

**T H E
D O C T R I N E
O F
Final Universal Salvation
E X A M I N E D A N D S H E W N
T O B E
U N S C R I P T U R A L :
I N
Answer to a Pamphlet
E N T I T L E D
Salvation for all Men
I L L U S T R A T E D A N D V I N D I C A T E D
A S
A S C R I P T U R E D O C T R I N E.**

**By *WILLIAM GORDON*,
Pastor of the third Church in *Roxbury*.**

**B O S T O N :
Printed and Sold by T. AND J. FLEET,
at the BIBLE and HEART in Cornhill, 1783.**

The P R E F A C E.

THE author of the following sheets doth not mean to detract from the merit of his worthy brethren, who have published on the same side of the question. He had begun before he knew the design of others ; and upon observing that his own plan was different, pursued it, desirous of contributing to the extinction of an ancient and generally exploded sentiment ; and of furnishing an antidote against the seemingly malignant poison of the OLD SERPENT, first instilled into the ears of our common mother Eve, when he gave the lie to God's threatening and said unto the woman——“ Ye shall NOT SURELY DIE.”

The mental tastes of men are as various as their animal ; and therefore a variety of publications may please a much greater number, and by that means do more universal service, than any single one however well executed.

The Friend of Truth will never regret, that he stands not alone in support of it. He rejoices, at seeing numbers coming in to the aid of a good cause. And the author of this performance
hopes,

hopes, that should that be attacked afresh, there will not be wanting those who shall offer themselves willingly to the service of the Lord in defence of it ; and the more so, as he will probably be prevented by particular engagements of a different nature.

Syriac was the vulgar language of Judea in the days of our Saviour ; but with regard to every book of the New Testament, the presumption is in favour of its being written in Greek ; and we must necessarily admit that the Evangelists were divinely influenced to give us the true sense of our Lord's expressions in the Greek words they used, which vindicates the representation made of them as though uttered by our Lord.

The pamphlet designed to be answered is anonymous ; and, whatever may have been whispered in private circles, it hath never been properly announced to the public, who compiled or who prefaced it. And it ought to be remembered, that when gentlemen think it eligible to enter into the literary world incog, they are not entitled to special respect from any excellency of private character, but may be fairly treated as though they were wholly unknown.

T H E

Doctrines of Final Universal Salvation

E X A M I N E D,

And shewn to be unscriptural.

INDIFFERENCE to religious sentiments, thought to be of *divine revelation*, however hastily pronounced a proof of candour, catholicism and good sense, must, upon mature deliberation, appear little other than an affront to the wisdom of that *Being*, who is supposed to have revealed them.

That the writer of the following sheets pretends not to such indifference, cannot be complained of by those who are *endeavouring* to spread their own particular tenets, which, though not really novel, are new to the generality of the present generation.

When persons reject doctrines upon the sole plea of their being new, it is warrantable to convince them of their mistake: but it is not the antiquity or novelty of doctrines, that should incline us to receive or reject them—no—but their being, or not being, contained directly or indirectly in the sacred writings. The appeal is to be made to *Moses* and the *Prophets*, to the *Evangelists* and *Apostles*, for it is the Bible that contains the religion of *consistent* Protestants, and not the writings of *Origen* or *Clement of Alexandria*, or any other *uninspired* divine. Should

Should it be asserted, that our Lord's words in *Matthew*, when he says, "there be eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake," are to be understood *literally*; and should it be brought in proof, that the pious and learned *Origen* castrated himself, the argument would produce a leer rather than conviction.

Whoever consults the first volume of the celebrated *Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History*, will learn from thence, that *Origen* and *Clement* were notorious, for introducing into the church, that "*pagan philosophy and vain deceit*, (alluded to by *Dr. Hartley*, but with a different view) and for mingling them with christianity, and so corrupting it."*

Clement of Alexandria, who was the præceptor of *Origen*, flourished about the year 206, and lived till towards 220. "His excessive attachment to the reigning philosophy led him into a variety of pernicious errors."† *Origen*, who died in the year 254, aged 69, enchanted by the charms of the *Platonic* philosophy, set it up as the test of all religion, and imagined that the reasons of each doctrine were to be found in that favourite philosophy, and their *nature* and *extent* to be determined by it.‡

But to dismiss *Clement* and *Origen*, and attend to *Jeremiah White*, chaplain to *Oliver Cromwell*, who is honoured with the epithets of *pious, ingenious and excellent*. If these epithets are designed to bias the mind and prejudice the reader, in favour of the chaplain's reasoning, it must be imputed to weakness or craft; but whether lay-craft or priest-craft is immaterial to the case in hand. That the chaplain was ingenious will appear from the following anecdote, which will also

* *Salvation for all Men illustrated and vindicated*, p. 21.

† *Mosheim*, Vol. I. p. 148.

‡ *Mosheim*, Vol. I. p. 221.

also prove at the same instant, that *Oliver Cromwell* was still more ingenious. *Jerry* while in a state of celibacy was ambitious of matrimonial connexions with his master's daughter, and laboured privately to gain her affections. *Oliver* obtained information of it, and, watching the opportunity, enters abruptly into the room where *Jerry* was upon his knees before his *Dulcinea*. The sight of him in such a posture led *Cromwell* to ask the reason of it. *Jerry* ingeniously answered, that he was beseeching her ladyship to intercede on his behalf, that he might obtain one of her maids of honour (mentioning the name) in marriage. O! cries the more ingenious master, *is that all!* Well! *I will help you out of your difficulty*; and immediately summoned the unsuspecting innocent maid into his presence, enjoined her compliance with the wish of the chaplain, and then saw to it, that it was so and the parties married.

But if *Oliver's* Chaplain was ever so pious, ingenious and excellent, what is that to the purpose? No man is to receive the doctrine of *Universal Salvation* upon that account; any more than that monster of monsters the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, because embraced taught and defended by many Papists far more pious, ingenious and excellent than ever was *Jeremiah White*.

We are told (p. 4) that *Mr. White's* introduction "breathes a spirit of piety and benevolence," it is not pretended however that this is an argument in favour of a *Universal Restoration of the human race*; and yet it may serve to *captivate silly women*, whether in petticoats or breeches, *who are ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth*; and to make them believe that he has the true knack of interpreting scripture.

The only answer, that *Mr. White's* benevolent rant and rhapsody upon the divine goodness is entitled to, are the following lines of *Dr. Young*.

"Not

"Not, *thus*, our infidels th' *Eternal* draw,
 A God all-o'er, consummate, absolute,
 Full orb'd, in his whole round of rays complete:
They set at odds heav'n's jarring attributes;
 And, with one excellence, another wound;
 Maim heav'n's perfection, break its equal beams,
 Bid *mercy* triumph over—God himself,
 Undeify'd by their opprobrious praise:
 A God *all* mercy, is a God unjust."*

Having done with Mr. *White's* introduction we should now proceed to his scripture arguments, which we must suppose have not suffered by being printed in the present form; but it may be proper to lay down beforehand certain principles and rules, to be regarded, while we are interpreting the scriptures, and profess to venerate them as *divine oracles*.

The writers being inspired by one and the same Spirit, no real contradiction of doctrine can be admitted; and each must be understood in a sense that accords with the whole.

The meaning of particular passages is not to be determined by the *sound* of words; but the sound of words is to be determined by the *meaning* of such passages, which must be fixed by the connexion, circumstances, and agreement with other passages.

We must not use a violence in forcing particular senses upon scripture expressions, when we should *blush* to practise the same with human compositions.

These maxims being admitted, let us pass on to try Mr. *White's* scripture arguments.

The first he produces is from the 1st epistle to *Timothy* ii. 3, 4. *God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth.* He tells

us

* The Complaint, Night iv.

us that "the letter of this text is full and express, *God will have ALL MEN to be saved*, and should we press it, there are almost as many arguments as words;" but we may *press* it to death before we can extract one argument from it in favor of the *Universal Restoration of the human race*. ALL MEN are in capitals, as though ALL necessarily meant *every individual*; and as though it would be absurd to understand the term with any limitation; whereas there are many universals in scripture use, that, if not understood with limitations, imply the greatest falsehoods. It is truly ridiculous, to observe how some trifling geniuses will furnish themselves with a set of *universals*, and, by jingling the same, please themselves and amuse their admirers.

Unhappily for the chaplain, he says, "the words are to be taken in the *same* latitude and extent with other places," and quotes ch. vi. 13. *God that quickneth all things*. Working upon it by his own example, *the letter is full and express*, God that quickneth ALL THINGS; and yet ALL in this passage cannot be understood without a limitation; for stocks and stones and a number of other *inanimate* things God doth *not* quicken. We live in an age of wonders. Who knows, but what some wonderful interpreter, one of ten thousand, may arise shortly, who shall attempt proving from this passage, together with the words of John the baptist—*God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham*—that the period will come when *universal animation shall prevail*, and the mountains shall skip with *real life* like rams, and the little hills like lambs.

Mr White or his transcriber has mis-quoted when he says "our Saviour tells us, *all things live to God*. Luke 20. 38. for *things* is not expressed, and cannot be

be implied in the *original*, as the transcriber will know by consulting the Greek, which it is apprehended he understandeth.

The original word and its compound, usually translated *all*, occur, in the masculine, feminine and neuter genders, in the singular and plural numbers, not less than 1278 times.*

It is translated variously by the terms, — ^{every} *whole* — *who-foever* — *whatsoever* — *whomsoever* — *all manner of* — and *all*. When connected with a negative, it answers to *any*; but our translators instead of *not any* render the terms *no*; thus *no flesh* should be saved (Mark 13. 20) *no flesh* shall be justified (Rom. 3. 20)

It often intends *every individual* without exception, and at other times signifies only *every kind*, or *a great number*, and that even when the number is *less* than half of the kind. It is used with like latitude that attends the term *all*, and when the *English* idiom will admit, is mostly translated by it.

What follows will evince, that it is by no means necessary to believe, that *every single man and woman will be saved*; because we read, "God will have **ALL** men to be saved!"

When we are told (Mat. 4. 23) that our Lord healed *every* (as it is in the original and is so rendered Mat. 9. 35) sickness, and *every* disease, we cannot understand any thing beyond what our translators have intimated by saying, *all manner of* sickness and *all manner of* disease. (The same may be observed of Matt. 10. 1.) It would be absurd to suppose that *all* (or even *half* of)

* Matt. 131. Mark 72. Luke 174. John 63. Acts 184. Rom. 71. 1 Cor. 111. 2 Cor. 52. Gal. 16. Eph. 53. Phil. 34. Coll. 40. 1 Thessa. 18. 2 Thessa. 16. 1 Tim. 24. 2 Tim. 18. Titus 14. Philm. 2. Heb. 51. James 13. 1 Pet. 18. 2 Pet. 7. 1 John 27. 2 John 2. 3 John 2. Jude 6. Rev. 59.

of) the sick and *all* the diseased of *all* Galilee should be brought to him. When it is mentioned (in the next, the 24th verse) that his fame went throughout *all* Syria, and they brought unto him *all* sick people ; nothing more could be designed than *great numbers*, and yet probably not a quarter of *all* the sick through Syria, which was a large country. When our Lord told his apostles (Mat. 10. 22) that they should be hated of *all* men, he necessarily excepted *all* that should entertain them and hear their words. When he pronounces the mustard seed (Mat. 13. 32) the least of *all* seeds, could he mean any other than that it was a small seed, one of the least ? as every one knows there are much smaller seeds. What a huge and strong net must that be (mentioned in the 47th v.) which when cast into the sea, could gather of *every* kind ; if by *every* (the same in the original with *all*!) is intended every one whatsoever without exception ! Our Lord charged his disciples (Mat. 23. 3.) to observe *all* whatsoever the Scribes and Pharisees sitting in *Moses's* seat bade them observe ; but it was only *that* *all* whatsoever, which agreed with *Moses* and the Prophets ; for they taught many things from that seat, which were derogatory from the glory of God and opposite to his holy commands. “ Had He enjoined an absolute submission to their dictates, He would in effect have forbid their believing in himself, whom the scribes rejected.” Every American is aware, that the expression must be limited or that otherwise it is not true, that *all* they that take the sword shall perish with or by the sword (Mat. 26. 52)

When *Simon* said to our Lord (Mark 1. 37) *all* men seek for thee, did he include all the Sadducees, Scribes and Pharisees ? Our Lord and the disciples that attended him were Jews, some of them eat with unwashed hands ; and yet we read, that the Pharisees and *all* the Jews

Jews except they wash their hands oft eat not (Mark 7. 3.) When our Lord said, *all* things are possible to him that believeth (Mark 9. 23) were there not *numberless* exceptions supposed, though the words are *full* and *express*? The like when he said (Mark 11. 24) '*what things so ever* ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them and ye shall have them: and again (Mark 13. 13.) ye shall be hated of *all* men for my names sake: and again (ver. 23.) behold I have foretold you *all* things. Did *every individual* of the *Jewish* council consent, though it is asserted that they *all* condemned him, i. e. Christ, to be guilty of death (Mark 14. 64) when we read (Luke 23. 51) that the counsellor *Joseph of Arimathea* had not consented to the counsel and deed of them?

We are informed (Luke 3. 21) that *all the people* were baptized by *John*; but from *John's* continuing to baptize long after this, it is evident, that *all* means only great numbers of *all* ranks and professions among the Jews. Our Lord tells the Pharisees (Luke 16. 16.) that *every* man pressed into the kingdom of God; and yet *they*, so far from doing it, hindered others all they could. When *Luke* says (19. 7.) that they *all* murmured at seeing our Lord going to be guest with *Zaccheus*, he could mean no more, than that there was a *general* murmur; for among the multitude there were many followers, who were so attached to Christ as to be satisfied with all he did. When the woman of *Samaria* cried out to the citizens "come see a man who told me *all things that ever* I did. Is not this the Christ?" (John 4. 29.) none of them were so foolish as to imagine, that she included *every* transaction of her life. When our Lord, to encourage his apostles, promises the Comforter, and adds (John 14. 26) "He shall teach you *all* things," He did
not

not include *all* the arts and sciences or other superfluous knowledge; but all that was necessary for them to know.

What words can be more *full* and *express* than the following, "there were dwelling at *Jerusalem* Jews, devout men, out of *every nation under heaven* (Acts 2. 5.) It is not only *every nation*, but every nation *under heaven*; and yet there were *many* nations at that time *under heaven* that were not known to any one in *Jerusalem*; though we should admit that *America* was not then peopled, whereas the contrary is most probable. Every nation under heaven *where* the dispersed Jews dwelt, is evidently all that is intended. The disciples, we are informed, had *all* things common (Acts 2. 44) but he that would infer from thence, that it was so in every particular is, not a fit member for either religious or civil society, and would not be admitted to reside long even among *Indians*, was he to attempt reducing his principles to practice. *Ananias* says to *Saul* (Acts 22. 15.) "thou shalt be his witness unto *all* men," though there were millions to whom *Paul* never preached, nor wrote, and to whom his very name was unknown.

The apostle *Paul* writes of himself (Rom. 7. 8.) "Sin taking occasion by the commandment wrought in me *all* concupiscence;" the translators have justly rendered it *all manner of* concupiscence. Again (1 Cor. 6. 12) "*all* things are lawful unto me;" though none testified more strongly against *all* things that were sinful, and to his being under the law to Christ, and not without law to God. He was made *all* things to *all* men, that he might by all means save some; (1 Cor. 9. 22.) and yet was never a sinful conformist to the manners and customs of the vicious, though rich, mighty and noble, and therefore must be understood accordingly: the same when he says "I please *all* men in *all* things (1 Cor. 10. 33.) for tho' in matters of pure indifference

no one was more condescending; and in *all* *such* things he was pliable as a thread; yet, when truth and holiness were concerned, he was firm as the rock and bold as the lion. Charity which believeth *all* things and hopeth *all* things (1 Cor. 13. 7.) cannot believe or hope *any thing* inconsistent herewith.

How unreasonable, arbitrary and cruel would it be for a man to argue from his reading (Eph. 5. 24.) "let the wives be subject to their own husbands in *every thing*," that his wife was patiently to submit to *every* cruelty and to *every* command, that he is pleased to lay her under, when intoxicated with wine, with rage, or attachments to other women. As unreasonable as to argue, that there were no disinterested christians but *Timothy*, when the apostle wrote (Phil. 2. 21.) "for *all* seek their own things, not the things of Jesus Christ."

In the first epistle to *Timothy* (6. 10.) the apostle tells us, "the love of money is the root of *all* evil;" and yet we know, that there is *much* evil that hath nothing to do with the love of money, and doth not grow upon that root. He says in his letter to Titus (2. 11.) that "the grace of God," viz. in the gospel dispensation, "*hath appeared to all men*," which must be understood as intending *men of all* nations ranks and orders; for every individual man, even myriads, *had not* been made acquainted with the gospel.

John tells us in the Revelation (5. 13.) "and *every* creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and *all things* that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing and honour and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb forever and ever." Will a person of any sense suppose from hence, that every thing that was before mute became vocal; and not rather, that *all* nature in different ways concurr'd in this song of praise.

When

When we read, that *every* bond man and *every* freed man hid themselves from the wrath of the Lamb (Rev. 6. 15, 16.) we must except *all* the friends of the Lamb. When the beast causeth *all* both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand or in their foreheads (Rev. 13. 16.) notwithstanding the words are so *full* and *express* we must exclude *every* one whose faithfulness and attachments to Christ would not admit of their complying. When Babylon becomes the hold of *every* foul spirit and a cage of *every* unclean and hateful bird (Rev. 18. 2.) we cannot suppose that foul spirits, unclean and hateful birds are to be found in no other part of the universe than *Babylon*: nor can we understand the phrase literally when it said (verse 24.) in her was found the blood of *all* that were slain upon the earth. When *all* the souls are called upon to come and gather themselves together unto the supper of the great God, that they might eat the flesh of *all* men (Rev 19. 18.) both free and bond, both small and great, the flesh of the enemies of God is all that can be meant. And when the foundations of the wall of the heavenly *Jerusalem* are said to be garnished with *every* precious stone (Rev. 21. 19.) the sense is no more than our translators apprehended and have expressed by *all manner of* precious stones.

But as saith Dr. *Doddridge* "it would be endless to enumerate the texts, where common sense requires us to take the word *all* in this general manner."

We may fairly conclude, from this induction of particulars, that we are not bound to admit, that *no one whatsoever*, let him be the most abandoned profligate that ever existed, will miss of *final* salvation, because the apostle has used the term *ALL*, and said "God will have *ALL* men to be saved."

