James says, v. 8, "Be ye also patient, establish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." Paul to the Romans xiii. 8, affirms, "The night is far spent the day is at hand," &c. These declarations
stand opposed to your assertion that the day or coming was viewed by them as very distant; and they show I think that "allusion" is made to the destruction of Jerusalem.

Dr. McKnight, uses the following language in his Preface to 2d Thessalonians.

"Wherefore, that the everlasting kingdom might be effectually established, it was necessary that Jerusalem and the Jewish state should be destroyed by the Roman armies. Now since our Lord foretold this sad catastrophe in the words of the prophet Dan., Matt. xxiv. 30, 'And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory;' and after describing every particular of it with the greatest exactness, seeing he told his disciples, verse 34, 'this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled,' can there be any doubt that the apostles, (who when they wrote their epistles, certainly understood the true import of this prophecy,) by their Master's coming, and by the 'end of all things,' which they represent as 'at hand,' meant his coming to destroy Jerusalem, and to put an end to the institutions of Moses?"

"Can there be any doubt?" Yes, replies the Rev. Mr. Hatfield, and he charges those with infidelity, and gross perversion, who venture to maintain such views. Now, to use your own words, "if the Scriptures teach any thing," they teach us that Christ came in judgment, in "the clouds of heaven" (metaphorically,) in "the glory of his Father," &c., at the abolition of the Mosaic economy, and the destruction of the city and temple. Refute this, sir, if you can. Do not employ baseless assertions; do not array texts inapplicable to the subject; do not beg the question! Come armed in the panoply of divine truth; buckle on the armor of candor, the helmet of sincerity, and the robe of brotherly love, and no longer "fight as one that beateth the air."
My next will be a continued examination of your quotations. In the mean time allow me to express the pleasure which my faith gives in the prospect of meeting you in heaven, while I can not congratulate you in the "foretelling of the endless misery of your dearest friends." Yours respectfully,

B. B. Hallock.

LETTER VI.

Reverend Sir—I shall devote this letter to an examination of the passages which you rely on to establish your position that "the judgment is yet future, and that this material world is to come to an end."

After quoting seventeen texts of Scripture, some of which relate to one event, and others to altogether a different one, and none of them relating to the conflagration of this visible world, you assert with all boldness, "All these refer to the same thing, namely, to the end of this earth, and the last judgment." And as though you thought that you had not yet amassed a sufficient number of passages to fortify your ground, or, from a desire to display your knowledge of the Scriptures, you cite Matt. xiii. 40, and Luke ix. 26, and then add, "These events are to transpire when the body of Christ shall return from heaven, and the popish apostasy shall have run its race."

I have not thus far, had much reason to complain of your "handling the word of God deceitfully," but really there appears to be an approximation to it in
the instance before us. Luke ix. 26, reads thus—
"For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my
words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when
he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's,
and of the holy angels." This you no doubt thought
most excellent and overwhelming proof of your as-
sertion; and so it was, I suppose, to those who have
made up their minds that the Bible must be so ex-
plained as to agree with the "Confession of Faith,"
at all events. Why, sir, allow me to ask, did you
omit to quote the very next verse in the connexion?
I know not, unless it was that you knew it would ruin
your cause. Verse 27—"But I tell you of a truth,
there be some standing here, which shall not taste of
death till they see the kingdom of God." Our blessed
Lord, it would seem, attached more importance to
the fact that his coming in his kingdom was to take
place during that generation, while some of his hear-
ers would be living witnesses of it, than he did to any
other circumstance connected with this event. "But
I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here," &c.

Now let me ask Mr. Hatfield, seriously, why leave
out this most solemn declaration of Christ? Is this
the way to arrive at the truth, or to communicate it
to others? That this subject may be placed in its
true light before our readers, (although it be a repeti-
tion,) I will present the testimony of the four evan-
gelists together. Matt. xvi. 27, 28, "For the Son of
man shall come in the glory of his Father with his
angels; and then he shall reward every man accord-
ing to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be
some standing here which shall not taste of death, till
they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."
Mark viii. 38, ix. 1, "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels. And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Luke ix. 26, 27, quoted above. John xxi. 22, "Jesus saith unto him, if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee."

I envy not that minister of the gospel, who, with these declarations before him, uttered by him who was sent of God, will have the presumption to make the baseless assertion, "All these refer to a very distant coming, and can not possibly have any allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem." I moreover marvel that a large assembly, composed of persons living in this enlightened community, with the Bible in their hands, should receive for truth such a declaration, however "larded it may be with holy grimace," or embellished with the flowers of pulpit oratory.

You have given no reasons, nor do I believe you can, that the coming, mentioned Matt. xxv. 31, is different from that in the texts just cited. If you allege, that here it is said Christ is to come "in his glory," the same is also affirmed in the above, where the period of his coming is confined to that generation. If you say the judgment did not take place during the life-time of some whom our Lord addressed, I answer, it is positively asserted, "then shall he reward every man according to his works." If you rely on the phrase "all his holy angels," this language also
is found in the texts referred to, by whom is meant, according to Dr. Clarke, "the apostles and their successors in the christian ministry." See also Rev. i., where mention is made of "the angel of the church of Ephesus," the angel of the church in Smyrna, and of Pergamo, &c. meaning the primitive and apostolic preachers stationed at these places.

But you quote 2 Thess. i. 7, 8, 9, 10—"And you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day."

This coming according to your declaration, (I will not say arguments—you did not produce any,) is yet future; it has not taken place, and will not, till "the body of Christ shall descend from heaven, and the popish apostasy shall have run its race." Whether this race was run, and this body brought down from heaven, before all to whom our Savior spake had tasted death, is a question which you must settle with the divine testimony, for that unequivocally assures us, that the coming of Christ, in his glory, with the angels, with power and in judgment, took place during the life-time of some who heard him.

The passages which you quote from Thessalonians refer to this coming. I beg you to compare the language of the apostle with that of Luke in chapter
17th of his gospel, "For as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall also the Son of man be in his day. And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it also be in the days of the Son of man. Likewise also, as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and consumed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed."

Here you perceive the revelation of Christ is compared to the destruction of the cities of the plain by fire, and the apostle says, he "shall be revealed" in flaming fire, "taking vengeance," &c.; and Luke declares, chapter xxii. 22, "For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled"; and he tells us the time of this visitation. "In that day, he which shall be on the house top and his stuff in the house, let him not come down to take it away, &c. Two men shall be in the field, the one shall be taken and the other left." Surely this was strange language to use in reference to a transaction which is to whelm this whole earth in flames of fire, and congregate the whole human family before the divine tribunal in eternity. At this period, will one be taken and the other left? What will disembodied spirits, or glorified bodies want of "stuff in the house," or of what avail will it be "to flee to the mountains"?

You failed entirely to prove that the coming mentioned in Thessalonians is yet "very distant, and that it has no allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem."
I need not enlarge on the subject, but will leave it here with what Paul affirmed, Rom. xiii. 12, "The day is at hand."

