The Rich Man And Lazarus

www.CreationismOnline.com

“Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.”— Paul.

Miles Grant

When we present the many plain passages which declare positively that the whole man dies, the question is often asked, “How can Luke 18: 19-31 be harmonized with the idea that the dead are unconscious between death and the resurrection?”

In answering this question, it will be necessary, in order to get the connection, that we go back to the commencement of the 15th chapter. In the second verse we read,—"The Pharisees and Scribes murmured, saying, this man receives sinners, and eats with them.” From this point, we think, the Savior goes on to vindicate himself against the above charge, by showing the Pharisees that they act on the same principle in temporal things, that he does in spiritual, and closes with the parable of the rich man to illustrate the then future history of the Jews, resulting from rejecting the Messiah. He first vindicates Iris course by the parable of the lost sheep, and says,—”What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it?” The Pharisees could not deny that this would be their course of action. Jesus then pleads guilty to their charge, and says,—”I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in Heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance.”

With the eighth verse, lie commences another and similar illustration in the parable of the ten pieces of silver. He inquires, what woman, who had ten pieces of silver and lost one. would not light a candle and seek diligently till she found it, and then rejoice?

He then _ makes the same application again, saying, “there is joy in the presence ot the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.” If they would rejoice because they had found a lost sheep or piece of money, should they not still more when a sinner is restored to the favour of God?

The Savior next introduces the parable of the prodigal son in the' eleventh verse, to illustrate the conduct of the Jews towards the Gentiles with whom he had been eating and conversing. In this pointed illustration, we believe the elder brother represents the Jews, and the younger the Gentiles. All were counted as Gentiles from creation to Abraham, who was considered the father of the Jews. Said they, ‘‘we have Abraham to our father.” Like the prodigal son, the Gentiles had squandered all their blessings, and wandered far from the Lord in their idolatrous worship; in short, they had spent everything; but when they beheld Jesus and his wonderful works, they began to think of returning to the true worship of God, and because Jesus sympathizes with them in their lost condition, they charge him with being a friend of publicans and sinners; and like the elder brother in the parable, they are offended, and entirely refuse to cooperate with Jesus and the angels in restoring the lost sinner, and rejoicing over him. The Jews, like the elder brother in the parable, for many years had been the favoured people of the Lord, and should have been delighted when they learned that Gentiles wore to share the blessings of the gospel with them, but they were so sectarian in their feelings, that they could take no satisfaction in the prosperity of any church but their own, and felt even angry when they' saw the Gentiles received into “Abraham’s bosom,” or in other words, brought into the Abrahamic covenant.

Thus far the Lord has been addressing Pharisees, who complained of him for receiving sinners and eating with them; he next speaks to his disciples, (chap. 16: 1-13) instructing them how to use “the mammon of unrighteousness,” and teaching them that they “cannot serve God and mammon.” We learn from chap. 16: 14, that the Pharisees listened to this conversation of Jesus with his disciples, and being covetous, “they derided him.” The Savior then continues his conversation with the Pharisees, to the close of the chapter, introducing the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. In verse 16, he declares that, “The law and the prophets were until John.” Since then, there has been a change which the Pharisees refuse to acknowledge. He illustrates this point in verse 18, by the law regulating the marriage relations, and says,—”Whosoever puts away his wife and marries another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marries her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery.” If any do not see the application of this, let them turn to Rom. 1: 1-4. Says Paul, “Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he lived? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband, - so long as he lived: but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband lived, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.” In the next verse he makes the application, which • shows plainly why the Savior introduced the same subject when talking with the Pharisees. Hear him. —”Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to Him who is raised from the dead, that ye should, bring forth fruit unto God.” We found the Lord declaring that the law was until John, that is, unto John’s ministry; and when he commenced preaching, the time had come to put away the law, be baptised, and be married to Christ, “for Christ is the end of the laic for righteousness to everyone that believeth.” Rom. 10: 4. This the Jews refused to do, and were married again to

the law which had been divorced by the Savior, consequently they were adulterers. We now come to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. We have endeavoured to show

1. That the Pharisees condemned Christ because he received sinners and eat with them.

2. That he pleads guilty to the charge, and vindicates his course by showing the Pharisees that, when they lose a sheep or piece of money, they at once make search for the lost, and rejoice when it is found.