But

But should we admit of Mr. *White's* interpretation, that *all men* means the whole human race, not a single soul excepted yet his favourite doctrine could not be supported by this text. He tells us indeed, "it is not said God *would* have all to be saved by his *good will*, but that he *authoritatively wills it* : *wills it* as a being of supreme, uncontrollable power, a being that *will* be obeyed. It is a *fixed, determined, immutable* will, not *transient*, nor revocable. Thus *powerfully, and irresistibly* does God *will all men to be saved.*" Boldly asserted ! When a man is haranguing and has a point to carry, there is nothing like declaring roundly and with the utmost confidence, without discovering the least change of countenance or trepidation of voice, *the story is true, it is certainly so*, let it be ever so contrary to reason, scripture or facts ; for he will find some, who will credit him upon it, even for those who are sensible and judicious in other respects ; but, through weakness of intellectual nerves, they suffer themselves to be *stormed* out of their senses, by the daring assaults of desperadoes in religion.

However, not to be terrified by Mr. *White's* bold assertions, let us try the truth of them ; and their agreement with his next paragraph, wherein we read "as he, i. e. God, *wills* the end, so does he *will* the *necessary means* leading to it. In order to their being *saved*, he will have *all men* come to the knowledge of the truth. No man *is* or can be *sanctified* or *saved* without the knowledge of the truth ; God wills therefore that this means of salvation shall pass upon them." But the chaplain or his transcriber has failed to tell us *where* this means of salvation—the knowledge of the truth—passeth upon all men.

That person is past reasoning with, who will deny that the apostle by *truth* here means the gospel. It
is

is indisputable that not one half of the world is christianized; and that, so continuing, it is morally impossible, they should have the *knowledge of the truth*. But if the end is not to be obtained without the necessary means, and the necessary means, do not take place—if no man is or *can be* sanctified or saved without the *knowledge of the truth*; and yet millions live and die, from age to age, without this knowledge, then it must follow, that the *will* of that Being, who is said to will that ALL MEN come to the knowledge of the truth, cannot mean that *authoritative will*, which is accompanied with *uncontroulable power* and is *ever obeyed*. Seeing then that God doth as powerfully and irresistably will all men *to come to the knowledge of the truth, as to be saved*; and that facts without number evidence, that all men come *not* to the knowledge of the truth, we are reduced, by dire necessity, to understand the divine will in the text for the *approving* and not the determining and effecting will of God.

The apostle makes no difference between God's willing that all should be saved, and his willing that all should come to the knowledge of the truth. Let it also be noted, that the original is *not*, who wills *to save* all men, but wills all men *to be saved*, the verb is passive and not active. Had it been active, Mr. White's first text in proof of the *certain salvation of all men* would have been far more to the purpose; as it is, he obtains no support from it. Our translators were sensible of a material difference, between God's willing *to save* all men and willing all men *to be saved*; and have hinted this difference by rendering the passage *will have all men to be saved*. They would have expressed the meaning of the apostle yet more fully, had they rendered it *would have all men to be saved*, intending, by
his

his *good will* : for, notwithstanding, what the chaplain *authoritatively* pronounces, the apostle, while he uses the original word for *will*, in the same tense and mood, not less than thirty-nine times in his writings, in more than twenty nine places alludes to the *inclination* of the mind and not the *operating power* of the will ; accordingly it is translated in twenty four* instances by *would*, in one by *disposed*,† in a second by *I had rather*,‡ and in three others by *desire*.§ In the other ten places,|| where it is rendered *will* and *wilt*, it might be once and again more properly *would* or *wouldst*. It occurs only twice in the remaining epistles. *James* says (2 ch. 20) but *wilt* thou know O vain man, which is tantamount to—but *know* thou O vain man. *John* writes (3 ep. 13 v.) I *will* not.

We meet with it, in the historical books of the new testament, sixty one times, fifty one of which it is translated *will* or *wilt* : the fifty one must be reduced to forty one, for in ten places of *Mark* and *Luke*,†† we have only a repetition of what we meet with in six of *Matthew*.‡‡ In twelve more,|||| at least, out of the forty one, the allusion is evidently to the *inclination*, *pleasure* or *desire* of the person or persons concerned.

The

* Rom. 1. 13.—7. 15, 16, 19, 20, twice in the 19th ver.—
11. 25.—16. 19.—1 Cor. 7. 7, 32.—10. 1, 20.—11. 3.
12. 1.—14. 5. 2 Cor. 1, 8.—5. 4.—12. 20. twice.
Gal. 3. 2.—4. 17. Col. 2. 1. 1 Thess. 4. 13.
2 Thess. 3. 10.

† 1 Cor. 10. 27. ‡ 1 Cor. 14. 19.

§ Gal. 4. 9,—6. 12, 13.

|| Rom. 9. 18. twice.—13. 3. 1 Cor. 4. 21.—7. 36, 39.
14. 35,—16. 7. 1 Tim. 2. 4.—5. 11.

†† Mark 1. 41.—8. 34.—10. 51.—14. 12, 36.—15. 9.
Luke 5. 13.—9. 23.—18. 41.—22. 9.

‡‡ Matt. 8. 3.—16. 24.—20. 32.—26. 17, 39.—27. 17.

|||| Matt. 13. 28.—15. 28.—17. 4.—20. 21.—27. 21.

Mark 6. 25.—15. 12. Luke 19. 14. John 5. 6.

Acts 7. 28.—9. 6.—25. 9.

The remaining number is twenty nine;* and should the impartial reader consult them, he will probably be ready to judge that in several of them no more is meant than the *inclination*.

As to the other ten of the sixty one, the original is translated would or wouldst,† desire or desireth,‡ and listeth.¶ Thus it appeareth, that not only in *Paul's* writings, but through the whole new testament, the original word, in the same tense and mood, rendered *will* in the text under consideration, alludes to the *inclination* of the mind, and not to that *operating power* of the will for which the chaplain contendeth.

It may be objected, that however the original word alludes in common to the *inclination* of the mind, as hath been now observed, because that it is the *will* of the *creature* that is concerned; yet that when the *divine Being* speaks or is spoken of, it hath another meaning: for, that as Mr. *White* saith (p. 6.) “the *will* of God does not rest in pitying men, and wishing it were better with them—no—the *will* of God and his *work* are one. He *wills* nothing but he *works* it.” That “He is an *omnipotent* and *wise* agent and can never be resisted,” so as to be frustrated even when opposed, is readily granted: but that, when he is said to *will* in the sacred writings, we are not always to understand *such kind* of *will* as the chaplain maintains, hath been shewn from *the fact*, that all men do *not come to the knowledge of the truth*, though he is said to *will* that they should do it;

* Matt. 9. 13.—11. 14.—12. 7 —15. 32.—19. 17, 21.
—20. 14, 15.—21. 29.—23. 4.—26. 15.—27. 43.
Luke 9. 54.—12. 49.—13. 31. John 5. 21, 40 —
6. 67.—8. 44 —9. 27.—17. 24.—21. 22, 23. besides
the six above specified at the mark ††.

† Matt. 12. 38. Mark 10. 35, 36. Luke 6. 31. John
9. 27.—12. 21.—21. 18.

‡ Mark 9. 35. Luke 5. 39. ¶ John 3. 8.

it ; and will be made further to appear, when it shall have been proved below, that all men *are not saved*, for that individuals do really perish. However before we enter upon that proof, let me point out the error of Mr. *White's* assertions from other passages of scripture, which contain a flat denial of them.

Our Saviour, to silence the cavils of the pharisees at his eating with publicans and sinners, tells them to go and learn what that meaneth *I will have mercy and not sacrifice.* (Matt 9. 13.) And when they complained to him, that his disciples did what was not lawful to do upon the sabbath, he answers them by saying, "if ye had known what this meaneth, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice*, ye would not have condemned the guiltless (Matt. 12, 7.) The words are a quotation from *Hosea* (6. 6) There *Jehovah* saith by the prophet, "for *I desir'd* mercy and not sacrifice ; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings." Dr. *Doddridge* renders the *Greek* in *Matthew*, "I require mercy and not sacrifice;" and then notes, "so the *Greek* evidently signifies, when it expresses the will of a superior ; and this the original *Hebrew* word imports, which seems to answer to that modern phrase used by princes *such is our pleasure.*" The *Septuagint* translation varies somewhat from our Saviour's quotation, which is as the *Hebrew* "mercy and not sacrifice," whereas the other is mercy *rather than or before* sacrifice, and the knowledge of God *rather than or before* burnt-offerings." The *Septuagint* observing, that the subsequent clause in the *Hebrew* determined the sense of the preceding, rendered both in the same manner. The *verb* used by our Saviour and the *Septuagint* is the same : and his authority justifies the use of it as answering to the *Hebrew* original ; and the meaning of the passage in *Hosea* proves, that in the

new testament it intendeth *I desire, prefer, take delight in, am pleased with, require,* and the like, whatever the chaplain or his transcriber may assert to the contrary.

One of the greatest *Hebricians* that this century hath produced, *Schultens*, makes *to bend* the primary notion of the *Hebrew* root in *Hesea*; from whence the transition is easy to the subsequent secondary significations—"to have a ready, well-disposed, and cheerful inclination of will and affection; to be well affected to; to favour; to delight in; to be willing; to choose;" which are given as the common meaning of the word by *Dr. Taylor* in his *Hebrew Concordance*. He hath omitted mentioning *to will*, but cannot be thought to mean, that it should be excluded; seeing, that the *very first translation* he gives, is in the *Latin* for *to will*; and in this he agrees with *Pagninus, Buxtorf, Leigh, Opitius, Stock*, and others, who had before interpreted the *Hebrew* root in the like manner that he hath done.

The Doctor in his preface remarks to the following purport, "The words and phrases of the new testament are but the words and phrases of the old translated into *Greek*. The same language runs through the whole, and is set in such a variety of lights, that one part is well adapted to illustrate another. To understand the meaning of the Spirit in the new, it is essentially necessary that we understand its sense in the old testament. By carefully collating those places of the sacred code where any word is used, you may judge what sense it will, or will not bear. Which being once settled, there lies no appeal to any other writings in the world; because there are no other books in all the world, in the pure original *Hebrew*, but the books of the old testament. A judgment therefore duly formed upon them must be absolutely decisive."

Let us proceed upon this plan, and attend to the issue. The *Hebrew* verb, the sense of which hath been given, is to be met with eighty four times in the old testament, thirty nine of which it is asserted of or uttered by, the divine Being. In sixteen out of these it is rendered *delight, have delight, delighted, delighteth,** *favourest,†* *well pleased,‡* and *have no pleasure.§* the negative being added; and that the true sense could not have been given, but in these or words of similar meaning, is evident from the prepositions with which the verb is connected in the original. In the other twenty three places it is rendered *please, please, hath pleasure in, and have I any pleasure at all; *** *would and will; ††* *delighteth in and delight; ‡‡* *desire, desired and desire? |||*

In the forty five places, where the *Hebrew* verb has a reference to the creature, it is translated in like manner as when referring to the divine Being, except in *Job* 40. 17: in which it is *moveth*. It is only *will* in *Ruth* 3. 13: *would* in *1 Kings* 13. 23: and *willing* in *1 Chro.* 28. 9.

The *Septuagint* have translated the *Hebrew*, in forty out of the eighty four places, by the *Greek* verb translated *will* in *1 Tim.* 2. 4; and in twenty of them, where the

* *Numb.* 14. 8. *2 Sam.* 15. 26.—22. 20. *1 Kings* 10. 9. *2 Chro.* 9. 8. *Pf.* 18. 19.—22. 8.—147. 10. *Is.* 62. 4. —65. 12.—66. 4. *Jer.* 9. 24.

† *Pf.* 41. 11.

‡ *Is.* 42. 21.

§ *Ezek.* 18. 32—33. 11.

** *Judges* 13. 23. *Pf.* 51. 19.—115. 3.—135. 6. *Is.* 53. 10. 55. 11.—56. 4. *Jonah* 1. 14. *Pf.* 5. 4.—35. 27. *Ezek.* 18. 23. twice, more literally *in desiring do I desire*, but more elegantly *have I any pleasure at all*.

†† *1 Sam.* 2. 25. *Job.* 9. 3. *Pro.* 21. 1.

‡‡ *Pf.* 37. 23. *Micah* 7. 18. *Mal.* 2. 17. *Is.* 1. 11.

|| *Pf.* 42. 6. *Hosea* 6. 6. *Pf.* 51. 6, 16.

the divine Being is spoken of or speaks.* The introduction of the verb *will* into these several passages, instead of what our translators have used, by such as please to make the experiment, must sufficiently shew the weakness of the chaplain, in laying that mighty stress upon it, and crying out “the *will* of God and his *work* are one. He *wills* nothing, but he *works* it” The generality of readers will probably be satisfied with the following specimens.

David predicts the language, with which the enemies of our Saviour reproached him when upon the cross, saying “he trusted in the Lord, that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he *delighted* in him.”† The Septuagint render it in the present tense, so that the word is *exactly the same* as in *Timothy*; and, what deserves observation, the *very same* with what the sacred historian records.‡ Let the *English* then be, “let him deliver him seeing he *wills* him.” Add Mr. *White*’s paraphrase on the same word in *Timothy*, only changing it for *him*, and read, “He, i. e. God, *authoratively wills* him; wills him, as a Being of *supreme, uncontrollable power*. It is a *fixed, determined, immutable will*, not *transient* and *revocable*. The *will* of God and his *work* are one. He *wills* nothing, but he *works* it.” What a sweet sense this makes of the passage! Our translators have avoided the absurdity by rendering it in the Evangelist, “let him deliver him now, if he *will have* him,” meaning *will approve* of him, or, to comport with the Psalm, *delighteth in* him, which must be the sense, because of the preposition that the *Hebrew* verb is there connected with, though it is wanting both in the Septuagint translation and in *Matthew*. The

* 2 Sam. 15. 26. 1 Kings 10. 9. 2 Chro. 9. 8. Ps. 5. 4. —18. 19.—22. 8.—37. 23.—40. 6.—41. 11,—51. 16.—115. 3 —135. 6 —147. 10. Prov. 21. 1. Is. 55. 11.—56. 4. Ezek. 18. 23. twice, and v. 32. Hos. 6. 6.

† Ps. 22. 8. ‡ Matt. 27. 43.

The prophet *Ezekiel* furnishes us with the following remarkable passages. "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die; saith the Lord God: and not that he should return from his ways and live? For I have no pleasure in him that dieth, saith the Lord."* The Septuagint translation reads in *English* with the *Greek* verb rendered as in *Timothy*, "shall I *will* with my *will* the death of the wicked, so much as, (or, equally with) his turning from the evil way and his living? For I *will* not the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord." The use of the *Greek* verb signifying *to will* by the Septuagint, must be allowed to be just, from what hath been already observed.

Here it is evidently maintained, that the Lord *willeth* the amendment of the wicked rather than his death: And if so, it may be proposed to Mr. *White's* transcriber, how comes it about, that as God wills *authoritatively*, with *supreme uncontrollable* power, with a *fixed, determined immutable* will—how comes it about that as his *will* and *work* is one; and as he *wills* nothing, but he *works* it; that the wicked doth not turn from his evil way and live? What hinders? He is an *omnipotent* and *wise* agent, he can never be *effectually* resisted. The text and context, supposeth, that in divers instances the wicked dieth; and yet the ~~wording~~ wording of the text shews, that it is true of *every* wicked man that the Lord *willeth* his amendment rather than his death. It matters not to the argument what *this* death is, whether it intends future punishments or dying by national judgments. There is no other way of removing the absurdities following upon Mr. *White's* mode of reasoning, but by admitting in opposition to what he pretendeth, that when the *will* of God is spoken of, it often means his benevolence or
good

* Ezek. 18. 23, 32.

good will; his approving, and not his *determining, effecting, omnipotent* will. The divine Being exerciseth a moral government over his rational creatures. They have all a law written upon their hearts; to some he hath given a fuller and clearer revelation of his mind. By that He tells us, what we are to do, and what we are to forbear. When we go contrary to his directions we act wickedly; when we obey them we act righteously. It is his *will* and *pleasure* that we should act righteously. He threatens us, if we do not: He promises us benefits, if we do. His sacred oracles are written in the language and dialect of these lower regions; and not, to us, in the *unintelligible* dialect of the upper; being designed for *mortals*, and not for angels. They speak after the *manner of men*, who cannot speak or conceive of the divine Being above human abilities; and therefore, to excite suitable thoughts and affections in them, distinctions are used concerning the Deity, and passions ascribed to him, which do not really belong to his nature, and which, to prevent mistakes, we are taught in other places are foreign to it, as implying changeableness and imperfection. Were we to consider more, when reading the scriptures, the divine Being as the moral Governor of the world, publishing his *will* and *pleasure* to his reasonable creatures, we should the more easily comprehend their meaning and design. It is the *will* and *pleasure* of every kind sovereign on earth, that all his people may be good subjects, and reap the benefit of it: and it is the *will* and *pleasure* of the King of kings, that all his reasonable creatures should be faithful and obedient subjects, and of consequence enjoy salvation.

It is not improbable, that when *Paul* wrote to *Timothy*, "who will have all men to be saved," he had his eye to those gracious and encouraging declarations contained

ained in Ezekiel (ch. 18. 23, 32. and ch. 33. 11.) for his expression is conformable therunto : and that this is not a singular conjecture, is plain from the reference made to this passage of *Paul's*, in the margin of some of our *English* bibles.

The gospel considers all men as sinners, and is, in short, a PROCLAMATION from the King of kings, promising pardon and grace to all who repent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. It is the divine pleasure, that this PROCLAMATION should be published far and wide, through this globe, to all nations, kindreds, tongues and people ; and that every one who hears it, should take the benefit of it : and this is the sense, in which " God *will* have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth ;" and let it be remembered, that it cannot be said with justice, " of this will of his that it *resteth* in pitying men, and wishing it were better with them ;" for, by his Son, He commanded the apostles to go into all the world, and to preach the gospel to every *human*-creature,† without exception ; and *Paul* was called to proclaim the glad tidings to the *Gentiles* expressly : and had christian sovereigns understood the calls of providence and of the scriptures, instead of having employed the fine arts of navigation to the infamous purposes of discovering new countries for to plunder and enslave the natives, they would have employed them in the glorious purpose of spreading the divine Proclamation of pardon and grace through Jesus Christ, to the everlasting salvation of all true penitents and believers, without regard to their complexion, features, manners or customs.

Some may with me prefer the above explanation of Mr. *White's* first text ; while others choose to answer him by urging, that the words *all* men, do not necessarily imply any more than *all orders* and *sorts* of men :
for

† Mark 16. 15.

for that the term *all*, both before and after, *must* be understood in a limited sense. When the apostle directs in the first verse, that prayer should be made for *all* men, he could not mean for *every individual*, as christians were virtually prohibited by that *loving* disciple *John* (1 John 5. 16.) praying for those who had sinned the sin unto death, i. e., had been guilty of the unpardonable sin against the holy Ghost. Again, when (in v. 8th) he writes, "I will therefore that men pray *every where*," he designs not in *each*, but in *any* place, without regarding its having been, or continuing to be, *holy* or *unholy*, which agrees with what our Lord taught the woman of *Samaria* (John 4. 21—24) in answer to her enquiry about the proper place of worship. Now if *all* in the 1st and in the 8th verse *must* have a *confined meaning*, why may it not have the like sense in the intermediate space?