As respects the passages which you quote relative to the resurrection, they give you no aid in support of your position, if we except John v. 28, 29: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

Your argument here is stated as follows: "This can not mean a spiritual resurrection, for the Savior had spoken of this kind of resurrection in the preceding connection. The plain meaning must therefore be those in the literal graves." I do not see the force of this argument. In the 22d verse it is said, "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son," and verse 27, "hath given him authority to execute judgment." Your argument would seem to show that here are two distinct kinds of judgment, altogether different in their design and effects. In verse 24 it is said, "He that believeth, &c. shall not come into condemnation." But will you say the damnation in verse 29, is entirely different from the condemnation, verse 24? If you will not, then your argument is not valid. Granting all that you wish to prove from these texts, does it follow that at the time of Christ's coming referred to in Matt. xxv., all in their "literal graves" were raised from the dead and judged, the world destroyed by fire, some welcomed into heaven, and others doomed to hell? No, sir, you have not proved that
any allusion was made to the general resurrection in Matt. xxv. You give us assertions, abundant and dogmatical, but these are neither proofs nor arguments.

Let us notice the consequences attending your exposition, and we will take Mr. Hatfield himself for an illustration.

He told us in one of his sermons recently preached on the prodigal son, that the former part of his life was a most striking resemblance to this dissolute, wayward youth; in other words, he has done evil; they who have done evil are to come forth to the resurrection of damnation, eternal, endless, intolerable. For the "thirteen years" in which he has been the servant of Christ, admit that he has done good; they that have done good are to come forth to the resurrection of life, eternal, endless in heaven! Here appears to me to be a dilemma.

Dr. Adam Clarke says, "The deliverance of the people of God from a state of the lowest depression is explained by images plainly taken from the resurrection of the dead. In the same manner the prophet Ezekiel represents the restoration of the Jewish nation from a state of utter dissolution, by the restoring of the dry bones to life, exhibited to him in a vision, chapter xxxvii. which is directly thus applied and explained, verses 11—13," to which I refer you, and I think this is the kind of resurrection alluded to in the texts before us. The prophet explains the phrase, "I will open your graves and cause you to come up out of your graves," in the very next sentence, "and bring you into the land of Israel," &c. Paul says, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead,
and Christ shall give thee light," and Col. iii. 1, "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above," where reference is had to this figurative or spiritual resurrection. I think this view is confirmed by the fact that in all Paul's epistles, where mention is made of the resurrection, he is silent on the subject of damnation and the final judgment.

It is surpassingly strange to my mind, that Paul, if he believed your doctrine, should speak so frequently of this grand doctrine of christianity, the resurrection, and never connect with it the mention of the fearful day of judgment, and the eternal damnation of the wicked. In Phil. iii. 21, and 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17, which you quote to prove the coming of Christ, not a word is said about the resurrection to damnation. Our Savior spake of the resurrection to the Sadducees who denied it, and here we should think the Great Teacher would have disclosed the whole truth on this subject; but he did not warn them of "the resurrection to damnation." See Matt. xxii. 29, 30, Mark xii. 24, 25. These several particulars seem to me to establish the fact that the resurrection in John v. 28, 29, is not the literal raising of all dead bodies, but a political and ecclesiastical revulsion, a spiritual deliverance and judgment expressed by the other evangelists by the phrases "the coming of the Son of man in his kingdom," "the glory of the Father," "sitting on the throne of his glory," &c.

At the close of the Jewish dispensation, they who had done evil, did come forth to the resurrection of damnation, the destruction of their church and polity, and all the miseries which came upon them for their rejection of the Son of God. They who had done
good, had embraced the gospel, came forth to the resurrection of life, the peace and rest consequent on faith, and an obedience to the gospel of Christ.

I had intended to close my review of your first lecture in this letter, but I shall be obliged to appropriate one more to a consideration of the yet remaining texts which you quoted, and of the notion that this world is to come to an end. Hoping that you may yet be led to adopt the language of the apostle, "For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach because we trust in the living God who is the Savior of all men, especially of them that believe,"

I am yours respectfully,

B. B. HALLOCK.

LETTER VII.

Reverend Sir—Your doctrine of the dissolution of this material world, and the closing remarks of your first lecture, will now receive attention. To prove this notion, you quote Matt. xiii. 39, 40, "The enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels. As therefore, the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of this world." I am inclined to make a remark here, like that of Dr. Clarke, respecting the doctrine of fallen angels: "It has been in all creeds and confessions of christendom, but the Scriptures have no direct testimony on the subject."

Even the Persian Magi held this sentiment of the
world's coming to an end. Their doctrine was, that there would be a continual strife between the good god, Arimanius, and the evil one, Oromasdes till the end of the world.

The Bramins of Siam, I believe, hold that the world shall be destroyed by fire, and that a new one shall be made out of the cinders of the old. The Epicureans and Stoics, according to Burnet, maintained the same opinion, so that it may not be untimely, to suggest to Mr. Hatfield the fact, that while he thinks we take sides with the devil, he is not in the best of company himself.

I must remind you of the views which your own approved commentators give of the phrase "end of the world"; views that stand opposed to your own, and which to my mind, appear consonant with the truth.

The original word which our translators have rendered "world," says Prof. Robinson, "signifies the age or world before the Messiah, i.e. the Jewish dispensation, and the age or world after the Messiah, i.e. the gospel dispensation."

Dr. Hammond remarks, "The phrase suntelia tou aionos means the conclusion of this age."

Dr. Clarke says, "Some learned men are of opinion that the whole of this parable refers to the Jewish state and people; and that the words suntelia tou aionos, which are commonly translated 'end of the world,' should be translated the end of the age, viz. the end of the Jewish polity. That the words have this meaning in other places there can be no doubt; and this may be their primary meaning here, but there are other matters in the parable which agree
far better with the consummation of all things, than with the end of the Jewish dispensation and polity."

The Doctor, however, afterwards renders this phrase, "The end of the age, or Jewish economy," and on the succeeding page of his commentary he adds this note: "It is probable that this parable (from which your quotation is made) also refers in its primary meaning, to the Jewish state, and that when Christ should come to judge and destroy them by the Roman power, the genuine followers of Christ only should escape, and the rest be overwhelmed with the general destruction."

The Doctor, you perceive, like yourself, had a creed to support, and having given the "primary," or true meaning, there must be a secondary, or double meaning in order to aid his system.

Dr. Lightfoot renders the phrase, "end of the Jewish age, or world."

Prof. Stuart renders it, "the close of the ancient or Jewish dispensation."

Bloomfield says, "The phrase 'end of the world,' relates not to the end of this world, but to the preceding ages being ended."

Bishop Newton observes, "The end of the world, or conclusion of the age, is the same period with the destruction of Jerusalem; for there being two ages among the Jews, the one under the law, the other under the Messiah, when the city and temple were destroyed, and the Jewish polity in church and state dissolved, the former, i.e. the Jewish, must of course be concluded, and the age under the Messiah commenced."

Dr. Doddridge says, "The phrase 'end of the
world,' signifies the end of the present age and dispensation."

Dr. McKnight says, "The conclusion of the Mosaic dispensation."