3. That, in the parable of the prodigal son, he brings out the fact that they did not rejoice when he came to save lost sinners, who are of more value than many sheep or pieces of silver, thereby proving that they, and not himself, were the ones to be censured.

4. That the time had come to put away the law, and be married to Christ, which they refused to do, consequently, they are condemned as adulterers.

We will now examine "the parable of the rich man," given as we believe to illustrate the history of the Jews and Gentiles, from that time to the end of this dispensation.

Some claim that Luke 16; 19-31, is not a parable, but a history of what actually took place. Let us look at this position a few moments. Ver. 22. "And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom; the rich man also died and was buried All, who claim that this is a history of what actually took place, must admit, First,—that Lazarus died, not his body, but Lazarus himself; and he that died was carried, not something else, for the record reads, "the beggar died, and was carried." If I say a man died in the street and was carried into the house, would anyone suppose that I meant they carried his soul in and left his body in the street? Then why say in this case that the angels carried his soul and left his body, when it is expressly declared that the beggar that died was carried?

If this is history then whatever it takes to constitute Lazarus, died and was carried to Abraham's bosom.

Second. "The rich man also died and was buried."' In this case, the one that died, is the one that was buried. If this is also a historic account, it follows that the rich man came to life after he was buried, and a flame burned in the grave, for the word rendered hell, in ver. 23, is hades, which is never used to denote the future punishment of the wicked, but simply the grave, where all remain between death and the resurrection. The word hades rendered hell in the passage, corresponds with sheol in the Old Testament, which invariably refers to the grave, or the state of the dead when used in its literal sense. The same word occurs in 1 Cor. 15:55. "O death, where is thy sting; O grave, (hades) where is thy victory?" If hades represents the place where the wicked are tormented and some come out and shout "victory," why will not all?

The question arises,—what is the condition of one hi hades or sheol? Let the wise man answer.—"There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, (sheol) whither thou goest." Such then was the state of the rich man while in hades, but this cannot be harmonized with the text if it is a historic account instead of a parable; because, while he is in hell, (hades, the grave,) he is .represented as having both device and knowledge, which could not have been true, unless he was buried alive; but the latter supposition cannot be accepted for a moment, for the text declares that "the rich man died." Whatever constituted the rich man, died, otherwise, it is not a true history, for there was nothing buried in hades (the grave) only what died-, hence, if there was anything about him that did not die, it was not the rich man, and was not put in hades at all, but went to some other place. If this is a historic account, there was nothing tormented only what died and was buried, and no one can sutler in the grave, unless buried alive, but as the. rich man was dead, we aro driven to the conclusion, that this account is not a history of what actually took place, but a parable.

But for argument's sake, we will take another view of the subject, and suppose that the man did not die —only his body or the house in which he lived, was buried in hell, (hades or the gave) while his soul went into torment. Now let us read this scripture in harmony with this position. Begin at ver. 22. "And it came to pass that the [body of the] beggar died, and [his soul] was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom; the [body of the] rich man also died, and [his soul] was buried. And in hell, [hades, the grave,] he lifted up his eyes [of his soul] being in torments, and sees [the soul of] Abraham afar off, and [the soul of] Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, father Abraham, [let thy soul] have mercy on me, and send [the soul of] Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his [soul's] finger in [literal] water, and cool my tongue" [of my soul.] The foregoing paraphrase is in harmony with the theory, that only the body died; but we think all can see the absurdity of such an exposition. Even if we should adopt this paraphrase .as truth, it completely overthrows the idea that min exists in a disembodied state between death and the resurrection; for he is represented as having eyes, fingers a id tongue, and these organs do not exist and act independently of the rest of man's physical organism; consequently, we have the whole material man existing and acting, between death and the resurrection; then what will he do with this body when he is raised from the dead at the coming of the Lord? "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we, which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air." 1 Thess. 4; 16-17.

This last scripture teaches plainly that something now dead is to be raised to life when Christ comes.

Job asks the interesting question,—"if a man die shall he live again?" Hark! and hear the Savior's answer.—"Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." John 5: 28-29.