One or other of these interpretations must be allowed, or the scriptures are at variance, and give an uncertain sound.

Now is the place, reserved in my own intention for replying to an answer that may be given to the argument, drawn from all men's *not coming* to the knowledge of the truth, in proof that all men are *not saved*.

It may be answered, that though millions live and die without the knowledge of the truth, yet this means of salvation may pass upon them *in another world*.

The pamphlet doth not assert it, in so many words; but the sensible and careful reader will observe, that *only some* principles are *published*, that others are concealed in *consequences* to be revealed when the favourable opportunity offers. We may rest assured, that we are not masters of the whole plan, while we stop short of *Origen's full* sentiment, who is pronounced by some to have "turned even hell itself into a *purgatory*; and to have

have thought, that not only wicked men, but the very devils might be so purged in it, as to come forth *angels of light.*"*

That the knowledge of the truth is attainable in the dark regions of hell, will not appear incredible to those who believe, that a free intercourse is maintained between the miserable inhabitants of it——that many who have prophesied in the name of the Lord Jesus, and in his name have cast out devils, and in his name done many wonderful works will be publicly doomed in the day of judgment to future punishments—and that numbers are called to the knowledge of the truth, who perish notwithstanding——it will be well, if there are no additions made to them, by the flattering and false hopes, that some entertain of being at length for ever happy, in a distant though unknown period, let their moral character here be what it may, from the unscriptural persuasion, that there is actual salvation for all men. But though it should be admitted, that the knowledge of the truth is attainable by all the damned in hell, whether men or devils ; yet there is not the least foundation in the sacred oracles, for supposing, that such knowledge will prove *saving* to any of them. It is evident, that the New Testament confines the Proclamation of pardon and grace for all who repent and believe on Jesus, to the inhabitants of our world ; and hence they are assured, that if they believe not, they *shall not see life*, but the wrath of God *abideth* on them.† This is the current doctrine of scripture, so plain and intelligible, that he who runs may read it, and that the way-faring man though a fool cannot mistake it—unless he is a *will-fool*. It is addressed directly to *sinners* on earth, and not to *sufferers* in hell ; there is not the least intimation, that it will ever be directed to
the

* Wake's Discourse on Purgatory, p. 3.

† John 3. 36.

the latter : the contrary is strongly asserted ; for the former are told, that if they believe not they shall *not see* life, but the wrath of God *abideth* on them. Will the wrath of God *abide* on them ? Shall they *not see* life ? They then that will venture to contradict this doctrine, and to teach men that the wrath of God will abide on them only for a certain period, and that after such period they shall *see life*, though they have *trod*den under foot the Son God, and have accounted the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and have done despite to the Spirit of grace—such teachers, methinks, ought to come invested with powers for working miracles greater than those wrought by Jesus and his apostles, for these verily taught the reverse. The poet *Milton* gives a far more scriptural account of hell than such teachers, when he crys out,

“ Regions of sorrow ! doleful shades ! where peace
 “ And rest can never dwell ! hope never comes,
 “ That comes to all : but torture without end
 “ Still urges, and a fiery deluge, fed
 “ With ever-burning sulphur unconsum’d !”

We may be told, that *Peter* writes,† “ Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, being put to death in the flesh, but quickned by the Spirit, by which also he went and *preached* unto the spirits in prison : which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of *Noah* while the ark was preparing.” This passage has been greatly perplexed and tortured by designing and interested theorists, whose business it was to support a favourite scheme. Dr. *Doddridge*’s translation is certainly a just one—“ Quickened by the Spirit, by which (or whom) *going forth* he preached to the spirits in prison, who were *long since* disobedient.”— The Spirit by whom our Lord was quickened was the Spirit of God ; this

E

Spirit

† 1 Pet. 3. 18—20.

Spirit was granted to *Noah*, that preacher of righteousness, by our Lord, who is therefore spoken of as going forth by him and preaching to those spirits in prison, who were long since, or formerly disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of *Noah*.

Whether this interpretation be allowed or rejected, matters not to the case in hand. Let persons maintain, if they will, that the passage refers to our Lord's descent into hell or limbus patrum, and to his preaching there; it doth not appear from it, that his preaching proved effectual for the salvation of any; for *Peter*, at writing, speaks of the auditors as being still *spirits in prison*, and makes no mention of any's returning with our Lord to a better place. His saying, who were long since or formerly disobedient, doth not argue that they were not now disobedient; for if they were not now disobedient, they would scarce be shut up in prison: but he alludes to that particular disobedience in the day of their trial, when once the long suffering of God waited to see, what would be the effect of *Noah's* preaching; and which disobedience proved the occasion of their being cast into prison.

Paul was a most zealous indefatigable preacher; and it is not to be doubted, but that he would readily have postponed going to heaven, on quitting the body, and have visited the damned in hell, had there been the least glimmering hope that he should be instrumental in saving a single soul out of that place of torments; whereas whenever he mentions being absent from the body, he concludes that he shall be present with the Lord. It is now above four thousand years since the disobedient in the days of *Noah* were sent to the prison of hell; and we have not yet had certain authentic intelligence of any one's having been brought, by means of his torments, to godly repentance, and commenced an holy person, and in consequence of such change obtained a removal to glory.

The

The Papists indeed assure us, upon their word and honour, that numbers have gone to heaven from the limbus patrum and from purgatory; and in Cardinal Bellarmin's time most of their divines taught, *that the damned and the souls in purgatory, are tormented in the same fire and in the same place*: but they distinguish between the *damned* and the *souls in purgatory*; the latter are "penitent sinners, who departed this life in grace and charity, but nevertheless indebted to the divine justice some *pains*, which they suffer in the other life; pardoned as to the eternal *guilt* or *pain*. yet obnoxious to some *temporal penalty*;" the *damned* are those abandoned wicked graceless spirits, whose sins shall *never be remitted*: so that in this point the Papists keep nearer to the scriptures than the *ingenious* Mr. *White* and his admirers.

Let us now proceed to the arguments in proof of there being *such* damned, whose sins shall *never be remitted*, and who will never *see* and enjoy *eternal life*; but shall have the *wrath* of God *abiding* on them.

The scriptures uniformly teach, that the moral characters of mankind are formed and fixed *in and by* the *present life*; that their states are *unalterably* determined at death; and that the *time of probation* is then at an end. The admonitions, promises, threatenings and representations of our Lord and his apostles evidently imply it.

Solomon's advice is—"whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, whither thou goest;"* by which he means to declare, that the present world is the stage whereupon we are called to perform the parts assigned us by our Creator; and that we shall not be allowed to perform them over again, in that invisible world to which we are going. A
greater

* Eccl. 9. 10

greater than *Solomon* expresses the same sentiment, when he saith, "I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is *day*; the *night* cometh when no man can work."* The last clause appears to be a general acknowledged truth applied to his own particular case—a truth holding forth this instruction, that the *day of life* is the time of action; that the *night of death* closes the scene; and that we shall be approved or rejected, as we have *finished* well or ill. In perfect unison with these ideas, it is written, "to *day*, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation. Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God; but exhort one another daily, while it is called *to day*."† "Now is the accepted time, behold, *now* is the *day* of salvation."‡ *John* the baptist, in his preaching, compares the national church of the *Jews* to a threshing floor covered with wheat and chaff, and says of our Lord, "he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."§ The good are compared to wheat, the bad to chaff. The former are to be gathered into a safe and secure place, the latter are to be destroyed—not to pass through a new and *fiery* trial, in order that they may be thereby turned into wheat.

We read—"God so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should *not perish*, but have *everlasting life*."|| He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned,"¶ or condemned in a judicial way to future punishment. The last quotation was spoken by our Lord, after his resurrection, a little before his ascension, and when commissioning his

* John 9. 4. † Heb. 3. 7, 8, 12, 13. ‡ 2 Cor. 6. 2.

§ Matt. 3. 12. || John 3. 16. ¶ Mark 16. 16.

his apostles to preach the gospel to every human creature ; and so deserves special attention. It would be tedious to the reader, to mention all the passages, where salvation or eternal life are promised to every one who repenteth and believeth on the Lord Jesus; and where it is threatened, *expressly* or by *manifest* implication, that whosoever believeth not shall not see life, shall perish, shall be damned or condemned to future punishment : *Salvation* and *eternal life* in such passages are evidently synonymous; and so are *not seeing life, perishing, being damned, or condemned*. The former and the latter are *contrasted* to each other as *opposites*. But what becomes of the *contrast*, if the threatening only means, that unbelievers shall be condemned and punished for a while, and after that shall be blessed with eternal life ? The first preachers of the gospel must have been thought egregious triflers or worse, if, while they spake as they did, they intended no more than *this*; and had a *reserved subterfuge*, according to which the vilest miscreant that ever went to the grave will at length be saved. Many persons, when they have entertained a pleasing opinion, through an indolence of temper, will not be at the pains of examining into the truth or falsehood of it. They had rather be deluded by an agreeable dream, though to their future damage ; than be awakened to a sense of danger, time enough to escape the approaching evil. I would hope better of some into whose hands this may fall; and therefore go on, and note, that the most and best arguments of the pamphlet in behalf of the *Restoration of all mankind to final happiness* are taken from the writings of the apostle *Paul*. Let us examine whether the *interpretation*, given to the passages quoted from him, doth not contradict what he advanceth in other places ; for if so, *such interpretation cannot be the true one.*

Paul

Paul tells the Romans,* that "all things work together for good *to them that love God, to the called* according to his purpose;" and, in support of it, adds, "whom he did foreknow, he did also predestinate to be conformed to the image of his son; moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Not to enter into dispute about the meaning of *foreknowledge, predestination, and calling*; the passage connects these with being *justified and glorified*, and appropriates the whole to *certain* individuals, to the exclusion of *others*—to *them that love God, to the called* according to his purpose. We may as well argue, that a *part* is the *whole*; as that *all* are foreknown, *all* are predestinated, *all* are called, *all* are justified, and *all* are glorified—or as that *all* are glorified and restored to final happiness, though *some only* are foreknown, predestinated, called, and justified.

In his epistle to the *Hebrews*, he declares it impossible for those who were once enlightened, and had tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the holy Ghost, and had tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, should they apostatize, to be renewed again unto repentance; and then represents their unhappy doom by the following illustration, "for the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God: but that which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing, *whose end is to be burned.*"† How puerile and impertinent is this illustration, if the end of the greatest apostate is only to pass through a temporary burning, in order to his *receiving a blessing from God*, and being made finally happy! He also warns them, saying, "see that ye refuse not him that speaketh, for if they
escaped

* Rom. 8. 28—30. † Heb. 6. 4—8.

escaped not, who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven."* Could it enter into the head of any believing sensible Jew, who recollected how the refusers in the time of *Moses* were destroyed, that the apostle *secretly* admitted, that should they turn away from him that spake from heaven, they would escape notwithstanding, and in length of time become the companions of them that *serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear.*

When he writes to the *Corinthians*, "but with many of them God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness;" he subjoins, "now these things were *our examples*," and again a little lower, "now all these things happened unto them for *ensamples*, and they are written for our admonition."† What was it that happened unto them? For their disobedience murmuring and lusts, they were overthrown in the wilderness, they were destroyed of the destroyer, and were never suffered to enter the *promised land*. But how are these *our examples*, if after having given into the highest acts of disobedience, indulged the basest lusts, and allowed ourselves in the most indecent murmurings against the divine conduct, through life, we are admitted into it? Upon Mr. *White's* principle, they were written *in vain*, and have *no admonition* in them; for they do not *prefigure* the absolute and perpetual exclusion of any from the *heavenly Canaan*, though the destruction of the *Jews* in the wilderness was an absolute and perpetual exclusion of all such from the *earthly one*. From the passages now quoted it is evident, that *Paul* was opposed to the *Restoration of all mankind to final happiness*, whatever some inquisitors may attempt forcing him to speak, by putting his expressions to the rack and torture.

It

* Heb. 12. 25. † 1 Cor. 10. 5, 6, 11.

It remaineth, that we attend particularly to the *great Prophet* of the church, whom if the christian professor will not hear, it is vain to think of calling other evidence. Our Lord testified, that "strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and *few* there be that find it."† Others maintain, that, though this is true in reference to the *direct* road unto life, yet there is another round about way leading from destruction, which, the many, who for the present prefer the wide gate and the broad way, will at last hit upon, so that *all* without exception shall have life. Could the multitudes of common people, who listened to our Lord's sermon understand him in this light? Or did he mean to impose upon their credulity? Or did he not believe what he taught? each was impossible. But his parable of the rich man and *Lazarus* will admit of no such gloss. In that he introduces *Abraham* as saying to the rich man in hell, "betwixt us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence."‡ Had Mr *White's* admirers the modesty that the poor tormented wretch had, they would give up the point, upon receiving such an answer from heaven, uttered by the father of the faithful, though they might like him imagine, that a messenger from the invisible world would be more convincing, than *Moses* and the prophets, with Jesus the evangelists and apostles. But they may plead, that this was a parable and a fiction. True, it was so; and a proper vehicle to convey instructions, after a striking and forcible manner never to be forgotten, into the minds of the attentive audience. One of these instructions, and which could not be mistaken, by them, unless they possessed Mr. *White's* ingenuity, was, that if they were once cast into hell, they could never pass from

† Matt. 7. 14.

‡ Luke 16. 26.

from thence to heaven. This was a truth, or it was not. If it was not, but artfully employed to terrify from bad practices, the character of our Saviour is impeached and his name blasphemed: he becomes a *Machiavelian* instructor, and does evil that good may come of it: he *deceives* his hearers that he may preserve them from vice. However, let Jesus be true, and every man a liar. Whether he spake plainly or in parables he taught the truth; and therefore the wicked, whether rich or poor, learned or unlearned, when once cast into hell shall never pass from thence to heaven.

In his answer* to the Sadducean objection against the resurrection, it is manifestly implied, that *all men* would not be saved: for while he saith, "they which shall be *accounted worthy* to obtain that world" where they neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can die any more, but are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God; he also teacheth, that *all* will not be *accounted worthy*.

Upon another occasion our Lord declared, "he that shall blaspheme against the holy Ghost hath not forgiveness for ever, but is obnoxious to everlasting condemnation"† (or damnation) according to the original. "The blasphemy against the *holy* Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men; whosoever speaketh against the holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him—neither in this world, nor in that which is to come."‡ How could our Lord have more *expressly* assured the *Jews*, that blasphemers against the holy Ghost would remain *perpetually* unpardoned? He says positively that "they shall *not* be forgiven;" and to give the greater weight to his words, hath a recourse to the *proverbial expression* by which it was usual to signify, in the strongest terms possible, that things should never be—"they shall not be forgiven—neither in this world, nor in that which is

F

is

* Luke 20. 35. † Mark 3. 29. ‡ Matt. 12. 31, 32.

is to come." According to Mark he said also, in the same discourse, of such blasphemer, "he hath not forgiveness for ever, but is obnoxious to *everlasting condemnation*" (or damnation.) We must then believe, that the guilt of such blasphemy will ever remain unpardoned; and, if so, the blasphemer cannot be admitted into heaven. If the repeated positive assertions of our Lord, though expressed in the most forcible language, are not to be credited, where are we!

Can it be *seriously* said in answer to this argument, that "the blasphemer will continue in hell, till by his sufferings he hath *fully satisfy'd* for the *unpardonable sin*; and then he will afterward upon a change of character remove to heaven?" It may be replied, that then upon this removal he may go about boasting among the glorified, that "he is less obliged to Christ than they, for that his greatest sin was not pardoned for the sake of Christ, and that he himself made a *complete compensation* for it *without any abatement.*" But it may be thought more to the purpose to observe, that if the blasphemer can by suffering compensate for the sin against the holy Ghost, and yet continue to exist in a capacity of being afterwards for ever happy; then the sinner doth not, by the *greatest sin* he can possibly commit, *forfeit* his *existence*; for the unpardonable sin is represented as the greatest possible.

But to come to the case of *Judas*, concerning whom, on account of his treason, our Lord assures us, "it had been good for that man, if he had not been born."† This must necessarily imply, that the traitor will never be finally happy: for if ever he was to enter upon eternal life, it was certainly good for him that he was born into existence; though his sufferings prior to it, should have continued for a period of as many millions of years as would be contained in a line of figures from
this

† Mat. 26. 24.

this paper to the sun, or even the most distant star; for such a period of suffering would not bear so much proportion to eternal happiness, as the unit one does in number to such a line of figures, or a moment in time to such a period. Temporary punishment however protracted is *nought* when compared with everlasting blessedness. The instance of *Judas* is then in point, and decides the controversy, that there cannot be a "Restoration of *all* mankind to final happiness;" because it would have been well for that man if he had not been born.

Now let us try, whether the other texts, quoted in the pamphlet, will admit of an interpretation agreeing with what hath been already advanced: they must, or there is a manifest opposition between different parts of scripture—the more easy and natural such interpretation, the more satisfactory it will prove. The apostle writing to *Timothy* could not do otherwise than say "God *our* Saviour," as he was *their* saviour, even though *no other* than *Paul* and *Timothy* were saved; and the extension of the pronoun *our* to *all* mankind is a violence, which though too often practised by, is notwithstanding a scandal to disputants. When in the 4th ch. 10 v. he styles God the *Saviour of all men*; it is not in allusion to *spiritual*, but *temporal* deliverance. We read (Judges 3. 9) "the Lord raised up a *deliverer* to the children of Israel;" and again (15 v.) "the Lord raised them up a *deliverer*;" in the *Hebrew* it is a *Saviour*, as noted in the margin of some bibles: the *Septuagint* use the same word as in *Timothy*. *Samuel* tells the Jews (1 Sam. 10. 19) "ye have this day rejected your God, who himself *sawd* you out of all your adversities and your tribulations." The *Septuagint* translate it, "who himself is the *Saviour* of you, out of all your evils and your tribulations," employing the
Greek

Greek word the apostle doth : and this they do in many other places, so that God the *Saviour*, my *Saviour*, our *Saviour*, and the *Saviour* of *Israel* are very common, even when *temporal* deliverance is plainly intended. In the beginning of the verse *Paul* writes, for the end of advancing godliness (" for this thing therefore" in the original) we both labour and suffer reproach ; he then assigns the reason for their labouring and suffering reproach, notwithstanding the dangers and fatigues attending them, and adds, " because we trust in the living God, who is the *Saviour*, *preserver*, *protector*, or *deliverer*, of all men, especially of those that believe." The title answers to that in Job 7. 20. *Preserver of men*. *Paul* refers to God's providential kindness, by which he preserves and defends all men, but *more especially* the faithful.

