

Where Are The Dead?

AND WILL ANY SUFFER ETERNAL TORMENT?

A DEBATE BETWEEN ANTIPAS, F.D.

"A Ringleader of the Sect called the Nazarenes,"

AND THE REV. ELI CLARKE A K.C

Vicar of Christ Church, Swansea,

AND REV. F. D. THOMPSON,

WITH A PREFACE BY C M. SPURGEON.

1886.

Preface.

For some years past my mind has been much exercised on the questions dealt with in these pages, and I cannot doubt but that there are thousands likeminded with myself, throughout the world, seeking for light on questions which are confessedly "hard to be understood." I have therefore pleasure in introducing this book to the reader, in hope that by the lucid and logical way in which the arguments pro and con are advanced, perplexities concerning the state of the departed, which doubtless beset the path of many devout minds, may be dispelled, and the Christian Pilgrim may be thereby enabled to "go on his way rejoicing." It is admitted on all hands that the way is rough at the best, and therefore anything that has for its object the help of travelers to the "better land" is always welcome to those who are struggling for no less a blessing than eternal life, associated therewith eternal glory and honor.

While not committing myself to all the views of either of the disputants, I am fully convinced that the reading of the work will do no harm, and verily believe will do some good.

Yours faithfully,

C. M. SPURGEON,

Cambridge Heath, London.

Author's Preface.

LORD BACON'S advice on reading a book is—"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse; but to weigh and consider." If there are any questions more than others which demand "consideration," they are those touched upon in the following pages. We have carefully "weighed and considered" the statements brought forward by Mr. Thompson and Mr. Clarke and have (we are sorry to say it), found them sadly wanting. It were easy to fill a large-sized volume in replying to their fancies, but we have contented ourselves by simply writing a discursive reply. We have noticed briefly most things they have said, and hereby submit it to the careful perusal of all into whose hands it may fall. We have no object but the advancement of scriptural knowledge. Tradition dies hard, but we feel sure that the pure and unadulterated word of Jehovah will ultimately prevail.

For this consummation we devoutly wish, pray, and work; and as the press is now the recognized medium of communication, from man to man, we have collected the matter which was used in the debate of 1876, and now for the first time in its classified form, place it in the hands of the public, in the hope that the interest then awakened will not only be revived, but largely increased throughout the length and breadth of the land. All we ask for the book is a candid, and careful reading, and comparisons of both sides these great questions in the light of the scriptures of truth—leaving the results to Him who "giveth the increase." Should the numerous readers of our literature ask the question to what "sect" does the writer belong, the answer is, we are out of fellowship with all the sects, because none, as we think, are walking "in the light," So much so is this the case that the utterances contained in this work and others published for years past over our signature would not for one moment be tolerated in any community of so-called Christians extant. Notwithstanding the much vaunted talk about "liberality," "toleration," and so forth, the "sects" are hopelessly and chronically off the lines, and our experience teaches us that they are by no means anxious to be put right, and are often positively displeased with any efforts in this direction put forth by these would-be reformers. Strange to say, that out of the nearly two hundred registered' denominations in England, not one of them is known by the designation of the primitive Christians, although it is plainly recorded in sacred history. One of the "ringleaders" of this early Christian section of society was the apostle Paul, and of him it is stated "He was a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes." Should any who read these pages be inspired to form a body, and meet together in small or large numbers, the name by which they should be known is the scriptural one, "Nazarenes." The prevailing persistency of what is called Christendom to refuse the truth, does not deter us in our efforts to do our best while we have the means at our command to call men back to the "old paths" from which, under the influence of a false and antiquated theology, they have unfortunately wandered.

The precise meaning of the word Nazarene is separated one; and this or itself would be a sufficient excuse for adopting it as an epithet of description, for it most concisely expresses the attitude of a follower of him who "was called a Nazarene" himself; for whilst it is a fact we are in the world, it is also a fact or ought to be, that we are not of it, that is, we are "separated" from it in spirit and purpose. We adopt this designation for the convenience and purposes of identification; and, furthermore, on account of its being scriptural. We are certain that the sect that is said to have been "everywhere spoken against" was so named (Acts 28. 22), and it is of this same "sect" that Tertullus affirmed before Felix, when prosecuting Paul, whom he indicted, or charged, with being "a ringleader of the seat of the Nazarenes." Acts, 24. 5. It is evident from these two facts that the "Nazarenes," or early disciples, were a very troublesome section of society, and that they were "separated" from and opposed to the world, and, consequently, "hated of all men," or "everywhere spoken against," and as it was with them so will it be with us. The news or report we have to proclaim strikes at the root of the tree of popular superstition now as then, and as human nature never changes we must not be surprised if the results are identical. The position of an ancient Nazarene was that of a man who had "a vow," and had made a pledge to live a life of purity, abstaining from the very appearance of evil, and to serve the Lord with full purpose of heart. This is exactly as it must be with those who put their hands to the Gospel plough, for it is declared "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Yet another meaning suggested from this word Nazarene is "the branch" (Netser.) This is one of the designations of Christ, applied to Him by a prophet.

The meaning of the word Nazareth is "a city of branches," and how suggestive a description—what a town of "branches" it has been. Can any good thing come out of Nazareth? Yea, verily. Christianity from there, as from a center, has spread (and will to the end), its rich foliage over the world, now, as the salt of mankind preserving the world from destruction till "the fulness of time shall come," in harmony with the mind of Christ, who said "I am the vine, ye are the branches." Nothing can permanently arrest the growth of this "vine," and when it is fully grown its "branches" will cover the whole earth, and be an everlasting refuge for the whole family of mankind. No doubt, on the appearance of our confession of faith, the cry will go forth "yet another sect;" for this we are prepared, and with any derision it may bring with it. Some doubtless will ascribe to us motives of "vainglory," and with a desire merely to figure as the founder of a new sect, and thus further divide Christendom. In reply to all this we have simply to say we have no such desires, but we are actuated by a sincere motive to spend and be spent in the work of making known the one and only Gospel, and to build on no other foundation than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ, who made himself known to Saul of Tarsus after his ascension to heaven as "Jesus of Nazareth." Hence we write down an epitome of the ancient faith for the perusal of all, and say, in the language of Him who is the way, the truth, and the life, "He that hath ears to hear let him hear." Whoso reads let him understand, so that we, in prospect of a speedy deliverance from all evil by the coming of the Master may sing not only with the heart, but "with the understanding also."

ANTIPAS, F.D.

Wartburg House, Flaxman Road, London, S.E.

P.S.—Any particulars as to "Nazarene" meeting places can be had on application to the publishers.

Where Are The Dead?

This was the subject of a lecture delivered at the Athenaeum Hall, Llanolly, on Monday evening last, by "Antipas, F.D.," who has gained great popularity at Swansea and elsewhere by his lectures. There was a crowded audience, who were very attentive during the discourse, the following outline of which is reprinted from the Laney Guardian:—

At eight o'clock the lecturer mounted the platform, and opened the Bible at the 14th chapter of Job, which he read in an emphatic manner, commenting thereon as he proceeded. When he came to the 10th verse, which begins "But man dies," the lecturer asked his audience how many of them believed the statement that "man dies." To believe so was to come into collision with modern thought on the subject, which is that man is immortal, and therefore cannot die. "The theory of Christendom is," said the speaker, "once in existence always in existence." Therefore, Job's statement man dies," must be and is disregarded. Something more was said of man being but a "FEW days" and "continuing NOT" when the chapter was concluded. The 49th Psalm was also read, after which the lecturer spoke as follows:—There is a well-known Anglicized Latin proverb, which says, "Of the dead say nothing but that which is good." Believing, as I do in this sentiment, I shall endeavor to observe it in the observations I may have to make tonight on this most serious and solemn subject. It is my intention to say nothing of the dead but that which is Scriptural, and therefore nothing but that which is true, and consequently nothing but that which is "good." The first thing that I will

say of the dead is, that they are in the majority—that is, there are far more people dead than alive. This is so much the case, that, when persons depart this life, it is often said of them, he or she has "gone over to the majority." Now (said the speaker) as many of those who once lived and moved among us while here were illustrious, great, and good; and as we must all, sooner, or later, "go over to the majority," it is but natural for us to inquire into their present whereabouts; and in solving this, which is to many a great difficulty, we shall settle the equally difficult question, "Whither are we going?" Now, it is an easy matter to fancy, in a mixed audience like this, that someone may be anxious to tender advice in something like the following language; "You are quite right in saying that it is quite 'natural' to inquire into these profound subjects; but is it not simply to gratify the inquisitive and curious—in short, is it not bordering on the impious, and treading upon forbidden ground, when you attempt to answer the question "Where are the dead?" I should meet such objectionable expressions by asking our friend—To which of the sects' do you belong? Are you a Catholic or a Protestant? Do

you know your catechism? If so, are you not aware that everybody of religionists have settled this question long ago? Surely you are familiar with the expression found in the Westminster confession of faith—viz.: "The souls of believers do immediately pass into glory." This being admitted, by inference we may conclude that the souls of unbelievers do immediately pass into misery; and what is this but settling the question we have met to talk over tonight? Therefore, your objection is strangely inconsistent. You should leave the subject alone yourself before you give advice to others.

The Popular View.

On February 10th, 1878, a telegram was sent through the United States to all the papers as follows:—" Rev. Henry Ward Beecher in his sermon this evening spoke of the late Pope as ' that dear and good old man who has just gone to heaven from the pontifical chair.' When Pius 9. died," said Mr. Beecher, that instant God's angels bore him gently as a little child into the arms of its mother —into the presence of his Savior—it was not because he was the Pope, but, because a new heart had been given to him. The nature of the Pope was all love." The Pope was the head of a system which is said by the Apostle John to be " drunken with the blood of the stunts." After this, a sermon speaking of the devil as " a dear old friend," would scarcely astonish us. In harmony with Mr. Beecher's sentiment, there was at the time published what was called an
Official Account of

THE POPE'S RECEPTION IN HEAVEN,
as follows:—

According to *Le Pelerin*, an Ultra-montane periodical, enjoying a large circulation in orthodox French circles, and laying claim to derive its information upon religious subjects from altogether exclusive sources. Pius 9., upon entering Paradise shortly after his lamented demise, was there received with somewhat exceptional honors. We subjoin in literal translation the account of his reception, printed in the *Pelerin*, and purporting to be the faithful reproduction of a communication "received from the highest authority." "When Pio None entered Paradise he at once obtained a crown from the hand of the Immaculate Virgin, as a reward for the crown which he had bestowed upon her during his sojourn upon earth. St. Joseph, whom he had made patron and protector of the Church, shook him heartily by the hand and thanked him. Then St. Peter gave out the key in which the hymn of welcome was to be sung, and the celestial choir chanted it, while Francis de Sales and Alphonse Liguori, whom he had formerly proclaimed teachers of the Church alternately recited in laudatory terms the deeds and achievements of his Pontificate. Fifty-two saints and twenty-six of the blessed, all of whom owe their present position to Pius 9., greeted him with harmonious choruses." The almost unique interest of this narrative would be still farther enhanced if the *Pelerin* would reveal the name of its "special correspondent " in the Elysian Fields.

Much more of such sickly sentiment could be adduced, but as it is poured out ad lib. from the pulpits of the churches and chapels of the land by hundreds of thousands of self-constituted spiritual guides. After mentioning the following very extravagant remarks, for the truth of which we can vouch, we will show mercy to our readers by forbearing to mention others. The late Rev. Thomas Jones, of Swansea, was noted for his matchless eloquence, and for his liberality and breadth of thought;—he was no fire and brimstone Christian; he again and again affirmed his disbelief in "eternal torment," and on one occasion made use of the following trenchant words—" I no more believe in the immortality of the soul than I believe in the immortality of the body." Yet on another occasion, (such is the inconsistency of clerical teaching) he said, in preaching the funeral sermon of the late Dr. Cook, of Swansea, (who was yet unburied) " My friend, Dr. Cook, is spending his first Sunday in heaven." And in " improving " the death of a Baptist minister, the preacher in a chapel in Swansea thus spoke of his dead brother—" Those hands which we so recently affectionately pressed are now sweeping the strings of the harps of heaven." This reminds us of a statement of Thomas Cooper after reading portions of Milton's *Paradise Lost*—" Its very pretty, but it is not true."

The lecturer then proceeded to establish what he called the legality of the subject, by quoting copiously from the numerous obituary notices found in the Scriptures, making mention of some statements made by the patriarch Job, who had, in the dispensation of God's providence, been called upon to look at death straight in the face, for to him above all other men death was a stern reality. He lost all his friends, and no attempt is made by him to stifle his contemplation of their state in death. He did not believe his friends were in "glory" or in "misery," for he says " Man dies, and wastes away . . . He lieth down, and rises not till the heavens (Political) be no more. They shall not wake nor be raised out of their sleep." (Job, 14. 12.) It was also mentioned that Job had spoken of the grave as the land of "forgetfulness," and as "where the 'wicked cease from troubling, and where the weary are at rest," (Job. 3. 17.) and he himself said that worms would destroy his own body; yet in his flesh he would see God," This was brought forward by the speaker to show that men in ancient times considered the subject of death, and came to conclusions thereon; and as it was left on record in the Scriptures, and as the Scriptures were "written for our learning," and having a divine command to search the whole of the. Scriptures and not part of them only, it was a matter of impossibility to comply with this command without entering heartily into the question of the death state. The language of the Apostle Paul was quoted to show that the early Christians were exhorted by him to study the subject—"I would not have you to be ignorant concerning those who are asleep." (1 Thess. 4. 18.)

At this point the speaker submitted evidence from the Scriptures to show that the words "death" and "sleep" were synonymous and constantly used to describe absolute death. Lazarus is said to have been asleep by the Savior when he was really dead; and Paul

affirmed that "we shall not all sleep," by which assertion he doubtless meant that Christ's disciples who are alive when He returns will not die, but be changed or made like unto Himself.

Good And Bad Alike Sleep Till The Resurrection.

Of the good man Stephen it is said "he fell asleep." Acts 7. 60. Of the bad man Rehoboam it is said he slept. 1st Kings 14. 34. Of the saints who were raised after the resurrection of Christ it said they slept." Matt. 26. 52. In Daniel "many that sleep," 12. 2. The lecturer said he had met a great number of persons who had a great aversion to death being a sleep, because they appeared to dislike the idea of going out of existence. Some had said to him that they would sooner live in "eternal misery" than go out of existence altogether. This, said the speaker, is easier said than experienced, for continual pain often make men wish to die, and such men ought to object to go to sleep at night, for healthy sleep is a state of unconsciousness as much as death. Drunkenness also was a state of dead unconsciousness. The speaker quoted some interesting medical evidence to show that some men had become unconscious through receiving scalp wounds. The bone of the skull having pressed upon the brain, thought was suspended until the bone was removed, when the patient began to think where he left off. If a man can be unconscious for a day why not for 1000 years, to the dead 1000 years is but as an hour. These facts said the lecturer, are all discarded by ordinary theologians, who call the "thoughts" the "soul" of which they say "it cannot die or sleep." A good deal was said about

Tombstone Theology,

and the paradoxical language engraved thereon was held up to ridicule. On the top of the stone may be read, "Died" on such a date; and on the bottom of the same stone, engraved by the same chisel, we may read, "Not dead, but gone before." Such language could only pass current for truth with the indifferent and thoughtless. If the good "go above" at death, and the bad "go below" at the same time, we ought to rejoice at the departure of the good, and weep at the departure of the bad; but it was always vice versa, which showed that our natural instincts are stronger than theological falsehoods. The lecturer thought that the general misunderstanding of the word "soul," and its consequent misapplication, was the prime cause of the prevailing errors. This had given rise to the delusion known as Spiritualism, and hundreds of other "abominations," and absurdities. The 49th Psalm was quoted to show that the "soul" could and did go into the grave, hence the phrase, "Thou wilt redeem my soul from the power of the grave;" and the prophet Ezekiel was referred to to show that "the soul, that sinned itself shall die." These "souls," spoken of by the Prophet and Psalmist could not be the "immortal souls" the clergy are always talking about. It is said of the Christ that he "poured out his soul unto death;" and Peter says that "his (Christ's) soul shall not be left in hell." This proves that the "soul" of Christ died, and that it went to hell (the grave); and it was not left there, because God raised him from the dead. It is of the highest importance that we should understand the constitution of our beings, and in so doing we shall understand the constitution of our "souls," for according to the Bible and the lexicon, the soul is the man or the person—not something inside the person, therefore Longfellow is mistaken when he says,

"Dust thou art, to dust returns, Was not spoken of the soul."

The scriptural testimony concerning man's nature is, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Gen. 3. 19. Abraham, in pleading with God, says, "I am but dust and ashes." Gen. 18. 27. It is, moreover said, speaking of God, "He knows our frame and remembered that we are but dust." This is said of the "soul." "Adam was the soul," or natural body. 1 Cor. 15. 45. Although God remembers this, yet most men seem to have forgotten it. If they would but remember it, much confusion would disappear. The Burial Service expresses Scriptural truth when it says, "Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, in hope of a joyful resurrection." This could be read with propriety over the grave of every true Christian, for it is by resurrection only that future life can be obtained. It is anti-scriptural when it says inasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to take to himself the soul of our departed brother, etc." The record of the death of Abraham was cited to show how devoid it was of common sentiment—no rhapsodies about Abraham, or part of Abraham going to heaven, but simply, "Abraham died an old man, full of years, and was gathered unto his people, or buried with his fathers." Gen. 25. 8. It could not be allowed for one moment (said the lecturer) that Abraham's fathers went to heaven, for they, as the Book of Joshua showed, served other gods, and were consequently idolaters; and Abraham was gathered unto them in the same cave or burying place referred to so touchingly by Jacob, when he charges his sons concerning his burial. Gen. 49. 29-33. "Bury me with my fathers," says the old man, "in the cave that is in the field of Ephron, the Hittite. There they buried Abraham and Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac and Rebeckah his wife; and there I buried Leah." After this arrangement, it is simply said that "he gathered up his feet into the bed and yielded up the ghost," or fell asleep. This idea harmonizes with Paul's commentary upon the death of the Patriarch in the eleventh chapter of the Hebrews, where he states that "these all (the Patriarchs and Prophets) died in faith, not having received the promises, God having provided some better thing for us, that they, without us, should not be made perfect." This showed that the fathers are dead, and that they will remain so until the time of the fulfilment of the promise, when all God's servants will be "glorified together." Rom. 8. 17.