We can see no possible way of harmonizing the scripture, if we take the position that the account of the rich man and Lazarus, is a literal history of what actually took place. At this time, the Savior had been speaking to the Pharisees in parables, and we read that, "without a parable spoke he not unto them." The Rich Man and Lazarus is a continuation of his discourse with them. See Luke 16: 14-15.

Let it be remembered that there is not one word about soul or spirit in the whole account.

We have endeavoured to show that this account could not be a history of what actually took place.

But we are sometimes met with the objection, that, "all parables are founded on facts," and consequently such a case happened at some time. We think those who make such a remark should examine the Bible and laws of language more closely before they repeat the statement. We would ask if the following parable, from Ezek. 17; 2-8, is founded on fact?

"Son of man, put forth a riddle, and speak a parable unto the house of Israel; and say, thus saith the Lord God, a great eagle with great wings, long-winged, full of feathers, which had divers colours, came unto Lebanon, and took the highest branch of the cedar; he cropped off the top of his young twigs, and carried into a land of traffic, he set it in a city of merchants, lie took also of the seed of the laud, and planted it in a fruitful field; lie placed it by great waters, and set it as a willow tree and it grew and became a spreading vine of low stature, whose branches turned towards him, and the roots thereof were under him; so it became a vine and brought forth branches, and shot forth sprigs. There was also another great eagle with great wings and many feathers; and, behold, this vine did bend her branches towards him, that he might water it by the furrows of his plantation."

It must be a very strange eagle that takes the branches off from the cedar and sets them out, causing them to grow "in a city of merchants and then takes the seed of the land to plant, raising vines which spread their branches towards himself! and more than this, the roots grow towards another great eagle!

We think all can see that this parable is not founded in fact.

Again, we think no one will claim that the parable of Jotham is founded in fact, recorded in Judges 9; 8- 15. It reads "The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them, and they said unto the olive tree, reign thou over us. But the olive tree said unto them, should I leave my fatness, wherewith by me they honour God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees? And the trees said to the lig-tree, come thou and reign over us. But the fig-tree said unto them, should I forsake my sweetness, and my good fruit, and go to be promoted over the trees? Then said the trees unto the vine, come thou and reign over us. Aud the vine said unto them, should I leave my wine, which cheered God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees?

Then said all the trees unto the bramble, come thou and reign over us. And the bramble said unto the trees, if in truth ye anoint me king over you, then come and put your trust in my shadow; and if not, let fire come out of the bramble, and devour the cedars of Lebanon." Do trees talk, assemble together, and appoint kings?

Without further remarks on this point, we think all must he convinced that parables are not always "founded on fact." We now return to the Scripture under consideration —"the rich man and Lazarus." We think it has been clearly shown that it is not a historic account of what actually took place, but sparable, given in connection with others to illustrate the character and history of the Jews as connected with the Gentiles. The Savior showed the Jews, who accused him of receiving sinners and eating with them, that, when they lost a sheep or piece of money, they endeavoured most faithfully to restore the lost, and that they rejoiced when success attended their effort; hut when Jesus came to save lost sinners, who are of more value than all the sheep or money, the Jews were offended, as illustrated by the parable of the Prodigal Son. The elder brother should have felt great joy when the lost one was found and restored to his father's family; but instead of this feeling, lie is offended, and refuses to co-operate in the rejoicing.

Alter instructing his disciples, by the parable of the unjust steward, how to use the mammon of unrighteousness; Jesus tries once more to convince the Pharisees that the time had come to put away the law, by saying, in verses 16-18, that "the law and the prophets were until John" and, consequently, if they went back to the law, they would be guilty of adultery, or of marrying the divorced; but as the Jews still refused to hear him, he proceeded to foretell their history, as well as that of the Gentiles, in the parable of the "rich man and Lazarus." The question now arises, who is Represented by the "rich man and Lazarus'?" According to the laws of parables and symbols, the rich man does not represent a rich man, neither does the beggar symbolize a poor man, for then it would cease to be a parable, and be changed to a simple history of the two individuals; but we think the absurdity of the historic view has been clearly shown. In the parable of the tares and wheat, the tares represent the wicked, and not literal tares; and the wheat symbolizes the righteous, and not literal wheat: and the same principle is applicable to all parables; and when applied to the rich man and Lazarus, it is at once evident, that, as the rich man and the beggar do not symbolize rich and poor men, literally; then- death does not represent literal death; in short, that which is symbolized, is different from the symbol; hence it follows also, that the grave, the gulf, the flame, and Abraham's bosom, do not represent themselves, for if they do, they are no part of the

parable; therefore, When we come at its true meaning, crumbs, dogs, sores, etc., will not represent crumbs, dogs and sores, but something bearing an analogy to the symbol; in other words, the poor man represents that which is in a degraded condition, and afterwards exalted, while the rich man symbolizes that which is highly favoured and exalted, and subsequently meets with a complete reverse.