Now, sir, you knew very well, that it was only necessary to quote a passage that contains the phrase "end of the world," to convince the most of your auditors of your sentiments on this subject.—Such are their preconceived opinions, their education, their modes of thinking, their confidence in their minister, that this one phrase, "the end of the world," was enough to awaken every thrilling emotion of the heart. Then in connection with your assertion, to call to mind the strains of the poet,

"The Lord of glory sends his summons forth,
Calls the south nations and awakes the north,"
settled the question beyond all dispute.

But sir, is your view of this phrase supported by the Scriptures? Did you employ any arguments to show that this mundane sphere is to be burned, or come to an end? You did not; but taking it for granted that your auditors would understand it, all that was needed, was to call up the passage.

How far the foregoing expositors are correct, you are able to judge; for my own part, I can not discover any evidence in the phrase in favor of that part of your creed which says, "Christ shall return to judge men and angels at the end of the world." Nor, sir, does it follow that we "deny the Scriptures and believe in no judgment," because we do not coincide with your sentiments. We believe that God is the Judge of the whole earth, and that he will do right. We believe with the Psalmist, "He is known by the
judgment which he executeth." He is too wise to err, too good to do wrong in judgment. He rewardeth every man according to his works.

You believe, I suppose, that the angels who sinned, are now suffering the pains of hell with all the spirits of those who have died in impenitence. Why this grand and awful display of the divine power to break up the order of the universe, consume the earth and the heavens by fire, to re-judge men and angels and confirm his previous decisions? You consider it "a great delusion to hold that men are judged every day they live," and that such a sentiment is "throwing off the moral restraints of society, and sapping the foundations of principle and virtue." But beware, sir, lest some living monuments do not arise in our midst to teach us that it was the far off day of judgment, the hope of escaping all punishment, by a timely repentance, which was the siren that lulled them into security, and bade them riot a little longer in "the pleasures of sin." I fear not the consequences of that faith which teaches that there is at the helm of affairs, the orphan's friend, the protector of the injured, the rewarder of the good, the punisher of the bad, who "will by no means clear the guilty," who will "recompense the righteous in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner."

Let men believe that "they are judged every day of their lives"; that the great God, the Searcher of hearts takes cognizance of their doings; that not a sinner shall go "unwhipt of justice" from His hand, whose "throne is established in righteousness and judgment," and I will risk the results. We shall not then hear of escaping a just eternity of torment by an
hour's repentance, nor that our sins are laid on the shoulders of another "to ward off the edge." No more would it then be said,

"But while the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return,"
as a kind of assurance that sin may be indulged in to the last, and justice be robbed of its claims.

The passages which you cited to prove your views of the judgment, shall now be considered. 2 Tim. iv. 1, "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing, and his kingdom." Now granting that this refers to the "final judgment," there is nothing said in it about an eternal separation of one part of the human family from the other. No intimation given that one class is to be welcomed to the everlasting joys of heaven, and the other banished to the endless pains of hell. No mention is made of "the Popish apostasy," nothing said of the "re-union of spirit and body," or of the dissolution of the world. All these are taken for granted, because it is said that "Christ shall judge the quick and the dead," &c.

The apostle will afford us what we are to understand by Christ's being the judge of "the quick and the dead," Rom. xiv. 8, 9. "For whether we live, we live unto the Lord, and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For this end Christ both died and re-vived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living."

I understand here that Christ is appointed the Ruler or Governor of the dead and the living, not for the purpose, however, of condemning a part of them to
ceaseless torments. This does not appear in the divine testimony. His rule or government is that of a Savior or Deliverer—the last enemy that shall be destroyed in his reign is death. "For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, [God] then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that did put all things under him, that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. xv. 28.

This is one sense of the term judge in the Scriptures, to rule or govern. There is another meaning, to chastise, afflict or punish, and this is the meaning which you attach to the word in the passage now before us, or rather perhaps, to make judicial decision. A similar view may be taken of the terms "quick and dead." They may mean the literally alive and the literally dead, or the spiritually living and the spiritually dead. Paul says, "You hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins," and Peter affirms in his first Epistle, iv. 5, 6, "Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and dead. For this cause was the gospel preached to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit."

Well, when was this judgment to take place? The word "ready," seems to convey the idea that it was not very distant; and the apostle makes this still more evident, verse 7, "But the end of all things is at hand, be ye therefore sober and watch unto prayer"; and in verse 17 he tells us, this "judgment must begin at the house of God," or the quick, the spiritually alive; the time for judging the quick and
the dead was at hand, soon to come, in the words of Christ, "even at the doors."

On the phrase "end of all things is at hand," Dr. Clarke thus writes, "In a very few years after St. Peter wrote this epistle, even taking it at the lowest computation, viz. A. D. 70 or 71, Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans. To this destruction which was then literally at hand, the apostle alludes, when he says, the end of all things is at hand; the end of the temple, the end of the Levitical priesthood, the end of the whole Jewish economy."

Dr. McKnight says, "This epistle being written A. D. 67, about a year after the war with the Romans began, which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the Jewish state, Peter, who had heard his Master prophecy concerning these events, and concerning the signs of their approach, had good reason to say that they had approached."

You may now judge whether the text, 2 Tim. iv. 1, means "a very distant coming, and could not possibly allude to the destruction of Jerusalem."

Your next quotation is 2 Peter ii. 3, "And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandize of you; whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not." The very phraseology of this passage stands opposed to your assumption that the judgment is yet future; it lingered not, when the apostle wrote his epistle, and their damnation slumbered not. It appears to me he could not have had in his mind a judgment many hundreds of years in the future, or he would not have employed such language.
Your next is Romans ii. 5. It is not said that the "righteous judgment of God" in this text was to be in eternity, or that it was to take place at the resurrection, hence it is not to your purpose.

Again you quote Acts xvii. 31, "Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." I refer you to the 96th Psalm to learn the nature of this judgment. "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad," &c. "Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein; then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord; for he cometh to judge the earth; he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth." Our Savior told his disciples that they "should sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Jesus Christ may judge or rule, or govern the world, without destroying it by fire, or without sentencing any to an endless hell.

Your next is 2 Peter ii. 9, "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to preserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." I have shown that this same apostle declared that the judgment was at hand when he wrote.—This text then, is no proof of your views on this subject. "The day of judgment (says Dr. Clarke) is a day in which God should send punishment on that particular city, or on that person, for their crimes; so the day of judgment of Sodom and Gomorrrha, was the time in which the Lord destroyed them by fire and brimstone." The apostle therefore might employ
the phrase, "the day of judgment," in reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the national punishments about to come on the Jewish nation.

I have noticed all the passages cited in your first lecture, and shall now briefly pass over your closing remarks. You say, "How great is the delusion of those who believe that the judgment takes place with men every day they live. If the Scriptures teach any thing, they teach that the bodies of all men with their immortal spirits will be judged and rewarded at the end of this world, and the resurrections, according to their works." You may think that the Scriptures which you quoted establish this position, but to me it appears quite the reverse.