Paul in this commentary on the ancient people of God, refers to "all the prophets," therefore the prophet Daniel is included. How does this harmonize with common sentiment, which is expressed in the well known lines—•

Query—Where is now the prophet Daniel?

Answer—Safe in the Promised Land.

The Apostle distinctly contradicts this. " They have not received the promises," and agreeable to this we have the case of Moses, who was taken to the top of Pisgah, and from its summit he was permitted to see the land of Canaan, (or promise) but was told that as a punishment for his sin at Kadesh, he should not enter in, but die; and he died on the mount, and was buried there. Deut. 34. It is reasonable to ask in what sense could the death of Moses be a punishment, if viewed from the ordinary orthodox standpoint, which makes the land of Canaan into which Moses was not allowed to enter, simply a type of the heavenly Canaan unto which Moses must immediately have passed. If ordinary theology is worth anything, Moses did not die, but went to heaven: and therefore he was not punished for his sin, but blessed. The Bible should come before any mere opinion of men, and its assertion is that Moses died and was buried. There is no land of Canaan beyond the stars, but there is a land of Canaan known to us as Palestine, which will one day again "flow with milk and honey," and be the source of joy to the whole earth. This is as sure as it has been said "The will of God will be done on earth, as it is done in heaven." Mat. 4. 10. The case of Hezekiah was also brought forward as proof that the soul could see corruption, and that the dead were incapable of thought or action. The king's words were quoted, "For the grave cannot praise Thee; death cannot celebrate Thee. They that go down into the pit, cannot hope for Thy truth. The living they shall praise Thee as I do this day," Isa. xxxviii. 19. The testimony of this king clashes with the generally-received notions which, taking Dr. Watts as an authority, teaches that the dead can, and do praise the Lord. His well-known words will easily be brought to mind—

" I'll praise my maker while I have breath: And when my voice is lost on death,
Praise shall my nobler powers employ."

But you cannot believe both the king and the doctor. I take the king and leave the doctor; you, of course, will please yourselves. I believe the statement of Isaiah concerning Hezekiah, because it harmonizes with the whole Bible, and beautifully coincides with the following statements of Solomon, whose wisdom is proverbial:—"The living know that they shall die: the dead know not anything. Their love and hatred and envy have all perished. Therefore, whatever thy hand finds to do, do it with thy might; for there is no device, or wisdom, or knowledge in the grave whither we go." Eccles. 9. 5, 6, 10.

Place Of Departed Spirits.

Some of our divines have concluded that the " grave " in the sentence just quoted is equivalent to "the place of departed spirits." Well, it is not true; but suppose, for the sake of argument, it be for a moment allowed, and read as written, it is just equivalent to the grave, for there is no device, or wisdom, or knowledge, or work in "the place of departed spirits" whither we go. David says in death there is no remembrance of God (Ps. 6. 5.) and Peter, many centuries after the death of David, says in the 2nd chapter of Acts: "He is both dead and buried, and is not ascended into the heavens." And agreeable to this, Jesus says himself, "No man hath ascended into heaven." The New Testament entirely agrees with the Old Testament on this great and important subject, Some may think otherwise, but I have learned that the books of the Bible cannot be separated without its uniform teaching being distorted. I should otherwise, if time permitted, be as willing to canvass one book as the other; and in conclusion, I will bring before your notice one or two instances in the New Testament. It is often said by persons who speak on this subject that "no one can ever come back to tell us." Such people were anticipated by Christ, of whom he said, "If they hear not Moses and the Prophets neither would they be persuaded, through one rose from the dead." Luke 16. 31. No one ever told us anything, but many have returned. There was the little child raised up by Elisha, recorded in the book of Rings. The child was really dead, and was raised up to life again from the Bible standpoint, but from the popular standpoint the child was in heaven and came back. If this be true is it not a wonder that it did not say to its mother, "Mamma I was in such a nice place; why did you not let me remain?" But, no—not a word. The child was only too glad to be restored to its mother; it said nothing, because "the dead know not anything." The case of Lazarus was brought forward to show that he was dead and not alive during the four days of his separation from his sisters. He came back, but did not tell us anything, because "the dead know not anything." (John 11. 43, 44.) Jairus's daughter came back but she was silent, because "the dead know not anything." (Mark. 5. 22, 23.) The widow's son was raised from the dead in the city of Nain, but had nothing to tell us, because "the dead know not anything." (Luke. 7. 11, 15.) In conclusion, "Antipas" requested the audience to look well into the subject at their leisure, as it was only when the death state was properly understood that the glorious doctrine of resurrection became interesting, which was held out in the Scriptures as the only hope of future life, after which judgment takes place. (Acts 23. 6; 24. 15; Phil. 3. 11, 12, 21; Heb. 11. 35; 1 Cor. 15. 18.)

No resurrection, no future life. He also begged them not to go away with the impression that he believed there was no future life He believed there was a future life for the righteous, because it is said the gates of the grave should not prevail against Christ's church. His view could be expressed in the language of a poet:—

"O! false, ungrateful words,
To call the grave man's long, last home
"Tie but a lodging place, held from week to week,
Till Christ shall come."

Where Are The Dead'?

In introducing to the public the Swansea lectures, which were first printed in The Cambrian, Mr. E. E. Rowse, a gentleman of admitted literary attainments, and a fellow laborer and believer in the millennium and kindred subjects thus writes,

"To the Clergy, Laity, and professing
Christians of all denominations in Great Britain and Ireland."

As the publisher of these Lectures I think it desirable to preface this subject with one or two thoughts.

Man's destiny is unquestionably one of the profoundest subjects which can possibly occupy his mind. The Soothsayers of Chaldean, the Sages of Egypt, the Philosophers of Greece, and the old Seers of Syria, gave all diligence in trying to unravel this knotty problem. The Pulpits of Christendom have for the last 1,800 years solemnly preached the dogma of an eternal abode in torment for the wicked; and an eternal home of bliss for the righteous, But the Pagans of Egypt and India; Assyria and Greece; taught a similar creed. Tartarus, the infernal regions, was depicted by them in horrible colors, and the names of the presiding gods and goddesses given, and their respective duties freely discussed. Cerperus, the three-headed dog of Pluto, guarded the gates of Hades. The furies, the goddesses who presided within, were armed with snakes and lighted torches and avenged the sins committed on earth, whilst the harpies were the winged monsters with enormous wings and claws who preyed upon their victims. The river Styx, a poisonous stream issued forth from the caverns of hell, hard by which the gods swore their most solemn oaths. Terrible tortures awaited the damned, and the infernal spirits were represented as rejoicing over their prey.

Now, I ask, wherein does the modern Christian priest differ- in his teaching from the Pagan? Christian Priests still consign all the unrighteous to an eternal abode of torment with the Devil and his angels; but as this view is so horrible in its conception, and as it has been the means of making tens of thousands of infidels, large numbers of the clergy have carefully re-studied the Greek and Hebrew text of Scriptures bearing on this point, and have been driven to the conclusion that the eternal torment dogma is a Pagan fiction and not a Bible doctrine.

It is high time, therefore to clear the air of the superstitious mists and prejudices of past ages. Divine Revelation is very clear on the nature of man and his destiny, and as these lectures deal with the subject in a very simple, lucid and argumentative manner, I have ventured to submit the same to the Christian public of these Islands, believing they will assist the thoughtful to a more righteous knowledge of the Deity, and help to justify the ways of God to men.

Where Are The Dead?

A densely packed meeting assembled to hear a lecture, on Sunday evening last, by Antipas, F.D., on the above subject.

The lecturer hails from London, and is the author of several works on religious subjects, and the editor and publisher of a monthly journal entitled, "The Old Sun Dial;" and as he treats subjects in somewhat an uncommon style, and at the same time declares that "the Bible and the Bible only," is the basis of all his advances—a good deal of interest was created by the huge placards announcing his lectures. The doors of the Agricultral Hall were thrown open at six o'clock, and in less than 15 minutes every part of the building was more than comfortably filled. Precisely at half-past six the lecturer made his appearance, accompanied by Mr. Williams, of Cardiff, both immediately proceeding to the platform. The 100th Psalm was first announced and sung with heartiness by the congregation, after which the speaker read portions of the Scriptures. He had not proceeded far with the 14th chapter of Job, before ho gave utterance in no uncertain manner as to what view he held upon the great question under consideration. "Sleep," said the speaker is the word which expresses the present state of the departed, if Job is reliable, for he says, he, the dead, "lieth down and rises not till the heavens (or high places of the earth) be no more: they shall not wake nor be raised out of their sleep." The lecturer laid great stress upon the few last verses, which speak of men who have died as knowing nothing even of matters concerning their own families. The statement was too clear to allow of the possibility of a mistake—"his sons come to honor and he knows it not."

Passages from the 49th Psalm were quoted to show that the enquiry into the death-state was perfectly legitimate, inasmuch as the whole world was, by the Psalmist, invited to "hear" what he had to say to them concerning it. What David advanced was in strict harmony with Job and other writers in the Scriptures. None of them indulged in the fancies of modern guides upon the subject, and no support for the fanciful theories of the pulpit can be had from Holy Writ. The Bible did not recognize the popular conception of the nature of man. According to the Scriptures, man was absolutely mortal; but according to popular sentiment was only part mortal. What is called the "body" was mortal, but the "soul" was immortal, and therefore incapable of dissolution. The two views were so opposite that those who held them could have nothing in common. Right conclusions only come from right premises—to begin wrong means ending wrong. The Scriptures begin (and they never contradict themselves) with affirming the mortality of man by declaring "Dust thou art and to dust shalt thou return." This law has never been repealed, and ever since Adam the process

WHERE ARE THE DEAD? 17

of creation and dissolution has been going on, and must continue until the law of Eden is reversed, which cannot be until Christ comes and destroys death and confers immortality. The lecturer then proceeded to submit evidence in favour of the mortality of the "soul" — persons, and not something inside persons, constituted the soul. He stated that all his hearers were, "living souls," but not necessarily "immortal souls," because of that, for a "living soul" is defined in the Scriptures as a "natural body," and every "natural body" "or living soul" was capable of becoming immortal, but there was no "royal road" to immortality: it is promised only to believers and doers of the Word, and will not be enjoyed by any till the resurrection or the coming of Christ, at which time those who have died in

him will be raised from the dead, and those who live and believe will "never die," but be changed from mortality to immortality. With the view of showing that the dead are unconscious, the language of the prophets, and apostles was quoted—notably the expression of Solomon, "The dead know not anything," and of David, "In death there is no remembrance of Thee." The death of Lazarus was cited to show that he did not "pass into glory," but into the grave, and that he was really dead four days; and the lecturer assigned as the reason for his silence after his return the fact that "the dead know not anything." If he had been in heaven for four days, which we are bound to believe if modern theology is true, then it is difficult to see any friendship or brotherhood in the act of calling him down; and not less difficult is it to account for his dumbness about his four days residence "beyond the sky." Several other cases were submitted with the same object, such as the 'widow's son' and "Jairus's daughter." In conclusion the speaker requested the audience not to conclude that he believed in no future life, because eternal life was still a matter of promise, but declared that the long "sleep of the just" was only "long" to us who are alive; to them a thousand years is as but a moment. Therefore it is true in a sense that "sudden death is sudden glory." He asked his hearers to suspend their judgment until they had heard his second lecture, and after one or two questions being put and answered the large meeting dispersed.

Eternal Torments.

On Monday evening the hall was again crowded to excess to hear the lecture on "Eternal Torment," which was designated on the lecturer's placards "a Ferocious Superstition." The meeting was commenced, as on Sunday night, by the singing of a Psalm, after which a portion of Scripture was read, when the speaker said: Last night we saw what the Scripture had to say upon the present state of the dead,—we saw that holy men of old are asleep or indeed out of existence. This being the case we must first give them existence before we can talk sensibly of retribution or reward of any kind being applied to them. Last night we, as it were, left them in the grave, to-night we must show in the first place the provision the Bible makes for their revival. Jesus, Paul and all the apostles taught future life by resurrection, but they do not either teach future life or resurrection for all men—the Bible does not teach the resurrection of all that ever lived, but only the resurrection of "the just and the unjust," the Bible, unlike modern speculation, recognized three classes of people which may be denominated "the good, bad, and indifferent;" or as the Railway Companies have divided mankind into 1st, 2nd, & 3rd class. The indifferent will not wake out of their sleep at all, while the good and bad will each rise at the coming of Christ. That death is a finality in the case of those who "understand not" is evident from various Scriptures. In the epistle to the Romans we read that "they who live without law will perish without law," and in the prophecy of Isaiah we read of certain who "shall not rise," that "they are deceased" and "are extinct," and of the same class Jeremiah thus speaks, "they shall sleep a perpetual sleep and not wake."

Paul again tells us that "in Adam all die," and that only those who are in Christ shall be made alive, and, to crown all, Jesus speaks of some who shall "never see life," and on whom the wrath of God shall abide in death; and adds, when speaking with the Sadducees, "they who are accounted worthy of a resurrection," clearly indicating that some would not be worthy to rise; and thus we can understand Daniel when he says "many" that sleep shall awake, the word "many" plainly limits the resurrection to a certain class—and necessarily leaves "some" in the bonds of death. This will not please "universalists," nor will it please those who believe in a general resurrection, but we have left off men-pleasing, we have no object but the setting forth of the truth as we apprehend it, and as it is found between the covers of the Bible. Those of you who have followed me thus far will be able to see that our subject is considerably simplified by the facts submitted. Will you now try to translate yourselves mentally beyond the resurrection, try to realize that the predicted coming of Christ and the resurrection of the dead are accomplished facts. You see a great company of men arranged before a great judgment seat.

They are divided into two companies called "goats and sheep;" the "goats" (the wicked) are on the left hand, the sheep are on the right. The latter are approved, and they hear the judge say to them, "Come up hither" the former are disapproved, and they hear the dread sentence—"Depart from me." Now this is something like getting at our subject. Where do these wicked men "depart" to? This properly answered will settle for ever the vexed question of "eternal torment." The Scriptures supply the answer. Paul's words are full of meaning when he says—"They shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord." "Everlasting destruction" is not "everlasting torment," these (the wicked), says Jesus, "shall go away into everlasting punishment"—that is not "eternal torment," but eternal death, which is the wages of sin. The penalty of sin is not an infinite penalty; sin is not an infinite crime, since men who commit sin are finite; wicked men are not to be bundled wholesale into everlasting flames, but they are to be judicially punished, or to use a scriptural phrase, "according to their works;" some are to be beaten with "many," and some with "few," stripes. The end of these things is death a second time, without hope of resurrection. The wicked are to be "cut off;" they are "not to be." They are to "consume alike the fat of lambs." They are to be "as stubble." They are to "perish in their own corruption." They are to be "burnt up," and left "neither root nor branch." This is not "eternal torment" but it is eternal destruction. There is no eternal process of torture, but there is an eternal result. Therefore, the dogma of eternal torment is not a Bible doctrine, but a superstition too ghastly and hideously cruel to describe. The lecturer now reminded his hearers that many men in and out of the Church had rejected the savage teaching, he told his listeners that the Church of England had expelled from her formularies the doctrine of endless pain, in the year 1562, when the creed was curtailed from 42 to 39 articles; he said also that the preachers of the non-eternity of torment could be counted by hundreds in the Church of England, and that scientists had declared in favor of the Bible, although some of them may not know it.

R.W. Dale, of Birmingham, and Thomas Jones, of Swansea, were cited as leading men in the Congregationalist body who had thrown the dogma overboard; but there were still persons who gloated over the Pagan bogie as a sweet morsel. Notably among these were

Mr. Moody, who said that if he did not believe in eternal torture, he would return home and take things easy. Dr. Watts had left a horrible legacy to the Church in the shape of hymns, a verse of one was cited, which began—

There is a dreadful hell,
And never ending pains;
Where sinners must with devils dwell.
`Midst darkness, fire and chains.

With what gusto has this been sung, two lines at a time, in Ranters' Meeting Rooms. This remark caused the risible faculties of the meeting to exhibit themselves; and when the speaker added it had been known to be sung with the chorus. "Oh that will be joyful," the laughing continued for some time. The lecturer, proceeding, said, to believe in "never ending pain" was bad enough, but to sing about the poor wretches who were supposed to be suffering it was infinitely worse. An extract was then read from one of Mr. Spurgeon's sermons, with the view of showing that the great Baptist preacher still believes and teaches the monstrous theory, but the audience had evidently had enough of that side of the question, and there were continual cries of "the Bible." "Never mind Spurgeon," "that's rubbish." An attempt was made on the part of the lecturer to finish the extracts, but the cries of the people ultimately prevailed. After the speaker had said he supposed they were ashamed of the orthodox view, he concluded his exhaustive lecture by explaining the following apparently difficult passages:

"Unquenchable Fire."