We are told, " that all men, *reprobate* as well as *elect*, have *one* and the *self same* God. The *elect* have not *one* God, and *reprobate* another ; but *one* God is the God of them both. To adopt the words in *Malachy* 2. 10. " *Have we not all one father ? Hath not one God created us ?*" yea, the same good and kind and merciful God and father made all. So then we see the blessed God stands in the same near and tender relation to the whole human race." A noble discovery ! But was it designed to *convince*, or to *confound* the reader ? Had not the *zeal* of the publisher out ran his *judgment*, he never would have suffered so sophistical a paragraph to have made its appearance. By way of answer I retort the argument. God is the parent of the universe. Men and angels, *Abraham* and *Judas*, the minutest insect and the most glorious Cherubim, the holiest Seraphim and the impurest devil, *Beelzebub* and *Gabriel* have *one* and the *self same* God. The good angel hath not *one* God, and the bad angel another ; but

one

one God is the God of them both. To adopt the words in *Milucky*, "Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us?"—all whether stones or trees, insects, birds, beasts or fishes, saints or sinners, angels or devils? yea, the same good and kind and merciful God and father made all *creatures*. So then we see the blessed God stands in the same near and tender relation to the *whole creation*." But will it from hence follow, that he must make *all equally happy* in proportion to their respective capacities? Or that he must not punish *any* who are disobedient and rebellious? Or, that he is *cruel and unmerciful* should he prepare everlasting fire for the devil and his angels; or should he consign to the same, the wicked and impenitent among mankind? Will such doctrine agree with the words of *Ishaiab*? (27th 11 v.) "It is a people of no understanding, therefore he that *made* them^x will shew them *no favour*." If a people may be thus dealt with, when universally abandoned, though there may be certain good characters among them—a *Noah*, a *Daniel*, a *Job*——much more may the worst individuals.

What Mr. *White* observes of the *one mediator* between God and man, is as little to the purpose, as his sophistical paragraph about the *one God*. *Christ Jesus* mediates, not for the *Jew* or the *Greek* only, the circumcised or the uncircumcised, the free or the bond, but for the whole human race without exception, who embrace and comply with the gospel. And the *value* of his atonement was *such*, that divine justice can acquit every one who repents and believes, agreeable to the gospel-proclamation; therefore it is with propriety said, "who gave himself a *ransom for all*:" but it doth by no means follow, that therefore in *justice* all men *must* be saved, or that the *blood* of *Christ* loses its virtue. The virtue of *Christ's* blood was designed to save men in perfect harmony

x will not have mercy upon them, & he that formed them

harmony with the divine holiness and justice, which require repentance and faith, according to the established mode of redemption; while then it saves *each individual* that repents and believes, it is not in any true sense *lost*, though *numbers perish* through their own impenitence and unbelief: so that Mr. *White* assigns a false motive for the apostle's adding—*to be testified in due time*—neither do these words mean as he pretendeth, “that there shall be a time, when, *from the actual salvation of every individual* (which though not printed is evidently intended) it will be manifest that *all men* are ransomed and bought by the blood of Christ :” the original is literally—*the testimony in due time, or proper season*—and therefore admits of different easy constructions without our being obliged to fly to this *unscriptural* one.

The reasoning that hath been now used, to set the passage in 1 Tim. 2. 6. in its true light, and to correct the misconstruction put upon it in the pamphlet, may be applied to 1 John 2. 2. “If any man sin we have an advocate with the father, *Jesus Christ* the righteous, who is the propitiation for *our* sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the **WHOLE WORLD**.” However Mr. *White* may exclaim—“A text so worded with a *not only*, and the *Whole World* looks as if the Spirit had purposely consulted to obviate and prevent all *clippings* of it :” yet it must be *clipped* of his comments; or the Spirit will not be *consistent*, and teach the *same* doctrines in different parts of scripture, but contrary ones. The apostle *John* wrote this epistle, as must be supposed, to believers within *certain* limits. Under a sense of the sinful infirmities attending him and those whom he addressed, he saith, “who is the propitiation for *our* sins;” but *they* were not the *only* believers who were thus privileged; the blessing was common

to all of that character, without any regard to their circumstances, nation or place of abode ; his benevolent heart glows with the thought, and in an extasy of pleasure he adds, "and *not for ours only*, but for the sins of the **WHOLE WORLD**," meaning believers whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, every where over the whole world. The propriety of the addition will be still more apparent, were the persons addressed mostly *Jews* or very much so ; for such might be still tainted with the bigotry and pride of their nation, who held the best of the uncircumcised *Greeks*, and much more *Barbarians* and *Scythians*, as unfit for conversation and company ; and could not bear the thought of their admission to equal privileges with themselves in the Messiah's kingdom.

The ingenious Mr. *White* pursuing his subject, refers us to *Romans* 5. from the 15th to the 19th v. *But not as the offence, so also is the free gift : for if through the offence of one, many be dead ; much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift : for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Therefore, 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. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.*

The passage is not without its intricacies ; but upon examination will be found *not* to favour Mr. *White's* scheme. The epistle was directed to believers, beloved
of

of God, called and holy. Paul sets himself, in the latter part of the chapter, to "shew that the calamities brought by the *first Adam* on his seed, are repaired with glorious advantage to all who by faith become interested in the *second Adam*;" as is observed by Dr. Doddridge; who in his note upon the 12th v. says "as this verse is an inference from the 11th, it seems evident that believers only are spoken of; for it is plain from comparing the 9th, 10th, and 11th verses with the 1st, that it is only they, *who are justified by faith, who have peace with God, and who joy in him by Christ as having received the reconciliation.* And this obvious remark clears the following passage of difficulties, which would be exceeding great, if it were to be considered without regard to this connection, and which have in fact, misled many commentators; who for want of attending to it, have plunged themselves and their readers into great perplexity, and given a sense to the paragraph, of which it is by no means capable." He afterwards remarks, that the 12th, 18th and 19th verses make one continued sentence, and that the intermediate verses do undoubtedly come in as a parenthesis.

In the 14th v. *Adam* is stiled the figure, or model of him who was to come, viz, the *Messiah* or *second Adam*. Each is described as a publick person or federal head, to his respective seed or posterity—herein they agreed; but *not* in this (whatever Mr. White asserts) "that they each, by turns, *represented mankind.*" Neither do the words *many* and *all*, wherever they occur in this passage, take in the *whole* human race: when connected with the *first Adam* they take in *all his seed*; and when connected with the *second Adam* they take in *all his*, but none other. Mr. White unwarily for himself admits the distinction between the
seed

seed of the first and of the second *Adam*, while he speaks of "the one sin of *Adam's* being charged upon *all his seed*, and the abundance of *Christ's* righteousness being imputed to *his seed*." The seed of *Adam* includes *all* mankind descending from him in the ordinary way; and the seed of *Christ* intends the *believing part* of mankind, as is evident from this chapter and other parts of scripture. Herein *Adam* and *Christ* agree, that they are publick persons; and that they convey important consequences to their particular posterity; but they differ in several respects. *Adam* conveyed to *his* posterity, *sin* and *death*; *Christ* conveyeth to *his*, *righteousness* and *life*. Nor is the offence and the free gift exactly alike. "*Through the offence of one, Adam, the multitude of his posterity died; but the grace of God and the gift by grace which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath much more abounded to the multitude of his posterity, and that in two very important articles. In the first place, the gift is not merely as the ruin that came upon us by one that sinned in respect of the number of offences in question; for the sentence of one offence passed upon us to condemnation; but the free gift is effectual to our justification from many offences. Moreover, in the next place, if by one man's offence death reigned by one over all his posterity; then they who thankfully and obediently receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall much more reign in life by the one restorer and recoverer of his seed, even Jesus Christ; they shall by him be brought to a much nobler and more excellent life than that from which Adam fell and which they lost in him.*" The agreement between *Adam* and *Christ* in conveying important consequences (though the consequences are extremely different) each to his particular posterity is summarily stated in the 18th

and 19th verses, when the apostle resumes the subject he had began in the 12th v, having finished his parenthesis. "*Therefore as by one offence the federal influence was to all men unto condemnation, so also by one grand act of righteousness the federal influence is to all men who receive and embrace it unto justification of life; for as by the disobedience of one man many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one, i. e. of Christ, shall many be made righteous.*"

The above paraphrase is chiefly an abridgment of Dr. Doddridge's, with a few small alterations.

The passage we have been considering appears to be written much after the modern curt sentimental manner—in broken, incomplete sentences—to be perfected by the contemplative mind of the knowing and judicious reader. But not to evade the force of it as quoted in support of Universal Salvation. It is pleaded—"there is one offence upon *all men* to condemnation, and the righteousness of one upon *all men* to justification;" and it may be urged "there is an opposition between that condemnation which comes upon *all men* through the offence of one, and that justification of life which comes upon *all men* by the righteousness of one, i. e. of *Christ*; and therefore *all men* must be taken in the same sense in both parts of the verse, and consequently must be extended to *all mankind*." This states the argument rather stronger than is done by Mr. White. "But it is not reasonable to suppose, that the terms of opposition have any respect to the *universal extent* of condemnation and justification, for the apostle's design is not to compare the *number* of those who shall be justified, with that of those who are condemned by the fall of *Adam*; but to compare the two heads together, *Adam* and *Christ*; and to shew, that as we are liable to condemnation by the one, so

we obtain righteousness by the other." From what was before noted it appears, that the terms *all* and *many*, when designed to express the numbers benefited by *Christ*, as a federal head, comprehend *his seed only*, and not all mankind; which may be farther argued from the *nature* of the *privileges* with which such are benefited. They are of the highest importance, nothing less than *justification*, or a judicial acquittal from the guilt of many offences, together with *eternal life*: and "it is so plain, that they are appropriated to persons of a particular character, expressed (in the 17th v.) by *receiving the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness*, that it is surprising any should have spoken of them as *common* to the whole human race. And nothing is more evident, than that the original word for *receive* often signifies *being active in embracing* a benefit proposed, or a person offering himself under a character of importance."*

Mr. *White* admits, that none but those, who *now* lay hold on the gift of righteousness, have the *immediate benefit* of it; but salves the difficulty, by supposing that others will reap the benefit of it *hereafter*, and by pleading that the word *all* must be taken as universally when *justification* through the righteousness of *Christ* is spoken of, as when *condemnation* through the offence of *Adam*.

This plea hath been already answered; but he attempts to strengthen it by saying, for *all* died in *Adam* and therefore *all* shall be made alive in *Christ*. These words he quoted before, and inferred from them the resurrection of *believers* and *unbelievers*: herein he was not singular: others have done the same, but without attending sufficiently to the chapter from whence they are taken; in which the apostle treats *not*, of the resurrection of the ungodly; but *only* of *Christ's*

* See Dr. Doddridge's note.

Christ's and that of *believers*, as consequent upon *his*. When he writes (1 Cor. 15. 16 — 20) "if *Christ* be not raised, *your faith* is vain: then they which are fallen asleep in *Christ* are perished. If in this life only we have hope in *Christ*, we are of all men most miserable. But now is *Christ* risen from the dead, and become the *first fruits* of them that sleep;" it is evident that he hath his eye to believers, with respect to whom only *Christ* is the *first fruits*; he is not the *first fruits* of them who come forth from their graves to the resurrection of damnation. When *Paul* saith therefore, "since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in *Adam* all die, even so in *Christ* shall all be made alive" (v. 21, 22.) we must understand the resurrection of the dead as referring only to the resurrection of *pious believers*, and the *all that are made alive* as intending them: in which we are confirmed by the following verses of the chapter: for "every man is raised in his own order, *Christ* the first fruits, and afterward they that are *Christ's*, at his coming:" by *they that are Christ's* is meant they that had fallen asleep in *Christ*, or deceased christians. The apostle doth not proceed to mention a word about the resurrection of the ungodly: but when he comes to answer objections against the doctrine of the resurrection asserts that the dead body is raised in glory—in power—a spiritual body, in the image of *Christ's* heavenly body, so that death is triumphantly swallowed up in victory: which assertions can never be applied to them, who come forth from their graves to the resurrection of damnation, and awake to shame and everlasting contempt.

The last quotation presented us from Mr. *White*, is, his remarks upon Eph. 1. 9, 10; and Col. 1. 20. The apostle writes to the *Ephesians*, "having made known

known unto us *the mystery* of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself," v. 9. The mystery spoken of is *not*, that the wicked part of the creation, whether men or devils, should, with the holy part of it, be reheaded in *Christ*; but that the benefits of the gospel were common to the *Gentiles* with the *Jews*. "The calling of the *Gentiles* had been long a secret, of which neither they nor the *Jews* had any conception, till revealed by the holy Spirit to the *Apostles*." That this is meant by *the mystery* here, is evident from the beginning of the 3d chapter to the 10th v. and it is called *the mystery of Christ* (in the 4th v. of the 3d chapter and in Col. 4. 3.) This was *the mystery* for which the apostle was in bonds (Eph. 6. 19. Col. 4. 3.) We may say with Dr. Taylor (in his note upon Rom. 5. 18.) "the grand point in view is the extensiveness of the grace of the gospel, in opposition to the narrow principles of the *Jews*, who would have confined salvation within the pale of their peculiarity." Had not Mr. *White's* prejudice diverted him from attending to this important point, he would have found the key by which to have opened the next words: but he first fixes an unscriptural sense upon the 10th verse, and then tells us *that* is *the mystery* spoken of in the 9th. The calling of the *Gentiles* to a full participation of similar privileges with the *Jews* was *that mystery*, which was so ordered, "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he (i. e. God) might reunite under one head all things in *Christ*, both which are in heaven and which are on earth." Dr. *Doddridge* hath the following note on the last clause, containing the true sense of the verse. "*Both in heaven and earth* is considered by some, as a *Jewish* phrase to express the *whole world*; and Mr. *Locke* thinks it may be equivalent

lent to *Jews* and *Gentiles*. But it seems most reasonable to understand it, of bringing *Angels* as well as *men* under the government of *Christ*. The original verb must, in its most literal signification, express *uniting again under one head*. Both *Angels* and *men* were at first in sweet and harmonious *subjection* to the *Son of God*, the great Creator of both; but *man* having broke himself off from the society, the *Son of Man* by his humiliation and sufferings *recovers* all who believe in him, and in his human nature *presides over the kingdom* to which in the world of glory, *they* and his *angels* belong. This interpretation presents us with a noble view," and preserves the *harmony* of scripture doctrines, while Mr. *White's* makes them a *jumble of discords*.

The church at *Colosse* consisted chiefly of *Gentile* converts, as did that at *Ephesus*; and *Paul's* epistle to it was written as that to the *Ephesians*, when he was in bonds. He takes special notice in both of that *mystery of Christ*, of which we have been speaking; and in Col. 1. 20. expresseth the same sentiment we have considered, with a small variation in words, "and (having made peace through the blood of his cross) by him to reconcile all things to himself, by him, I say, whether they be things on earth or things in heaven." On which Dr. *Doddridge* remarks, "Dr. *Whitby* would render it, *by him to make all things friendly in him, making peace between them by the blood of his cross*; and I apprehend, that to be the true sense, and the only sense in which *things in heaven* can be said to be reconciled; when a breach commenced between man and the blessed God, the *angels*, as faithful subjects, must join with him against the rebellious creature, and be ready to act as enemies to him, while he continued the enemy of God," but, upon that breach's being made up by the blood of the cross, *angels* are reconciled to man.

Mr.

Mr. *White* harps upon the comprehensive terms *all things* which he or his extractor gives us in *capitals*. He tells us, "And when he, i. e. the apostle, says, *all things*, it is manifest *nothing is excepted*. Had he not been bigotted, he would have recollected, that though the word *things*, the apostle intends *persons* or rational beings; and that therefore *many things may be excepted*, especially the *everlasting fire* prepared for the devil and his angels, and the *worm that dieth not*, which are generally supposed to be *in hell* and not *on earth*. There have been, and may be still, maggotty people, who have supposed hell to be somewhere *in* or *under* the earth; but if the apostle had foreseen it, he could not have taken a more effectual method to have prevented our supposing, that such as were confined there would be united again, with the rest of the creation, under one head in Christ Jesus; for though when he speaks of heaven he uses a preposition whose general meaning is *in*, when he speaks of earth he changes it to another which means *on, upon, or above*. Mr. *White* might possibly have triumphed had the apostle said, "which are *in* heaven and which are *in* earth;" and yet, as it is not granted by all, that hell is somewhere *in* or *under* the earth, it might still have been maintained that the apostle ought to have been more explicit, and after having said "which are *in* heaven and which are *in* earth," should have added, "and which are *in* hell:" but for want of this, all Mr. *White's* conclusion "there is nothing either *in heaven* or *earth* which shall not finally be reconciled to God, and be reduced to a proper state of subjection." is nothing more in support of *Universal restoration to favour*, than if he had told us, *in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*. It may not be amiss to note, that the change of the preposition from *in* to *on* is in both

both *Ephesians* and *Colossians*. It is needless to dwell upon the futility of laying stress upon the term *all*, after what hath been so fully proved above, that it is often very far from including every individual.

—“Thus much for the excellent *Jeremiah White*,” at present : proceed we to another writer upon the same subject of *Salvation for all men*; who, though not honoured as Mr. *White* with the epithet *excellent*, is certainly as *extraordinary* an interpreter of the sacred oracles.