Again you assert, "It appears there is a hell beyond the grave, a punishment after death, and the resurrection, so horrible in its nature, that it can only be expressed by figurative language, the worm that never dies, outer darkness, fire and brimstone, torment in flame, smoke of their torment, (here comes your favorite epithet.) How great is the delusion of those who believe that hell is in this life." You then vauntingly ask, "Do you believe the worm is now gnawing your heart, that you are suffering the torments of the rich man who is rolling in anguish amid the flames of hell? Oh who would be a Universalist, to believe that such is the condition of the sinner, and to wage a war with the plain truth of the Bible!"

From what, it appeared "there is a hell beyond the grave," endless in duration, and the torments of which can not be expressed in simple terms, surely did not appear in your lecture. If repeated assertions, a promiscuous assemblage of texts, and loud
denunciations are proofs, then your point was attained. Reverend sir, do you believe that the Bible does not teach the fact that the sinner is tormented "in this life"? You can not. For the same reason then that you would not be a Universalist, you would be an infidel. You in effect declare, that if the Bible tells us of a hell for the sinner in this life, you will reject it with disdain and contempt!

In an evening lecture not long since, on "the prodigal son," you occupied a large portion of it to show the misery and degradation, and wretchedness, and intense suffering of this young man, and he, you alleged, represented a sinner in unbelief, in darkness, &c. Oh who would be a Presbyterian! "How great is the delusion of those who believe that hell is in this life?" You and I will not disagree that the phrases "outer darkness," &c. are used to set forth the punishment of sin, but until you show that this punishment in its nature is endless, and that these phrases relate only to such a punishment, Universalism, the doctrine which you so much despise, stands unharmed, and you can not overthrow it.

A word of friendly admonition, and I have done. Become, dear sir, acquainted with the views of those whom you assail, and there will be less danger of misrepresenting their sentiments, and less liability of incurring the imputation of a disingenuous opponent. Throw off the shackles of a creed, and stand out before the world, a seeker of truth for the sake of its own intrinsic excellence, and for that alone. Come to the Bible to know what that teaches, regardless of the rudiments of men, their favors or their frowns. Say with yourself that shall be my creed, my confession
of faith; to that will I bow, nor shall it ever pay its obeisance at the altar of human synods, assemblies or sessions. "Speak evil of no man, be no brawler, but gentle, showing all meekness unto all men." "For one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren." Respectfully,

B. B. HALLOCK.

LETTER VIII.

Reverend Sir—I now enter upon an examination of your second lecture against Universalism. Your text is recorded in Rev. xiv. 11, "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever."

Before I proceed, I wish to make a few remarks on the Apocalypse from which your text is selected.—The highly figurative style of this book, its metaphorical and hyperbolical language are such, that it appears to me, great caution should be used in our attempts to explain it, and more particularly in our use of it to establish any important sentiment of religious faith. Thomas Hartwell Horne, B. D., in his "Introduction to the critical study and knowledge of the holy Scriptures," says,

"No book has been more commented upon, or has given rise to a greater variety of interpretation than the Apocalypse, which has ever been accounted the most difficult portion of the New Testament. The figurative language in which the visions are delivered; the variety of symbols under which the events are presignified; the extent of the prophetical information which appears to pervade all ages of
the Christian Church, afford little hope of its perfect elucidation, till a farther process of time shall have ripened more of the events foretold in it, and have given safer scope to investigation."

Eusebius in his "Ecclesiastical History," observes,

"Among the spurious must be numbered both the books called 'The Acts of Paul' and that called 'Pastor,' and 'The Revelation of Peter.' Moreover, as I said before, if it should appear right, "The Revelation of John," which some, as before said, reject, but others rank among the genuine."

Dr. Clarke affirms repeatedly, "I do not understand the Book."

"Shall I have the reader's pardon (says he) if I say, that it is my firm opinion, that the expositions of this book have done great disservice to religion; almost every commentator has become a prophet; for as soon as he began to explain, he began also to prophesy. And what has been the issue? Disappointment laughed at hope's career; and superficial thinkers have been led to despise and reject prophecy itself."

I am led to these observations and extracts, not from a desire to invalidate the truth of this book, but to show that it is neither very modest nor discreet, for you to assert, "The Revelator plainly declares the future state of the wicked in the text, 'And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever.'"—The same phrase, you tell us, occurs chapter xix. 3, "And again they said Alleluia. And her smoke rose up for ever and ever." xx. 10, "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." Here, you assert, "John describes what he saw which was to take place hundreds and thousands of
years in the future. He informs us of the punishment of those who shall hereafter perish." Verily (in the words above quoted) you have become a prophet.

But let us hear John give his own interpretation on this subject. He begins his book in these words—"The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass." Verse 3, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophesy and keep those things which are written therein; for the time is at hand." And in the last chapter of the book we read—"And behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly, Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

Beware, sir, lest in your zeal to promote your own cause, and involve your opponents in the vortex of infidelity, you do not deny the Book, and have applied to you the words of the apostle, "Therefore thou art inexcusable O man, for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest, dost the same things."

With regard, then, to the time of the fulfillment of the things contained in the Revelations, we have on one side, the writer of the book himself affirming they are "shortly to come to pass," &c., and on the other the assertion of the Rev. Mr. Hatfield, "hundreds and thousands of years yet future." "Choose ye whom ye will serve."

I had thought that your doctrine is, that future punishment is to be in eternity, after day and night shall have ceased their regular alternations, and time with
the revolving earth shall have come to an end. In the very verse containing your text it is said, "And they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." This punishment appears to me to be inflicted and endured where there are days and nights. Whether this is applicable to the future eternal state, is, to say the least, rather questionable. I will not be severe or uncharitable; but it may be possible, that the reason for your not announcing the whole verse, is founded on this consideration. It would hardly do to connect "day and night" with the assertion that the Revelator was setting forth the torments of souls in eternity.

According to your own showing, the phrases "smoke of their torments, fire and brimstone," &c. are metaphorical or figurative expressions, to denote misery which can not be described in any other mode. Has it ever occurred to you, sir, that figurative language implies a reality? And that the thing itself must exist, before we can use figures to denote it? For example, God is called a rock and a fortress, but where would be the force or propriety of such terms, if there was not the most indubitable proofs that God exists, and possesses all the moral attributes metaphorically signified by a rock, a high tower, a refuge, &c.? What have you done in your lectures to prove that there is a real state or, condition of dreadful misery beyond the grave? Just nothing; and according to your views, there is no real name for this state. Your position is the same as if you should assert, that God is so wise, so powerful, so holy, and good, and merciful, that his character and perfections can
only be expressed in figurative language; hence according to this view, the name Jehovah or God would only be a metaphor. You say "the thing is so horrible, it can only be expressed in figurative language." Well now here is a begging of the question. You say, "it appears there is a hell," &c.; prove this, my dear sir, and then apply your figurative language to it, and not till then. I may say the lamb is an emblem of the patience, and innocence, and meekness of the Son of God, but if I could not show that there really was such an individual as Jesus Christ, my assumption would be sheer nonsense. Away with these emblems, and metaphors, and figures to denote a nonentity, or something which can not be proved to have a real existence.

I have shown that Christ came in judgment on the perverse nation of the Jews; that they suffered "great tribulation, such as was not from the beginning of the world, no, nor ever shall be," and I claim the right of appropriating the figurative expressions "torment, outer darkness, gnashing of teeth," &c. to this judgment. Do this, in reference to your "eternal hell," and then I will grant you the use of the emblems and figures, on which you have laid violent and lawless hands.