The first passage is found in Mark 9. 43, "Into the fire that shall never be quenched." This is continually quoted by believers in "endless suffering" in support of their dogma, failing, as I think, to distinguish between the perpetuity of fire and the perpetuity of persons in the fire. It surely must occur to our opponents that if they were able to prove that in some part of God's universe there would be an eternal bonfire that would not by any means prove that there were people being eternally tormented therein. But now, as to what is really the scriptural meaning of "unquenchable fire." I will assert that it means fire that is not put out, but which may of itself for want of fuel go out, or as Solomon says, "Where no wood is the fire goes out." Now for proof—In Ezekiel 20. 47 verse, fire is mentioned as the agent which was to destroy Jerusalem, and this fire moreover is denominated unquenchable. It is easy to perceive that the fire here mentioned was kindled for a specific purpose—namely, to destroy Jerusalem, and that this judgment overtook the city, and that her great men and her houses were literally burned with fire is proved by the 52nd chapter of

Jeremiah and the 15th verse. That this unquenchable fire after doing its work went out it is needless to affirm, since the fire is not now burning. If this destruction in any way typifies the destruction of wicked men in the future, it certainly does not convey any idea of perpetual suffering, but agrees with the whole tenor of Scripture, that the wicked shall be destroyed and that without remedy. The phrase, "fire shall not be quenched," in Mark, had a local significance to the Jews; the reference is to a fire that was continually burning in the valley of Hinnom, outside the walls of Jerusalem, for the purpose of burning up or destroying the carcasses of malefactors which were thrown therein • but what can be said of the fire which destroyed Jerusalem can be said of this fire, it was not quenched or put out, but having achieved the object for which it was kindled there is no longer any reason for its existence, and it has gone out. This is one of the strongest arguments in the New Testament for the annihilation of wicked men, for it is apparent that the only object for which it was uttered, and for which our opponents throw it our teeth, was to typify the coming day of retribution for the wicked. The type establishes beyond doubt that the malefactors were "burnt up" and "utterly consumed." The anti-type must accomplish the same results, therefore the unquenchable fire in the valley of Hinnom points undoubtedly to the time yet future, when the chaff (or the wicked) shall be burnt up with the unquenchable fire. Wicked men will not be always dying, but always dead. They are not generated to be unconsumable fuel for an eternal bonfire, and those who think so should cease to propagate the race, for it would be far better for men never to be born than to run the risk of so terrible a fate.

"Everlasting Punishment."

The next passage which I purpose to explain at some length is that found in Matthew 25. 46, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." The antithesis supplied in the same verse to this word, punishment, is "life," and therefore we are irresistibly driven to the conclusion that the word punishment means death; and on looking a little below the surface, viz., into the original expression, we find it is "kolasia," which word, according to Liddell and Scott, means "a pruning or cutting off separation, as a branch from a tree." Here then is an everlasting result, not a process, and in this sense is quite an equivalent to death, thus making Jesus agree with Paul, who said—"The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life." In the epistle to the Hebrews may be found the following expressions, which are grammatically constructed precisely as the phrase "everlasting punishment":-

- 1.—Eternal Judgment.
- 2.—Eternal Salvation.
- 3.—Eternal Redemption.
- 4.—Eternal Covenant.

Is it not evident that these expressions all imply an everlasting result, and not an everlasting process?

"Immortal Worms."

"The worm that dies not" is a sentence which some may think necessary I should explain to my hearers. This must necessarily take us back for a moment to the Valley of Hinnom for it was there that their worms lived, and it was there that their worms died, therefore the worms of the passage are not immortal ones. Some have concluded "that their worms" are the "souls" of men, but to affirm this is to affirm that their soul dies not, which is a flat denial of the plain scriptural statement, "The soul that sinned it shall die," there is to be no more death, and when this is an accomplished fact there will be no more "worms," for death produces the kind of "worm" referred to here. But what I think is a mortal stab to the "cruel dogma of endless pain" is the scriptural expression "There shall be no more pain" (Rev. 21, 4). How can this be true if 99 per cent. of the human race are to writhe forever in eternal suffering? Evil had a beginning and it will have an end. The cause is to be removed, and the effects therefore will cease. Under Christ's reign the whole world will become a paradise, and instead of the voice of weeping, "thanksgiving and the voice of melody." The next passage is found in Rev. 14. 11.

"The Smoke Of Their Torment."

"The smoke of their torment ascended up for ever and ever." Instead of this applying in a general sense to the ungodly, it is evident from a careful reading of the context that it is a special judgment for a special sin upon a special people. The people who are thus tormented are those who worship the beast, and although the phrase for "ever and ever" occurs in the passage I think the judgment is only temporal in its application, and therefore for ever and ever must be understood in a limited sense, and we proceed to give the following reasons for this suggestion:-

1st. The torment is said to be inflicted in the presence of the Lamb and the Holy-Angels. Can anyone suppose that Jesus and the Angelic Host will throughout eternity be witnessing the torment of the lost?

2nd. The torment is said to be inflicted during a period divided by day and night. If this has reference to the popular hell, then its inhabitants may cheer up, for it is not all darkness, but there will be day or a ray of light to alleviate their eternal misery. I confess that I am unable to look upon eternity in the light described in this verse. That the phrase "for ever and ever" is used in a limited sense, even in common parlance, may be seen on reference to a legal document called a Will, in which may be seen the sentence "he and his heirs forever." That this is often the scriptural use of the word is proved by Exodus 12. 14, also 21. 6, "And his master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever." The word in the New Testament is used in the same limited sense in Paul's letter to Philemon, verse 15 "for perhaps He therefore departed for a season that thou shouldst receive Him forever." Every reader will be able to see that the "forever" in these passages has reference to the period of a man's natural life.

Finally, I see in the passage about which there is so much fuss and smoke made by the tormentationists, the complete and final destruction of the Papal kingdom, and I have arrived at that conclusion by the careful balancing of all the facts of the case, not the least of which may be seen in the language used by the Prophet Isaiah, to describe the final destruction of the kingdom of Idumea (chap. 34. 10). Let the readers observe that the Prophet uses even stronger language than the Apostle makes use of. He says "it shall not be quenched night or day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste, none shall pass through it for ever and ever." There is no fire or even smoke in the land of Idumea now, and travelers may pass through it at will. The parallels are so striking that no further comment is needed.

When parabolical language is used we should endeavor to find out the intent and mind of the teacher, and thus not risk the truth by attempting to literalize when this peculiar mode of conveying it is, to all intents and purpose, figurative.

"The Rich Man And Lazarus."

The lecturer said he had often been requested to explain the parable of "Dives and Lazarus." So as to fit it in with his view of matters he had sought for this many times at the hands of "orthodox" men, but never could get an explanation, which he consider fitted with "orthodoxy." For instance they affirm that the "souls" not the "bodies" of these men departed into bliss and anguish when they left this state, (it would be scarcely correct to say when they died, because "orthodoxy" says death is impossible, and so it is if we are immortal), but if this be so, how comes it to pass that these "souls" of Dives and Lazarus could see and speak to each other? Does not this imply that these "souls" must have had eyes and tongues or how could they "see" and "speak?" and if "souls" can mount up like eagles and fly to heaven in a moment, is it not strange that neither of these "souls" could pass over this narrow gulf? It could not have been very wide for those on either side could see each other. And again, can anyone suppose that in the future state that heaven and hell will be visible to the occupants thereof, so much so that the inhabitants of these respective places will be able to hold converse.

Whatever this parable may be intended to set forth, it is certain that it does not support popular theology; and if men would approach it free from prejudice, they would never dream of such a thing. Eternal torment is not mentioned in the parable, and it is very questionable whether the future state in a coming age is referred to. When it was uttered it was prophecy, but now it would appear to be partially fulfilled, (although it will not be wholly fulfilled until the final judgment). The phrase "the rich man" may have reference

to the Jews as a people, and the death in the passage would then refer to the political demise of that nation, and the " torment " would mean the terrible sufferings which have for 1800 years afflicted them, though not giving heed to " Moses and the Prophets." The history of the Jews will answer to the parabolic description of "the rich man," and the Gentile world, and its history will correspond in some measure to the description in the narrative of Lazarus, to whom Dives appeals. Whatever may be intended by the Savior's language it certainly cannot and must not be tortured into so meaningless an object as supporting popular theology.

In concluding, the lecturer made an impassioned appeal to his hearers to remember that the dogma of endless pain was not only a libel upon a gracious and wise God, but a positive denial of His character as revealed in His Word. It is there affirmed that God " is too wise to err, too good to be unkind;" that he delighted not even in the death of any, much less can he delight in eternally-torturing any of his creatures. He has told us in His works and word that He "is love," and that he cannot deny himself. He is slow to anger and full of compassion, and " his mercy endures forever." Death, of which man himself is the author, is the fearful penalty for a life of sin; and this, and nothing else, should be held up as the doom of the sinner. The popular doctrine of Hellfire has caused many to weep; it has disgusted the heathen when taken by the missionaries to foreign parts; it has filled many a vacancy in lunatic asylums; it has filled the earth with indifference and infidelity; but it never was the means of converting a solitary man or woman to Christianity.

An animated discussion ensued. The meeting separated about eleven o'clock.

There was some turbulence, but this was not to be wondered at, seeing that the lecturer spent the evening in throwing cold water upon fire.

The forgoing lectures created such intense interest that the lecturer was induced to follow up the effort by delivering other lectures in the town. The Music Hall, (now called Albert Hall,) the largest building Swansea can boast, was taken for the purpose. The subjects chosen were—" Where and how will the righteous spend eternity? " Does heaven and paradise refer to the same locality?" and " The second coming of Christ to reign on the earth." The building was crowded, and the opposition was fierce; so much so that the lecturer narrowly escaped with his life, and the scene will not soon be forgotten by the thousands of Swansea people who witnessed it.

However, having obtained help of God, we continue unto this day "—possessing a measure of hope that we shall be spared many years to come and testify concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ. Our effort should have merited better treatment, as the gravest crime that could be laid to our charge was that we had

Dared to be a Daniel,
Dared to stand alone;
Dared to have a purpose clear,
And dared to make it known.

The lectures also called forth the following correspondence which appeared in the Western Mail, and which we now reproduce.

Antipas, F.D. At Swansea.

Sir, —A certain Antipas, F.D., has been delivering lectures in the Agricultural Hall, to crowded audiences of curious rather than critical people. His subjects have been, "Where are the dead? " and "Eternal Torment," which latter he has expressed in his bill which was thrust into all our doors, as a " Ferocious superstition, and not a Bible doctrine."

Now, Sir, I have no more time than to suggest that some competent gentleman should follow this Antipas, F.D. (I suppose we may understand this "F.D." to mean "Destroyer of the Faith"), and to counteract his erroneous doctrines, as the late famous Dr. Brindley followed Bradlaugh to America, and, by fair arguments, beat him out of every town, exposing his ignorance and fallacies. There is no fear at all that the educated will be caught or upset by this man's novelties; but the danger is that the uneducated and unwary may be entrapped by sophistries, on the face of them plausible. As to arguments, it often happens that, where passed off for such, and when there is no discussion, these statements go unchallenged, and appear like incontrovertible facts. I am well supplied with papers containing all Antipas's theories; and unanswerable arguments to them prepared, and if any gentleman desires to know what tracts or leaflets to circulate at Antipas's meetings, so as to undo his mischief or counteract his errors, I shall be glad to give the names and places where to get a large and cheap supply; and, at the same time, I would suggest that an able opponent should start off after this Antipas, challenge him on his own ground, and I am sure a Christian public would readily subscribe for the support of an able fidei defensor—defender of the faith—as they did for Dr. Brindley to go to America.

Perhaps the Shepherd of the sheep will look after this matter, and caution the innocent against attending Antipas's meeting.—I am, etc.,

F. D. THOMPSON. Parish Church, Swansea, Feb. 2.

Sir,—There are one or two points raised by the Reverend F. D. Thompson's letter in your Thursday's issue, which, with your permission, I will comment upon. I was present at Sunday evening's lecture, and took very particular notice of those who were present. There were certainly Episcopalians, Baptists, Independents, Unitarians, Wesleyan, and others in great numbers, and many of them furnished with Bibles, and it struck me that the audience was superlatively critical rather than curious. In proof of what I state I will add that many present were very anxious to cross-question the views as enunciated by Antipas, F.D., but one gentleman only was allowed to do this on account of it being Sunday, further discussion being postponed to the following evening.

The questions were, "Where are the dead?" and "Will any suffer eternal torment?" The subjects of the two evenings' lectures, while they may excite the curiosity somewhat, are yet essentially critical in their nature. The dogma of eternal punishment, for instance, as written in the prophets and apostles, is understood in a variety of ways by scholars and divines, one school arguing that the wicked will suffer an eternity of torment, the 'other school maintaining that although the banishment from God's presence will be eternal, yet the mental and physical torture will be over as soon as the judicial sentence is legitimately carried out.

"Antipas, F.D." preaches the latter view, and does so on Scriptural grounds. He argues that the eternal torment dogma is a Pagan theory, is anti-scriptural, and utterly opposed to the Christian view of the Heavenly Father. The Sunday evening lecture, "Where are the dead?" was very exhaustively treated from a Scriptural standpoint. "Antipas, F.D." maintains that the dead in Christ, i.e., all believers in Christ, who have died, are in a sleeping state, and only await the resurrection morning to be awakened from that condition in order to receive their reward, and enter the Kingdom of the Saints.

Now, as a listener to "Antipas, F.D.," it struck me in common with a large number of other people, that the Bible only was the basis of all he desired to advance. He eschewed, in fact, all philosophic and speculative writings on the subject, and declared that all his arguments were based on Scripture. Why, therefore, my friend the Rev. Mr. Thompson should suggest that "Some competent gentleman should follow this Antipas, F.D.' from town to town, to beat him out of every place, and challenge him on his own ground." I am at a loss to understand, seeing that "Antipas, F.D.," as his nom de plume implies, is a defender of the faith. If, however, some of "the shepherds of the sheep," are uncharitable enough to send "a competent gentleman" to follow and hunt down this learned wolf, it is to be hoped he will meet with a better fate than Dr. Brindley did, who died suddenly in New York in the attempt to oppose Bradlaugh; and, notwithstanding the quasi-liberality and thoughtfulness of English Christians, was buried at the expense of the American Republic. "Antipas, F.D.," thoroughly believes in Holy Scripture, whilst Bradlaugh despises it.

I would suggest, Mr. Editor, that instead of sending to the Rev. Mr. Thompson for a number of his leaflets, that the press give verbatim et literatim, reports of "Antipas's" lectures, so that the whole body of laymen and clergymen are put in possession of exactly the points urged by the lecturer, to compare his views with the text of Holy Writ, and see whether he is heretical or not. The fact is, large numbers of divines, in and out of the Established Church, hold the views of the lecturer, and it seems to me that as truth was never yet worsted in any encounter, the ultimate issue of his efforts cannot be doubtful. Only a few months ago "Antipas, F.D.," was offered ordination in the Church of England.,

I therefore question the wisdom of the Rev. Mr. Thompson's suggestion. At the same time, the lecturer evidently would never shrink from any public discussion, even if the Rev. Mr. Thompson himself threw down the challenge.—

I am, etc., E. E. Rowsa. Castle-Square, Swansea.

Sir,—I observe in your issue of to-day a notice of the lectures of "Antipas," in which Mr. Thompson states that the arguments of the former are antiquated, and can be easily refuted; and certainly "Antipas" is quite unworthy of the large audiences he commanded at the Agricultural Hall, on Sunday and Monday last, if it is such A B C work to falsify his deductions from the Bible, which he reads openly during the lectures. I had thought, in common with many others, that the matters "Antipas" discusses were by no means so easy of understanding as Mr. Thompson would lead us to infer, and that they were questions upon which many honest minds (allied to not very obtuse intellects) would like to be enlightened. With regard to one of his subjects, viz., the doctrine of eternal punishment, does Mr. Thompson regard the late Rev. Chas. Kingsley as willfully heterodox, and am I not right in stating that the latter gentleman more than once stated that the doctrine alluded to was of heathen origin, and utterly unworthy of 19th century belief?

It may or may not be wise to leave these matters alone, but Mr. Thompson may rest assured that vast numbers of men are seriously interested in, and if mischief alone will be the result of discussion, we shall certainly have to put up with a good deal of mischief in the time that is coming.—I am, etc., VINDICATOR. Swansea, Feb. 3.

ANTIPAS, F.D.'s LECTURES AND THE "WESTERN MAIL."

Sir,—With your permission, I will make one or two observations upon the letters which the above have called forth. First in order is Mr. Thompson's, who gives his address, Parish Church, Swansea, and, by this, I am able to identify him as a clergyman of the Church of England, so called. He begins with a remark which is little better than a slander upon the people who assembled to hear the lectures. He says "they were curious rather than critical." How does he know this? Was he present, and, if so, has he the gift of "discerning spirits?" This he must be able to do to speak so positively of the ability of people to judge, seeing that it is impossible for him to be personally acquainted with such a vast number of Swansea people, although he is resident in the town. He may have missed a few "

curious" ones from his Church, and this may have inspired his letter, but it is manifestly unfair to judge the many by the few. It may be well for Mr. Thompson and the system he espouses that there is not a superabundance of "criticism" in the world, and that when that faculty is brought into action it is generally brought into small things, such as bonnets, and the fashions in general, and seldom extends into the domain of important doctrinal matters pertaining to the future and to God. However, I am informed that nearly all the "critical" element of Swansea attended the lectures, and not a few of them exhibited their "critical" ability; some in assenting to the evidence submitted, and others in presenting questions for solution.

Mr. Thompson next talks about our handbills being "thrust into all our houses," and his remarks about the language in which the advertisements were couched suggests that Mr. Thompson believes that "eternal torment" is a Bible doctrine. If it is, then I am not able to find it: and many others, not merely "curious" people, have in their seeking, failed to find it also. If it is a "superstition" then the strongest adjective in the English language cannot describe its "ferocity." It would seem that Mr. Thompson, in common with the majority of mankind, regard the subjects of our lectures as mysteries past finding out; but this sentiment is peculiar to mal ern times; the nature of the soul and its destiny were more freely described by the ancients, whose lives and statements are recorded in Holy Writ. And, further, only some 350 years ago, when the great disruption between the Pope and Henry 8. occurred, the Church which he founded, now called the Church of England, concocted a creed consisting of 42 articles, and the three last in the code spoke in the most positive manner upon the subject of our lectures. The wording of the 40th article ran as follows:—"The souls of those that depart this life do neither die with the body nor sleep idly." Of course everyone knows that there are at present but 39 articles of faith in the Church, in which Mr. Thompson is a minister. Why are the other three not in the Prayer-book? The answer is simple. The 42 articles were only in use for 10 years when a convocation of clergy—in the year 1662—lopped off the three last paragraphs of the creed, and thus we have to-day 39 only. Why were these cut off? Obviously, because the doctrine of "the immortality of the soul" could not be sustained by Scriptural evidence. Thus we see that something, whether "curiosity" or "criticism," we are unable to say, enabled the Clergy and Parliament of 1562 to come to a conclusion upon the questions canvassed lately at the Agricultural Hall, Swansea.

