

SNT on Death and Dying 2

Welcome to this second evening when we're going to consider the bible's teaching on death and dying. Those of you who were here last month will be aware that our focus then was on what happens to Christians when they die. We didn't take any time to consider the question of those who have not placed their trust in Jesus – and so we want to take some time this evening to explore the whole range of opinions on this topic which exist within evangelicalism.

And we need to note that there is a range – I am aware that when I was growing up there was one view taught on this subject, it's the view with which we will be most familiar. But within the tent of evangelicalism, I think it's fair to say that there has been a greater diversity of opinion in recent years.

Before we begin, just a little bit of groundwork. For anyone who has ever studied theology in a formal setting will usually encounter, before too long, what is sometimes called the Wesleyan Quadrilateral, a set of four sources which we ought to draw upon when we think about God. I've mentioned these before at other SNTs, but thought it would be helpful to briefly summarise them again:

- ❖ **Scripture** – the biblical texts which we recognise to be inspired by God, and authoritative for the church. It's also important to note that when we talk about being faithful to Scripture, we are referring to an approach which doesn't just cite individual chapters and verses, but which also seeks to understand those verses within the overall, grand story of the bible.
- ❖ **Tradition** – I think we would all agree that we attach weight and significance not only to what the Bible says, but also to certain interpretations of Scripture which have been adopted historically by the church. It's worth noting on this point that the relationship between Scripture and tradition is one of the differences between Protestantism and Catholicism – Protestants will tend to give more priority to Scripture, but Catholics will attach more weight to church teaching.
- ❖ **Reason** – any conclusions which we draw on a given topic need to be those which we can regard as being intellectually coherent. We can't lay aside our critical reasoning when we engage with the bible.
- ❖ **Experience** – this refers to life as we have lived it, the things we have been through, the relationships we have formed. All of us this evening will come here with certain people on our mind as we think about this subject – our family members who never claimed to believe in God; our Muslim or Hindu neighbours who appear to us to live peaceable lives and whose kindness we have experienced. How will we reconcile our views on this subject to who we have known these people to be and how we believe or hope that God will relate to them?

My hope is that as we explore these issues this evening, we can do so in ways which are faithful to these sources, and perhaps I can add one principle to this list, which is this: holding ideas in tension. One of the things we need to acknowledge is that within faith there are often competing ideas that we somehow have to hold together, even though it

can feel hard to do so: inclusion and holiness; providence and free will; grace and truth. Often when we disagree as Christians it's because we veer to one end of these extremes at the total exclusion of the other.

A couple of weeks ago, I read words in Ecclesiastes which I'm sure I'd read before but they'd never struck me in quite the way they did this time.

**It is good to grasp the one
and not let go of the other.
Whoever fears God will avoid all extremes.**

Ecclesiastes 7:18

As we begin, I thought I would share with some words from a hymn. Isaac Watts is sometimes given the title of the 'Father of English Hymnody,' we still sing some of his hymns in our churches today, including the likes of 'When I survey the wondrous cross,' and 'Joy to the world.' But I wonder how we would feel about singing these words of Watts which I came across recently:

*What bliss shall fill the ransomed souls
When they in glory dwell
To see the sinner as he rolls
In quenchless flames of hell*

My hope would be that most of us would at least think twice before uttering those lines... for me, they raise a number of questions. How should we regard the prospect that a significant number of people in our world may never come to a recognition of Jesus as Lord, and what does that mean for their future? How exactly might they experience any punishment for their failure to believe in Jesus? And how might any awareness of their destiny impact of the experience of those who share in the victory of Jesus? Will it really be the 'bliss' as Watts seems to suggest? Or might it not diminish the sense of joy that we will feel?

There are three positions which I'll talk about this evening:

- **Eternal conscious punishment**, with suffering experienced on a never-ending basis
- **Annihilationism**
- **Universalism**
- Many of us will be aware that another idea we've come across is purgatory, which is a teaching of the Catholic church. It's worth noting that purgatory is not considered by the Catholic church as a place of lasting punishment.... It is seen as being a place where believers go if they don't die in a 'state of grace,' in other

words if they haven't had the opportunity to show full penitence for serious sins which they've committed.¹

I want to spend some time talking about the arguments which are made for each case, before offering some concluding observations. And there will be time to pause and discuss these views as we go.