I will here remind you of a difficulty involved in your exposition of the Scriptures. In the verse preceding your text it is said, that "he who shall worship the beast, &c. shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb," and you refer us to 2 Thess. i. 9, "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the
"glory of his power." As you contend that both these passages refer to the future eternal condition of the wicked, you may solve this difficulty at your leisure. As I think that the first alludes to the destruction of Jerusalem, in which, to a Jew, was "the presence of the Lord," and the other refers to the downfall of "Babylon," the "Gordian knot" is in your own hands.

It appears to me that if you had carefully examined the context, and other parts of this book, you might have made this "smoke of their torment" refer to the things of time, without doing injury to the truth. In verse 19, it is said, "And the angel thrust in his sickle into the earth, and gathered the vine of the earth, and cast it into the great wine press of the wrath of God." How could this be, after "the end of the world," in your sense of the phrase? And verse 20, "And the wine press was trodden without the city, and blood came out of the wine press, even unto the horses' bridles." I ask, Do "immortal spirits" have flesh and blood, and are horses equipped and caprisoned for war, in the eternal state? In Rev. ix. we read, "And thus I saw the horses in the vision, and them that sat on them, having breastplates of fire, and of jacinth and brimstone, and the heads of the horses were as the heads of lions; and out of their mouths issued fire, and smoke, and brimstone. By these three was the third part of men killed, by the fire, and by the smoke, and by the brimstone which issued out of their mouths." Will you assert, "this is punishment which shall never end, and such is the future condition of them that worship the beast"?

But I must pass to your first position. It is thus stated:
"The terms in which the duration of punishment is expressed, signify endless, continued being, the same phrase which is applied to it, being used to denote the endless existence of God."

Hence your argument; the duration of the one must be equal to the other. You then commence your quotations; Rev. iv. 10, "The four and twenty elders fall down before him that sat on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever." Verse 14, "And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever," x. 6, xv. 7, i. 18, in which the same phrase is found. "In all these passages (you affirm) there can be but one meaning, and I call on every man here with his eyes open, to say that the same phrase is not applied to the punishment of the wicked that is applied to the existence of God."

Your argument is now before us. As the words for ever and ever are applied to God and punishment, they must both be endless. I will not charge you with plagiarism; but from the fact that you have quoted the same texts, and stated your argument in similar language, I may believe, at least, that you consulted Prof. Stuart's "Exegetical Essays." On page 57 he says, "It does most plainly and indubitably follow, that if the Scriptures have not asserted the endless punishment of the wicked, neither have they asserted the endless happiness of the righteous, nor the endless glory and existence of the Godhead."

Let us now apply this argument to some passages of Scripture. Ex. xxi. 6, "Then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to
the door or unto the door-post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him for ever." Now it follows, that if Moses did not declare that this servitude is to be endless, then we must give up the endless existence of God, for the word for ever is applied to both!

Hab. iii. 6, "He [God] 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." If we deny that the mountains are endless, that they will exist through eternity, then we must also deny that the ways of God are endless; to use your own words, "we prove that the glory of God will come to an end, that God himself will die."

See Isa. xxxiv. In speaking of the destruction of Idumea, he says, "And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof into burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever; but the cormorant and the bittern shall possess it; the owl also, and the raven shall dwell in it." Little did the prophet dream, that if the time should ever come in which this flame should cease, and in which owls and bitterns should not possess the land, that the eternal glory of God, too, might come to an end, and "His breathing Spirit" for ever expire. Little did Jonah think when he declared, "the earth with her bars was about me for ever," that if his seclusion from the light of day ever came to an end, the happiness of the
righteous too might come to an end, and "that God himself would die." When the prophet Jeremiah declared that "Jerusalem should remain for ever," he never once thought, I suppose, that he was making the city equal to God, and that if this famous metropolis should ever be leveled to the dust, and destroyed, the eternal throne of God, too, might crumble to the ground, "and the glories of the Godhead be covered with everlasting darkness."

I might continue these quotations in order to show the weakness of your argument; but it appears to me you must already see, "with your eyes open," the absurdity of supposing that because "the everlasting hills" may come to an end, the self-existent and everlasting God may also come to an end. Nor, sir, is it in the power of the word "eternal," "for ever and ever," &c. to make punishment equal to the Deity so far as relates to time. The Lord "has neither beginning of days nor end of life." "He only hath immortality." He is from eternity; we can not conceive of a period or time when He was not.

Now if we affix the word eternal to torment, to punishment, &c. does it make them equal to God? No, sir; punishment must have a beginning, it may end; it is not, and can not be self-existent, and immutable, with the word eternal qualifying it, any more than the mountains or the hills can be so, with the word everlasting attached to them. I presume that you would venture on the task of proving the eternity and infinite glory of Jehovah, if the word eternal did not occur once in all the Scriptures. But would you do so with punishment? I think not. Then there is a vast difference in the nature of the two subjects; punishment
in its nature is not endless, but the Supreme Being "changes not"; Jehovah, the self-existent and immortal God, is infinite and strictly eternal.

Dr. Clarke remarks: "In all languages, words have, in process of time, deviated from their original acceptations, and have become accommodated to particular purposes, and limited to particular meanings. This has happened both to the Hebrew olam and the Greek aion; they have been both used to express a limited time. The first and best writers in both these languages, apply olam and aion to express eternal in the proper meaning of that word; and this is their proper meaning in the Old and New Testaments when applied to God, his attributes, &c. and these words when applied to things, which, from their nature, must have a limited duration, are properly to be understood in this sense. For although the word aion means in its primary sense, endless being or duration, yet in its accommodated sense, it is applied to any round or duration that is complete in itself." Dr. McKnight says, "There was the patriarchal aion, or age, or dispensation; the Mosaic age, and the gospel age." Hence we have the derivation of the original term rendered "everlasting, eternal and for ever."—Everlasting punishment may mean age-lasting punishment, "a round or duration complete in itself;" and from its very nature it must be limited. If it be contended that aion rendered age, always means absolute eternity, then it must appear that there is an end to eternity, which involves a contradiction. Paul says, 1 Cor. x. 11, "upon whom the ends of the aions or ages are come," and Heb. ix. 26, "Now once in the end of the world (aion) hath Christ appeared,"
&c. Here are eternities mentioned, and their end, which can not be said of endless duration. When we speak of eternity as applied to God, we have no conception of its beginning or ending; but the term aion has a beginning. In Acts iii. 21, it is said, “since the world (aion) began.”

I reply then to your argument, that the word aionios, rendered “everlasting, eternal, for ever and ever,” when applied to punishment, implies limited duration; its nature demands this interpretation, its object and design require it. Would you consider an argument sound, stated thus: The words eternal and everlasting when applied to God, mean endless duration; therefore, when applied to hills and mountains and the Levitical priesthood, they must signify the same. And as you admit the endless duration of the Deity, so you must admit the endless duration of the hills. Give up the eternity of the one—show that the hills will come to an end, and you prove “that God will die”!