Every Church of England clergyman who upholds the immortality of the soul, or the doctrine of endless pain, breaks the law of the land, and is liable to be ejected from the pulpit. They are neither doctrines of the Bible nor are they legally doctrines of the Church of England. The Prayer-book may appear to teach them, but there are large numbers of clergy, who declare they are nowhere to be found in the formularies of the Church. This being so, it does seem strange that Mr. Thompson should arrange such a peculiar program for my extinction. Why he should bracket me with Bradlaugh, I can only understand in the same way as I understand his interpretation of my "F. D." What would he think of the man who concluded, because his initials happened to be "F. D.," that he is, because of that, a "faith destroyer," I used the "F. D." to denote that I am defending the faith which was once delivered to the saints; and as soon as some competent gentleman (who, I am happy to know, cannot bring into operation the rack or the stake) can convince me that I am wrong, I will cease from my labors. I invite discussion and court publicity, knowing that any system that fears ventilation is doomed. Mr. Rowse has sent you a sensible letter, which you have been good enough to publish. I understand that Mr. R and Mr. T. are on intimate terms, and their letters serve to show how friends may differ in their views on the same matters.

"Vindicator," judging from his letter, is not cramped in his views. He appears to be acquainted with the thoughts of some of our great men upon the subjects, and wisely foresees that whatever may be the result of discussing these questions, discussion must be. In my humble opinion nothing can stop the tide of enquiry which has of late years set in; and if the priests won't instruct the people, the people will try to instruct the priests,—I am, etc.,
ANTIPAS F.D. Mount Pleasant, Swansea.

The Debate.

Not only were the columns of nearly all the local newspapers filled with letters for and against, but the Rev. Eli Clarke, Vicar of Christ Church, Swansea, preached and printed his sermons, in which he professed to have "refuted Antipas, F.D.," and at the same time supplied a "Christian Guide to Truth;" these were sold in large numbers. We give the pamphlet as it appeared. The following is the

Preface.

The following pages were not originally intended for publication, but are sent forth at the earnest request of many of my congregation and friends who believed they would do good in refuting the errors recently put forth in the Agricultural Hall, Swansea, by Antipas, F. D.

Great pressure of parochial and ministerial duties prevented me from giving that time to their preparation which the subjects require, This I regret. Those readers, however, who are searching after Truth, will I trust find something which by the Divine Blessing will lead to its possession, and ground them in the true Faith of the Gospel.

E. CLARKE.

Refutation Of Antipas, F.D.

THE CHRISTIAN'S GUIDE TO TRUTH.

WHERE ARE THE DEAD? & ETERNAL TORMENTS

[Reprinted from the Cambrian.]

The following is the substance of two discourses delivered by the Rev. Eli Clarke, A.K.C., Vicar of Christ Church, Swansea, in reply to two lectures given by "Antipas, F.D.," in the Agricultural Hall, January, 30th and 31st, 1878. On —1st, "Where are the dead?" 2nd, "The Eternity of Torments, a Ferocious Superstition. 2nd Cor., 5. chap., 8 verse—" Absent from the body present with the Lord."

The New Testament makes mention of two men named Antipas. The first was the son of Herod the Great, and so called "Herod Antipas." He married the daughter of Aretas, the King of Arabia, whom he divorced for Herodias, the wife of his half-brother, Philip. She was the instigation of John the Baptist's murder, for his courage in telling Herod "it is not lawful for thee to have her." To this very Antipas Christ was sent by Pilate, who set him at nought and mocked him; urged, on by the ambition of this wicked princess, Herod Antipas went to Rome to claim certain honors which resulted in his perpetual banishment.

The other Antipas is mentioned in Rev. 2. 13, as being a faithful martyr for Christ; very little is known, of this good man, but he is supposed to have been a Christian Bishop, and the Angel or minister of Pergamos.

Swansea, however, has been visited by another Antipas, who puts F.D. at the end of his name, and which means, as most of you know, "Defender of the Faith." Whether this Antipas, F.D., can trace his descent back to the sensual son of Herod the Great, or to the faithful martyr of Pergamos, I am not prepared to say; in any case it is clear that great deal of ambition gathers around his assumed name, which is notorious both for infamy and fidelity. It may be however that his real name is not Antipas at all, but that coming to us without credentials and without authority, he thought it expedient to hide himself behind the illustrious name of "Antipas" and the title of "F.D." (which Kings and Queens only assume), to advance tenets of which he appears to be quite ashamed.

Before bringing this gentleman's theories before you, let me ask first of all is it so that on Sunday evening last when all our churches and chapels were open for the preaching of the Gospel, that "Christian men of all denominations" left their respective places of worship and ran after, what? They left their own ministers, who had led many of them to the Savior, who had fed them with the real food of the Gospel, who had visited them in affliction, and stood by them in temptation, and ran after a stranger. Brethren, let us beware, lest we be found amongst those of whom Paul says (2 Tim., 4., 3.) "Who after their own lusts heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears." I am truly thankful to think that not a single communicant of this church ran after this strange teacher. I have confidence in you that I have not labored in vain.

One other thing let me mention at the outset, it is this—the two questions "Where are the Dead?" and "The Eternity of Torments" (and upon which Antipas, F.D. lectured), are not questions vital to Salvation; they belong to the future, and not to the present; they lie beyond the boundaries of time, and concern those who have passed away from our midst into the unseen world. A man will not be damned because he disbelieves them, neither will he be saved on account of his belief in them. Our great concern should be "holy living," and not so much as to whether a soul goes to sleep after the death of the body, or whether the punishment of unregenerate men be eternal or only for a limited period.

Then why offer any defense of your own view on these subjects it may be asked? 1st, because it is the duty of the Christian minister to purge out error; and 2nd, to build up his flock in the true faith, both for their comfort and defense.

Now, let us proceed to the first subject—"Where are the dead?" Antipas, F.D., refers us to Job 14, 10, 12, where Job answers the question so far as he had light, "Man," he says, "dies and giveth up the ghost, and rises not till the heavens be no more." Now, the first thing to observe is this—"man dies." But what part of man? Is it his spirit which dies?—his higher, nobler self? "Man" has a threefold nature. 1st, The body—the physical—which is made up of flesh and bones, etc. 2nd, The soul or, as the literati call it, the psyche, which is the sensitive part of man—that which feels, tastes, etc., and makes us conscious of pain or pleasure. 3rd, The spirit, or pneuma, the higher self, that within man which is intelligent; which thinks, and wills, and reasons; which is conscious of the presence of spiritual forces, and a spiritual Being which we call God; which meditates on God, etc. St. Paul (1 Thess. 5. 23.) uses this very threefold distinction, when he prays that their whole spirit, soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of, etc., etc.

Now, when Job said "Man dies" what part of man did he mean—his spirit or the body? The living spirit which God breathed into man, or the body—"the man"—into which God breathed the living spirit? In another place Job speaks of the worms destroying "this body," but no where does he speak of the worms destroying this spirit. Antipas's explanation of verse 12, as to the time when the dead shall awake out of their sleep, is so absurd that one hardly knows whether to smile or to weep over it. The words in Job (14. 12) are "until the heavens be no more." Antipas, F.D., says this means the ecclesiastical and political heavens. If Antipas is right, then the power of awaking the dead from their sleep is not in the hands of God, but of those who upheld the ecclesiastical and political heavens, whatever these heavens might be. For the heavens to which Job refers, see 2 Peter, 3. 7, "The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt, etc."

Time would fail us to go over all the passages in the Psalms, etc. We will only just refer to that famous passage in Psalms 16., 10,— "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, etc. The passage was prophetic of our Lord's resurrection; it does not apply to us at all. We have this comfort in it, however, that His resurrection was a type of our own, and when He died upon the cross His spirit did not die, which is proved from the fact that He commended it into the hands of His Father, and from his promise to the thief.

The passage in Isaiah 28., 18, 19, to which Antipas, F.D., refers, and of which he tries to make a great deal, must not either be passed by in silence. It is this—"The grave cannot praise thee; death cannot celebrate thee." Of course not. Death and the grave are included in the curse. They are among the concomitants of evil, and are the foes of men. "They that go down to the pit (adds the prophet) cannot hope for Thy mercy," and are we not often preaching this very same thing? That, those who die in an unregenerate state "go down into the pit in which they can neither find nor hope for mercy." Surely there is nothing abstruse here. The passage is paralleled to the Eccles. 9., 10—"Whatsoever thy hand finds to do do it with thy might, for there is no wisdom, &c, in the grave whither thou goes."

But we must pass into the New Testament for clearer teaching on this question, "Where are the dead?" The doctrine proceeds upon the principle of growth, and this is where Antipas, F.D., fails; he goes back to the Old Testament to prove doctrines which are only fully developed and made manifest in the New Testament. The patriarchs and prophets saw but dimly the great truth which Christianity brought to light. Has not our apostle St. Paul said "Light and immortality are brought to light through the gospel, 2 Tim. 1., 10?"

To go back to the Old Testament to prove a doctrine which is made clear only in the New Testament is as if a Scientist whose recent researches had made him perfect in this or that particular branch of science, should go back to the time when that science was only in its infancy, to consult with men who at best knew but imperfectly only its very element. It is like summer looking back to winter, noonday looking back to twilight.

Let me now take you to the earliest instance in our Lord's ministry. Turn to Luke 9. 30 and 31. Christ is here transfigured on the mount—"And behold there appeared two men, which were Moses and Elias, who appeared in glory."

Now who is right, Antipas or St. Luke? Antipas says that souls go to sleep when they die, and that there is -no conscious joy or bliss for them till the ecclesiastical and political heavens have passed away; but St. Luke says that these two men appeared to our Lord in glory and talked with him.

Antipas wonders why Lazarus, and the Young Man, and Jairus's daughter, whom our Lord: raised from the dead, did not say something about "the land of the bliss to which they went. Surely if they did go to such a place they would not thank anyone for bringing them back." But let us remember that St. Paul was caught up into paradise, 1 Cor. 12. 4, which paradise in heaven, see Rev. ii, 7, and Paul said he heard in paradise unspeakable words which it is not lawful (original, possible) for a man to utter. Now if what he heard and saw was unutterable, how could Lazarus and the others raised from the dead speak of these things more than Paul could?

Again, our Lord says, Luke 20. 38, God is not the God of the dead but of the living, for all live before Him, and again, John 11. 5. 26, Whosoever lives and believeth in Me shall never die. Who is right, Antipas or our Lord?

In 2 Cor., 5. 1, we shall see how the doctrine has grown upon the church. In the contest St. Paul has been speaking of his outward man and his inward man. No doubt Antipas, F.D., would have put Paul right had he been present with him, for Antipas says—"man has no inside self—he is the ego." Now Paul, What have you to say on this subject viz , as to the place of departed (believing) souls? Answer: We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. Anything else Paul? Yes. To die is gain —not asleep of our conscious intelligent, spirit, but how can it be "gain," if death cuts us off from communion with God and from His conscious presence. Death would not be a loss to us of these things if Antipas be right.

Anything else, Paul? Yes.—"Absent from the body, present with the Lord," not asleep, but present with the Lord.

1 Thes. 4. 14. shows that God will bring the saints with Him, which proves that they are present with Him and not dead in their graves.

One more reference. Rev. 7. 9. I beheld and lo a great multitude, which no man could number—where?—Where did you see them, John, asleep in their graves? No, but "before the throne of God and of the Lamb." But do you not think you are mistaken John? No, I heard them singing "salvation to our God, etc."

But we have other evidence beside scripture. For nearly 2,000 years members of the Christian Church have been passing away to the Church triumphant. They have been cheered in their last moments by some sweet assurance that they are going to be with Jesus. Some

have said, " I see the angels who are come to carry my soul to heaven;" others, " Jesus is waiting to receive me," " I see heaven open, and Jesus calls me away," etc. Some of our own loved ones have left us with words akin to these, and it gave us comfort. Shall we say it was all a delusion? It was the silver lining of the cloud—the one ray of hope that reconciled us to their departure. And shall Antipas rob us of it by telling us that they are dead, asleep, cut off from conscious joy and spiritual communion? As we stood by their graves we thought it was only the frail body we put into the cold, earth, and that the spirit was with Jesus. But Antipas says, " No; all that was theirs is in the grave, and there it will be till the resurrection of the dead."

The man materializes too much. His theory is more materialistic than spiritual. He makes death the negation of life instead of a fuller development of it. This is as unphilosophical as it is unscriptural, for if death be an unconscious sleep of the spirit, as well as of the body, then we have a reversion of the principle upon which God has proceeded with our life. We have proceeded hitherto upon the principle of growth and development. We see it in the body, we see it in the mind, and also in Christian experience. We have come from stage to stage, from height to height, and from growth to growth. Therefore, if death be not to the Christian a fuller manifestation of divine life, and spiritual and unseen realities, then death is a serious loss to him, and not a gain.

In his reply on Sunday evening, Feb. 13th, to Antipas' subject, " The Eternity of Torments— a Ferocious Superstition," Mr. Clarke chose for his text St. Matthew 25. 31, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal;" and in his opening remarks said;--If a man were passing through a busy city, and should dare secretly to cut off every available means of artificial light, he would throw the whole of its inhabitants into the greatest confusion, and probably be instrumental of very much damage to life and property. Such a man, at the bar of society, would be held guilty of high treason to its interests and happiness. And if a man were bad enough to destroy the Mumbles light-house, and break loose the bell of danger which rings upon the Mixon, you would say of him that such a man deserves any punishment the law and society can inflict, for he has endangered every ship and every life passing up and down the Channel. But, sirs, what will you say of the man who runs over the Bible, and dares to extinguish every signal light of danger, and hush every warning voice which tells of " wrath to come?"—who removes every barrier from the brink of the worst precipice over which unregenerate souls will surely fall, and makes it easy to sin against God by spreading roses in the path which leads to that worst of all catastrophes? Such a man commits a sin against those who stumble over him into perdition, and against God, who warns men of these dangers. Antipas F.D., says that "eternal torments is a ferocious superstition;" but if this can be proved to be untrue and unscriptural, then his assertion gives a lie to the Holy Scripture, which teaches it, and to the best men of all Christian denominations, who believe it and preach it.

The subject is a most solemn one, and we should approach it without bias, and with becoming states of mind. Let us depend upon the aid of the Holy Spirit, while we endeavor to set forth (as far as we have time) what we believe to be true on the subject.

" We saw," says Antipas in his second lecture, "that holy men of old are asleep, or indeed out of existence." And we saw in our sermon last Sunday evening that they are not asleep in the sense in which he teaches—much less are they " out of existence." The Bible nowhere says so, neither do the words " out of existence" occur in the whole of the Bible. We saw that they were with Jesus in the paradise of God, and that they are happy, singing His praise who redeemed them.

Now, the first question which we have to answer is this: " Will all men—good, bad, and the indifferent,—(this distinction indifferent, is made by Antipas; the Bible knows only of two classes)—will they ALL be raised from their graves, and be judged?" Antipas, F.D., says they will not. But see Matt. 25. 31, " When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels and before Him shall be gathered ALL nations, and He shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats, etc."

John 5. 28. " Marvel not at this, for the hour cometh in the which All that are in the graves shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life—and (original condemnation)." 2 Cor. 5. 10, "For we must ALL appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, whether (it be) good or bad." Rev. 20. 12, " And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God. and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the Books.

And whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life, was cast into the lake of fire."

These are a sample of the many passages which may be adduced in proof that ALL men will be raised in the last day, and that ALL will be judged, Other proofs may be furnished had we time, e.g., ALL are warned to repent, ALL have the offers of the Gospel, when that is preached.

The passage in St. Luke 20. 35, 36, is misquoted (unintentionally, we hope) and misapplied by Antipas. He quotes it thus: " They who are accounted worthy of a resurrection—clearly indicating," he adds, " that some will not be worthy." Now, our Lord's real words are these: " They who are accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead." The resurrection our Lord refers to is the first. That which is " out from the dead," as saith St. Paul; and for this reason, that he is " Blessed and holy which hath part in it."—Rev. 20. 6. This resurrection will not prevent the general one, in which, as our Lord. says, " They which have done evil shall come forth to the resurrection of damnation."

So far, I think, it is proved that the resurrection will not be a limited one; for if the words "ALL nations," " We must ALL appear before, etc.," " The dead. small and great, etc.," mean anything, they mean that none will be excluded, The passage in Daniel 12. 2 may appear not to favor this; but a great doctrine like this cannot be determined upon one single passage in the Old Testament. The Gospel brings it fully to light.

But secondly, is the punishment of the wicked who die impenitent " eternal?" or is it only for a limited period of time? Antipas, F.D., says it is not eternal. Jesus says it is. Antipas determines that this word " eternal " does not mean unending. Therefore eternal punishment must mean a limited 'period of chastisement, at the end of which the wicked Shall have no further existence. Antipas is therefore what is called " a destructionist,' whose theory of punishment-

1. Admits of no degrees, which is anti-Scriptural.

2. As it allows a state of punishment or torment (for the state Greek word kolasin means both), before the extinction must be a relief from punishment rather than punishment itself.

3. The punishment of impenitent men set forth by our Lord (Matt. 25. 41) is to correspond with that of fallen angels:—" Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels," and they will not go out of existence.

4. The punishment, whether mental or corporeal, or both, will be grievous, for "There will be weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. 24. 51).