The apostle being led to speak of the resurrection of believers at the coming of *Christ* (1 Cor. 15. 23) without damping his present joyful feelings, arising from the contemplation of a glorious resurrection, by staying to take notice of the awful solemnities of the last judgment, springs forward in his views to the consummation of the mediatorial scheme, and cries out, “then, or after that, the end! when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power: for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy *that* shall be destroyed, is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest, that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.” But there is “*a great deal to be done after the second coming of Christ*, for the accomplishment of which, *a long period of time* may be requisite,” before this end cometh; as the day of judgment according to scripture follows upon *Christ’s* second advent. Before this end cometh, *universal subjection to Christ* shall take place; agreeable to the *strong and extensive* terms that
are

are used ; from which our extraordinary interpreter infers, that the *universal subjection to Christ* implies the *total and absolute* destruction of *sin, Satan and death*, the *second* no less than the *first*, and the reduction of the *whole human race* under a *free and yet full* subjection to the government of God, so as to be the *meet objects of his mercy*, when he shall *finally* take the *kingdom into his own hands*. He charges the *common explanation* of the passage with giving us a *poor, low* idea of the *final effect* of *Christ's* reign, in comparison of what he contends for. It may so, in the opinion of one, who appears to be wise above what is written, and to leave the *common explanation*, that he may force upon us an *uncommon* one, in order to serve a purpose. To serve this purpose he unfairly introduces into the passage a distinction that hath nothing to do with it, *the distinction* between the first and second death ; and then very artfully endeavours to palm upon his reader, the *poorest and lowest* of all ideas, even a *false one*, that the apostle spake of the second death as well as of the first, when he said, " the last enemy that shall be destroyed is *death* : " whereas it is plain from the whole chapter, that he speaks of that *first corporeal death* which is destroyed by the resurrection. This death is the last enemy " that continues to hold in some sort the subjects of *Christ* under its dominion ; " and is the *last* to be totally and literally destroyed ; and its destruction commenceth upon the sounding of that trumpet which announceth the coming of *Christ* to judgment. Now if this death is the *last* enemy to be totally and literally destroyed, what becomes of our author's scheme ? For after its destruction followeth that awful judgment which will consign the devil and his angels and the ungodly race of mankind to the pains of the second death ; and thus the absolute destruction of *sin, Satan*

and the *second death*, as built upon this passage, is totally set aside, and numbers of the sons of Adam will be *justly* confined for having been, and continuing to be, **REBELS** against the government of God—whether *everlastingly confined* in hell remains to be enquired into.

The *common explanation* may be pronounced *poor* and *low*; but if the *true* one, and according to the divine mind, it would argue more wisdom and piety to withhold the epithets. It is not what we wish or fancy; but what the Lord reveals that we are to receive for truth: and while professed believers in scripture, as a revelation from heaven, we should be upon our guard, lest our wishes and fancies should impose an *uninspired* sense upon it.

All rule, and all authority and power is put down, and all enemies are subdued, and all things put under the feet of *Christ*, when they are either brought into a willing and holy subjection to him, or are vanquished and punished by him, so as fully to display his superiority and sovereignty over them; and we are led to conceive of the latter rather than of the former, by the terms “till he hath put *all enemies under his feet*.” The expression inclines us to apprehend, that the persons in this state of subjection are *still enemies*, who deserve to be trampled under foot; instead of *true penitents*, reduced to a *free* and *full* subjection, *meet objects of God’s mercy*, and fit to enter upon the joys of heaven: and is, therefore, wholly subversive of the author’s design in quoting the passage.

He is certainly an uncommon genius, or he would never have thought of finding in the *first promise* of a Saviour, the doctrine of *Salvation for all men*. He tells us that the words (in Gen. 3. 15.) *And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel*; are designed to convey the thought of
that

that "*complete victory*, which *Christ*, the seed of the woman, should gain over the *devil*, there spoken of under the emblem of a serpent : for the words are evidently an allusion to the way of *destroying* serpents, by striking their head. To *bruise a serpent's head* is a phrase expressive of *one* and the *same* thing with *killing a serpent*." One would imagine, that the next paragraph should therefore have been, "Consequently, when it is said of Christ, that he should *bruise the serpent's head*, the idea obviously and naturally communicated by the words, is, that he *shall destroy the devil*," his very being, so that he should not live any longer ; but contrary to our author's own premises, it is, "not his *being*, but that *kingdom of his*, which as a *tempter*, he has introduced into the world, accompanied with *sorrow and death*:" and thus, according to our author's reasoning, though the serpent means the *devil*; and though to *bruise a serpent's head*, is a phrase expressive of *one* and the *same* thing with *killing a serpent*, the *devil himself* is *not* to be *destroyed*, he is to escape; and the stroke instead of *killing him*, is only to destroy the kingdom he hath set up in the world. But still, if our author is right; and "*this first promise of God* fairly leads us to look for the time when *sin that work of the devil* shall be *totally and absolutely* destroyed by him who was born of a woman;" then either the devil, or his devilism must be destroyed, and he be converted into a good being, or sin still remaineth in the temper of the devil, and it is *not* "true in *event* and *fact*, that SIN is totally destroyed, by a reduction of *all men* under *moral subjection* to God," "and it ought (upon his own principles) to be fairly and honestly owned (by *him*) that Christ has not *bruised the serpent's head*, as it is declared that he should." What means our author by saying the *devil*, that is, his *kingdom*? Is the *devil* and his *kingdom* one and the same, so that
the

the destruction of the latter is the destruction of the former? Then indeed, he who destroys the *building*, destroys the *builder*.

But our author seems to think, that if the human race are *all saved*, then the devil's kingdom will be destroyed. He hath herein overlookt certain truths of no small importance in the present case. Sin did not *first* begin, when *Adam* fell in paradise; but in the blisful regions, when the angels deviated from their *first state* of integrity and holiness, and for their thus sinning were cast down to hell. One of these fallen angels, for some special reason, is stiled the *devil* and distinguished from *his* angels; and probably is the same active and leading agent in wickedness that is meant by *Beelzebub* the prince of devils. While the *devil* and *his* angels remain at enmity with God, retaining their character as *rebels* against him, *sin* and *lust* still reign. If then, the *being* of the devil is to be spared; and yet, *sin*, that work of the devil, must, according to the first promise, be *totally* and *absolutely* destroyed, by him who was born of a woman; the words in Genesis are a promise of salvation to the *devil* and *his* angels, no less than to *Adam* and *his* posterity. But that this promise of salvation to them, should come in while the Deity was pronouncing a curse upon the serpent, appears to me impossible!

Another text from the same writer, and the last which the extractor brings to view, is recorded in Revelation 5. 13. *And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the lamb for ever and ever.* The interpretation given to this passage, is farther from the truth, by

by some hundreds of years, than from the present moment to the end of time; and had our extractor considered it duly, he would, for his own credit, have concealed it *from* instead of *bringing* it to view. It hath no manner of relation to transactions *beyond* the day of judgment; it is a figurative representation presented to *John* in vision, before the Lamb opened any one of the seals, of that book wherein was written the future condition of the church at different periods. The general opinion is, that *John* was banished to the isle of *Patmos* in the reign of *Domitian* about the year 96; some place it earlier, none later. The period connected with the opening of the first seal is thought by Dr. *Newton*, bishop of *Bristol*, to have terminated with the life of the emperor *Nerva*, A. D. 98. He supposeth, that the banishment of *John* happened under *Nero's* persecution; and that the period commenced with *Vespasian* and *Titus* in 70, when *Jerusalem* was destroyed. Mr. *Lowman* reckons, that the period ended with the first century. Dr. *Isaac Chauncy*, eldest son of a former president of *Harvard* College, and pastor of a church in *London*, in a manuscript work upon the Revelation, wrote about ninety years since, in my possession, interprets the *white horse*, which appeared upon the opening of the first seal, as expressive of that state of peace and tranquility which the churches enjoyed soon after *John's* having the vision, which he places in the reign of *Domitian*. He thinks that the period from the opening of the first seal began about 98, and lasted till the third persecution under *Trajan*. I know not of any who bring the opening of the first seal so low down as the year of our Lord 100. The last passage therefore which the extractor gives us, instead of relating to a transaction to take place (no body can imagine *when*, upon the scheme of the pamphlet)

pamphlet) after the day of judgment, *preceded* an event that existed near upon seventeen hundred years ago.

The extractor having given us from a *number* of writers, (*two only*) some *few* (doubtless the *most weighty*) of the many texts mentioned by them in favour of *Salvation for all men*, exhibits a *like extract* from what they and others have offered in answer to the objections brought against the doctrine.

The first he brings forward is Dr. *Joseph Nicol Scott*; for after he quitted the ministry, he was a Doctor of Physick.

The Dr. hath certainly been trepanned into the support of a scheme, to which he was opposed. I shall state the case to the reader, and leave him to follow it with his own remarks. The Dr. indeed preached and published against the *proper eternity* of hell torments; but in the same discourses from whence the quotations are made, he argues that—
 “a *great part* of the texts which the scripture-writers make use of, whereby to express future punishment, as to *die*, to be *destroyed*, to *reap corruption*, to *burn up*, to *consume*, when applied to the *persons* of men, are so far from implying a *perpetual continuance* of their *life*, that, on the contrary, these terms (if literally understood) suppose, that a *period* will be *put* to it. And should this *death*, or *destruction* be so circumstanced, as not to admit of any *after restoration*. it may, for that reason, be styled an *everlasting destruction*; and the means by which it is performed, an *everlasting* or *eternal fire*. And, if this *death* or *destruction*, be administered by way of *punishment*, for the same reason, that the *death* or *destruction* are said to be *eternal*, so also may the *punishment*. When it is *affirmed*, that the *reprobate* shall *die*, shall *reap corruption*, shall be
burnt

burnt up; and when the ideas of *life, incorruptibility, indissolubility*, are constantly restrained to the *good and virtuous* part of mankind, as their *peculiar prerogative*, will it not follow from hence, that to *affirm* the *wicked* to be *continued for ever alive*, though in a state of *miserable sensation*, is not only to *affirm* that which is not *affirmed* in *scripture*, but which in reality, *contradicts* it, and renders the *scripture-account* of things inconsistent with itself? I add, that, how true soever it is, that the *common catastrophe* belongs to *all the wicked*, that they shall be *destroyed*, or, to speak in the *scripture style*, that *the soul, which sins, it shall die*: yet this *death or destruction*, may admit of different *degrees of misery*, in proportion to the different *degrees of guilt*."

"The *strict and proper* sense of the *scripture threatening* conveys the idea of a *true and proper* death. *Fire* is a *destructive element*, and has a tendency to *consume the bodies* that are *cast* into it; both the *nature* of it and the *scripture account* oblige us to infer, that the *wicked* shall be *consumed and burnt up* in it."

In the close of the second sermon on the subject of *future misery*, the Dr. addresses the sinner thus, "Canst thou, in *cool reflection* reconcile thyself to the *thought* of being *condemned* by that *all-righteous Judge*, and, by his *impartial sentence*, not only excluded from the *future happiness*, but also consigned over to *destruction*, a *destruction* which (by supposition) will not be *reversed*, an *everlasting destruction* from the *presence of the Lord*, and from the *glory of his power*? Is thy passion of *fear* *incapable* of being moved by a *destruction* so circumstanced as this? And where, besides that circumstance of *dissolution*, which belongs to all *bad men* in common, each is given to understand, that this *death* will be executed upon *him*, with that *degree of suffering*, which is proportioned to his *crimes*."

However

However erroneous the Doctor's sentiments respecting future misery and other matters might be deemed by many who had a personal knowledge of him ; yet his integrity, was unimpeached ; and he cannot be supposed to have said as above, if he favoured or held with the doctrine of *Salvation for all men* ; for his reasoning is designed to prove, that the wicked will be so *fully* destroyed, as after a certain period to have no *further* existence.

Notwithstanding the Doctor asserts, that " the term so commonly translated *eternal, everlasting, for ever and ever*, does not from any force of the word, imply what we mean by a *strict and proper* eternity ; the original words, both in the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, signify nothing more than an age, and in the plural *ages*, either *longer* or *shorter, definite* or *indefinite* ;" yet, from the above quotations, one would be ready to imagine, he had *some doubts*, whether or no, a *strict and proper* eternity was not intended, when the punishment and destruction of the wicked and the means of effecting it are spoken of ; or why doth he say, " if the *destruction* admits not of any *after restoration* it may be styled an *everlasting destruction* and the means by which it is performed an *everlasting* or *eternal* fire—and that, if the destruction is administered by way of *punishment*, for the same reason, that the death or destruction are said to be *eternal*, so also may the *punishment* ?" Why doth the Dr. thus attempt to prove, that there is a sense in which the term *eternal, or everlasting*, when applied to the destruction and punishment of the wicked and the fire of hell, may intend a *strict and proper* eternity, so be that the original doth not mean it in the places alluded to ? Doth not this amount almost to a yielding up the point in dispute ?

But to examine the assertion respecting the term, both in the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, translated *eternal*, *everlasting*, *for ever* and *ever*; beginning with the *Hebrew* *gnolam*, frequently printed in the *European* publications *olam*. Dr. Taylor, who was intimate with Dr. Scott, and published his concordance many years after the sermons of the latter were printed, expresses the same sentiment on the word *gnolam*, roundly declaring, "It signifieth *eternity* not from the proper force of the word, but when the sense of the place, or the nature of the subject, to which it is applied requireth it; as God and his attributes." If this is a *just* remark, it holds good in a much higher degree with reference to all the other *Hebrew* terms* translated *everlasting* or *eternal*; so that of consequence there is not an *Hebrew* word in the old testament, that in its strict and proper sense signifies *eternity* or *eternal*—which may be deemed a most extraordinary circumstance in a *divine* revelation

I of

* The other *Hebrew* words are *tamidh*, *kedhem*, *netzahh*, and *gnadh*.

Tamidh occurs one hundred and one times; but though translated *always*, *continually*, *perpetual*, *ever* and *evermore*, doth not even *once* include the idea of *proper* eternity.

The true meaning of *kedhem* is *antiquity*; you meet with it forty and three times. In Deut. 33. 27. it is rendered *eternal*, the *eternal* God, instead of the God of *antiquity*. In Ps. 55. 19. *of old*, he that abideth *of old*: so in Micah 5. 2. whose goings forth have been from *of old*. In Hab. 1. 12. *everlasting*, art thou not from *everlasting*? In Pro. 8. 23. in the plural *ever*, or *ever* the earth was.

Netzahh out of forty five times is often translated for *ever*: but does not necessarily imply *proper* eternity more than twice or thrice, unless we include those places, where if that interpretation is allowed the scheme of *Universal Salvation* must be of course demolished; and those also wherein it is asked "wilt thou forget me for *ever*? wilt thou be angry for *ever*? wilt thou hide thyself for *ever*?" and the like. It is not *once* joined with any name of God to express his *eternity*.

Gnadh

of that magnitude, and whose subject matter, in places, is so peculiar as to require it. But possibly the candid reader, after having weighed what is to be offered, may be ready to pronounce both the Doctors greatly mistaken, and to believe, that the fact is, that the *true* and *proper* force of the word *gnolam*, is, *eternity* or *perpetuity*, but that like the word *eternal* in *English* it is, on occasion, used *figuratively* to express a *longer* or *shorter*, a *definite* or *indefinite* duration, which is to be determined by the sense of the place, and the nature of the subject to which it is applied.

Gnolam is to be met with for the first time in Gen. 3. 22. In that and the following verse, the Lord God proposes to send *Adam* (now that he hath fallen and is become mortal) forth from the garden of *Eden*, "lest he put forth his hand, and take of the tree of life and eat, and live for *ever*" — hope and expect to live for *ever*. *Gnolam*, cannot here mean an *age*: for, as yet *no age* had run out: and besides *Adam* was not to live it; whereas he lived an *age* longer than any man else,

Gnadh as a noun occurs twenty and eight times. Dr. Taylor would not admit, that, in Is. 9. 6. (in the original *the father of eternity*, translated *the everlasting father*) it means *proper* eternity a parte ante if applied to the Lord Jesus; and then there are only six places where it must be understood of *proper* eternity. It is joined with *gnolam* eighteen times, and once with the plural *gnolmee*: thrice it precedes *gnolam*, but follows it fifteen times, and *gnolmee* once. According to *Aben Ezra*, when following *gnolam*, it serves only as a preposition and refers to the word *gnolam* sunk by an ellipsis; so that *legnolam vegnadh* is a concise mode of speech or writing for *legnolam vegnadh gnolam*. This remark of *Aben Ezra* appears just, as the abbreviation is mostly in the *Hebrew* poetry (whose metre might require it) the song of *Moses* after the destruction of *Pharaoh*, and the *Psalms*. Whether *gnadde* Num. 24. 20, 24. is to be considered as the plural of the noun or as a preposition is hard to determine. *Balaam*, instead of saying of *Amalek* or *Eber*, he shall perish for *ever*, might only say, he shall perish *until* or *onward*, and there stop, leaving imagination to fill up the blank.

else, should you deduct from those antediluvians who were *born* into the world, only fifty years for their *minority*, It is evidently contrasted to *death* or *mortality*, and therefore necessarily includes *immortality* or *perpetuity*; and signifies expressly the same with our translation. This we may pronounce the *original* signification of the *Hebrew* term. And such a sense well agrees with the root from which it is derived, meaning to be *hid*, *concealed* or *secret*: for most assuredly nothing is more *hid*, *concealed*, or *secret*, with regard to *finite* beings, than *eternity*—the *eternal* God only excepted. Eternity, properly considered, is *that only which is concealed* from the understandings of men and angels, and viewed by the divine mind alone. Whether *Hebrew* was the language of *Eden* or not, *Moses* without doubt did express the truth in the most proper and significant terms.

In support of what has been now advanced, let it be noted, that *gnolam* is used as an epithet whereby to characterize the *true* God, and to distinguish him from the false gods of idolaters. Some of the names by which He was spoken of, as *El*, *Elohim*, *Elohee*, were given also to false deities and idols; and therefore the term *gnolam* is once and again added when the *true* God is intended, in order to *mark* him out by it; and the attribute, by that term ascribed to him, is considered as being sufficiently descriptive, and what no other gods could pretend to, their origin being of late date: But if the word *gnolam*, by its own *proper force*, doth not express that attribute, on the contrary gains that *special* meaning from its connexion, how can the application of it, to a name of God *common* to false gods, *describe* the true God? The epithet in that case does not describe the *subject*, but the *subject* the *epithet*; which is contrary to the very *design* of epithets. When indeed the *proper* meaning of an epithet expresses more than

than *can* belong to the subject, then the nature of the subject obliges us to understand it *figuratively* : but this is widely different from its *gaining* a meaning *infinitely* beyond what is *proper* to it, by being joined to a name of deity *not peculiar* to the true God, and therefore *not necessarily* implying any thing infinite or eternal in it. Let it also be observed, that the *proper force* of a word may at length vary. The word may obtain through custom and common consent a signification widely different from what it had when first used : *knave* and *villain* are instances, each had formerly a good meaning, it is now the reverse. The use to be made of the observation is, that could it be proved that the *original* signification of *gnolam* was not *strict* and *proper* eternity, contrary to the evidence above produced ; yet it is plain from the manner in which it is used, in order to *mark* out the *true* God, that it acquired and possessed this as its *true* and *proper* sense, when the sacred oracles of the old testament were written.

But to advert to the passages wherein it is used for *eternity* or to *mark* out the *eternity* of God, and so to *distinguish* the *true* from every *false* god ; after having noted, that the *Hebrew* language through want of *adjectives* often makes use of a *noun* ; thus *gnolam* signifying *eternity*, is used for *eternal* or *everlasting* in manner following, the god of eternity, for the everlasting or eternal God ; in many places it is translated by *ever* or *evermore*. JEHOVAH, one of the *peculiar* names of the true God, is synonymous with the *everlasting* God ; and hence *Abraham* is said to have called upon the name of JEHOVAH *the everlasting* God ;* and *the everlasting* God JEHOVAH, the creator of the ends of the earth is said not to faint or be weary. † We read, “ Thou O JEHOVAH, remainest for *ever* ; ‡
Thou,

* Gen. 21. 33.