Eternal Conscious Punishment

My guess is that this is the view which all of us will have grown up with, and probably the one which most of will still hold to. This idea is defined by the American writer John Walvoord in these terms:

'... the belief that punishment for the wicked is everlasting and that it is punitive, not redemptive.'

Walvoord et al, *Four Views on Hell*

The advocates of each position on this issue make an appeal to the Bible, and especially, the New Testament, when they make their various claims. The Old Testament has much less to say on the afterlife.

But we need to recognise that when we read these texts and we see a reference to 'hell,' there are different words being used from one verse to another. We may see what we think of as a whole set of verses about our idea of hell, but there may be different ideas suggested in the original texts.

On some occasions in the New Testament, the Greek word *hades* is used – and *hades* was the Greek word used as an equivalent of the Hebrew word *sheol*. Now the word *sheol* was one which, on many occasions when it's used in the Old Testament, seems just to mean 'the grave' or 'the pit,' it's the abode of the spirits who have departed, but it remains a shadowy place.

Job speaks of *sheol* as a place of darkness, and restlessness:

²⁰ Are not the days of my life few?

Let me alone, that I may find a little comfort

²¹ before I go, never to return,

to the land of gloom and deep darkness,

²² the land of gloom and chaos,

where light is like darkness."

Job 10:20-22

And David questions the possibility of whether those in Sheol can offer praise to God:

¹ In Catholic terminology, these serious offences would be termed as 'mortal sins' rather than 'venial sins'

**For in death there is no remembrance of you;
in Sheol who can give you praise?**

Psalm 6:5

Overall, the picture of Sheol does appear to be a gloomy one. There is also, you might recall, a very pessimistic view of death suggested in Ecclesiastes – in Ecclesiastes 9, the writer says on one occasion that a living dog is better off than a dead lion, to be in the land of the living is clearly considered to be a better place than to be among those who are dead.

It's also worth noting that there are some references which suggest a more positive future for the 'righteous,' for those who are trusting God. An example of these can be found at the end of Psalm 73, but, again, note that the language is vague:

**My flesh and my heart may fail,
but God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever.**

Psalm 73:26

Now... why am I mentioning this? Because, on some occasions, in the New Testament, when Jesus speaks of hell, the Gospel writers record what he's said using the Greek word *Hades*, which corresponds to the Hebrew idea of *Sheol*. And he uses the word on a number of occasions.

- There is the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus – we're told the Rich Man is suffering in Hades (see Luke 16:19-31)
- There is the warning spoken by Jesus in Matthew 10:23, when he speaks judgement against the cities of Chorazin and then Capernaum.
- And in Matthew 16:18, when Jesus says that the gates of Hell will not prevail against his church, he again uses this word Hades.

But there are more occasions when he uses a different word, *gehenna*. Now this is a term which was also used to describe the Valley of Hinnon, which was a place outside of Jerusalem used as a burial place for criminals and also for burning rubbish. If you read the end of Isaiah, and chapter 66, it includes a vision of the future where everyone comes to worship God, but verse 24 speaks about them seeing the dead bodies of those who rebelled against him. The image used there is also evoking the Valley of Hinnon. So, when this word is used it would conjure up some fairly grim images for those listening to Jesus.

- Jesus speaks of *Gehenna* on a number of occasions in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5:22, 5:29, 5:30).
- And this is also the word used in one of his most foreboding warnings, which we find in **Luke 12:5: 'But I will warn you whom to fear: fear him who, after he has killed, has authority to cast into hell.'**

And then asides from the language spoken in these occasions, we have moments when Jesus does not use these specific words, but clearly warns of judgement which will bring suffering for those who are not found to be righteous. In Matthew 13:30, he explains the parable of the weeds and warns that the weeds will be burned.

And then in two parables in Matthew 25, there is some very disturbing and stark language used to describe the fate of the unrighteous.

- The parable of the talents concludes with this pronouncement of judgement on the servant who has been such a poor steward: **‘As for this worthless slave, throw him into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.’ (Matthew 25:30)**
- And then we read shortly afterwards this conclusion to the parable of the sheep and the goats: **‘And these will go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life.’ (Matthew 25:46).**

Now, again, it does need to be pointed out that there is a lot of debate around the use of the word **‘eternal’** in Matthew 25:46. It’s the Greek word **aiōnios** which is usually translated ‘everlasting’ but can also mean ‘the period of the age to come.’