5. As the happiness of the saints in heaven will be unending, so to support the contrast, the punishment of the wicked must be unending also.

6. The same word everlasting (aionion) is used in both cases, everlasting punishment and everlasting life, and if the first (donjon is limited in its meaning, why not the second? The very thought that the joy of heaven would at some future period come to an end, would throw a gloom over the face of every saint, hush every harp, and pour bitterness into every cup of pleasure.

Antipas, F.D., says " The word kolasin means pruning." So it does, but it also means the " severance, chastisement, punishment, and torment" (see Baxter, Liddel and Scott). And it is the sad thought that this will go on for ever and ever, that must make the wicked very miserable. Only let the thought that one day the punishment would end, and they cease to exist, this would extract the sting from their suffering. The passage in 1 Thess. 1. 9, which Antipas uses to support his theory does not really help him. The passage fairly translated run thus: " Whose approaching sentence or judgment is destruction from God," and the word olethr on translated, " destruction perdition, ruin, and misery."

It must be a terrible thing to trifle with these words. The man who does so reduces them to a minimum of meaning, weakens every motive to a holy life, offers insult to the divine wisdom, and trifles with his own destiny.

The idea of non-existence did not enter the minds of the best philosophers of other days. They had crude notions as to what immortality was, but their system was certainly not negative. They believed that men would pass through different forms of life until they reached the habitation of the gods, and became as one of them, but never taught that men would become extinct.

Now with reference to the passage in St. Mark 9. 34, " Into the fire that shall never be quenched, where the worm dies not." Antipas is quite right in saying there is a local reference here to " the Valley of Hinnom." The children were passed through the fire to Moloch: here the bodies of malefactors were burnt and the offal of the city. The Jews looked upon this valley as a type of the place of punishment for the wicked, hence we have for it the word " Gehenna." Antipas says: " Men are not unconsumable because the worm in this valley was consumed, and this fire is gone out, so the type rather points to a limited period of punishment for wicked men."

But then our Lord says: " The worm (the soul) shall not die." The worm in Hinnom may, but not the soul. This fire kindled by the hand of man in Hinnom is but a poor type. This declaration of our Lord like many others in one which no dexterity of interpretation can give any other good sense than the continuance of conscious punishment.

Antipas's treatment of the parable of Dives and Lazarus needs no remark, for in the first place, it is difficult to conclude that he is quite sincere in what he says upon it; and, secondly, his theory that Dives represents the Jews, and Lazarus the Gentiles, is so puerile, that any remark upon it would be a waste of time.

I am truly sorry that Antipas has asserted that so many clergy of the Church of England, and many leading Nonconforming ministers had thrown the doctrine overboard, and further, that " the Church of England had expelled from her formularies the doctrine of Eternal Pain in the year 1562, when the creed was curtailed from 42 articles to 39." If she has done this, how is it we pray in our glorious

Litany " to be delivered from everlasting damnation?" and in the burial service, "for any pains of death to fall from Thee." (See also the " Commination Service.")

The fact about the articles is that Archbishop Cranmer drew up 42 Articles in the time of Henry 3. and kept them back with the intention, if possible, to use them at a fit moment to unite all the reformed Churches. These articles, when brought into Convocation, suffered the loss of six, which are the 10th, 16th, 39th, 40th, 41st, and 42nd. Convocation added three others—the 5th, 12th, and 39th, which made up our present 39. The six articles expunged referred to certain forms of misbelief, e.g., the Millenarians, Universalists, etc., but neither of the articles expunged favored Antipas's theory. They never had the sanction of Convocation, for as Canon Berry says, " the Church felt it was not necessary that a dictum should be laid down on these subjects, so she concern herself with what was True belief rather than Misbelief."

In conclusion, let me warn you against the tendency of some in the present day, who pick out of Scripture that which is easy and pleasant, and reject the harsh.

Note.—It is no secret at Swansea that since writing the Christian's Guide to Truth, that Mr. Clarke has declared "that the doctrine of Eternal Torment has no place in the Divine Economy."

Rev. F. D. Thompson's Defence.

WHERE ARE THE DEAD?

The Rev. F. D. Thompson failing to find " a competent man to follow us and beat us out of every place," put on the harness and delivered himself in the parish church. We take nothing from and add nothing to what, according to report in the " Cambrian," he said on the occasion.

The Rev F. D. Thompson, the senior curate of the parish Church, in his sermon on Wednesday week, preached from Thess. 5. 23, having special reference to two lectures recently delivered in this town by Antipas, F.D. In his introductory remarks, justifying his noticing the assertions of "strangers" who have set themselves up as teachers and arrogated to themselves the title of " Defender of the faith," he said that every minister is placed on a watch tower and required to give an alarm when a foe approaches. The late utterances may be considered contemptible by some, but many things contemptible were so plausible as to mislead souls and endanger the salvation of those who ignorantly take to them. And these doctrines are plausible, for is it not acceptable to the wicked to be told that there is no such thing as eternal torment, but total annihilation? He affirmed that such offered a premium to wicked men.

The views put forward by Antipas are thoroughly Sadducean. They are promulgated by someone whose name is not given; but we are told that he hails from a town which is notorious as the center of disloyalty and infidelity—a town in which. strong doctrines abound and flourish. While saying this we desire to make no reflection upon the peace-loving and truth-loving citizens, who are the salt of that town, and for whose sake it may yet be preserved blameless. But it is strange to come across an extract from the learned Josephus touching this doctrine, and then to see how coincidentally the doctrine and the doctor, in his assumed name and with his appendix, are associated with one of old.

" The tendency of infidelity to the destruction of social order is illustrated by a remark of Josephus on this sect, that the Sadducees, whose tenets were the denial of a moral government and a future state, were distinguished from other sects by their ferocity, and again for their inhumanity in their judicial capacity." Josephus says, Herod was a Sadducee, and Caiaphas was a Sadducee. And the Herod mentioned in Mat. 14. 1, who beheaded John the Baptist was surnamed " Antipas;" the word means " one who is against all." This Antipas was against John the Baptist, against Jesus Christ, and therefore he was against all. He was alike dissolute in morals and careless of the welfare of his subjects. And Sadducee as he was, he became so alarmed at the fame of Jesus Christ, that he said to his servants when he found that many were running after Christ, and as he thought would make him king instead of him, " This is John the Baptist, he is risen from the dead." In this utterance we have a striking instance of the power of conscience overcoming against a man's own will the sophistries of infidelity.

However, we merely notice incidentally this circumstance, and without applying it to the lecturer, whose real name is suppressed, we think it was not a happy title he has selected, nor a prudent nom de guerre. In taking the "Bible and the Bible only," as he professed to do, as the basis of all he advanced, was no more than many others have done who made as futile a use of it. The Bible truly contains all things necessary to salvation, but there were those in the Apostles' days who proposed to do the same, and Peter said of them—(2 Pet. 3. 16)—that as " unlearned and unstable, they wrested the Scriptures unto their own distraction."

We must take it as a whole, and so interpret it that one passage may not contradict another. To omit here, and put in a piece then, and sometimes to make a piece of Mosaic in order to construct our own fancy work which is not authorized. There is a way to manage so as to get any teaching a man desires from the Bible. There is, as Paul says (2 Cor. 4, 2), a way of " handling the word of God deceitfully."

But now let us come to the question:

"Where are the dead?" Now in order to understand each other on this, it seems necessary first to settle clearly a few terms used in the argument. First, what is it that dies? Secondly, whither does that go which dies not?

For the first:—Man consists of body, soul, and spirit. This we gather from 1 Thim, 5. 23—"I pray God that your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Here we have three different words used to express the constitution of man. One, defining the material part, and two, defining what we all agree to call the immortal part. There are two distinct words in the Greek corresponding to two in the Hebrew to express the immaterial part of man. There is *psyche* for the soul, answering to *nephesh* in the Hebrew. There is *pneuma* for the spirit, answering to *ruach* in the Hebrew.

Now we find that these words are freely used in common language, the one for the other, soul and spirit, without much confusion of ideas. But if we attend accurately to the words, we shall find that what may be said of the soul, cannot be said of the spirit. The word *psyche*, rendered soul, refers to man's animal life, which of course dies with the body. In this sense the soul dies, for animal life ceases at death. But the *pneuma*, or spirit, is the immortal part of man, and cannot die either in the wicked or the righteous.

But Gen. 1. 30, is quoted to show that the beasts have a soul equally with man "And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that crept upon the earth wherein there is (margin) a living soul." Thus the lower animals are classed with as having a living soul; but this proves nothing, for a living soul is not necessarily an immortal soul. Paul says (1 Cor., 15.), "All flesh is not the same flesh, for there is one kind of flesh' of men, another flesh, of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds. There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial, but the glory [of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another."

Good And Bad Alike Sleep Till The Resurrection.

Here we see Scripture making a difference between the bodies of living animals, in which I include man—some are heavenly (celestial) bodies, and some are earthly (terrestrial) and the glory of each is different. Here no doubt he compares the future glorified body of the saint with the present body of either man or beast—for as to the present there is no difference between the end of both, as all flesh alike returns to dust.

But what a strong argument we have in this, that since the bodies of creatures differ, that the souls differ too? It was not said of beasts that "God breathed into their nostrils the breath of life, (Gen. 2. 7.) They sprang simply out of the ground at the word of the Lord; but of Adam it is written, "The Lord God formed Adam out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." If we now turn just to one passage in Eccles. 3. 21, we have this difference between the beasts and man confirmed. "Who knows the spirit of man that goes upward, and the spirit of the beast that goes downward to the earth?" It is useless for men to insist on the literal meaning of the verses preceding this, to establish an identity of existence between men and the beasts that perish.

Eccles. 3. 5, 19 reads thus—"That which befalls the sons of men befalls beasts; even one thing befalls them: as the one dies so dies the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that man hath no pre-eminence over a beast." The meaning must be to make Scripture consistent, "that which befalls the sons of men," respecting merely animal pleasures and pains, "befalls also beasts." Both live, and breathe and die alike, and go to the same place (the ground), and return to dust whence they were taken. So that in these things man hath no pre-eminence above a beast.

This is the whole tenor of the wise man's words, and properly understood puts no difficulty in our way.

And now, if I have sufficiently defined man's soul as opposed to beast's, and that man's living soul means an immortal soul, whereas a beast's living soul is a very different thing; and that where the spirit of a beast goes downward to the earth, otherwise perishes, while the spirit of man goes upward; and if we may quote from the same book of Eccles. 12. 7, when the wise man describes death as the loosing of the silver cord, the breaking of the golden bowl, the smashing of the pitcher that contains the life, the derangement of the wheel at the cistern, (all this in allusion to the ancient clepsydra, a water clock,) and then pronounces the verdict (5, 7), "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." If, I say, this is sufficient to satisfy any unprejudiced mind on the first question I proposed, let us proceed to show from the Scripture in what state that spirit is which has returned to God who gave it originally.

This part of our argument we may call "The Intermediate State."

We refer to the period between death and resurrection; or, longer still, between death and the judgment.

What are the departed doing during this period of their existence? Do they sleep idly? Are they conscious? What saith the Scripture? The usual passages quoted for this are the well-known parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16.), which gives us a conversation between Dives in the torments of hell and Abraham in Paradise with Lazarus in his bosom. The next passage is Luke 23. 43, where the

Savior, as He hung upon the cross, promised the penitent thief " that he should be that day with Him in Paradise." Another passage is from Phil. 1. 23, when the Apostle Paul spoke with joy of departing to be with Christ, which was better than remaining any longer here.

Now, to an honest mind, these passages convey the plain impression that whether in the case of the unconverted departed, as " the rich man;" or the converted departed, as, " the penitent thief," and the apostle about to depart, there is perfect consciousness, and no sleeping idly.

Now Job 14. was used to prove a state of unconsciousness, and Eccles. 9. 5. is also quoted with Job. Let us hear the words, and the plain and easy interpretation.

" For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope: for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward.

Now, here the Preacher takes for his text a common proverb—" A living dog is better than a dead lion." Then he starts by saying in substance, a living man has hope. While a man lives, there is hope that he will prepare for death. But if a man die unprepared, he has no hope of that. He has lost his opportunity for ever. In such a case the condition of the meanest man, most obscure man, a slave to man if you like, is preferable to that of the most renowned princes who have died impenitent. Thus the living dog of a man is better than the dead lion of a prince.

What becomes of the theory of unconsciousness before so evident and palpable an explanation as this?

Psalms 6. 5, may be explained as this, and all difficulty vanishes.

There is an analogy between sleep and death, recognized in all languages. But the Scriptural, the Christian adoption of such modes of expression was never meant to imply a state of unconsciousness.

1. Thess. 5. 10, says, our Lord Jesus Christ " died for us, that whether we wake or sleep we shall live together with Him." Again Scripture says, " All live to Him." Now, the dead in Christ and the dead in their sins would be in precisely the same condition throughout the intervening ages if both alike passed into insensibility and oblivion. Whereas those who die in the Lord are blessed from the time of their departure out of this life. They sleep in Jesus. But that sleep does not incapacitate them for a faithful, loving, and patient looking forward to the consummation of their bliss in God's good time.

Now, the silence of Lazarus, who lay four days in the grave, was taken by the lecturer Antipas to prove that during that time " he knew not anything." And it was also said that modern theology taught that he must have been in heaven during that time. Well, I can show that the silence was an enjoined silence, though not an ignorant or oblivious silence. We have every reason to believe that God did not allow Lazarus to break that silence any more than He allowed not Jairus's daughter, the widow's son, Dorcas, or the Apostle Paul, who was " caught up to the third heaven " into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which he says it was not lawful for him to utter (2 Cor. 12). This muteness on the part of those, who were raised from the dead is one of the sublime mysteries of the unknown world which shall be revealed to us as we depart this life. But I maintain that it proves nothing for those who hold to a state of unconsciousness. Then as to the modern theology that is said to teach that after death the spirit is at once in heaven. I deny this. It is not proved from Scripture, and it is not the teaching of the Church of England, as may be seen from our Prayer-book burial service. First, it is not the doctrine of our Church, for we pray "that God will shortly accomplish the number of His elect, and hasten His kingdom; that we with all those that are departed in the true faith of His holy name may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul in His eternal and everlasting glory." We should not pray this if the departed required nothing more to consummate their bliss, which they certainly would not if they were in heaven.

Then as to Scripture—what Scripture says that the departed are now in heaven?

Turn to Acts 2., 34, and you will read what Peter said of David who had been dead more than 1,000 years at the time the Apostle spoke this—" David is not ascended into the heavens." Again Luke 20. 27, when the Sadducees came to Christ with their question about the woman who had had seven husbands, all of the same kindred, one after the other, and asked whose wife she should be in the resurrection (not that they believed in a resurrection)? Our Lord. in His reply, taught them about the very thing they denied, and showed them that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were still alive, and mentions that their bodies should be raised. But if they were already in heaven at the time when Christ confuted their arguments, what argument would this have afforded for raising the dead? They were not in heaven itself, and if " the father of the faithful " (Abraham) is not in heaven, then we may at once conclude that no other departed saint is.

Where are they then? For if we are ever to see them; and to see our own departed friends again, they must be somewhere. Where are they? 'Where are the spirits? What saith the Scripture? Where was the penitent thief that same day—that Good Friday—that Jesus was

crucified? In Paradise. Where was Lazarus while the rich man was in hell? In Abraham's bosom, that is, Paradise. Where was Paul when he was caught up, and was so transported that he could not tell whether he was in the body or out of the body? In Paradise.

What can we say of this place? Not more than Scripture reveals. The word is used only three times in the Old Testament and three in the New. But we must regard it as a state rather than a place. The early Christians acknowledged it distinctly and frequently, but what they said of it was limited to Scriptural phrases. Absence from the body was with them presence with the Lord. And it is easy to conceive that conscience, the instant after death, is at once irresistibly impressed with the destiny of the soul for weal or woe.

The state of Paradise being admitted, then as the abode of departed saints, (for I am not showing where the departed sinners are,) and having shown from Scripture to say nothing of reason and the Fathers, that all the departed are in perfect consciousness as regards themselves if not also as regards us who remain behind, we see that for them remains the final, full fruition, which may be regarded as far beyond this state, as Paradise itself rises above earth. The being made like to Christ, when at His appearing we shall see Him as He is, must of necessity transcend all.

Jeremy Taylor says—" Here we see God as in a glass darkly; in the separation we shall behold Him, but it is afar off, and after the resurrection we shall see Him face to face, in the everlasting comprehensions of an intuitive beatitude. In this life we are warriors; in the separation we are conquerors; but we shall not triumph till after the resurrection."

Well would it have been if these several stages in the life of the soul of man had always been carefully discriminated and steadily borne in mind.

Well also, if men generally had submitted to feel and confess, with Lord Bacon, that the knowledge of the soul is no part of philosophy, that it must be had from Scripture, Then we should not have the fiction of Purgatory. Then we should not have had speculations confidently put forward, as to the whole interval between death and the judgment being passed by the soul in trance and unconsciousness.

The Rev. F. D. Thompson's Second Lecture.

The second lecture by the Rev. F. D. Thompson was given on Wednesday evening last in the Parish Church, the text selected being Matt. 25. 41, "Then shall He say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

After a few introductory remarks, the rev. gentleman said:—The question of eternal torment is not to be settled by any man, whether in the Church or out of it. The point is this, " Is it in the Bible?" For if we should all go wrong in agreeing that it was not in the Bible, and yet, after all, it is there, the wicked will not escape it, simply because they blinded their eyes not to see it or refused to believe it. Now, God has given us a revelation which informs us concerning our future state. He has also given us minds and judgments, which we are called upon to exercise in the handling of his book; and while we examine this text, we must not attempt to sit in judgment upon the verdict pronounced against the wicked, but calmly and reasonably compare Scripture with Scripture, using our faculties under the direction of the Spirit of Truth.