† Is. 40. 28.

‡ Lam. 5. 19.

Thou, JEHOVAH, art most High for *evermore* :* Thou art from *everlasting*," † and that JEHOVAH shall endure *for ever*. ‡ JEHOVAH, though not named, is intended by him that liveth for *ever* in *Daniel* (12 ch. 7 v.) When He himself lifteth up his hand to heaven and sweareth, the form of the oath is "I live for *ever*." § In order to express particularly his existence from eternity to eternity it is said, even from *everlasting* to *everlasting* thou art God. ¶ Instead of *for ever and ever*, as in our translation (1 Chro. 16. 36—29. 10.) it should be, according to the original, and as translated elsewhere (Psal. 41. 13—106. 48.) "blessed be the Lord God of Israel *from everlasting to everlasting*."

We must understand the term *gnolam* in various other places as meaning *eternity*; thus when we read, that Jehovah sitteth king for *ever*; that his counsel standeth for *ever*; that his glory shall endure for *ever*; that his mercy endureth for *ever* or is *everlasting*; that his truth endureth for *ever*; that his name endureth for *ever*, and is from *everlasting*; that he keepeth truth for *ever*, reigneth for *ever* and is an *everlasting* king. According to *Aben Ezra*, as observed in a preceding note, it is meant to be repeated, in order to heighten the expression, and is most justly rendered for *ever and ever*.

In the *Chaldee* dialect it retains the same meaning. *Daniel* cries out, "blessed be the name of God from *everlasting to everlasting*." ¶ *Nebuchadnezzar* in his imperial proclamation to all people, nations and languages, declares God's kingdom to be an *everlasting* kingdom, that his dominion is an *everlasting* dominion, and that He liveth for *ever*. † When *Daniel's* vision was explained to him, it was said of the most High, that his kingdom is an *everlasting* kingdom ‡

Applied

* Psal. 92. 8. †—93. 2. ‡—9. 7.—102. 12. § Dent. 32. 40.

¶ Psal. 90. 2. ¶ Dan. 2. 20. †—4. 3, 34. ‡—7. 27.

Applied figuratively to those subjects that necessarily exclude *eternity*, it frequently answers to the *English* terms *ever* and *alway* when used in a relaxed sense. Thus the *Hebrew* servant who had his ear bored was to serve his master *for ever* ;* and the *Jews* were to observe certain ordinances and statutes *for ever* ; † as long as possible, whilst the servants ability and the Mosaic dispensation continued. But that *gnolam* when thus used doth not properly mean *the age of man* or a *century* (which are expressed by other words) is evident from the phrases, *throughout your generations by an ordinance for ever*, and *it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations*. ‡

We read, “notwithstanding the cities of the Levites may the Levites redeem *at any time*,” || in the original *gnolam*, and the text is *literally* “the redemption-right shall be *ever* or *perpetually* to the Levites,” to be exercised at pleasure. When the Psalmist saith, “I have inclined my heart to perform thy statutes *alway*,” § he means as long as possible. But when *Job* saith, “I would not live *alway*,”** the word might be rendered *eternally* : and what man of a similar character with *Job* would not loath *immortality* in the present body and world? The word might also have been rendered *eternally* in that passage, “and *Jehovah* said, my spirit shall not *alway* strive with man.” ††

Gnolam

* Ex. 21. 6. †——12. 14.—27. 21, and many other places.

‡ Ex. 12. 14. Lev. 10. 9. || Lev. 25. 32. § Ps. 119. 112.

** Job 7. 16. †† Gen. 6. 3 The original *Jehovah* has been given in several quotations, instead of the *English* Lord, which last term relates to *dominion*, whereas *Jehovah* expresses *absolute existence*. Here I cannot omit mentioning my earnest wish, that whenever another *American* edition of the bible is printed, it might be recommended by Congress, that *Jehovah* should be retained in the *English* translation wherever found in the Original.

Gnolam may or must have the force of *eternity* in more than one hundred and twenty, out of four hundred and twenty eight times that it occurs in the singular number. It is designed more than fifty times to express the continuance, of the covenant with *Noah* relative to the world's not being again drowned——of the covenant with *Abraham* and his seed——of the covenant with the Jewish nation——and of those statutes ordinances and so on, which were to be observed by that people while the Mosaic dispensation lasted. In other places it intends a longer or shorter duration, and hath a sense given it in the translation suited to the connexion. It occurs in the plural number only nine times in the *Chaldee* and twelve in the *Hebrew* :* but it is plain that the sense is mostly sunk by means of it, to undefined periods of duration instead of expressing eternity ; in like manner as *gods* mean less than *God*, for *though there be gods many and lords many, to us there is but one God, and one Lord.*

Notwithstanding

- * It is plural in the *Chaldee* when it is said, " O king live for ever" (Dan. 2. 4—3. 9—5. 10—6. 6, 21.)—that, the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom, which shall not be *ever* destroyed, but shall stand for *ever* (Dan. 2. 44 twice)—that the God of Daniel is the living God and steadfast for *ever* (6. 26.) that the saints shall possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and *ever* (7. 18.)

It is plural in the *Hebrew* when it is said, " I have surely built thee a settled place to abide in for *ever*" (1 Kings 8. 13. 2 Chro. 6. 2.) " I will abide in thy tabernacle for *ever*" (Ps. 61. 4.) " I have considered the years of *ancient times*. Will the Lord cast off for *ever*?" (Ps. 77. 5, 7.) " Thy kingdom is an *everlasting* kingdom" (Ps. 145. 13. where the plural has the *Hebrew* for *all* before it) " It hath been already of *old time*" (Eccl. 1. 10.) " In the Lord Jehovah is *everlasting* strength" (Is. 26. 4.) " Israel shall be saved with an *everlasting* salvation, ye shall not be confounded *world without end*" (Is. 45. 17. twice) " Awake O sword of the Lord as in the generations of *old*" (Is. 51. 9.) " Seventy weeks are determined to bring in *everlasting* righteousness" (Dan. 9. 24.)

Notwithstanding the number of places, in which *gnolam* must, from the nature of the subjects to which it is joined, signify *limited periods of duration*, is greater than where it means *eternity*; yet it is apprehended, that, if the impartial enquirer after truth attends duly to what hath been above advanced, he will be convinced, that the *original* and *continued* literal import of the term is *strict* and *proper eternity*, and that wherever it doth not express *this*, it is used *figuratively*.

Let us now see by what words *gnolum* is translated in the *Greek*. The *Greek* translation of the bible is supposed to have been made at *Alexandria* about two hundred and eighty four years before the birth of Christ, by seventy two of the most learned Jews, who were the best skilled in the *Hebrew* and *Greek* languages: for brevity they are usually called the *Seventy*, and the translation from them the *septuagint*. The *Hebrew* term is always (half a score times only excepted) rendered, by the *Greek* noun *aion*, or the adjective *aionios* formed out of it—by the noun full as many again as by the adjective. The plural of the noun does not occur so often in the *septuagint*, as the plural of *gnolam* in the *Hebrew*. In fourteen places the adjective is plural being joined to nouns that are plural, as generations, doors, paths, wastes, hills, ways and places. The *Seventy*, as they must have attended to *sense* and not to *sound*, were of course led to use the most expressive word or words in the *Greek*, as oft as *strict* and *proper eternity* was meant in the original; and yet, though there is no denying that the *Hebrew* in numerous places intends *strict* and *proper eternity*, not more than a single instance offers wherein they use any other term than *aion* or *aionios*: that instance is in Deut 33. 27. where mention is made of the *everlasting* arms of the eternal God, which they

render

render by a word that signifies *always flowing* and so *perpetual*. The natural inference is that the Seventy were of opinion that *aion* and *aionios* fully expressed *strict* and *proper* eternity, and that neither any other single word nor any periphrasis was wanting in the case. It is not strange, that they were of this opinion, when it is recollected that *Aristotle* tells us that *aion* is derived from two words that mean *always existing*. The etymology is perfectly easy, and does not labour as often happens in matters of that kind, and is somewhat countenanced by the use that *Homer* made, five hundred and sixty years before, of the same words, only altering the last into the plural number, when speaking of his *immortal* gods.

Aristotle flourished only sixty years before the Septuagint translation was made, and died within thirty eight of it ; so that the Seventy might be fully informed of his sentiment. His own abilities, and having been tutor to *Alexander* the great, gave him an extensive character ; and men of letters were obliged, for their own credit, to seek after and consult his writings.

Alexander's conquests spread the *Greek* language, and it became common. Of course, vast numbers, especially of the dispersed *Jews* being better acquainted with the *Greek* than the *Hebrew*, the Septuagint came into general use, both privately and in their synagogues ; and so continued, until and long after the days of our Saviour and his apostles, when it was evidently in high esteem. Our Lord's words in Matt. 15. 9. "in vain do they worship me teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," are the same with the septuagint in Is. 29. 13. and *might be* (tho' it becomes me not to say *were*) quoted by *Matthew* from that translation. The Eunuch we must suppose used the septuagint, for the words of the prophet *Isaiah* (53. 7, 8.) which we are told (Acts 8. 32, 33) he read, are

K
literally

iterally the same with it. The evangelists and apostles are thought to have followed it often. *Peter* in his address to the men of *Israel* quotes the Patriarch *David* speaking concerning the Messiah (Acts 2. 25, 26, 27, 28) which is given us in the words of the *Greek* translation, something different from the *Hebrew*, though the sense is much the same. From the regard thus shewn to the Septuagint, it may be fairly concluded, that *aion* and *aionios* continued to retain the sense in which they were first used by the Seventy as expressive of *strict* and *proper* eternity; and in confirmation of their still answering to the *Hebrew* *gnolam* let it be noted, that the *Syriac* version of the New Testament, which was made in the most early times, uniformly renders them by the same term *gnolam*.

Now let us search the New Testament for the sense of *aion* and *aionios*. "The reader may, if he please, look into the *Greek concordance*, and he will there find," that *aion* is to be met with thirty and three times in the Evangelists, and *aionios* thirty. And are we to understand an *eternity* as implied or intended, when our Lord said (to the fig-tree) let no man eat fruit of thee hereafter for *ever*—he that shall blaspheme against the holy Ghost hath not forgiveness for *ever*—whosoever drinketh of the water I shall give him, shall not thirst for *ever*—if any man eat of the bread which came down from heaven, he shall live for *ever*; he that eateth of this bread shall live for *ever*—if a man keep my saying he shall not see death for *ever*—they shall not perish for *ever*, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand—whosoever believeth in me shall not die for *ever*"——then the noun *aion* was rarely used by our Saviour in any other sense than as meaning *eternity*, unless when confined to a different one by an adnoun or the subject he is treating

treating upon. I have not added his words, "the servant abideth not in the house for *ever*, but the son abideth *ever* : and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you for *ever* : and lo I am with you alway unto the end of *the world* ;" as it might be disputed, whether more than a certain measure of time was intended in *any* of these places. The meaning of the word is limited when he saith, "it shall not be forgiven in *this* world—the cares of *this* world—the harvest is *the end* of the *world*—so shall it be in the end of *this* world—the children of *this* world." There is no mistaking him when he saith, "in the *world to come*, eternal or everlasting life ; and *that* world," in opposition to *this* world. In closing that pattern of prayer he gave to his disciples, commonly called the Lord's prayer, he uses the word in the plural number, "thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory for *ever* : " so did *Gabriel*, when it was told the Virgin " he, i. e. Jesus, should reign over the house of *Jacob* for *ever*. *Mary* used it in the singular, saying, " he hath holpen his servant *Israel* in remembrance of his mercy for *ever* : " and so did *Zacharias* when he mentions the holy prophets which had been *since the world began* ; and *Peter* when he rashly told our Saviour, " thou shalt not wash my feet for *ever* ; " and the man cured of his blindness when he confounded the Jewish Sanhedrim by declaring, "*since the world began* it was not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind." It matters not whether the Jews intended *proper* eternity, when they took notice of their having heard out of the law that Christ abideth for *ever*. But when they said, " now we know that thou hast a devil ; *Abraham* is dead and the prophets ; and thou sayest, if a man keep my saying he shall not taste of death for *ever* ; " it is plain that they referred to and understood our Lord

Lord as intending a continued perpetual existence, or *immortality*; and it must be conceded, that the noun *aion*, as commonly used by our Saviour without an ad-noun or special subject to confine its meaning, doth contain in general the idea of perpetuity, or *strict* and *proper* eternity.

Let us in like manner try the meaning of *aionios*. When the young ruler inquired "good master, what shall I do that I may inherit *eternal life*?—When the lawyer meant to try our Lord's skill in divinity by the same question—When our Lord told *Nicodemus* that whosoever believeth in the son should have *everlasting life*; and *John* the baptist declared the same to his disciples—When the woman of *Samaria* was informed that the water which Christ had to give, would be a well of water springing up into *everlasting life*—When the Jews were directed to labour for the meat which endureth unto *everlasting life*; and were told, who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath *eternal life*—When *Peter* said to our Lord, thou hast the words of *eternal life*—When Christ tells us, that he gives unto his sheep *eternal life*; and speaking of the Father's commandment to publish the gospel, says, and I know that his commandment is *life everlasting*—When he says, "thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give *eternal life* to as many as thou hast given him; and this is *life eternal* (in the principle and will terminate in it) that they might know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent"—can any other be intended by *eternal life* than a *glorious immortality*? The adjective *aionios* is joined to *life* twenty five times, by Christ himself nineteen, out of the thirty, and in all these places means *eternal* as including *strict* and *proper* eternity, not to insist upon *everlasting* habitations (in Luke 16. 9.) And yet, if we
will

will give up our judgments to the disposal of certain interpreters, in the four others, when joined by our Lord to *fire, punishment and damnation*, we are to believe it means nothing more than a *temporary* duration, the *real length* of which scarce one of them will undertake to tell us. Such interpretations in direct violation of the general meaning of scriptural words are calculated to promote deism, rather than christianity. When revelation is so treated by its friends, no wonder that it is spurned by its enemies.

The phrase of *eternal* or *everlasting* life is to be found in the Acts and Epistles nineteen times, in sixteen of which it also means a *glorious immortality*; another indeed might be added, for when *John* writes "ye know that no murderer hath *eternal life* abiding in him," he thereby designs that lively faith and holy obedience with which a *glorious immortality* is connected as the end thereof. The same apostle in two other places intends by it Jesus Christ.

The adjective *aionios* is used twenty and two times more in the Acts and Epistles; four times in the plural, and eighteen in the singular number. In the plural by *Paul* when he writes of the mystery, which was kept secret *since the world began*; of the grace which was given in Christ Jesus before *the world began*; and of that eternal life which God promised before *the world began*. As our cause is not straitened for evidence, let it be admitted, that the idea of eternity does not enter into any of these passages. But when he saith, "the things which are not seen are *eternal*," the connexion and the apostolic character oblige us to maintain, that *strict and proper* eternity is intended; for these things which are not seen are opposed to those that are *temporal—temporary* would have been a better word, as expressive of their insignificant

nificant duration. It was also beneath the dignity of the great apostle of the Gentiles, to look, in the sense he meant, at things which had a duration short of eternity. As in this passage, he refers to a *proper* eternity, we must conclude he does the same in that which immediately precedes, when he speaks of an *eternal* weight of glory, and in that which follows, wherein we read of an house not made with hands *eternal* in the heavens. It is most reasonable to believe the like, when he writes of God's having given *everlasting* consolation—when he ascribes to the King of kings and Lord of lords honour and power *everlasting*—when he mentions, the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with *eternal* glory; Christ's becoming the author of *eternal* salvation unto all them that obey him; the doctrine of *eternal* judgment; Christ's having obtained *eternal* redemption, and his having offered up himself through the *eternal* Spirit; the promise of the *eternal* inheritance, which they that are called receive; and the blood of the *everlasting* covenant. Thus also when he speaks of the commandment of the *everlasting* God: by which epithet he means rather to mark out the true God by the attribute alluded to; than to express that the true God possessed that attribute. But it is a false assertion, that “did we not know, before hand, that eternity was an essential attribute of God, it could never be argued from the application of this word to him.” Indeed did we know, before hand, that it was *not* an essential attribute of God, it could never be argued that it was, from the application of this word to him: but the application of words may and do convince of those truths respecting God, which we neither did nor could know before hand, as every one must allow who believes christianity: for till words convinced us we
knew

knew not, before hand, the love of God in providing a Saviour, nor the exceeding riches of his grace in pardoning the greatest of sinners. But to return from this digression ; and admit that the apostle is not to be understood as meaning *proper* eternity, when he writes to *Philemon* " perhaps *Onesimus* departed for a season, that thou shouldst receive him for *ever* : " however, methinks it is offering an amazing violence to his writings, and taking an unwarrantable liberty with them, to say, that, because, in this last mentioned place and three others, he might not mean *proper* eternity, therefore he could not mean it, when he makes mention of *everlasting* destruction, though in thirteen other places he uses the term to mark out a *strict* and *proper* eternity. *Peter* speaks of *eternal* glory, and of the *everlasting* kingdom of our Lord and may be allowed to intend a *proper* eternity : but *Jude* is not to meet with the like indulgence when he talks of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha* and the cities about them, suffering the vengeance of *eternal* fire, though it should be observed, that by cities we are not to understand the buildings but the citizens, as is evident from our Lord's declaring, that it should be more tolerable for *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*, in the day of judgment, than for that city which would not hear the apostles. As the *everlasting* gospel in the Revelation may possibly be so stiled in a *figurative* sense, we shall not employ it in our argument. It may suffice, that the adjective *aionios* is to be understood fifteen times out of the twenty two, as referring to *strict* and *proper* eternity.