So... in Judaism of the time when Jesus ministered on earth, the great hope was of the dawning of a new age, which would bring in the reign of the Messiah, the age to come. We get our English word **‘aeon’** from this Greek word. But this is a major question concerning this verse: is Jesus talking about a punishment which takes place in a future age, or a punishment which goes on and on, without ceasing?

It’s worth flagging that up as an issue. But we also need to acknowledge that much of the language of these verses does suggest a punishment which manifests itself in pain and suffering of a sustained duration. And those who hold to the view that hell constitutes unending suffering will place a great emphasis on them.

Another verse which they will point to is found in Revelation 14, and it’s often cited as a key text in this debate. In this chapter we read of a scene where three angels are heard pronouncing judgement against Babylon and those who ‘worship the beast and its image.’ This is what we read:

⁹ A third angel followed them and said in a loud voice: “If anyone worships the beast and its image and receives its mark on their forehead or on their hand, ¹⁰ they, too, will drink the wine of God’s fury, which has been poured full strength into the cup of his wrath. They will be tormented with burning sulphur in the presence of the holy angels and of the Lamb. ¹¹ And the smoke of their torment will rise for ever and ever. There will be no rest day or night for those who worship the beast and its image, or for anyone who receives the mark of its name.”

Revelation 14:9-11

And for the traditionalists this will be seen as an almost irrefutable text, this idea of suffering without rest. There are other perspectives on it, and we'll talk about those later...

That is a case, from Scripture, for the traditional view, but it's also worth noting that there are other cases made for this perspective:

- Those who would wish to affirm the importance of tradition will remind us that for the majority of the church's history, this view has been considered as the orthodox one.
- There is also the question of justice – those who support this view will rightly remind us that part of the vision we have of the future is one where there is a reckoning for sin, where people are held accountable for oppression, for exploitation, where the lofty are taken from their thrones. And a crucial element of that justice will be the punishment of sin. I often find that when I talk to people about hell and the afterlife, they will say that they hope there is a punishment for those who have caused great suffering to others: Vladimir Putin's name has recently come up in such conversations.
- Those who believe in this view will also tell us that because the righteousness of God is infinite, then he is entitled to punish those who rebel against him on an infinite basis. They may also suggest that it is not for us to impose a human concept of justice or fairness onto a holy God. They will remind us that God's ways are higher than our ways, we may struggle to understand this but we need to accept that this is the way things are.
- And traditionalists will also say that our desire to see those who do not know Jesus escape this punishment represents the best motivation we could have for preaching the Gospel.

Time out: an opportunity, for a few minutes, to reflect on the arguments for this position.

What do I agree with? What is making me anxious?

Annihilationism

But as I said earlier, this is not the only perspective on this issue. I want to talk now, for a few moments, about the position of annihilationism, which contends that:

'... eternal punishment (hell) is eternal in consequence, not in duration... In this view the wicked are eternally annihilated, not tormented.'

Greg Boyd, *Satan and the Problem of Evil*

It's important to note that those who advocate for this position make it clear that they are not suggesting there is no eternal punishment, but rather that that punishment takes the form of the withdrawal of existence. I think that's a point made very well by one of the advocates of this position, Nigel Wright, until recently Principal of Spurgeon's College.

‘... this is no soft option, no kinder, gentler damnation, but a destiny to avoid, for God’s sake and our own.’

Nigel Wright, *The Radical Evangelical*

I’m conscious that this is not a position which as many of us will be familiar with, or will agree with, but it’s worth noting that as far back as the year 2000, when the Evangelical Alliance published a report called *The Nature of Hell*, they acknowledged this position as a legitimate one within the tent of evangelicalism. And it’s also a position which a number of significant evangelical leaders have, in recent years, identified with including John Stott and Michael Green.

Those who argue for this position will cite a number of bases for the bible for the claims they make.