Notwithstanding the awful consequences which you attach to limiting the word for ever, we shall see that you have involved yourself in them. In your first lecture, you quote Heb. x. 12, “But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God.” You now tell us that “after the judgment, Christ will resume his seat at God’s right hand,” which shows that he had left it, although he was set there for ever, time “endless and continued.” You quote Daniel vii. 27, “whose kingdom [Christ’s] is an everlasting kingdom,” and tell us that “if the word everlasting means limited duration when applied to punishment, then we rob the Savior
of his glory, and show that his kingdom will cease.” You then afterwards affirm, “the work of redemption will be fully accomplished, and Christ will cease to reconcile sinners to God.” Here you virtually limit the word for ever in both instances, and sir, have you not proved conclusively “that God will die”!

Now, sir, if you can show that there is any thing in the nature of “the smoke of their torment” which is endless, as enduring as the throne of Jehovah, and as lasting as His eternity, I will yield you the argument. Till this is done; with the evidences before me that God punishes His erring children “for their profit, that they may be partakers of His holiness,” I must view punishment as limited in its nature. I am no more bound to believe that punishment is of endless duration because God is so, than you are bound to believe that He is of limited duration because you believe the mountains are so; the word everlasting is applied to both. I could prove incontestibly the eternity of God, if the word everlasting was not applied to the name; you can not prove the eternity of the hills and mountains by either of the words, everlasting, eternal or for ever. You spenk of endless punishment and endless misery. Why did not the translators employ this word, if the original really, and primarily, signified endless duration? The word endless occurs twice in our English version; the original word is not the same in both, and in neither is it the term which is rendered everlasting, eternal and for ever. An age is not endless, and the word, meaning as long as an age, and after, does not imply endless duration when applied to smoke and torment.

Yours respectfully. B. B. HALLOCK.
LETTER IX.

Reverend Sir—You proceed to quote the following texts to prove the "endless duration of God's glory." Rev. vii. 12, "Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever." Gal. i. 5, "To whom be glory for ever and ever." Phil. iv. 20, 1 Tim. i. 17, 2 Tim. iv. 18, Heb. xiii. 21, 1 Pet. iv. 11, v. 11. After quoting these passages, which speak of the glory, power, &c. of God in connexion with the terms for ever and ever, you ask, as though you had vanquished the enemy, and was triumphing over his fall, "Can any one think for a moment, that the writers of these texts intended to denote less than the endless existence of the glory of God?" What if they did not? Is the doctrine of endless misery true on this account? Must the words "smoke," and "hills," and "land," have the same meaning when the term "for ever" is annexed to them, as the glory and power of Almighty God? If this be the fact, if this be a philological rule to ascertain the meaning of words and names, I suppose it to hold good with other adjuncts. Let us see. I may say that you are a good man, I must say that God is good, but it is not possible for me to consider you or any other creature equal to Jehovah in goodness, because this adjective is applied to both. Yet your argument, if it be good for any thing, would lead me to attach as much moral excellence to a good man, as to him of whom it is said, "There is none good but one, and that is God,"
and I employ your argument and say, if a good man is not so in the highest sense; if you deny that a man does not possess all the attributes of moral goodness of which it is possible to conceive, when the word good is added to the name, then you must admit that the Deity is a frail and erring Being! This is the amount of your argument on the term everlasting; I conceive the cases to be parallel.

Let us take another word. When you used the phrase Infinite Jehovah, I presume you associate with it the idea of that adorable Being whom we call God, that invisible Spirit who pervadeth eternity and who filleth immensity. In Nahum iii. 9, we read, "Ethiopias and Egypt were her strength, and it was infinite." Now for your argument. Deny that infinite here means endless duration when applied to a city, its walls and ramparts, and "you prove that the kingdom of Christ will come to an end—you prove that God will die!"

I might continue this subject, but I think enough has been said to show you, that when the word everlasting is applied to objects which in themselves are necessarily limited, destructible, and perishable, it can not have the same meaning as it has, when applied to the immortal and self-existent Creator. Solomon says, Eccl. i. 4, "The earth abideth for ever," yet you contend the earth will come to an end. This is one of the cardinal doctrines of your church. You believe and preach it. Then, according to your own showing, you prove that the happiness of the saints will come to an end, and that the glory and power of Jehovah will also cease. If you charge Universalists with the monstrous absurdity of holding
that God will die," because they contend that "everlasting punishment" may come to an end, you are in the same predicament in contending that the earth shall come to an end, which the wise man declares "abideth for ever."

You seem not to be aware, with all your apparent veneration for the endless perpetuity of the Divine glory, wisdom, might, &c. that your creed virtually denies one of the attributes of the Deity, an attribute of which his justice, power and wisdom are modifications. I refer to the Divine goodness. You have selected several passages to prove the endless duration of God's glory, and I can not conceive of this being eternal, unless his goodness is. Indeed the Psalmist affirms, Ps. lii. 1, "The goodness of God endureth continually." Moses earnestly prayed that the Lord would show him his glory, (see Exodus xxxiii.) "And the Lord said, "I will make all my goodness pass before thee." David says, "The heavens declare the glory of God," they bear the impress of his power and goodness. The prophet Isaiah speaks of "the glory of God being revealed," in connexion with some signal display of his goodness. Our Savior declared to Martha, when about to raise Lazarus from the dead, that she should see the glory of God; his power and goodness in the restoration of her lamented brother.

"Would you form a just notion of the goodness of God, (says Saurin,) then conceive a perfection that is always in harmony with, 1st, the spiritually of his essence; 2d, the inconceivableness of his nature; 3d, the holiness of his designs; 4th, the independence of his principles; 5th, the immutability of his will;
6th, the efficacy of his power—but above all, 7th, the veracity of his word."

Dr. McKnight says, "Properly, glory denotes the bright rays about the body of the sun, by which the sun himself and all other objects are seen. Applied to God, it signifies his perfections, by which he discovers himself to his intelligent creatures. It signifies also particular attributes of the Deity."

I consider the goodness of God his glory. If his glory is eternal, so is his goodness. You admit the endless duration of the Divine glory, then you must admit the endless duration of the Divine goodness. But, as I have before remarked, it appears to me there is one doctrine in your system, come in what form it may, modify it as you will, which must stand for ever opposed to the proposition that God is eternally and immutably good. In your "Confession of Faith," the doctrine alluded to appears in this form:

"Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto, and all to the praise of his glorious grace. The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice."
If this be goodness, it appears to me that kind of goodness which no man can put into practice, in complying with the Divine command, "Love your enemies," &c.; which no parent can put into practice, in reference to his children, acting up to the command, "Be ye imitators of God as dear children." But the point to which I would call your attention is this.—You will admit the truth of David's declaration, "God is good unto all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." The adoring Christian and the blaspheming scoffer experience the goodness of that munificent God who "openeth his hand and satisfieth the desire of every living thing." "The earth is full of the goodness of the Lord." The prostrate and benighted pagan, as he implores his senseless idol, has his share of that goodness, the Author of which he knows not, the glories of whose perfections have never dawned over the darkness of his soul. This goodness is as impartial as "the mellow dawn of morning"; it is the glory of Jehovah, "it is in harmony with the inconceivableness of his nature"; it is of endless duration. You have argued its eternity; you have proved it from the Scriptures, but the doctrine of endless misery denies it. Either abandon this sentiment, or give up the endless duration of the Divine glory. It is of the goodness of God, that "we live and move and have our being"; it is of his goodness that blessings are scattered among all the children of men, and according to your view, I presume, it is because this goodness fails not, that many a sinner is walking the green earth, instead of "rolling unpitied, and unwept, in the fiery flames of hell."