It appears from the preceding paragraphs, that the adjective *aionios* is joined to *life*, one and forty times in the New Testament, and as often includes *strict* and *proper* eternity, being used with that noun
to

to express a *glorious immortality*. What a paltry quotation is that then! "the *bare force* of the word will not support us, in maintaining an *endless duration* with respect, either to the *happiness* of the righteous, or the punishment of the wicked. We know the *righteous* shall be *happy for ever*. And why! because they are said, in other texts of scripture to be *incorruptible, indissoluble, immortal, not to die any more*, and the like." Yes; and we should know it from the numerous declarations made of their being to enjoy *eternal life*, and the like, were the other texts of scripture wanting: for the enjoyment of *eternal life, eternal salvation*, and an *eternal weight of glory*, as necessarily implies *immortality*, as life does being. The original signifying *indissoluble*, and translated *endless*, is to be found *only* in Heb. 7. 16. and has no direct reference whatever to the righteous; but relates to Christ alone, who is said to be made a priest not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after or according to the power of an *endless life*. It is a vain pretence of some, that the *endless life* intends that of believers, which Christ by virtue of his priestly office confers upon them: "for as Dr. Owen well observes, the comparison and opposition that is made between *the law of a carnal commandment*, whereby Aaron was constituted a priest, and *the power of an endless life*, whereby Christ was made so, do evidence that the making of Christ *such a priest* as he is, was the *effect* of *this endless life*: but how can Christ be *made a priest* according to the power of that *endless life* which by *virtue of his priestly office* he confers on others?" Such pretence makes the *effect* productive of the *cause*, and then the *cause* productive of the *effect*; and forms as complete a circle as ever was travelled by a Popish disputant. Our Saviour saith, "this is the bread which cometh down from

from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and *not die* (John 6. 50.) and below (v. 58) he that eateth of this bread shall *live for ever*, where *aion* is used. Can the words, *and not die* mean more, or are they more expressive, than the words *shall live for ever*? In answering the objection of the Sadducees regarding the resurrection, he tells them, that they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead (he means a blessed resurrection because it is connected with worthiness) neither marry nor are given in marriage, *neither can they die any more* (Luke 20. 36.) but their immortality is no more secured by that mode of expression, than if it had been, *they shall live for ever*: it indeed leads to this thought, that, as they *can die no more*, there is no occasion for marriage to supply the losses that death would occasion. We read also (Rev. 21. 4.) there shall be *no more death*. My concordances do not furnish me with more places wherein the righteous are laid *not to die any more*.

The apostle *Paul*, treating of the resurrection of the righteous, writes concerning the body, "it is sown in corruption it is raised in *incorruption*. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God: neither doth corruption inherit *incorruption*. The dead shall be raised *incorruptible*; and we shall be changed: for this corruptible must put on *incorruption*, and this mortal must put on *immortality*; so, when this corruptible shall have put on *incorruption*, and this mortal shall have put on *immortality*, then shall be brought to pass that saying, Death is swallowed up in victory." (1 Cor. 15. 42, 50, 52, 53, 54.) these assertions relate to the body, and express the change it shall undergo, in order to that *glorious immortality* intended by *eternal life*, and which passes upon the

In
righteous

righteous, ere they, in their complete persons, enter the heavenly regions. The *Greek* translated *immortality* is applied to the righteous only *twice*. What is rendered here *incorruption* is translated *immortality* in 2 Tim. 1. 10 and Rom. 2. 7. This last place is a full proof that *incorruption* means *less* than *eternal life*; for in it the apostle tells us, that, to them, who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and *incorruption* God will render *eternal life*.

And thus the reader may observe, that the righteous are not *once* said to be *indissoluble*; that make the most of it, they are said, only *thrice*, *not to die any more*; but *twice* to be *immortal*, and *five* times to be *incorruptible*; however that *incorruption* is by the apostle *Paul* affirmed to be *inferior* to *eternal life*. They who, after weighing what hath been now mentioned, and the number of times the adjective *aionios* — eternal, is joined to life in the New Testament, will pretend, that we could not know, that the righteous would be *happy for ever*, but because they are said in other scriptures to be *incorruptible (indissoluble) immortal, not to die any more*, and the like, are so enthusiastically fond of their own dogma, as to be out of the reach of reason with regard to the point in hand.

It remains that we examine the different meanings of the noun *aion* in the Acts, Epistles and Revelation. But let it be first noted, that *aion* hath several significations, like a number of *English* words, with which if a person is not well acquainted, he will blunder most egregiously in translating them into another language: just as a novice who should translate the original in Luke 16. 8. "the children of *this eternity*," because that *aion* in other places intends *eternity*; The school-boy who, having been conversant with the *Greek* for a while, would obstinately refuse to
translate

translate it *world* though confined to such like signification by the adnoun *this*; or maintain that the sense must be the same, the sound being the same, in all places, might probably be adjudged to wholesome discipline. Ignorance in, or inattention to, the different meanings of the same word in the *Hebrew*, has given rise to a most ridiculous circumstance in the pictures of *Moses*, who is generally drawn with *horns*. We are told (Ex 34. 29.) that when he descended from mount *Sinai* the skin of his face *shone*, the original means also a horn. In the vulgate edition of the old testament, in use among the Roman Catholics and authorized by their Popes, it is translated, his face was *horned*, and hence that ridiculous circumstance.

Aion, with other *Greek* words to confine its meaning, in nine places answers to *this world*; in three to *the present world*; in one to *the present evil world*; in one to *the world to come*; in one to *since the world began*; and in one to *according to* (the age or manners of the age, or as in our translation) *the course of this world*: in the last quotation *aion* is rendered the *course*, and another word is used for the *world*.

We cannot suppose, that the apostle *James*, in that grand consultation which was held at *Jerusalem* by the apostles, elders and whole christian church within that city, respecting the liberties of the *Gentile* converts, meant any thing short of "known from *eternity* unto God are all his works," it is pity therefore that the original *aion* had not been so translated, instead of "known unto God are all his works from *the beginning of the world*."*

Paul wrote to the *Corinthians*, "if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh for *ever*," this is more in the style of the apostle and suits the *English* idiom as well as *while the world standeth*.† When he saith

* Acts 15. 18. † 1 Cor. 8. 13.

faith of the liberal man, "his righteousness remaineth for *ever*," † he may mean that the power and inclination of that his righteousness which consisteth in dispersing abroad and giving to the poor, remaineth for *ever*, in the preceding sense, *while life lasteth*. In his epistle to the *Hebrews*, he speaks of Christ's being a priest for *ever*, and consecrated for *evermore*, five times; which in the opinion of numbers means only a certain unchangeable duration unto the end of the time and works of the gospel; but they who suppose, that the priesthood of Christ, after having put the saints into possession of glory, will have a continued influence in the glorified state, will plead that a *strict* and *proper* eternity is intended: without doubt the apostle designed *that* when he applied to Christ a quotation (from Ps. 45. 6, 7.) in the words of the septuagint saying, "thy throne, O God, is for *ever and ever*," &c. and when he said that Christ continueth *ever*.

Peter also meant a *strict* and *proper* eternity when he declared "the word of God abideth for *ever*;" and again "the word of the Lord endureth for *ever*," which is no other than a quotation of *Isaiah's* assertion, "but the word of our God shall stand for *ever*." He certainly meant it, when he closed his second epistle with "to him, i.e. our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, be glory, both now and for the *day* (or term) of *eternity*," an unusual expression in the original, and which is translated "both now and for *ever*." Surely it is reasonable then to understand him as meaning *strict* and *proper* eternity, when he writes of the ungodly "to whom the mill of darkness is reserved for *ever*." The very same expression, in the original, that *Jude* makes use of concerning them, though rendered somewhat different, "to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for *ever*."

When *John* writes, of the truth "and which shall be with us for *ever*;" it is not so clear that he intends

a proper eternity, as when he asserts, "he that doth the will of God abideth for ever."

These are all the places in the Acts, Epistles and Revelation, in which *aion* occurs in the singular number, excepting Eph. 3. 21. where it precedes the plural and helps to form one of the strongest expressions, which the devout zeal of the apostle *Paul* could devise for glorifying God—"unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus, *throughout all ages world without end*," as in the *English*. *Blackwall* in his sacred classics,* says of this conclusion, "it defies any version to come any thing near it, and commands our wonder." Dr. *Doddridge* pronounces it, "one of St. *Paul*'s self-invented and most expressive phrases;" and adds, "*through all the successions of an endless eternity*, may come something near it; but even this *emphatical* as it may seem, falls vastly short of the sublimity and spirit of the *Original*."

The apostle uses the plural of *aion* five times in pronouncing the Creator, God, blessed for *ever*, and for *evermore*; and in ascribing glory to him for *ever*: and once in declaring, Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to day, and for *ever*. Toward the latter end of his epistle to the *Hebrews* he writes, "through faith we understand that the *worlds* were framed by the word of God:" and in the beginning, that by his Son He made the *worlds*, which some would render, He constituted the *ages*, meaning the dispensations of the church and world. When he says to the *Corinthians*, "upon whom the ends of the *world* (ages) are come," he means upon whom the concluding age or last dispensation of God to mankind on earth is come. In agreement herewith Dr. *Doddridge* hath, "but now once for all at the conclusion of the *ages*," instead of "but now once in the end of the *world*, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."† There
are

* Vol. I. p. 64. 12mo. † Heb, 9. 26.

are interpreters of note, who would render " according to the *eternal* purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord,"* according to that predisposition of the ages, or several dispensations which he made in Christ Jesus: while others prefer the common translation as agreeing most with the meaning of the original. When he mentions of the *Ephesians* that they were quickened together with Christ and so on, that God " might in the *ages* to come shew the exceeding riches of his grace" he means finite periods: and the like, when he writes to the *Colossians* of the mystery which had been hid from *ages* and generations. But when he mentions, " the hidden wisdom which God ordained before *the world* unto our glory;"† and " the mystery which from *the beginning of the world* hath been hid in God."‡ he means more than our translation hath expressed, even from *eternity*, or *eternal ages*; the same as when he styles God the King of *ages*, which in our translation is *eternal*.||

It is frequent for writers, in certain cases to strengthen their expressions, by what might otherwise be styled redundancies: the practice is not only allowable, but oratorical. *For ever* intends to all eternity, and so doth *for ever and ever*; and *for ever and ever, world without end*, can intend no more: but there is more force in the *manner* of one than the other. The sacred writers use different forms to express the same meaning; and it is done also by one and the same writer. *Paul* closeth his doxologies with two plurals of *aion* in five places, in each they are rendered for *ever and ever*. *Peter* doth it twice. The noun *aion* is used in no other way whatever in the Revelation of *John*, where the plurals occur fourteen times. Our Lord useth them when he saith, " I am he that liveth and was dead and behold I am alive for *evermore*:" and they

* Eph. 3. 11. † 1 Cor. 2. 7. ‡ Eph. 3. 9. § 1 Tim. 1. 17.

they are used, when it is said, that he shall reign for *ever and ever*; and of the servants of the Lamb in the *New Jerusalem*, that they shall reign for *ever and ever*: and five times when it is asserted of God, that he liveth for *ever and ever*. They close doxologies three times. In *each* of these eleven instances *strict* and *proper* eternity is intended: and yet truly *all* must be no evidence that *strict* and *proper* eternity is intended in the remaining three, when it is said, "and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for *ever and ever*;* and her smoke rose up for *ever and ever*;† 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*.‡ The most mighty reasons ought to be produced for such liberties with the phraseology of a sacred writer, which would not be otherwise allowed in the case of a human author. Should it be urged, that the great whore, whose smoke is said to rise up for *ever and ever*, is the same with spiritual *Babylon*, that great city which makes all nations drink of the wine of its raging fornication, and that the smoke of no city can go up for *ever and ever*, understanding *strict* and *proper* eternity, because after a while it will be totally consumed: it is answered, as hath been observed with regard to *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*, that it is not the buildings so much as the citizens that are intended: and besides, that the great whore, *Babylon* and the beast are but different names for one and the same community; and it is asserted of the beast and the false prophet that they are in the lake of fire and brimstone, (when the closing scene hath taken place) where they shall be tormented day and night for *ever and ever*—so that, though the total destruction of the great city may be included, the *perpetual* punishment of the profligate

* Rev. 14. 11. —† 19. 3. —‡ 20. 10.

fligate and wicked citizens is the main thing intended, when it is said, "and her smoke rose up for *ever and ever*." The place of torment to which they are consigned, is figuratively spoken of, as a *lake of fire and brimstone*, in allusion probably to the kind of punishment by which divine justice was glorified in the destruction of *Sodom and Gomorrha* and the neighbouring cities. The whole place might for some considerable time be a burning lake, and when the combustibles were greatly exhausted might be extinguished and filled with the waters of *Jordan* and other rivers, and form that lake, which afterwards took the name of the *Dead Sea*, or *Lake of Sodom*. The *blackness of darkness*, by which *Peter* and *Jude* represent future torments, may also be an allusion to that horrid darkness, with which the whole atmosphere for a vast number of miles was probably filled, by the sulphurous foot and smoke that ascended into it, and might hang over the cursed region, for weeks or longer before it was dispersed, to awe and reform the inhabitants of distant cities.

It hath been falsely pleaded, that the Greek word *aidios* is more expressive of *proper* eternity than *aionios*. The Seventy never once use it, even where they could not but be persuaded that the *Hebrew* meant *proper* eternity; and in the New Testament it is to be met with only *twice*, in *Romans* (1. 20.) where God's *eternal* power is mentioned, and in *Jude* (6. v.) when the fallen angels are said to be reserved in *everlasting* chains.

After all that hath been observed upon *gnolam*, *aion* and *aionios*, ought we not to apprehend, that the *Angel* meant *strict* and *proper* eternity, not only when he spoke to *Daniel*, of them that should awake to *everlasting* life, but also of them that should awake to shame and *everlasting* contempt*—that *John* the baptist meant the like, when he says of wicked professors, comparing them to chaff

* Dan. 12. 2.

chaff for their worthlessness, that Christ will burn them with *unquenchable* fire,*—our Lord also when he speaks of sinners being cast into hell, *where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched* ;† of their departing into *everlasting* fire prepared for the devil and his angels, and their going into *everlasting* punishment, while the righteous go into life *eternal* ;‡ and of the blasphemer against the holy Ghost being in danger of, or liable to *eternal* damnation”||—the apostle *Paul* when declaring, that the disobedient shall be punished at the appearance of Christ with *everlasting* destruction from the presence of the Lord §—the apostles *Peter* and *Jude* when they assert, that for the ungodly the blackness of darkness is reserved for *ever* ; that the angels which kept not their first estate are reserved in *everlasting* chains ; and that the inhabitants of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha* suffer the vengeance of *eternal* fire ¶—and the apostle *John*, when he says, “ the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for *ever and ever* ; her smoke rose up for *ever and ever* ; the devil, the beast and the false prophet shall be tormented for *ever and ever*.”**

But notwithstanding the above reasoning upon the *original* words ; and even though mathematical demonstration could be given, that their *literal* import implied what we mean by *strict* and *proper* eternity ; yet, as they are often used *figuratively*, they, who are set upon denying the real eternity of hell torments, would maintain, that when applied to future punishments they are to be understood *figuratively* ; and would require other arguments to support the doctrine they reject.

Let us see then what was the opinion of *Jews* and *Gentiles* respecting this matter, in the times of our
M Saviour

* Mat. 3. 12. † Mark 9. 43—48. ‡ Mat. 25. 41, 46.

|| Mark 3. 29. § 2 Thess. 1. 9. ¶ 2 Peter 2. 17.

Jude 6, 7, 13. ** Rev. 14. 11.—19. 3.—20. 10.

Saviour and his apostles. *Philo* of *Alexandria*, the historian and eminent for his learning, surnamed *Judeus* from his being a *Jew*, and who flourished about forty years after our Lord's birth, when *Matthew* is supposed to have penned his gospel, saith, "the punishment of the wicked person is *to live for ever dying*,* and *to be for ever* in pains and griefs and calamities that never cease."† The original *Greek* translated *to be for ever* is peculiarly strong; we have no *English* word to answer it, was one coined upon the occasion to *eternatize* might be adopted. *Dr. Scott* writes "had the scripture said, in our *modern* style, that the *reprobate* shall be *ever dying*, and yet *never die*, there might have been some colour of argument, and it might have been inferred, that, though a *never-ceasing-misery* is not expressed in *so many* words, it is still, from the *scripture-phrasology*, necessarily implied" ‡ It will be noted by the reader, that *Philo's* expressions are almost the very same with *shall be ever dying, and yet never die*, and therefore the latter is not a *modern* but *ancient* style, nearly as old if not older than any part of the New Testament; and though no part of it, yet is to be regarded as declaring the sentiment of many of the first men among the *Jews*. And that this was the sentiment of that sect which was had in the greatest repute by them, viz. the *Pharisees*, is confirmed by *Josephus* who survived the destruction of *Jerusalem*, and informs us, "the *Pharisees* held, that the souls of the wicked were to be punished with *perpetual* punishments, and that there was appointed for them a *perpetual* prison."|| The word *aidios*, which he uses,

mult

* Mangey's edition of his works, vol. 2. p. 419.

† Ditto p. 420. London 1742. ‡ Vol. 2. 341, 342.

|| Bell Jud. i. 2. c. 8. § 14. p. 1065. Ant. i. 18. § 2. p. 793. Hudson's edition Ox. 1720.

must mean *perpetual* as expressive of *proper* eternity ; or he gives an uncertain unintelligible sound, instead of informing us what the *Pharisees* held. That this opinion of theirs was not peculiar to them or the *Jews*, is plain from what *Ovid*, who died sixteen years before our Lord's crucifixion, saith in his *Ibis* (lines 196, 197.)

Nec mortis pœnas mors altera finiet hujus :

Hœc erit tantis ultima nulla malis.

Herein he declares that *no future death shall put an end* to the pains and penalties of that death, to which the wicked shall be doomed ; and that there will be *no last hour* to such great evils. He was too debauched a libertine to believe it for his own part, but he gives us the common notion of the day : as doth *Seneca*, who was murdered by *Nero* anno domini 65. when in his *Hercules Furens* he makes *Amphytrio* ask *Theseus* advising him to refrain from human blood, &c.

Certus inclusos tenet.

Locus nocentes ? utque fert fama, impios

Supplicia vinculis sæva perpetuis domant ?

What ! doth some certain place confine the guilty ? and, as common report saith, do dreadful punishments keep the wicked under in *perpetual* (or *everlasting*) chains ?

Collins in his *Discourse of free thinking* (p. 36) asserts " the evil of superstition is now much increased, and men are under greater terrors and uneasiness of mind, than Pagans of old possibly could be, when they thought they hazarded less." Dr. *Bentley*, in his 21st Remark* upon *Collins*, answers, " this manifestly shews, that he thinks *eternal torments* were never imagined in the *Pagan* scheme, but were first introduced by Christianity. Just contrary. The vulgar in Paganism universally believed

* My acknowledgments are here made to the Doctor's namesake at Cambridge, for having directed me to this Remark in the College Library.

believed them, as his friend *Lucretius*† would have told him in express terms.

Nam, si certam finem esse viderent
 Ærumnarum homines, aliqua ratione valerent
 Religionibus atque minis obistere vatū :
 Nunc ratio nulla est restandi, nulla facultas;
 Æternas quoniam POENAS in morte timendum.