Firstly, they will argue that across the New Testament the language which speaks of the destiny of the lost invariably describes obliteration:

Word	Instances	Examples (NRSV)
<i>apōleia</i> annihilation	Matt 7:13; John 17:12; Acts 8:20; Rom 9:22; Phil 1:28, 3:19; 2 Thess 2:3; 1 Tim 6:9; Heb 10:39; 2 Pet 2:1	‘Enter through the narrow gate; for the gate is wide and the road is easy that leads to destruction, and there are many who take it.’ Matthew 7:13
<i>olethros</i> destruction	1 Thess 5:3; 2 Thess 1:9	‘These will suffer the punishment of eternal destruction, separated from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his might...’ 2 Thess 1:9
<i>thanatos</i> death	Rom 1:32; 6:21ff; 7:5; 8:6; 1 Cor 15:21; 15:56; 2 Cor 2:16; 7:10; James 1:15; 5:20; 1 John 5:16; Rev 20:14; 21:8	‘So what advantage did you then get from the things of which you now are ashamed? The end of those things is death.’ Romans 6:21
<i>phthora</i> corruption/ disintegration	Gal 6:8; 2 Pet 1:4; 2:12	‘If you sow to your own flesh, you will reap corruption from the flesh; but if you sow to the Spirit, you will reap eternal life from the Spirit.’ (Gal 6:8)

Now there isn’t time to look at every single one of the references which are cited here, but a couple of points are worth making.

There is one instance where Jesus does seem to speak clearly of eternal punishment as something which involves the end of any conscious existence:

Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul; rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell.

Matthew 10:28

And there are other observations which annihilationalists will make of the language used by Jesus in the instances when he speaks of eternal punishment:

- What is really meant by the word ‘everlasting’? Does it suggest that the consequences of the punishment are permanent, or that the actual experience of punishment goes on and on?
- And what about the language of fire? Isn’t it normally the case that fire consumes that which is burned?

Another important passage which is cited by annihilationists is 1 Corinthians 15. A major question which these scholars want to ask concerns the immortality of the soul... Let me remind you of one of the things Paul says in this passage:

For this perishable body must put on imperishability, and this mortal body must put on immortality.

1 Corinthians 15:53

Another term which you will sometimes hear used to describe annihilationism is conditionalism – the suggestion being that immortality is not something all humans inherently possess, but only a gift God will give to those who trust in him. This is how one proponent for this view makes the point:

‘While “those who belong to Christ” at the resurrection of the dead will “put on immortality,” immortality is never promised to those who reject God. This is the significance of that familiar biblical promise of eternal life, and the warning that the wages of sin is death.’

Glenn Peoples, in *Rethinking Hell*

It’s also worth briefly noting that there are also arguments from church history and from reason which proponents for this view will point to.

In terms of history, they will point out a number of the early church fathers – the likes of Ignatius, Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, were annihilationists, and that Tertullian, who lived from 160 to 225AD, was actually the first of the church fathers to insist on a doctrine of eternal conscious punishment. And they will also point to other philosophical arguments:

- There is the **proportionality** argument – is suffering which goes on forever and ever a just punishment for seventy or eighty years of waywardness?
- There is the **pointlessness** argument – why would a loving God keep on punishing people who never have any prospect of turning to him?
- And finally, there is the suggestion that eternal conscious punishment results in a **marred new creation**. How can we claim that God has won a victory over evil if people continue to suffer? Don’t the flames of hell cast a shadow over the new heaven and earth?

Time out: an opportunity, for a few minutes, to reflect on the arguments for this position.

What do I agree with? What is making me anxious?

Universalism

The final perspective which I want us to consider this evening is universalism. Now... coming up with an overarching definition for universalism is difficult because it is a perspective which comes in various shapes and sizes. What I don't want to explore now is Pluralist Universalism, which is the suggestion that people of all faiths are worshipping the same god and will therefore all go to heaven.

Instead, I want to briefly talk about the case of evangelical universalism, which is a perspective which continues to place a central emphasis on the saving work of Jesus, and which argues for people finding faith in Jesus, even those who are in hell. An important book which makes a persuasive argument for this view is ***The Evangelical Universalist***, which was originally published in 2006 under the pseudonym of Gregory MacDonald. The author's real name is Robin Parry.

Parry roots his case in an overview of the whole biblical story, including an extensive analysis of the great hope of Israel, which we read of in the Old Testament: the vision of an eventual time when all the peoples of the earth would come to a recognition of the greatness of Israel's God, and would worship him on a day when his rule was established over all the earth.