Is the sinner, the "unconverted," an object of the
Divine goodness? To deny it, is to deny that he dwells on the face of the earth and is regaled from its prolific bosom. To deny this, is to deny that rain, and sunshine, heat and cold are alike his portion with other human beings. The goodness of God, you say is everlasting, of endless duration, yet as soon as the sinner has stept beyond the narrow boundary of time, this goodness, at all events, in his case, ceases for ever. Tell us not that goodness shines forth in the lightnings of a hell, "the torments of which are so horrible, they can only be expressed in figurative language"! Tell us not there was goodness in creating a sentient being, either with the foreknowledge, or the fixed decree, on the part of the Creator, that this would be his doom! Is goodness over all the domains of Jehovah now? Is it of endless duration? Can that be goodness which with its relentless and unceasing ire pursues the creature of its power throughout eternity?

Your argument against us is, if we deny the endless duration of punishment, we must also deny the endless duration of God's glory or his goodness. We reply, sir, if you contend for the endless duration of punishment, you must also contend for the limited duration of God's glory. Or in other words, you must also contend for the endless duration of the Divine wrath. On this hypothesis, you oppose the very position which you intended to establish, viz. the eternity of the Divine goodness, and you wage a war with the Scriptures of truth. I refer you to Isa. lvii. 16, "For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." Ps. xxx. 5, "His anger endureth but a moment." Jer. iii. 12, "For I
am merciful, saith the Lord, and I will not keep anger for ever." Ps. xxxvi, in which the phrase "his mercy endureth for ever," occurs twenty-six times. Micah vii. 18, "He retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy."

You quote six texts in addition to those I have already mentioned, which speak of the Lord's "living for ever"; that his throne endureth for ever, &c. and in connexion with these, you quote other seventeen passages, in some of which are found the phrases "eternal life," and in one, Mark iii. 29, the phrase "eternal damnation"; in one occurs the phrase, "blackness of darkness for ever." Your object in this, was, to make it appear that "if punishment is not of endless duration, then, neither is the happiness of the righteous, nor the existence of God of endless duration."

I have shown that the eternity of the Almighty could be proved, if there were no word "eternal" in the language; I may say the same with regard to the endless duration of happiness. I conceive, moreover, that there is such a shade of difference between the two subjects, happiness and punishment, as to admit that the one may be never ending, while the other may be limited, with the word everlasting applied to both. It is so with "heirs" and "priesthood," and why not with punishment? In 1 Pet. i. 4, the apostle speaks of "an inheritance undefiled, incorruptible, and that fadeth not away." You are aware, sir, that here are two words in the original, denoting the perpetuity of the resurrection state, which are not the words that our translators have rendered "everlasting,
for ever," &c. and which are never applied to punish-
ment. You are, moreover, aware, that there are
other words, rendered endless, &c. which are capa-
bale of expressing continued and perpetual existence.
It was, therefore, altogether gratuitous, not to say ar-
rogant, for you to assert, "If the word for ever does
not denote endless duration, then it is not in the power
of language to express it; and if it be proved that
punishment is not endless, then it can be proved, the
happiness of heaven, and the glory of Christ will come
to an end, and that God himself will die."

Your error, it appears to me, is found in the view
which you take of the nature and design of punish-
ment. I think the Scriptures represent punishment,
not as the end itself, but as the means to an end.—
The apostle affirms, Heb. xii, "We have had fathers
of our flesh, which corrected us and we gave them
reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjec-
tion to the Father of spirits and live? For they
verily for a few days chastened us after their own
pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be par-
takers of his holiness." See also Ps. lxxxix, "If his
children forsake my law, and walk not in my judg-
ments, if they break my statutes and keep not my
commandments; then will I visit their transgressions
with the rod and their iniquity with stripes. Neve-
theless, my loving kindness I will not utterly take
from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail." Isa.
x. 10, "For in my wrath I smote thee, but in my
favor have I had mercy on thee." This can not be
said of the punishment in that hell, of which you tell
us. How can it be said that the punished will be the
partakers of holiness? That they will profit by it, or that the Divine mercy and loving kindness will never be taken from them?

"Punishment (says Dr. Paley,) is two fold—amendment and example." Endless punishment denies the first, and as to its example, it can only benefit the saints in heaven, and surely they do not need so horrible a spectacle to keep them from rebelling against heaven. The learned and pious Robert Hall says, "The infliction of every species of punishment is out of place, which has no tendency to reform the offender, or to benefit others by his example; which are its only legitimate ends. Whatever is besides these purposes, is a useless waste of suffering, wholly condemned by the dictates of reason and religion." Yet this is the very kind of punishment, "a useless waste of suffering," which you tell us the God of love "who delighteth in mercy" will inflict on the creatures formed by his own plastic hand. Did it ever occur to you that things are sometimes called by their wrong names? Substitute revenge in the place of punishment, and call it "endless revenge in hell," and you will be more true to your creed.

Your second position in your second lecture is thus stated:

"There is no account in the Bible of any release from the punishment of hell; the scenes of the judgment are very particularly described, and as the Bible is silent on the subject that the bottomless pit leads to the gates of heaven, it is idle to hold out such an idea."

I forgive you this foolish notion, from the consideration that you have since read Br. Skinner's book on Universalism, and have no doubt found out ere this,
that the plan of getting to heaven through an endless hell, was originated in Mr. Hatfield's study. I cannot avoid, however, reminding you again of begging the question. Would you not smile at a Mohammadan, who, in order to prove the existence of his seven hells, should adopt your mode of reasoning? Suppose he takes the first which he calls Jehan, and tells you that there is no account of any wicked rebel ever having been released from this hell, and so he goes on to the seventh. I am inclined to think you would desire him to prove that any had ever got into his seven hells, (or perhaps I ought to say seven stories or apartments to the same hell) before he called on you to admit that they could never get out. Prove to us that the Supreme Being has sentenced any to torments unending, "which are so horrible that they can only be expressed in figurative language," and you need not bring the silence of the Bible to show that there can be no release from them.

As to the other part of your postulate, remember that the salvation which we believe in, is a salvation from sin—not from the bottomless pit—not from an awful hell. "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world." "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." See also Titus iii, "For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared; not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us." Heb. ix. 26, "Christ hath appeared to put away sin," &c.
The Bible is not only silent as to "the bottomless pit leading to the gates of heaven," but it says not a word about being saved from an eternal hell.

In the 3d place you say,

"None can enter heaven without repentance; millions have died without this saving grace; have they become holy in hell? Why then are not devils converted? Who ever heard of a prayer meeting in hell?"