1 B l. 108.

[For, if men could see there would be a certain end of their miseries, they would by some means or other get rid of the religions and threatnings of priests. At present there is no way, no power of standing out against them; because, truly, *eternal punishments* at death are to be dreaded.]

'Tis so false what our author lays down, that the Pagan religion gave less uneasiness in life because they thought they *hazarded less* after death than we christians think we do, that its certain they thought bad men *hazarded as much* and good men *obtained infinitely less*."

A question arises, Did our Saviour or his Apostles contradict this common notion? Nothing of that kind appears from the New Testament; and the Papists pretend not to have any thing of it among the arcana of oral traditions; for as hath been already noted, tho' they hold a *purgatory*, they admit that abandoned wicked graceless spirits will be *perpetually* tormented. Had our Saviour thought, that the age was not ripe for the discovery of the *non-eternity* of hell torments; and that it was *prudent* to let the vulgar opinion prevail, till the remarkable out-pouring of the Spirit and the clearer instructions following upon it, had prepared the way for that *particular discovery*; his character as the great Prophet of the church might have been

* *Lucretius* died, aged forty four, and fifty four years before the birth of our Lord,

been capable of a full vindication, had he been *silent* upon the matter : but what will be thought, supposing the opinion to have been absolutely false, should he be found to have spoken so as to *confirm* the vulgar in their false opinion, and to have left his Apostles to do the same ?

Our Lord was far from sparing the *Pharisees* through fear of their resentment : no design of conciliating their regards could induce him to countenance their errors : when alone with his disciples we must conclude that he would be the furthest from doing it ; and yet we find by *Mark*, that in such a circumstance, he appears to labour at impressing the minds of his followers with the idea, that future punishments were *really perpetual*, "it is better for thee to enter into life maimed than to go into hell, into the fire that *never shall be quenched* ; where their worm *dieth not*, and the fire is *not quenched* : " and again, " than to be cast into hell, into the fire that *never shall be quenched* ; where their worm *dieth not*, and the fire is *not quenched* : " and the third time, " than to be cast into hell-fire ; where their worm *dieth not*, and the fire is *not quenched*." *Matthew*, in his abridged account of this matter, mentions only hell-fire and *everlasting* fire. * That the disciples might not slight the *pains of hell* they are compared to a *worm* and to *fire* on account of the exquisite *torment*, that the gnawings of the one and the burnings of the other produce upon living bodies ; and not on account of the *destruction* that either occasion to *dead* carcases that feel no pain. That they might not imagine, these pains would end after a while, for as much as a material worm dieth and proper fire goeth out, our Lord saith, their worm *dieth not* and the fire is *not quenched*, and he repeats it again and again—the ascription of such *perpetual* qualities, to the worm and

* Matt. 18. 8, 9.

to the fire, manifested also, that the worm and the fire were to be taken *figuratively*; which must moreover appear with reference to the *worm* from hence, that a *real* worm can live but a moment in the *fire*; and if the *fire* must be understood metaphorically, there is equal or superior reason for supposing the same of the *worm*. How little ground then had Dr. Scott to say, "as to that construction, which some *modern* writers have put upon this *worm*, as though it should relate to the *remorse* of *conscience*, it requires no other reply than this, that it is a mere *arbitrary* interpretation, that has no proof or warrant from the scripture use of this phrase."* Would leisure and opportunity admit, probably it might be shewn, that the construction of some modern writers is the same with that of some ancient ones; and that the Dr. has failed here, as much as before, in his *modern* style. But to pronounce, "it requires no other reply than this, that it is a mere *arbitrary* interpretation," is tantamount to telling us, that we must understand it *literally*, which obliges us to embrace an *absurdity*; how much easier to conceive it alludes to the *gnawings of conscience*! and how striking the allusion! However, a careful judicious reader of Dr. Scott's sermons will apprehend, that the Dr's head was strangely possessed with the notion that hell-fire was real and material; and that much of his reasoning against the wicked's being eternally punished is built upon that notion—a notion evidently subverted by our Lords saying, that in the day of judgment the accursed shall depart into *everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels*. How *material* fire by any preparation can torment the devil and his angels must exceed the comprehension of every mortal; if the accursed then are to be punished in the same fire with them, we ought to understand the term *fire* in a *figurative* sense, for

for that misery which the wrath of an offended God kindleth. But should we grant, that the *bodies* of the wicked will be consumed and burnt up by the fire of hell, be it what it may, a difficulty still remaineth, viz. can the spirits of such bodies be also consumed or burnt by such fire in length of time, without any annihilating act of the divine Being? If they are mere spirits, then it appeareth to me impossible: and as to their being struck out of existence by an annihilating act of God the scripture appears to be totally silent upon the head. It may be urged in support of their being *totally* destroyed, that *John* the baptist compares them to *chaff*, which fire will, of course, burn up *altogether*. But it must be noted, that he uses the comparison in accommodation to the other parts of the simile he hath a recourse to, while speaking of Christ, "whose fan, he says, is in his hand, and who will thoroughly purge his floor." Dr. Doddridge in his note upon the place, saith, "as to the phrase of burning the chaff with *unquenchable fire*, Mr. Horberry has observed with his usual accuracy of judgment (*Enquiry into the Duration of future Punishment*,* Ch. 1. No. 1, 2.) that it is absolutely inconsistent with all views of the *Restoration of the wicked*; and that however the phrase of being *consumed like chaff* might seem to favour the doctrine of their *annihilation* (which, nevertheless, it is certain no punishment of mind or body can of itself effect) the epithet of *unquenchable* given to this *fire* is so far from proving it, that it cannot by any easy and just interpretation be reconciled with it."

Our Lord compares "the kingdom of heaven to a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind; which when it was full, the fishermen drew to shore

* I have enquired after, but have not been able to get a sight of this author, and should be greatly obliged to any gentleman for the loan of it,

shore and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. So shall it be, saith our Lord, at the end of the world; the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire, there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth."* The Dr. gives us this note upon it, "the word which we render *bad*, generally signifies *corrupt* or *putrid*, and seems an allusion to the drawing up some *dead fish* in a net with the living. Mr. Horberry justly observes, that this in the strongest terms represents the hopeless state of sinners at last."

Our Lord did further confirm the opinion of the *Pharisees* respecting the perpetuity of future torments, when, a few days before his crucifixion, he closes his representation of the last judgment with saying, and these (the accursed) shall go away into *everlasting punishment*, but the righteous into *life eternal*? It was impossible, after what he had taught them before, and considering the known doctrine of the *Pharisees*, that his disciples could, without a *particular caution* to direct them, apprehend, that the punishment of the wicked might, or was to be of shorter duration than the life of the righteous, the adjective applied to both being one and the same in the original; and that *eternal life* was meant to express a *glorious immortality*, and necessarily implied *proper eternity* hath been already proved.

Thus it appears, that our Lord instead of contradicting, or even being silent as to the common notion of the *proper eternity* of future punishment, contributed by his very expressions; and the circumstances attending them, to establish it. We may observe also, that the apostles after the miraculous effusion of the holy Spirit, and their being *fully instructed* in the things of religion,

* Mark 13. 47, 48, 49.

religion, no where teach contrary to what the *Pharisees* held. Should it be pleaded, that *Paul* makes use of the word *destruction*, which seems to imply the being put out of existence; it is answered, that *everlasting destruction* evidently means the same with *everlasting punishment*, which is stiled *destruction*, not in reference to the wicked's being struck out of existence, but to the destruction of all his comforts, when, as the apostle teaches elsewhere, God shall render to him, by Christ the Judge, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish. Considering the number of Gentile converts, and that the gospel dispensation was designed for all people, had the apostles thought, that future punishments were not properly eternal, and that the doctrine of eternal punishments would be a grand obstacle to the propagating of christianity, and that the contrary was a truth which it was profitable upon the whole to proclaim most audibly, that every body might hear it, and not have *terrors proposed to them that exceed belief*—we must conclude that they would have declared themselves freely and explicitly upon the head; whereas they evidently join with their Lord in countenancing and establishing the common opinion of the day, that future punishments were *really* everlasting. Indeed if they are not strictly so, the use of the word *everlasting* or *eternal* always one and the same in the original (excepting the two places above mentioned where *aidios* occurs) is, not to say worse, little less than trifling; the same may be observed of the terms, *that dieth not* and *that is not quenched*. When it is said, that the worm *dieth not*, that the fire is *not quenched*, that it is *everlasting*, that the punishment is *everlasting*, and that the chains are *everlasting*—the ascription of these *perpetual* qualities is designed to excite *special* terror; but what *special* terror is justly excited by
N their

their being *perpetual*, if the party punished is wholly destroyed or after a while escapes by a change of place. *Perpetuity* is nothing to the purpose, is of no avail at all, when a total destruction is effected, or the sufferer has got out of hell for *ever*.

The answer quoted (p. 22, 23.) to set aside the argument drawn from its being said "their worm *dieth not*, and the fire is *not quenched*," is, in expressions different, but in meaning the same with what *Mr. Richardson* gave above a hundred years ago, viz. "fire may be said to be *everlasting*, when it doth not go out, till the combustible matter is consumed." To which it was replied, that, "at this rate of arguing, his own beard might be called an *everlasting* beard, as it was capable of growing while the nourishing matter lasted; and that the flame of a farthing candle might be called an *everlasting* fire, since it would last till the wick was spent."

The reader is desired likewise to recollect the scripture representation of the closing scene, with which all human affairs finish. When the second advent of our Lord commenceth, then is the hour in which all that are in their 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 to the resurrection of damnation. The quick and the dead are judged by him; and he renders to every man according to his deeds. The period employed in this most solemn and interesting transaction—grand beyond description—affecting beyond conception—is stiled the *day of judgment*: but of how long continuance is matter of uncertain conjecture, being reserved among the arcana of heaven. On its ending, the accursed go away into everlasting punishment; and the righteous into eternal life; answerable to the irreversible sentence

sentence of the upright Judge. And thus all human affairs terminate, and are fixed—the scene closes—and all expectation of a *new state* of probation, and of a *new* sentence is set aside.

The pamphlet (p. 24.) speaks of hell as the *next state*, wherein, though “the sufferings of the wicked will be *exceedingly great* in degree, as well as *long* in duration,” they are really under a *merciful* and *gracious* dispensation, as it is, “in order that they may be the *willing people of God*.” How far condemning the wicked to *suffer* the punishments of hell, is placing them *anew* under a *merciful* and *gracious* dispensation, let every one judge for himself! But when it is added “nor will they be delivered from their *suffering* till this is effected, i. e. till they are made the *willing people of God*” all expectation of their being delivered is at an end; and the *main* objections against the *proper* eternity of hell torments are virtually abandoned. If the wicked may be punished in hell, till they become holy and are fit for heaven; then in case they become not holy, God can consistently with his justice goodness and other attributes, punish them *everlastingly*. Should they be thus *everlastingly* punished, it is for sins committed in this world, or because of their *continuing to sin*: if for the former, then they may be *everlastingly* punished for *temporary* crimes: if for the latter, they are continued *perpetually* in a state of suffering, without the divine Being’s *preventing* it, through *benevolence*, by striking them out of existence.

Let it be now noted, that it is morally impossible, that their sufferings in hell should make them the *willing people of God*. In the worst of company, with the devil and his angels, surrounded by accursed persons like themselves, and *not a single* holy soul in the place, how can it be thought, that they will learn to be holy!

They

They go to the place of torments with fixed habits of wickedness. Is it the nature of those punishments, which occasion wailing and gnashing of teeth, to produce holy dispositions, full acquiescence in the government of heaven, and love to God? Do such punishments in general take this effect upon earth, that we may look for the like in hell; or is it not the very reverse? From what we know by present experience, may we not fear that the torments of hell will excite rage and rancour of heart, and lead on to the most horrid blasphemies? The gentlemen, who hold the Salvation of all men, it is judged, exclude all *positive* operation of the Almighty in effecting holy dispositions, under the notion of its being inconsistent with moral agency: we must not therefore admit of any such operation in hell; the damned then are left to the full influence of their wicked habits, in a state that hath a natural tendency to strengthen them; so that we must despair of their ever being made, by suffering, *the willing people of God*; or rather, of their being induced, by their suffering, to *make themselves* so. However could we believe, that it might happen with respect to many or the majority; yet should a *single* soul remain possessed of wicked principles, and continue everlastingly in the place of torments, the scheme of *Universal Salvation* is fallacious. Yea, should *any one* of the fallen angels continue everlastingly there, then the chief arguments, against the proper eternity of hell torments, would be thereby proved to be futile. It might be asked, if the pains of hell are calculated to produce holiness, how comes it to pass, that we have *no intimation*, that some of the fallen angels, who know also what the loss of heaven meaneth, have at length by their sufferings learnt obedience, recovered their virtue and been restored to happiness? What may be
the

the opinion of the favourers of *Universal Salvation* with regard to the wicked at death, whether they fall asleep, not to awake till the day of judgment, or are conveyed to a place of punishment, may not have been *published as yet* : but should the wicked go to hell upon dying, agreeable to the representation made in the parable of the rich libertine, we may conclude, that there is no hope of their being made *the willing people of God* by their sufferings. They that will have died five thousand years before the day of judgment, will be then condemned to the punishment of hell for the wicked deeds done in the body : but if they had, within that period of suffering, learnt to fear and love God, are we to suppose, they would be sent again to hell, being already fit for heaven ? It is more reasonable to think, that they continue in their disembodied state, during the intermediate space between death and judgment, impenitent, without undergoing a change of moral character. Who will may believe, that it will be afterwards effected, by their suffering in bodies to which they have been united by the resurrection.

No other answer need be given to Dr. *Hartley's* assertion, that "it does not appear from the writings of the most ancient fathers, that they construed the texts that speak of the future punishment in the *never-ending* sense ;" than that Dr. *Watts* writes, "It is really an imposition upon unlearned readers to pretend, that the doctrine which denies the eternity of the punishments of hell, was the common sense of the primitive fathers, though it is granted that *Origen* and some others *might* be of this opinion."*

It

* *Watts's* World to come, Vol. 2. p. 320. Dr. *Watts* might word himself thus guardedly "~~might~~ be of this opinion" by reason of what some writers on the Controversy have noted, "that *Origen* signalized himself by explaining the scripture, and

It has been already shewn, that *Origen* and *Clement* were notorious for introducing into the church the *pagan philosophy* and *vain deceit*, that *Dr. Hartley* complains of, as what might prove introductory to the belief of the *absolute eternity* of punishment: from whence it would rather follow, upon the *Dr's* reasoning, that the *denial* of such *absolute eternity*, if truly imputed to *Origen* and *Clement*, was owing to the *pagan philosophy* and *vain deceit* he alludes to. It would have been much more to the purpose could the *Dr.* have said, that the *denial* of this *never-ending* sense of future punishment in the ancient creeds, shews that it *was* no *original doctrine*; but the mere *omission* of this *never-ending* sense in such creeds, rather shews that it *was* an *original doctrine*, instead of the contrary, and that it was generally admitted, and therefore the *insertion* of it was *needless*.

The

and confuting of heresies; *that* whatever enemies he had while living, their hatred of him was not grounded on heterodox, or singular, opinions laid to his charge, but took its rise from envy at his growing reputation and usefulness; *that* the common charge against him was not heard of till a long time after his death, when his writings might be considerably interpolated and corrupted (as other ancient writings were) *that* his books of *Principles* are extant only in a *Latin* translation not to be depended upon, and those published by *Huet*, are commonly supposed to be in several places corrupted; *that* his eight books against *Celsus*, which he wrote in his old age, and are come down to us rather more pure than any other of his works, contain nothing *clearly favourable* to the opinion ascribed to him, but much that is inconsistent therewith." It has been much questioned whether *Origen* and *Clement* of *Alexandria* did really and steadily believe, that devils and damned men would be at length restored to the favour of God. "*Clement* is charged with this by *Le Clerc*, and some few others. But tho' he refers to *Plato*, as observing, that God inflicts no punishment but for the good of his creatures, 'tis not deducible from any thing he says, that he approved of this as true *universally*."

The contents of the pamphlet entitled *Salvation for all Men &c. &c.* have been, it is hoped, fully and fairly canvassed. May it not be thought, that the following reflections will occur to one or another upon the occasion?

The arguments brought to prove the *proper* eternity of hell torments, should they not silence every objection, are sufficient to evince the *wisdom* and *prudence* of not hazarding any thing on the possibility of the contrary doctrine.

No man of common sense and understanding can be justified in allowing himself to live in vicious courses, and other than the scriptures prescribe, on the *per-adventure* that *everlasting* punishment is no more than a *figurative* expression for an *indefinite time*; and on the presumption of his learning to be holy in hell among devils and damned spirits, should he omit doing it under all the superior advantages attending the present state of probation.

But should it be doubted, whether future punishment is *properly eternal*; yet the *Salvation of all Men* is a *distinct* subject, and may be absolutely false, though the damned should not be always suffering. The evidence of scripture against the *Salvation of all Men* is so full and express, that no dependance can be had upon any doctrine of revelation, if not on that which teaches, that some individuals will never be admitted to the enjoyment of everlasting happiness. Whatever becomes of them, they will not be suffered to enter the heavenly paradise; or the word of God, is, as the Papists tell us, a nose of wax that may be formed into any shape, and requires an infallible interpreter; whom, though they pretend to possess, they are not agreed in; it being a question agitated among them, whether it is the Pope in his own person, or a general council, or the church diffusive, or the Pope and a general council in conjunction.

conjunction. It must be the height of folly therefore for a person to encourage himself in any evil practice on earth, from the present ease, pleasure or profit it may afford him, under an apprehension, that, after having suffered for a longer or shorter period in hell, he shall remove to heaven, where his happiness will be the better flavoured by reason of the miseries through which he hath passed. Must not a conduct of this kind evidence a greater lunacy, than what subjects multitudes to confinement !

The pamphlet hath a natural tendency, by holding forth a distant *never ending* happiness to every one, though wicked in the *highest possible* degree, to encourage the indulgence of passions, subversive of family and civil government, and of the most destructive quality : and therefore is in itself pernicious beyond expression, and more especially so at the present particular time, wherein liberty hath too universally degenerated into licentiousness. Whether it hath mended or injured the morals of individuals, and made them better or worse husbands, parents, children, neighbours, citizens or christians, is not below the attention of those that espouse it.

What can we think of those teachers, who, apprehending the doctrine of *Universal Salvation* to be scriptural (notwithstanding the countenance our Lord and his Apostles gave to the contrary) undertake to publish it, as from the house-top, for a *wholesome* doctrine, though they have not the *example* of their Lord and his apostles to warrant them ?—that they are not arrived at years of *discretion* ? or, that they have past them ? If happily so grounded in the love of virtue as to need no terrors, they might have considered more the bulk of mankind, and in mercy to the present world *have had their faith to themselves.*