The text, be it remembered, is spoken by him whom the Scripture says shall actually pronounce it at the Judgment Day over the wicked. There will be no trifling with the sentence then. There must be no trifling with it now. We have here the Judge, the judgment, and the judged. Can it be conceived that when our Lord uttered these words in the solemn manner that He did, that He meant to convey the opposite meaning to that which the words convey to our minds? If He did, then He departed, for once at least, from His usual, simple, plain manner of teaching. Is it likely that the disciples were deceived too and misled? This we cannot admit; for before, when He uttered a parable which was not too plain, they immediately asked the meaning, which He gave. But here no doubt existed in the disciples' minds, and they ask no question. It is not a parable. It is a plain statement of the last judgment, and left no doubt in the apostles' minds as to its meaning. Well, then, our text contains the judicial verdict; and as we have not to examine the summing up of the Judge, but the sentence, let us take notice of its significance.

And now let us enter into the vital part of our text. We have no dispute about the Judge who is to utter this sentence at the last day. There is no disagreement as to the genuineness of the text. The great stumbling block which the annihilationist want to get out of the way is " EVERLASTING."

Now, they say that everlasting is not everlasting; eternal is not eternal. They thus limit it to time. Some of these strange teachers limit eternity to 1,000 years. They say it means " millennial."

Well, what saith the Scripture? Take up a concordance, and turn out with the Bible in hand all the passages in which the words " eternal " and "everlasting " occur. It is the same word in the original for both our English words. There are about seventy places in which the word occurs. What does it mean? Let us select a few of the most striking passages that determine the extent of duration signified by this might word " eternal " in the Greek *aionioe*.

Heb. ix, 12, " Christ entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Now, are annihilationist as ready to admit that redemption is only limited to a period of 1,000 years, as they are anxious to confine punishment to a millennial period? Who will believe that eternal redemption is limited to any period of years? Then the word here means what it says—" eternal." Heb. ix, 14, " How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God." Who is this " eternal Spirit?" Does He live for 1,000 years and then become extinct? Why should they not be consistent, and limit the existence of the " eternal Spirit," in order to prove their interpretation of this mighty word?

Once more: Romans 16. 26, speaks of " the commandment of the everlasting God (aionioe.)" Now, we have heard eternity defined by an obscure boy as "the lifetime of the Almighty." Here that lifetime is forcibly described in the words "the everlasting God." Would it not be blasphemy to limit this aionioe? Then, if we find the very same word used in connection with life, punishment, torment, what reason have we to change its meaning? And if any man says, simply to get rid of the eternity of torment, that " eternal " means millennial, or any other period short of for ever and ever, then I say, to be consistent with his own definition, he must apply it in this limited sense to the state of the blessed, and make their happiness not eternal, but millennial, lasting only for a certain short period less than eternity. Are they willing to do this? I know not. But this is not the only inconsistency which they are unable to reconcile with truth.

They make a difference between " punishment " and " torment. " "These shall go away into everlasting punishment ' (verse 46.) Here, they say, it is not said " everlasting torment;" but if the word translated " punishment " here is not rendered "torment," well, we can at once refer to a passage where it is, (1 John 4. 18) " There is no fear in love, but perfect love castes out fear; because fear hath torment." It is the same word used in both places—kolasis. So that " these shall go away into everlasting punishment" means 'everlasting torment.'

The Worm That Dies Not.

But Mark 9., 44, speaks thus—" Where their worm dies not, and the fire is not quenched." Now this was the last word almost spoken by the prophet Isaiah, referring as has been properly observed to the valley of Hinnom, outside Jerusalem, into which all kinds of filth were thrown, and in which some of the Kings of Judah made their children pass through the fire to Moloch (Jer. 7. 31) —and this place had fires forever smoldering in its corruption, and so was used by the prophet as a type of. the penalty and pollution of hell.

There as long as the material lasted the worm preyed on the carcasses, and fuel was provided for the flame. But that fire is gone out long ago. It was not the Gehinnom, or Gehenna, or hell-fire, of the New Testament, but a type of it; and as everyone knows that no type comes up to the antitype, so this valley of Hinnom is a faint picture of the real pit in which " the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars shall have their part,—the lake which burned with fire and brimstone." Leprosy was but a feeble type of sin; for leprosy could at most but destroy the body, whereas sin brings both body and soul to destruction. Sin it is which is able to kill both body and soul in hell.

Dr. Adam Clarke, whom no one will suspect of holding Calvinistic views, especially as he writes a long treatise in defense of Judas, and strongly urges the probability of that traitor's salvation, speaks of this worm in no mistaken terms.

He says: —The bitter reflection, " I might have avoided sin, but I did not; I might have been saved, but would not, must be equal to ten thousand tormentors. What intolerable anguish must this produce in a damned soul!"

Now, Antipas and his party select passages from the Old Testament that refer entirely to temporal things and national judgments, and from these passages argue by a false analogy that therefore future judgments will in like manner come to an end. They bring forward such words as burnt up, consumed, destroyed, perished, plucked up root and branch, as proving the extinction of the wicked. But any honest man reading the context would judge otherwise. They will see that such passages in the Old Testament speak of judgment on the earth, just as they speak of blessing for the righteous on the earth. Take the 37th Psalm and read through, contrasting the worldly condition of the wicked with that promised the righteous— verse 9, " Evil doers shall be cut off;" verse 10. " Yet a little while and the wicked shall not be; thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be;" verse 28, " The seed of the wicked shall be cut off;" verse 38, " The end of the wicked shall be cut off." Now see the condition of the righteous — verse 9, " They that wait upon the Lord shall inherit the earth;" verse 11, " The meek shall inherit the earth; verse 19, " In the days of famine they shall be satisfied;" and many more passages of the same import. The general comment on this Scripture, showing that it refers solely to this life, is found verse 3, " Trust in the Lord, and do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed." The only reference to a future state is in verse 37, " Mark the perfect man and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace."

Another general remark I have to make respecting this deceived set of teachers, is the use of Greek. They speak much of Greek, and talk of the original language, and simple people are carried away. Good Greek scholars are very few and well known. The many are only learners. But a little learning in Greek is a dangerous thing.

I will give you a few specimens of the skill displayed by some of this company of annihilationist in both Hebrew and. Greek.

Genesis 2. 5. 7., " Man became a living soul," they have translated in a book entitled " The Bible Versus Tradition," " Man became a vigorous soul."

On the same principle they might just as well change the name of our Mother Eve, and call her Mother Vigorous, because it is the same word used in both verses. Gen, iii, 20, says—" Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living." And Chap. 2. 7, when God " breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, man became a living soul." This instance surely does not exhibit much learning?

One more, from Prov. 24. 20. "There shall be no reward to the evil man." This they rendered, " There shall be no hereafter (no future state) to the evil man." This is an instance of gratuitous dishonesty.

Now, just one from the New Testament. Acts 17. 28, For we are also His offspring," they make " We are also His product." It must be a hopeless case when they thus alter God's word to suit a bad purpose. If they had been present at the crucifixion they would surely have told Pilate to alter the inscription on the Cross.

A little reasoning will suffice. If a man break the laws of his country—say steal—he did the deed perhaps in a moment. Should he therefore be imprisoned for a moment only? Is it considered too severe if he be locked up and condemned to hard labor for a month or six weeks? Or again, if a man shoot another on the highway, and the law finds him guilty of murder, is his punishment to be only as lasting as the time in which he perpetrated the crime? And does not a righteous government hang him, as the only equivalent they have power to exact from a man whose body only they can kill? But in a country where hanging is not the law, he would be imprisoned for life. But they say, "God is love," and He would never be so cruel as to consign His creatures to endless torment." Now, I may ask how any man discovered first that God was love? Was it not by revelation? Did he not read it in the Bible? Then if he believes that, why not believe other plain revelations?

I find Antipas referring to Rev. 21. 4 —" There shall be no more pain." Now this he says is " a mortal stab to the cruel dogma of endless pain."

What answer shall we give? It proves conclusively the very thing he denies. Notice his position; not in chap. 20. 14, where all is delivered over to "the lake of fire," but in chap. 21, which describes the saints of God redeemed and blessed, and their now happy state, belonging to the new Jerusalem, all tears wiped away from their eyes, no more death for them, no more sorrow or crying, and " no more pain."

It comes in too late for the lost. They Were not found written in the Book of Life, and so they were cast into the lake of fire (Rev. 20. 15).

What shall be said of such interpretations? And many are the statements equally erroneous, that one hardly knows but that to take them up adds to one's own littleness. What a reckless assertion that is lately made that " every clergyman who upholds the immortality of the soul, or the doctrine of endless pain, breaks the law of the land, and is liable to be ejected from the pulpit?" Then, he adds, "they are neither doctrines of the Bible, nor are they legally doctrines of the Church of England." This is very ingenious. They are not legally doctrines of our Church.

This contradicts the first statement, and leaves it open to reference that yet the doctrines are after all doctrines of the Church of England. If Antipas would only go on a little longer in this strain, he would sufficiently refute his own proposition, and so spare us the trouble.

But it is no use. The spirit of error is working away, and will work till the end of time. The real reason why men oppose the old Bible doctrine of eternal torment in hell, is because it has so strong a hold on their moral being. Man will settle non-existence with himself—or temporary purgatory with his priest, or perhaps his own imagination, but he must settle eternity with God, and man does not like that.

Anything but God for him who is not reconciled with Him. But what brings us into God's presence is that which has real hold of our moral being. Our text says—" Depart, ye cursed, etc. . . . prepared for the devil and his angels." O, you see, they say, it is prepared for the devil and his angels. Precisely so, and the devil and his angels are immortal, will last for eternity, and so will the fire, and it is into this very. fire of punishment that the wicked are sent. The same eternity of punishment for wicked men as for wicked angels. No difference made. If there were any, we might, with reverence say, it should be for the angels who had no Redeemer, rather than for man who despised the Son of God, and trampled underfoot the blood of the covenant.

" The wicked come to a fearful end." It does not end with them here. It is a fearful result, a terrible issue. Take the case of a wealthy man, living in fine style, enjoying his house and servants, and equipage and so on; highly respected and esteemed. Now if by

wickedness and drunkenness that man reduces himself to a beggar, forfeits his character, commits crime, and is sentenced to penal servitude for life, we say of him, " see what a fearful end. he has come to." But do we mean that this is the finish? No. This is the beginning of deserved punishment, and will be as long as the man has natural life. And so the end of the wicked begins at the day of Judgment, when the Judge pronounces the text " Depart, etc." The assertion that the terms of Scripture all convey the idea of complete extinction is totally unfounded. Being tormented for ever and ever does not mean extinction, everlasting punishment does not mean extinction; being punished with few and many stripes does not mean extinction; weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth when cast into outer darkness does not mean extinction; being lost even while we exist here does not mean extinction; the smoke of torment rising up, though a figure no doubt, does not convey this meaning; an undying worm, though also a figure, does not mean extinction. In the face of all these negatives, I would earnestly entreat all who hear this to " flee from the wrath to come." It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God, and ten thousand times more stripes will be added to those who are the means of throwing unredeemed sinners into the hands of the living God.

And now, brethren, we must bring this to a close; much more might be said, but sufficient has been said to disprove the statement of Antipas; that " Eternal torment is a ferocious superstition." I commit this to the care of the Spirit of Truth. I have spoken God's truth, to God's people, in God's name. I would warn you not to be deceived. We have a Savior to look to who has redeemed us from the curse, who has set our faces heavenwards. We care not about punishment now. The perfect love of God in our hearts has cast out that fear which hath torment. The wicked may say, look down there; but we reply, look up yonder; they may say, see thy sins there; we reply see the blood shed to put them away. And thus the world will go on till an Almighty shout shall shake the foundations of our earth, and " Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him," shall ring in every ear, and then shall begin the weeping and gnashing of teeth! We testify to you now, brethren, that man, whether saved or not, must one day look eternity in the face; that he will one day find a dwelling place somewhere, and forever, either in everlasting glory or in everlasting condemnation. And then, ah! but too late, the dreaded reality will scare away all human deceptions. But let us testify by word and walk, that now the mighty arms of Jesus are wide open to receive every weary heavy laden one, and Antipas too, and lead him into the unspeakable blessings of a never ending, eternal glory. " Behold now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation."

Antipas, F.D., Replies To "Enquirer,"

REVEREND E. CLARKE, AND F. D. THOMPSON.

TO THE EDITOR OF " THE CAMBRIAN."

Sir,—All the world seem to live in a glass house. Thanks to the swarm of newspaper reporters which are on the track of everybody, we cannot, if we required, now do things in a corner; hence your valuable paper gave wings to the words uttered by myself, Mr. Clarke and Mr. Thompson on the above subject; and now, with your consent, I reply to the criticisms of the two gentlemen above-named.

The profound silence of the clergy on debatable theological questions, when compared with the conduct of the Apostles is enough to kindle the scorn of angels, and when they speak they never fail to excite the scorn of all biblically educated men. A few Sundays ago Mr. Clarke thought it necessary to say something to his flock concerning our lectures, and his addresses on the occasions show unmistakably the truth of the aphorism that " silence is golden," and that if his discretion had induced him to have held his peace the antiquated and God-dishonoring theories of Christendom would have been better served. Without wasting any time and space upon his preface to his two lectures or sermons concerning our nom de plume, and our being " without credentials " and "without authority," together with his expression of sorrow that Christians of all denominations should have left their own ministers and ran after this stranger," we dismiss these observations with but one or two remarks. First, We do not claim descent from either "the sensual son of Herod the Great," or " from the faithful Martyr of Pergamos," but we have chosen to be known by the name of " Anti as " on account of etymological significance. It is a compound Greek word, and its meaning is soon seen when divided—anti (against) pas (all). Now we do not wish to be regarded as lifting our hand against every man, seeing that we have no desire or reason to be against the faithful. The word "Anti-pas" by itself is a blank negative. We sought and found that which represents our real attitude in the world and to the Church in F.D.—(fideo defender) Defender of THE Faith. This was added a few years ago, and by this cognomen we are known in our writings, and public lectures, of which writings and lectures let it be known to Mr. C. and his friends we are not ashamed. As to our being "without credentials and authority" it is not quite clear what Mr. Clarke would regard as " credentials," but perhaps a white necktie and a surplice and the word " Reverend " prefixed to our name, together with what is called " ordination" would constitute with Mr. C. 'credentials.'

Well, we have none of these, but we do not feel less " authoritative " because of this. The Bible says — " Let him that heareth say come; " and having given heed to this passage of Holy Writ, we feel that with an open Bible we are not " without credentials nor without authority." As to the wail about leaving the churches " to run after a stranger," if Mr. Clarke is wise he will see in the willingness, even eagerness, of the Swansea people to hear Bible truth, that the people everywhere are getting painfully alive to the fact that "the Bible and the Bible only " is now the basis of the religion of the day: and in proposition as this fact spreads dissatisfaction and distrust will obtain. The time has already come when many men will not deal in the merchandise of the so- railed. church; but the word of prophecy says that the time will come when " No man buys their merchandise anymore." (Rev. 18. 11.) This is yet future, but not less true because of that. Not a jot or tittle of the Word shall fail; and therefore the time shall come—and it would

seem not to be very far off—when they shall say " Verily, our fathers have inherited lies and things in which there is no profit; and it shall come to pass in that day that the prophets (preachers) shall everyone be ashamed of his vision." (Zec. 13. 3-4). Then will the people and the preachers be aware of the fact that they have not been " fed with the real food of the Gospel," but we would fain hope, that many will see their folly before it is too late.

Mr. Clarke avows his object in opposing us is-1st, he wishes to " purge out error;" 2nd, " to build up his flock in the true faith for their comfort and defense." The objects are good, but as to how far Mr. Clarke has succeeded in accomplishing them the following remarks must testify. He begins by underrating the importance of the topics which we submitted for the consideration of the Swansea public. He says " they are not questions vital to salvation." Well, if this is so, it is a great pity that so much time has been wasted by Church Councils in discussing them. It would also seem that much of the Bible has been written in vain, for it is impossible to "Search the Scriptures" without searching into both the questions referred to, and at the same time perceiving that holy men of old came to the conclusion that death was a full stop to life, and upon this fact based the doctrine of resurrection. The settlement of the questions " Where are the dead?" and "Will any suffer eternal torment?" implies the study of a variety of questions such as " the Nature of Man," "the penalty of sin," "the redemption of men from a state of sin and from the power of the grave." Are not such questions as these " vital to salvation?" I have no doubt that Mr. Clarke and many of his colleagues would see a lot more "vitality" in a wrangle about " Vestments," " Candles," " Postures," baptizing infants, and the like nonsense, than to discuss those questions with which undoubtedly the Bible deals. But, according to Mr. Clarke, and the Church in general, neither knowledge nor belief of any kind is necessary to Salvation; " holy living " is the only desideratum. The popular motto is:— "For forms of faith let graceful bigots fight, He can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

But amidst that noisy cry of "holy living" (which is the thing when it proceeds from the right source) the Bible still says " This is life eternal to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent," and " Without faith it is impossible to please Him." John 17. 3, Heb. 11. 6.

The next statement of Mr. Clarke, that we have to consider is the one which defines the nature of man, which he declares is tripartite. 1st "the body which is made of flesh and bones." 2nd, " the soul or the sensitive part of man—that which feels, tastes, etc. "3rd, " the spirit, or the intelligence, which thinks, wills, and reasons. He then quotes Paul, and says he recognized this three-fold distinction when he prayed that their whole spirit, soul, and body might be preserved blameless unto the coming of the Lord. Now let us carefully examine the above series of statements. 1st, there can be no objection to the definition of " body." It is doubtless composed " of flesh and bones," etc. But the definition of " soul " is somewhat novel, inasmuch as it is not popular. Mr. Clarke recognizes the " soul " as part and parcel of the body; it is, says he "the sensitive PART of man." This is not the " immortal soul " of the creeds, catechism, and pulpits, but very like the soul or man of the Bible. The " spirit," says Mr. Clarke, is that which " thinks, wills, and reasons. Well, let us see how much better than a beast man is as defined by Mr. Clarke. 1st, a beast has a body, and it is composed of " flesh and bones," and if the sensitive part of man " is his soul, what is the sensitive part of a beast?