None will ever enter heaven, sir, in their sins.—"We have seen and do testify (says an apostle) that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world." When this purpose shall have been accomplished, "when all things shall be subdued unto him," "all things reconciled to God," when "every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father," they will have every "saving grace" necessary to the enjoyment and full fruition of heaven and happiness.

As to there being "prayer meetings in hell," I suppose there are none there, though perhaps I might say, without being too severe, that devils themselves could not imprecate a more direful evil on the victims of their malice, than that which you believe will be the result to millions, in the last fearful act of the drama of man's existence. I ask you to point me to an instance in all the book of God of such a prayer meeting as we have at the present day. In all the account of the transactions of "holy men of old," of Christ and his apostles, tell us when and where there were prayer meetings day and night to pray the Almighty to save men from the just punishment of their sins, or to deliver them from an eternal hell!
Your 4th postulate is,

"There is no probation beyond the grave, no account of another judgment; once in hell always there."

Here, it is assumed, that man is placed in the earth to choose heaven or hell; but alas for him, "By his fall into a state of sin, he has wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation." Con. Faith, p. 47—"All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, he is pleased in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call by his word and spirit out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ." p. 48. The amount of this "probation" seems to be, that it will be much more "to the praise of his glorious justice," for God to "pass by" some of these poor subjects of hell, and that it will be more "to the praise of his glorious grace" also, to select a few from the vast whole, all alike subject to an endless hell, "a definite number which can neither be increased nor diminished"? "This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from any thing at all foreseen in man; who is altogether passive therein, until being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit he is thereby enabled to answer this call and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it." Con. Faith, p. 51.

This is your boasted probation, the time allotted to mortals to "scape from hell and fly to heaven."—Have the necessary preparation before death, they must, or be tormented without mitigation or end; yet this "passive," disabled creature, "wholly inclined to evil," is to suffer this awful doom because forsooth, he
was not "predestinated unto life." "The elect only can be saved." p. 19. "Once in hell, always there." Be it so. As long as its eternal fires shall prey upon the soul, the sinner there according to your views, may ask, how he could add to a number fixed in the decree of God before the world was? How he, being unable and passive, and wholly averse to good, could save himself, and as he, with "the rest was foreordained to wrath," how he could change high Heaven's fixed decree?

To prove your position, you refer to the "Rich Man and Lazarus," Luke xvi, and you do this, just as you would speak of a criminal whom you knew had gone to our state prison, by which I am evidently to understand that you consider it a historical fact! But, sir, it is not such—it is a parable, and was designed to set forth the Jews and Gentiles—the rejection of the gospel by the one, and its reception by the other. It was not designed to teach the doctrine of endless misery, as can be conclusively shown by your own commentators. Among them I may name Dr. Lightfoot, and his words are these:

"Whoever believes this not to be a parable, but a true story, let him believe also those little friars, whose trade it is to show the monuments at Jerusalem to pilgrims, and point exactly to the place where the house of the rich glutton stood. Most accurate keepers of antiquity indeed! who after so many hundreds of years, such overthrow of Jerusalem, such devastations and changes, can rake out of the rubbish the place of so private a house, and such a one too, that never had any being, but merely in parable. And that it was a parable, not only the consent of all expositors may assure us, but the thing itself speaks it. The main scope and design of it, seems this—to hint the destruction of the unbelieving Jews, who, though they had Moses and the prophets, did not believe them, nay, would not believe, though one
(even Jesus) rose from the dead. For that conclusion of
the parable, abundantly evinceth what it aimed at; If they
hear not Moses and the prophets," &c. Exerc. vol. xiii. on
Luke xvi.

Now, sir, you might as well take the parable of the
Sower, and tell us that Christ designed to teach that
there really was a certain man who went out to sow
—that this was the grand doctrine of the parable, as
to contend for the doctrine of torments in hell in the
parable before us. "A parable, (says Dr. McKnight)
signifies an information, either by speech or action in
which one thing is put for another." For example,
take the phrase in this parable, "and in hell he lifted
up his eyes being in torments," this is "one thing put
for another," but you say it is the thing itself. Ex-
plain all the parables in this way, and you will bring
dishonor on "the Christ of God." According to your
view of this subject, it was one of the great doctrines
of Jesus, that a certain woman took "three measures
of meal," "swept her house for a lost piece of silver,"
&c. By "the rich man" in the parable, I understand
the Jewish nation; by "the beggar," is meant the
Gentiles; both these in their political and religious
condition answered to such figures. The one, in a
national point of view endured what is well repre-
sented by the words, "tormented in this flame," and
the other, by embracing the gospel, may truly have
been said to rest in Abraham's bosom. I wish you
to bear in mind also, that the word hades, rendered
hell in this parable, is never used by the sacred wris-
ters to denote a place or state of endless misery, or
even misery at all, after death. "Hades signifies
(says Prof. Stuart) the under world, subterranean re-
gions simply, in opposition to the regions above the
earth." With this signification your best expositors agree; and how can they do otherwise? for it is in hades, or hell, that the Savior's soul was not left to suffer corruption; it is this which is to be destroyed. See Hosea xiii. 14, 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55.

My review of your two lectures closes with this letter for the present. Should you deem what I have written worthy of attention, and if you will point out any errors which you think I may have embraced, I shall be truly grateful, and will consider it a call to resume the subject. That you may come to the work with any prospect of success, I hope you will direct your efforts to the following particulars:

1st. Show that God has not purposed, nor designed, nor promised to redeem from sin and death the whole human family, and that such a sentiment is at war with reason and revelation.

2d. Prove to us that it is neither the Divine will, nor pleasure, that all mankind shall share in this salvation, that Christ died for only a part, and gave himself a ransom for a part.

3d. Reconcile the doctrine of endless misery with the developments of the moral character of God in nature, providence and the Scriptures, and show us that the infliction of it harmonizes with the Divine benevolence.

4th. Point us to the law given from heaven as the rule of moral obedience, to which law is affixed the penalty of endless torments in hell.

5th. Give a candid exposition of those passages which speak of "all things being subdued to God, all being reconciled to him, that every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess, &c.; that Christ is
the Savior of the world; that God is the Savior of all men, specially of them that believe"; so as to prove clearly a limited salvation.

And 6th. Show that my views of the coming of Christ, the judgment, the end of the world, and the nature of punishment, are discordant with the Scriptures, and unsupported by reason and analogy.

I hold myself ready to discuss these several topics with you in any equable mode which you may suggest. "Ignorant" though I may be, yet the truth is mighty and you can not overthrow it.

I believe I have now noticed all the texts by you cited in your two lectures preached against the sentiment which you think it is my "delusion" to maintain. You have not shaken a pillar of my faith, nor thrown down one stone of the temple in which I worship. I still say with Paul, "For therefore we both labor, and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God who is the Savior of all men, specially of those that believe. These things command and teach." 1 Tim. iv. 10, 11.

Yours respectfully,

B. B. HALLOCK.

ERRATA.

Page 15, first line from top, for Bishop Horne, read Thomas Hartwell Horne, B. D. Page 20, eighteenth line from top, read ditto. Page 43, twenty-seventh line from top, read ditto. Page 65, eleventh line from top, read resurrection, instead of resurrections.
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