We read of this hope in the psalms – a great example is Psalm 67, where we read:

**⁴Let the nations be glad and sing for joy,
for you judge the peoples with equity
and guide the nations upon earth.**

**⁵Let the peoples praise you, O God;
let all the peoples praise you.**

Psalm 67:4,5

And, of course, there are also visions in the Prophets as well, particularly in Isaiah, of a time when all the nations come in pilgrimage to the Temple. Listen to these closing words from Isaiah:

**From new moon to new moon,
and from sabbath to sabbath,
all flesh shall come to worship before me,
says the LORD.**

Isaiah 66:23

Similar visions of hope concerning the future are found in Isaiah 2:1-4, 11:10-12; 18:7; 60:1-16; 61:5-6; 66:12, 18.

Now what Robin Parry also comments on are a number of instances in Isaiah where scenes are judgement upon nations are followed by their restoration. So, for example, if you read Isaiah 19, you will find there an account of divine punishment on Egypt, which

is then followed by a promise of restoration from God – it's a remarkable passage! And you see the same pattern played out in Isaiah 45 where there are promises of restoration from God which are given to those who have survived the judgement of the nations. And Parry is making an important point when he writes about these texts, he is saying that in Scripture the judgement and the punishment of God may not always be the final word, there may yet be the possibility of restoration, even for those who have received God's wrath.

When it comes to the New Testament, there are a number of key texts which Parry points to as he builds his argument. There is an extended reflection in his book on Romans 5, and what he writes of there as being a universal promise of salvation:

¹⁸Therefore just as one man's trespass led to condemnation for all, so one man's act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all. ¹⁹For just as by the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man's obedience the many will be made righteous.

Romans 5:18-19

Parry suggests that we have to see these verses as being absolutely fundamental to our understanding of the scope of the saving work of Jesus. It is clear when you read Romans that Paul sees the fall and sin as being problems which apply to absolutely everyone. Well, Paul is taking that same principle of the actions of 'one man,' first it was Adam and now it's Jesus, and he's saying they result in salvation for all of us.

Some scholars will say that Paul is only talking here about an offer of salvation which is available to all of us... but Parry disagrees. He points out that the text says nothing about an offer, it simply says there is justification for all of us.

There are other texts which Parry draws on from Paul's writing. He also talks about Philippians 2, and that famous poem which speaks of Jesus taking on the form of a slave and being made in human likeness. If you remember how that poem finishes, it speaks of every knee bowing before Jesus and every tongue confessing that he's Lord, it is language which strongly evokes images like the ones we spoke about from Isaiah, of all people worshipping the true God.

And finally we come to Parry's view of Revelation – and his suggestion is that those verses which warn of punishment need to be read within the wider context of the whole book. His view is that where punishment is spoken of it is in similar terms to what we talked about earlier in Isaiah – that even apparent warnings of destruction are then followed up by the prospect of redemption

And this is a pattern which is played out on a number of occasions in the book:

Judgement	Salvation
6:12-17: Judgement on ‘everyone, slave and free’ upon the opening of the sixth seal	7:9-17: Worship of the Lamb by ‘a great multitude that no one could count, from every nation...’
11:18a: The wrath of God and judgement of the dead	11:18b: Reward for ‘saints and all who fear your name.’
14:6-20: Judgement pronounced upon Babylon and ‘those who worship the beast and its image.’	15:2-4: The Sea of Glass and the song of ‘those who had conquered.’
16:17-18:24: A vision of ‘Babylon the great, mother of whores and of earth’s abominations’ and a description of the fall of Babylon	19:1-10: Rejoicing in Heaven after the defeat of Babylon (‘what seemed to be the voice of a great multitude’).
20:7-15: Satan’s defeat (‘thrown into the lake of fire and sulphur’); Death and Hades thrown into the lake of fire, ‘the second death.’	21:1-22:5: A new heaven and earth, and a vision of the new Jerusalem. ‘Its gates will never be shut by day...’

There are a couple of points which I think are important to highlight with regard to Parry’s interpretation of these texts:

- He states that he is arguing for an authentically biblical view of punishment, because in Scripture God never punishes for the sake of it, it is always punishment as a means of encouraging people to turn back to him.
- He also makes clear that this is an ‘evangelical’ vision of universalism – what saves people is a recognition of the Lamb.

Now I must confess that I struggle with this idea of punishment as the means by which God persuades people to accept his love. Parry himself acknowledges that it could be construed as torture, with God effectively saying to people, ‘I will keep on hurting you until you acknowledge who I am.’