Have not beasts sensitive parts; and does not the sensitive part of a beast as well as the sensitive part of a man die, with his body? If Mr. Clarke's theory is followed to its logical conclusion it proves that men and beasts alike have souls, and that the body and the soul (" the sensitive part") of each live and die together, with which we entirely agree. Mr. Clarke sees a great distinction of man on account of his being the possessor of " a spirit," or the power to " think, will, and reason;" but we would remind Mr. Clarke that it has never been established that the power to think, will, and reason is peculiar to man. If the possession of a spirit implies the power to " think, will, and reason;" then the beasts can " think, will, and reason" for Solomon affirms that all the beasts in common with mankind have one " spirit" (roach) or breath; besides there are untold millions of mankind who do not " think, will, or reason;" babies, idiots, and the residuum in general. Mr. Clarke will do well to reconsider his view of " the spirit." It cannot be " thought," for the spirit came from God and returns to him when men or beasts die; but " thought," is the result of education. It does not continue after the death of the body, for a man cannot think without a brain, any more than he can see without eyes. "Mind" and "matter " live only together; hence it is said, "Their love, and their hatred, and their envy (these are qualities of mind), are now perished. Eccl. 9. 6; and David says "in that VERY DAY (the day of a man's death), his THOUGHTS PERISH" (Psalms 146. 4); and thus in death there is no remembrance. As to Paul's "threefold " man, if Mr. Clarke will read the chapter in which the phrase occurs (1 Thess. 5.) he will not fail to see that it is not a man as such which the Apostles' refers to but to the Church, and for whose preservation in a corporate capacity he prays. The definition of " body, soul, and spirit " is comprehensible from this standpoint. The body, i.e., all the members; the soul, or the life; " the spirit " or the doctrines or the word, of which Jesus says " the words which I speak to you, they are spirit and they are life;" by which spirit, or word of truth, Christ prayed for the sanctification of his disciples. Mr. Clarke's non philosophical, unscriptural, and un-sustainable view of man's nature, is the cause of his erroneous conclusions as to the meaning of many passages, which we now proceed to explain in harmony with explicit statement of scriptures that " the dead know not anything." First,

"The Heavens To Be No More."

Upon our explanation of the above page in the book of Job, Mr. Clarke found it far easier to smile than to argue, and, by way of a set-off, he ridiculously enough concludes that if the heavens, "political and ecclesiastical," are meant, then "the power of awaking the dead" is in the hands of men and not of God, surely forgetting that the passing away of the " heavens," and "the awaking of the dead" are separate events, and that men who uphold the heavens do so by God's permission ("for the powers that be are ordained of God"),

and will not retain their position a day longer than He willed. If Mr. Clarke's hearers took his advice, and referred to the 2nd Peter, 3. 7, and merely glanced at the chapter, they would have discovered that Peter is speaking of things political and social, and not physical; for he speaks of certain " heavens," in verse 5, that had passed away, and the reference doubtless is to the destruction of the antediluvians, and he adds " the heavens that are now" (that is in Peter's day), " shall pass away with a great noise and the elements (rudiments) shall melt with fervent heat." Now nothing more need be said than that this prophecy of Peter is fulfilled to show that Peter was speaking of the Jewish or constitutional heaven and its rudiments, and not of the material heaven and earth. It used to be popular to dream of the earth becoming a huge bonfire and being dissolved into ashes, and it would seem that Mr. Clarke believes that "heaven " also is to share a similar fate, and be engulfed in the devouring flames. If this be so, it is difficult to see how the "immortal souls," which are supposed to be dwelling in heaven, will escape; but as Mr. Clarke appears-to be a believer in three heavens it may be that only one is to be burned, and two will always remain. Or it may be that Mr. Clarke, like Job, is speaking " as far as he has light." If this be so, we think there is tolerably good reason for him to suspect the light that is in him and see that it " is not darkness."

"Christ's Death And His Promise To The Thief."

Here Mr. Clarke proceeds with considerable caution. He does not say that Christ's body did not die, nor does he say a word about the "never-dying soul," but says " His spirit did not die," that is his " thought, will and reason." The " soul," according to the passage (Psa. 16. 10) was in hell (Sheol) or the grave, or it could not be said with any force, " thou wilt not LEAVE my soul in hell," as the soul was in the grave. Mr. Clarke doubtless saw that this looked very unlike popular sentiment on the subject, and remembering that it is said of Christ, " He poured out his soul unto death," he immediately invests the spirit with immortality, and says positively nothing about this passage, which cuts at the very root of the tree of popular superstition. It is here brought out clearly that the soul is the man, not another entity inside the man. The promise to the thief appears to be brought forward to prove that his " spirit " accompanied the " spirit " of Jesus to heaven on the day of their crucifixion. Here we have an important discovery, remembering Mr. Clarke's definition of " spirit " viz, " thought, will, and reason." Many wise men have been not a little puzzled as to what " thought" is, but Mr. Clarke has unraveled the secret. " Thought" is " spirit," and spirit is an entity, and constitutes the highest part of a triune man, in short, the man; and thus " disembodied spirits " (or thought) have been for the past 4,000 years departing into some unknown world, leaving " body " and " soul " man behind in the arms of death, till the resurrection, when the " spirit-thought" man will return, and the whole will be re-united. Now, it is quite unnecessary to say this view is simply an echo of ancient paganism, and is such a glorious muddle that no one need attempt to comprehend it. it is " visible " darkness, and yet how simple and sweet are the narration is of the Scriptures when untouched by theological pruners and patchers, commonly called divines. It should not be forgotten that the thief did not ask that his soul (or the sensitive part) might be remembered, nor did he say remember my spirit (or thought), but " Lord remember ME." not today, " but when thou comest into thy kingdom. "

The reply is tantamount to this. "Verily I say unto thee, in that day (when I come into my kingdom,) thou (the man, not part of him only), shalt be with me in Paradise. The common version of the Scripture is misleading, unless the whole of the context is carefully read. The American translation reads " in that day." The translation, unlike the original is punctuated, and the comma being placed before to-day, (when, if used at all, should be placed after,) is the cause of this passage being constantly raked up to support the heaven-going theory, and Mr. Clarke seems not to have escaped the error. Christ died, and so did the thief. Christ was unconscious for three days and three nights when he revived and rose again. The thief is now in an unconscious state, and will remain so till Christ come into His kingdom. Jesus did not go to heaven or paradise, which places are distinct, on the day of his death; for three days after he told Mary Magdalene, " I have not yet ascended." But on the fortieth day after his resurrection he was received up into heaven in a cloud from the Mount of Olives, and it is arranged that he will so come from heaven in like manner, when he will restore our faded Paradise, and cause the whole earth to become the Garden (or Paradise) of the Lord, when he will graciously remember, not only the malefactor, but all who love his appearing. Thus we unmask the follies of clerical interpretations, and, let Mr. Clarke note, this is in the New Testament; we are not now consulting poor Job, who told us all he knew, and shed forth what little light he had. We are not looking into the wintry and twilight days of revelation, we are basking in the sunlight of the New Testament, and as yet we have found nothing to clash with the teachings of Job, David, Solomon, and Isaiah concerning the present whereabouts of the dead.

But to proceed, Mr. Clarke asks us to ascend the Mount of Transfiguration; and there see Moses and Elias.—Acts 11. 30.

The object of citing this passage is to prove that Moses and Elias are alive, and the proof of their existence is the fact of their appearance on " the holy mount."

Let us see what the testimony says.

Concerning Elias there is no difficulty, since his case cannot be submitted in proof that when men die they go to heaven; for Elias did not die. He (his " body, soul, and spirit") was taken up " in a chariot of fire." His appearance, on the mount therefore could be easily accounted for, but his continuation in being is no proof that, men who die, continue in being.

Now of Moses it is said he died, and that the Lord buried, him (Deut. 34. 5-6), and if Moses was on the mount he was raised up for the purpose. There is nothing supplied in the narrative to prove that he was alive somewhere and came from that somewhere to amount, but the fact of his appearing is plainly recorded in the Scriptures, and if he appeared there with Elias he was there "body, soul

and spirit," for it is said there appeared two men in glory which were. Moses and Elias, and they talked with him. Moses must have been raised up seeing that he died and was buried, and unless it be allowed that he died a second time it is very difficult to see how Paul's words are true when he says that Jesus is "the FIRST fruits of them that sleep, The popular view of things makes Moses the "first," not Jesus. But concerning the scene on the mount, the different statements of the Evangelist make it tolerably clear that PERSONALLY neither Moses or Elias was there.

Matthew says Christ himself called it a "vision," or a representation of a reality, past or future. Tell the VISION to no man" are Christ's words (Mat. 17. 9).

It seems from Mark and Luke that it was a fulfilment of the promise to the disciples " there be some standing here who shall not taste of death till the kingdom of God is come." Thus the three disciples were taken on the mountain and saw by means of a vision the future king of the world glorified and in the talking, or the voices, they were enabled to have the news of " His decease " broken to them by means of a vision, which they were told not to say anything about "till the Son of Man was raised from the dead;" and this Peter afterwards refers to in his epistle (2 Peter 1. 17-18) and says that Christ, on, the mount received "honor and glory" when there came a voice to him from the excellent glory. He does not say that he heard the voices of Moses or Elias but only the voice which " came down from heaven when we were with him on the holy mount." This quotation from Peter seems to omit any reference to Moses or Elias. This, together with the sudden disappearance of the vision, and the sleepiness of the disciples, to our minds shows that the disciples were favored with a vision or panoramic scene, like John on the Isle of Patmos, of things to come.

Immortality And The Gospel.

Mr. Clarke truly says immortality is brought to light by, or through, the gospel. This being so the doctrine of immortality must be unknown to those (and there are untold millions of them) who never heard the gospel—therefore such must be mortal and have no real hope of ever becoming anything else. A question may be asked at this point which comes directly out of Mr. Clarke's statements, viz., Was there ever a time when the world was without a gospel; and how many gospels are there? If immortality is brought to light by the gospel then immortality was brought to light to Abraham and to the Jews in the wilderness, for Paul expressly says the gospel was preached unto them (Gal. 3. 8.—Heb. 4. 2); but nowhere does the Bible speak of the immortality of part of a man but of the whole man. The Bible teaching concerning immortality is that it will be bodily by the resurrection from the grave, or a change of nature at the second coming of Christ, and thus immortality was brought to light to Adam and all his descendants in old time, and in no other way.

Paul Caught Up In Paradise.

To the next point dealt with by Mr. Clarke. This cannot be said to support the departure of part of a man at death to same place of bliss; for Paul did not die, he was alive and on the earth, and at the same time in Paradise, which we understand to be the kingdom of heaven, but not heaven itself. Paul was not bodily in heaven, as Mr. Clarke calls paradise; to say so, would be to say what is not warranted by the passage, and to presume to know more about it than Paul himself; for he says, " whether out of the body, I cannot tell; or whether in the body, I cannot tell"—that is, he was so fast asleep, that he was quite unconscious of his own existence, and while in this state, he had a vision (2 Cor. 12. 2.) of the "third heaven," that is, he was mentally beyond the resurrection, and in this sense he was in the millennium or kingdom of God. Whatever Mr. Clarke or Mr. Thompson may say or think about this " third " heaven, I think the facts will bear me out in saying the millennium, or thousand years' reign of Christ upon the earth, called by Peter, John, and. Isaiah, " the new heavens," are the third in numerical arrangement. 1st—The heavens that perished at the flood; 2nd—The heavens that passed away with a great noise at the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; 3rd—the new heavens in which the Saints will enjoy life, of which Paul had a vision so grand that it was not possible to describe it. John, however, by divine assistance, at a later date wrote in his book, called the Revelation, a symbolic description of the third heaven, and that it should be read and understood, he wrote in chap. 1. 3, the words, " blessed is he that reads."

Mr. Clarke quotes the above with all the confidence of a Lord Chancellor, to prove that those who are in Christ "never die." Now it should not be forgotten that this privilege belongs only to those who believe. The inference is, therefore, that those who believe not will die. Thus we have Mr. Clarke unwittingly advocating death as the punishment of unbelievers. To comprehend fully the teaching of this chapter, the circumstances and topic under consideration must receive attention. " The Resurrection at the Last Day," Martha has introduced (John 11. 24,) and Jesus says to her that all who believe in him, though dead at that time (the last day,) shall live, and he adds, "and whosoever lives (or is alive when I come,) shall never die." This is just what Paul taught the Corinthians, when he said "We shall not all sleep (or die) but we shall be changed," etc., also "all which are alive shall be caught up together with them (called the clouds) which have been dead (1 Cor. 11. 51, 1 These. 4. 16, 17.) With these facts before us, it is difficult to see why these passages should be dragged out of their legitimate position to support an unproved and improvable theory of disembodied existence.

"To Die Is Gain."

This cannot be one of Mr. Clarke's strongholds, surely. Did Paul die? Does anyone die? Messrs. Clarke and Thompson and the whole orthodox world say no. Then, for this passage to be of any use to orthodoxy it should read, " To live in another world is gain. To change from a terrestrial to a celestial abode is gain; to go out of a lower apartment to a higher is gain." This is how it should read if

the affirmations we hear from the pulpits or cowards' castles be true. But to interpret the passage so would be to destroy the teaching which the spirit, through Paul, wished to convey. Paul was a prisoner; he was a suffering prisoner: he was destitute, and persecuted on every hand; and therefore if his trial before Caesar should end in his martyrdom, "to die would be gain." He would sleep a calm sleep and be rid of all the ills of a life such as he led, and wait in perfect rest till his Lord from heaven should call him forth to inherit the kingdom. Thus to him death would be gain: he should lose his bonds and find rest. (Thus to die is gain. Or it may be explained thus: For me to live is to preach Christ, and to die will be gain to Christ's cause, for my example will stimulate others to persevere in the right path.

Absent From The Body, Present With The Lord.

If the body and soul of Paul die and sleep until the resurrection, and the spirit only (that is, the thought, reason, and will) is present with the Lord, can it be said that Paul proper is present with the Lord before he comes? This is not only unreasonable, but it clashes entirely with Paul's statement in another place—"I (Paul) strive if by any means I might attain unto a resurrection from the dead." Paul did not think he should be rewarded before he was judged, but says "We all must appear in body at the judgment seat;" and further says that he shall get his crown of life AT His second appearing, when Paul will (if worthy) be invested with a spiritual body, and, mortality being swallowed up by incorruptibility, he will be absent from flesh and blood and "present with the Lord." The Bible teaches not only that the just will be as Jesus is now in nature, but shall spend eternity with him on the earth; 'therefore as and where he is they will be also.

"Souls Under The Altar."

Not spirits, but souls, that had been beheaded—souls that could be seen that could sing—real persons—"a great multitude that no man can number." How did John see them—with his ordinary eyes, or with his mental vision? He saw something yet to come. There was no altar on the Isle of Patmos, and there were no souls nor any of the imagery which John says "I saw!" It was an uninhabited island; but in that place of banishment Jesus sent his angel (probably Elijah) to reveal things that were then and are now to come to pass. (Rev. 1. 19.) The Bible speaks of things that be not as though they were; and if Mr. Clarke had kept this divine principle before his mind he would not have given to the world what some people will probably call arguments in favor of a separate and individual existence of body, soul and spirit.

"Eternal Torment."

Time and space will not allow us to follow Mr. Clarke through his second lecture, but it would be scarcely the thing to dismiss it without saying that Mr. Clarke has not attempted to deal with our arguments already before the public. He tries, but miserably fails to establish the popular doctrine of a "general resurrection." This is natural enough for Mr. Clarke, because if the resurrection is partial then according to his theory there would be a great number of spirits without bodies throughout eternity. He lays great stress upon the word "all," when it is used in connection with the raising of the dead. If he would read the verses he quotes (John 5. 28,) he would see that the word "all" has reference to the two classes denominated in the verse, "They that have done good, and they that have done bad." The phrase "all nations," is limited in the same sense to the Sainte, small and great, of all time, and therefore out of all nations. The word "all" is often used in common phraseology, and in the Scriptures, in a limited sense—for instance, "all Jerusalem and all Judea went out to hear him," "all nations" (during the millennium,) shall go up year by year to keep the feast of tabernacles. Who believes that everybody, including babies of Jerusalem and Judea, went out to hear John preaching, and who believes because it says that "all nations" will go up to Jerusalem, that it means other than by representation; and in this sense too the passage "we all must appear," etc., and "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." It must be understood that the "we all" is confined to the people to whom the Epistle is addressed, and "all men" in the Savior's language, are confined to all believers. Let Mr. Clarke digest this, and not forget the abundance of Scriptural truth already in his hand in our published lectures, and also to remember the words of the wise man who spoke in the book of Proverbs of the third class of society, in the following definite language, "they shall remain among the congregation of the dead," and again, "they go down to the grave and come up no more (Job. 7. 9.)

Mr. Clarke affirms that Antipas says "eternal' is a limited period of time."

This we deny, and in doing so, must express our surprise that Mr. Clarke should have so mis-read that which is printed, and if not this, misrepresented us. We say that the "punishment" of the wicked is eternal—that is in result, but not in application. The gist of the argument is not in the word "punishment"—observe it is not punishing or tormenting, but punishment, which implies an eternal result eternal death. When the phrase "eternal torment" can be found in the Bible, we will subscribe to the doctrine. The Bible teaches judicial torment for the wicked; they are to have many or few stripes as they deserve. This fact alone shows that the stripes cannot be inflicted throughout eternity. The phrases "many stripes," and "few stripes," are of limited meaning, and flatly contradict the dogma of eternal pain, and show that the Scriptures admit of degrees of punishment, which we have never denied; and we are therefore not a destructionist, as represented by Mr. Clarke.

In concluding, Mr. Clarke gave his hearers what he calls "the facts about the articles" of his church, and states that "neither of the articles expunged favored Antipas' theory." Mr. Clarke and a correspondent writing over the name of "Enquirer" seem to think that the forty-two articles to which we referred in our lectures were only "prepared," but never became the lawful creed of the Church.

That Mr. Clarke and " Enquirer" are both mistaken the following evidence will show. It is taken from a pamphlet published by Mr. H. S. Warleigh, Rector of Ashchurch, Tewkesbury, entitled, "Bear the Church of England, which has expelled from its articles the dogma of endless torments." After expressing his sorrow that this cruel dogma is held by denominations, which their ministers are obliged to teach, he says " A peculiar honor belongs to the Church of England in this respect, for long since she has formally and authoritatively expelled it from her standards of doctrine; and in this she has been happily upheld by the chief court of the realm. For this vindication of God's revealed character, and this honor put upon His word, he will in hex day of trial honor her. Let us enter upon the question as becomes those who wish to know the real truth, whether it be held by many or by few.

In 1552 a code of forty-two articles was framed and enacted by Convocation of the whole realm. It was promulgated by Royal authority and subscribed by the clergy at large. Among these the following were found:— " XL. The souls of them that depart this life do neither die with the bodies, nor sleep idly."

" They which say that the souls of such as depart hence do sleep, being without all sense, feeling, or perceiving until the day of judgment, or affirm that the souls die with the bodies and at the last day shall be raised up with the same, do utterly dissent from the right belief declared to us in Holy Scripture."

This Article clearly taught the immortality of the soul, and that it had a principle of life in itself and from its own nature.

And now that the Article is expunged, does it not show that " the Church as by Law Established," believes that the "soul does die with the body " and " sleep idly " till the resurrection, How can Mr. Clarke with this fact before him continue to terrify, intimidate and excite his hearers by the popular theory; and how can he say that neither of the expunged Articles favored our view of the matter? XLII. "All men shall not be saved at the length."

" They also are worthy of condemnation who endeavor at this time to restore the dangerous opinion that all men, be they never so ungodly, shall at length be saved, when they have suffered pains for their sins a certain time appointed by God's justice."

This Article was opposed to what is now called Universalism, but what at one time was called Origenism, because it was invented and first introduced by Origen into the Christian Church as a relief from the inconsistencies and perplexities in which his Alexandrine philosophy had involved him and others who received it.

In 1562 the whole Synod of the Church met in Convocation, reviewed these Forty-two Articles, and deliberately expelled the above two; and the Amended Code, in its reformed state, was again promulgated by Royal authority and again subscribed to by the clergy. The legal ratification by the Synods bears the above date of 1562, and in 1571. The Reformed Code of Thirty-nine Articles was rehearsed before the Convocation, " which Articles were deliberately read and confirmed again by subscription of the hands of the archbishop and bishops of the upper house, and by the subscription of the whole clergies in the nether house of their convocation, in the year of our Lord God 1571."

For proofs of the Acts, see the Liturgies of Edward 6., published by the Parker Society, and the Prayer-book interleaved by the Rev. W. M. Campion, B.D., and Tutor of Queen's, and Rev. W. J. Beamont, M.A., Fellow of Trinity, with a preface by the Lord Bishop of Ely.

He further says—" From the conclusion of the examination of the Expelled Articles it is evident that in the Code of Articles of 1552, there were two which together affirmed the dogma of endless torments for the wicked; that the whole Synod of the Church deliberately expelled these Articles in 1562, and legally ratified the new Code of Articles; that in its reformed state it was promulgated by Royal authority, and subscribed to by the clergy of the day; that nine years after it was again read, and ratified by Convocation, and solemnly subscribed to by all the members of both houses. These are historical facts which the clergy are taught, or supposed to be taught, and they are worthy of the deep, candid, solemn attention of the public at large."

Nor is this all; another article was expelled at the same time.

The forty-first Article of the old Code was against millenarians and unless this also had been abolished, no clergyman, in consistency with his signature, could have held and taught the personal reign of Christ upon earth, and the consequent universal spread of His religion; but the obstacle to this glorious truth was removed, and we cannot sufficiently praise God for giving such spiritual knowledge, wisdom, and foresight to our Reformers. A large number of the clergy avail themselves of the liberty, and preach, with happy effect, the opposite of this expelled Forty-first Article. We would respectfully and affectionately entreat all classes of them to do the same with respect to the other two expelled Articles. They will find themselves on safe ground if they thus follow their Church.

After pile upon pile of crushing evidence in favor of the mortality of the soul, and of DEATH being the wages of sin, Mr. Warleigh further says:— "But there is still more evidence on the point, and this as clear and decisive as the other. No longer ago than 1864 the question was tried by the Judicial Committee, whether endless torments was a doctrine of our Church or not. In the case Wilson

Versus Fendall, it was argued on both sides by most able counsel, and after mature deliberation, the Lord Chancellor gave judgment that it was not a doctrine of the Church of England; for, remarked his Lordship, to affirm it was so would be reinstating the expelled Article, which we have no "power to do." It should be especially remarked that this judgment was given with the approval of the two Archbishops. An account of this judgment may be found in the reports of the Law Times " for February 20, 1864."

If any further facts were needed, it were easy to refer to the verdict in a celebrated trial which took place through the publication of a book a few years ago, entitled " Essays and Reviews," when it was stated by the judge that the verdict " not only killed the devil, but put out hell-fire." And still later a verdict has been given in the well-known case of Jenkins 5. Cook," which really amounts to saying that the doctrine of " the personality of Satan " or of eternal torment are not legally doctrine of the Church of England. It is to be hoped that the foregoing facts will satisfy both Mr. Clarke and " Inquirer " and convince them that " There are more things in heaven and earth Than are dreamed of in their philosophy."

The Rev F. D. Thompson's Lectures.

The alarm raised from the watch tower of St. Mary's Church gives a very uncertain sound. Almost the first statement is a very glaring (let us hope not willful) misrepresentation. The alarmist says "the views put forth by Antipas are thoroughly Sadducean." Paul says (Acts 23. 8), " the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit." We have never uttered any sentiment which could help Mr. Thompson to the conclusion that we believe with the Sadducees, but on the contrary we have again and again affirmed our belief in the doctrine of resurrection, and we now repeat that as we believe in death robbing us of existence, so we believe that resurrection is the only way by which men get life again, and consequently, if there be no resurrection, there can be no future life. Mr.

Thompson charges us with "deceitfully handling the word of God." We won't say so hard a thing of him, but we will state that he must have read our lectures through with some very "deceitful" spectacles or he never would have classed us with the unbelieving Sadducees. Applying himself to the subject, he asks "where are the dead?" and then he labors in a very novel and futile manner to show that there is no such thing as death, therefore it would have been far more to the point to ask " where are the living." Judging from the novel argument brought forward by Mr. Thompson we may safely infer that Mr. T. knows that all the old arguments urged for the natural immortality of man are worn out, and that people are beginning to see that what was once thought to be conclusive evidence is no evidence at all. Mr. Thompson truly observes that " a living soul is not necessarily an immortal soul," for the lower animals are classed with man as living souls, but, he says, Scripture makes a difference between the bodies of the flesh of the immense variety of living souls on the earth. He says some of these "living souls" are heavenly (or celestial) while others are earthly (or terrestrial,) and the glory of each is different. Now is Mr. Thompson serious in this statement? If so, will he object if we ask him with no other object but to ascertain the truth to point us to a " celestial body" on the earth at the present time. It must be apparent to all that the earthly body is the basis of the heavenly body, and as Paul puts the matter in the same chapter (1 Cor. 15), the natural is first and the spiritual after, that is the natural body of those who are amenable, will be made into a spiritual body at the second coming of Christ, either by being raised up from the dead, or being changed. That there is a difference (in kind) between the flesh of man and, the flesh of birds, and fishes is evident. We all recognize—and so does Paul, human flesh is " sin's flesh," while none of the other kinds of flesh are "sold under sin." But, because of this, to say that all spirit is not the same spirit, that there is one kind of spirit of man, another of beasts, another of fish, another of birds, is to our minds not only an evident sign of weakness—not to say absurdity—but is a palpable contradiction of the plain statements of Holy Writ.

Paul, who says there are many kinds of flesh, also says there is but ONE SPIRIT (Eph. 4. 4), and concerning its possession by all living souls, whether brutes or men, Solomon says in the passage (Eccl. 3. 21,) quoted by Mr. Thompson, and upon which he talks in a very oblique manner, that men and beasts all have ONE breath (Roach) or spirit. What Mr. Thompson calls a strong argument, we beg to call the opposite to strong. He quotes just one passage as though he could quote a thousand more if required. Wo shall deal with the one he quotes, and see what its strength is. " Who knows" asks Solomon. Mr. Thompson answers, " I do," for he tells us that the spirit of a man goes upward, and the spirit of a beast goes downward. But Solomon does not affirm this, but he puts it as an interrogation, "who knows?" Now supposing we allow Mr. Thompson to know, and that he is right when he says the spirit of man goes upward, will he object if we ask him, what man? Does this refer to good and bad alike? Do all men's spirits go upward, or do not the vast majority of spirits go down to hell. And again, although we don't care to propound too many questions, we should like to know from Mr. Thompson, what the spirit is? Is it not the breath of life which was breathed into man at the first. If it is not, how comes it to pass that it is said it returns, and yet still more explicitly, "to God who gave it." If it returns, is it not evident that it departs to where it was before. And as it is said that God gave it, does not this show that the spirit existed before the body; and if the spirit is man, then man must have pre-existed; and such a theory as this would lead to the doctrine that man is like God, from everlasting to everlasting. But the fact is the spirit is not the man or yet part of the man. It is the spirit or breath of the Almighty, and is no more the man than the steam is the engine. As to the spirit of a man going upward and the spirit of a beast downward—we do not understand this to have reference to the departure of the spirit at the death of the body, but to refer to the nature of a man and the nature of a brute while alive; that is, it is natural for a man's spirit to aspire and worship. Man is naturally pious, while it is quite natural for a brute to grovel, or his spirit to go downward to the earth. If we are to conclude upon this question of Solomon, this must be the right conclusion. To say that the spirit of God can die or goes downward to the earth is passing strange, and it is not less so because it comes from the watch tower of a parish church. The Bible distinctly says that if God shall gather together his spirit and his breath, ALL FLESH (men and brutes) will perish together. (Job 34. 14-15.) Mr. Thompson next treats his congregation to his view of:

The Intermediate State.

of the departed. He asks how do they spend their time? " Do they sleep idly." Yet Mr. Thompson can cry out " disloyalty and infidelity," while he eats the bread of the Church and refuses to teach her doctrines; and he quotes the parable of " the rich man and Lazarus," and the statement of Christ to the " penitent thief," to show that the dead do not " sleep idly" till the resurrection, as though the parabolic and figurative statements of the Scriptures were to govern and give the lie to a plain and literal statement, such as "the dead know not anything," " those who are asleep," " the dead praise not the Lord," " no knowledge in the grave, etc." Having replied to the arguments of Mr. Clarke upon the points raised by Mr. Thompson, there is no necessity to recover the ground further than to say that the torment spoken of in the narrative of " Dives and Lazarus," is not ETERNAL torment, but judicial torment, and therefore will come to an end. Mr. Thompson is welcome to his view (which he calls an evident and palpable explanation), on the passage in Eccl. 9. 5, that the " living dog " means an inferior person as a slave, and the ' dead lion' means a superior person as a prince. Solomon probably did not anticipate he was writing for such men as Mr. Thompson, or he would have altered his style and spoken plainly. The point raised about the silence of LAZARUS AND OTHERS WHO CAME BACK is treated in true clerical style. He could show that it was an enjoined silence, but there is no attempt even to fulfil the promise, and show it was enjoined silence, but simply contents himself by making another assertion, that "the muteness on the part of those who were raised from the dead is one of the sublime mysteries of the unknown world, which shall be revealed to us as we depart this life." Thus the matter which Mr. Thompson declares he can show in his very next remark he calls a " sublime mystery." which belongs to an unknown region.

We may ask at this point if the silence of Lazarus, Paul, and " the widow's son," and those who came out of the grave after Christ's resurrection was enjoined silence, is the great and detailed publicity given in the creeds and catechisms of modern times " enjoined publicity," if so, when was it " enjoined," and by whom? And if it has not been " enjoined" how can the compilers of the Catechisms and the teachers thereof escape the charge of lawlessness? If it was not lawful for Paul to utter what he saw, how can it be lawful for modern divines to enter into details and speak of the streets of heaven as " golden streets " and the gates thereof as " pearly gates ajar," and of "harps of gold," and everlasting songs " and speaking of the throne of God in heaven. It is freely sung in Sunday-schools that around it "Thousands of children stand, A holy and happy band."

But after Mr. Thompson's assertion that " the departed are not in heaven " but in paradise, and that " the consummation of their bliss" is the subject of prayer by the living Church this sort of thing will be very distasteful to him. Neither David, Abraham, or Paul, according to Mr. T., are in heaven (and this is according to Scripture) but he says they are in paradise. Well, suppose this to be true, then let Mr. T. remember that " Paul is not present with the Lord," " for Jesus is ascended into heaven," which is affirmed by Mr. Clarke to be paradise but which Mr. Thompson denies. Consequently Mr. Thompson does not think that Paul being in Paradise is present with the Lord, whereas Mr. Clarke believes that Paul and Jesus are at present together in heaven. The palpable contradiction between two members of the same church, remind us of the lines— " When doctors disagree Disciples may go free."

Paradise, says Mr. Thompson is a state rather than a place. Adam we expect thought it was both a state and a place when he was put into it at the first, and when by sin he " paradise lost " he lost " a state and a place "; and that " state and place " is to be regained by the last Adam, and by his righteous laws made fit for the eternal abode of all righteous men. It is in paradise that men are to live forever. Heaven and paradise are distinct, the former has never been promised to the sons of men, but the latter is offered on terms stipulated in the Bible. The Kingdom of heaven (which, when established upon the earth will be paradise) has been prepared for the righteous from the foundation of the world. The departed are in a state and a place between death and the resurrection—but the state is one of profound silence or sloop, and the place is the grave, " where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest." Upon the second subject, viz:— " Will Any Suffer Eternal Torment?"

The " foe" is met by the assertion, that no man, in or out of the church, can settle the question, but the Bible can. This is our own ground, and we have already shown that it is not according to the Bible to teach the doctrine of endless pain, and Mr. Thompson who thinks our conclusions wrong, after all his labored remarks, fails to produce a " thus saith the Lord " in favor of the gloomy superstition. If the book is interpreted by its own light, and with the aid of the lexicon, no man in the world can find it there, and Mr. Thompson has distinctly stated that the doctrine of " the immortality of the soul," or the kindred doctrine of endless pain, " are not legally doctrines of his church." By this admission he allows that the reformers, who studied the Bible, concluded that "eternal torment " was not a Bible doctrine, and have published the same to the world. It would seem that Mr. Thompson is not quite clear as to what is the " intermediate state of the wicked." He does not say they go into paradise, nor does he say whether they go direct into the fire or not, but he gives no attention to this aspect of the subject at all, but calls the attention of his hearers to scenes and transactions which evidently do not take place until after Christ's appearance. If Mr. Thompson can speak so positively as to the " intermediate state " of the wicked, to put it in the form of plain questions:

" If Abel is in paradise, where is Cain?" Is the bonfire now burning, or is to be kindled after the coming of Christ? In either case it is evident, if Mr. Thompson's theory be true, that the Deity's intentions and purposes in creating this planet have been entirely frustrated by the acts of Adam and Eve, for no one can suppose that it was His original intention for man to die at all, much less was it His will that man should suffer " never ending pain." Shall we ask Mr. Thompson to again read our published lecture if he would ascertain how we understand the word " eternal " applies to the punishment of the ungodly? The Greek word KOLASIS does, as he truly observes, mean torment when applied to a living man, but he must know that it never has this meaning when applied to the dead. It was to the

dead we applied it and not to the living. That there is to be torment, and weeping and wailing, during the just infliction of the stripes, we believe, but we also believe that there will be no eternal weeping and wailing but the whole of the rejected will, in the end, be overtaken of the second death. And that the state of the righteous and the wicked is total destruction (not the atoms, but the men) till the resurrection is proved by the following Scriptural quotation—" He destroyed the perfect and the wicked." (Job 9. 22.) And now after noticing briefly one other point we must bring this long letter to a close.

The point is the preparation of everlasting fire for the " Devil and His Angels." The general notion about the devil is that he was once a happy angel in heaven and fell from that holy place, is now on the earth and is the source of all temptation and wickedness, that he is to suffer " eternal torment;" few persons ever dream, it is supposed, that he will be the TORMENTOR not the tormented. But the probabilities are that on this point Mr. Thompson is right and the multitude wrong. There can remain no doubt in a Bible student's mind that the devil and his angels are to be tormented, and what is more that they are in the end to die. Therefore Mr. Thompson is quite wrong in claiming immortality for the devil mentioned in his text, the words "devil and his angels" might be properly paraphrased by the words " adversary and his messengers." If we read the Book of Revelation we shall there find many references to the devil and his angels, and it is very easy to see that it is some living, powerful authority existing contemporary with the second advent of Christ, and which power is to be consumed at that time by the breath of his mouth. " The lake of fire" is prepared for their destruction, and in it with them those to whom the Lord says " depart," together with all the abominable and the wicked. Judas was a member of the human race, but he is called a devil, and Peter, they were both adverse to the will of God. The world is full of such at the present time, and it "will wax worse and worse;" but when he comes, who was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, evil will come to an end, and there shall be no more curse. We could extend the subject but think we have said enough to lay bare two facts, viz 1st, that the Scriptures do not contradict themselves, and 2nd, that both Mr. Clarke and Mr. Thompson have been caught in their own nets and yet in the words of the Queen of Sheba, " The half hath not been told."

www.CreationismOnline.com