But no one can deny that his interpretation does provide us with a hopeful picture of the future, which fulfils the vision the prophets have of a huge number of people from all the nations coming to know God. This picture offered to us by Parry reminds me of a point made by the American writer and speaker Rob Bell:

‘Telling a story in which billions of people spend forever somewhere in the universe trapped in a black hole of endless torment and misery with no way out isn’t a very good story. Telling a story about a God who inflicts unrelenting punishment on people because they didn’t do or say or believe the correct things in a brief window of time called life isn’t a very good story.

In contrast, everybody enjoying God’s good world together with no disgrace or shame, justice being served and all the wrongs being made right is a better story. It is bigger, more loving, more expansive, more extraordinary, beautiful and inspiring than any other story about the ultimate course history takes.’

Rob Bell, *Love Wins*

You may not agree entirely with the point Bell makes... and ultimately, in this book, he doesn't go so far as to identify himself as a universalist. But we can't deny that he is asking an important question. If Jesus has died to win a victory for God, and the consequence of that is that only a very small proportion of all the people who ever lived get to heaven, how much of a victory is that, really?

Time has almost gone but I do want to make a few brief remarks in conclusion, to raise what I believe are wider issues which we need to consider as we come to a position on this issue?

- Can we reconcile whatever position we take to our understanding of the love of God? How much punishment, and for long, do we think could be heaped upon people by a God of love?
- Can we reconcile whatever position we take to our understanding of God's holiness and his justice? On the one hand, those of us who are saved by grace will know that one of the implications of that grace is that God has overlooked our own sin, but we also believe he has done so in a way which is faithful to justice, by giving us his son. And we also need to recognise that part of the biblical vision of the future is that there is a reckoning for sins which have been committed, that those who have oppressed and exploited and injured others are held to account by God. And we also need to take on board the words of warning by Jesus, that some people will miss out.
- Can we reconcile whatever position we take to a view of the future which is genuinely hopeful, and which offers the prospect of the triumph of God over evil, and the removal of evil from the universe? And do we have an understanding of the Gospel which goes beyond a consideration of what happens to individual people when they die, and considers the plans God has for the whole world, that remembers that God is reconciling all things to himself.
- Can we reconcile whatever position on eternal punishment to the view we have on providence? I'm afraid that I struggle to accept the Calvinist notion of a God who predestines some people to go to hell, without any chance of turning to him. I think that idea is morally repugnant. But my belief in free will is centred on the idea that God loves us, and that love is not something which can force a response from someone. God's love will always require the possibility that people are free to reject him. Because I believe in free will, I can't bring myself to believe in universalism.
- Can we reconcile whatever position we take to a position which also affirms the importance of mission and evangelism? There is no escaping the fact that warnings about whether or not we can have eternal life in the age to come are a central part of the teaching of Jesus? But is there a danger that we conceive of evangelism as being more of a stick and less of a carrot? The good news is an invitation to be part of the movement here on earth which is the first fruits of the future God is bringing in, a future where all things will be reconciled to him. It is

an invitation to be fully human, when we are forgiven by and enter into a close relationship with our creator and live lives which are ordered as he intended. I sense that we live in a time when we need to communicate that whole vision of the present and future offered by God if we are to speak in ways which are truly compelling to people.

- Can we have this conversation with humility, remembering some of the starkest warnings we find in Jesus' teaching on this subject: that some of those who will face punishment will be those who thought of themselves as certain of making it to heaven:

²¹ **“Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does the will of my Father who is in heaven. ²² Many will say to me on that day, ‘Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name and in your name drive out demons and in your name perform many miracles?’ ²³ Then I will tell them plainly, ‘I never knew you. Away from me, you evildoers!’**

Matthew 7:21-23

Final discussion time

Which of these views is most compelling for us?000

Bibliography

- Rob Bell, *Love Wins*, Harper Collins, 2011
- Christopher M Date et al, *Rethinking Hell*, Cascade Books, 2014
- Gregory MacDonald, *The Evangelical Universalist: The Biblical Hope that God's Love Will Save Us All*, SPCK, 2008
- John F Walvoord et al, *Four Views on Hell*, Zondervan, 1996
- Nigel Wright, *The Radical Evangelical: Seeking a Place to Stand*, SPCK, 1996