Having shown, as we believe, that the common application of this parable to the intermediate state of the dead, cannot be true, because it makes' the Bible contradict itself, and also does violence to the plain principles of justice, by sending men to their reward and punishment, before the day of judgment, it remains for the advocates of the common, theory to give us an exposition that shall be in harmony with sound principles of exegesis and the Bible itself. As Jesus has given us no explanation of this parable, we do not feel under obligation to offer any ourselves, but, in order that the whole conversation of the Savior at this time may be made plain, it seems proper that a brief exposition should be presented.

As we have before remarked, we understand that the Savior gives a condensed history of the Jews and Gentiles by means of this parable,—the rich man representing the Jews, and Lazarus the Gentiles. This is not a new theory got up by those who believe in the Bleep of the dead, or by Universalists who believe all men will be saved; but was believed and taught by such men as Lightfoot, Whitby, Wakefield, Theophylact, James Bate, Dr. Gill, and many others. Says Lightfoot:

"Whosoever believes this not to be a parable, but a true story, let him believe also those little friars, whoso trade it is to show the monuments at Jerusalem to pilgrims, and point exactly to the place where the rich glutton stood. Most accurate keepers of antiquity indeed! who, after so many hundreds of years, such overthrows of Jerusalem, such devastations and changes, can rake out of the rubbish the place of so private a house, and such a one too, that never had any being, but merely in parable. And that it was a parable, not only the consent of all expositors may assure us, but the thing itself speaks it. The main scope and design of it seems this, to hint the destruction of the unbelieving Jews." Whitby says:

"This is only a parable, and not a real history?" Says Wakefield, an able translator:

"To them who regard the narration as a reality, it must stand as an unanswerable argument for the purgatory of the papists."

Theophylact, an ancient Christian writer, says:

"By the rich man is signified the Jewish people." Although he applied it also to the concerns of the next life, he says:

"Lazarus was the Gentile people, poor in divine grace and wisdom, and lying before the gates; for it was not permitted to the Gentiles to enter the house itself, because they were considered a pollution." Dr. Gill makes a two-fold application of it; and says the death of the "rich man " may be understood to represent "the political and ecclesiastical death of the Jewish people." James Bate, M. A., Rector of Deptford, says:

"We will suppose, then, the rich man who fared so sumptuously, to be the Jew, so amply enriched with the heavenly treasure of divine revelation. The poor beggar who lay at his gate, in so miserable a plight, was the poor Gentile, now reduced to the lust degree of want, in regard to religious knowledge The beggar dies, and is carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom; that is. he is engrafted into the church of God. And the rich man also (lies and is buried. He dies what we call a political death.— His dispensation ceases. He is rejected from being any longer the peculiar Sou of God. The people whom he parabolically represents are miserably destroyed by the Romans, and the wretched remains of them, driven into exile over the face of the earth, were vagabonds, with a kind of mark set upon them, like Cain, their prototype, for a like crime; and which mark may perhaps be their adherence to the law.

There can be no doubt that the account of the "rich man and Lazarus" is a parable. A manuscript of the seventh century commences it as follows:—"And he spoke also another parable." One of the tenth century reads:—"The Lord spoke this parable." We have introduced these testimonies to show that the exposition we give was not got up to favour the sleep of the dead, or those who believe in universal salvation, but to give a common sense view of the parable in harmony with the rest of the Scriptures.

We are fully persuaded that the rich man represents the one house of Israel, composed of the two tribes, Judah and Benjamin; and the five brethren, the other house, or the ten tribes, who were carried captive- by Shalmanezer seven hundred and twenty-one years before Christ, and have not returned to this day. They are denominated the ten lost tribes of Israel. These two houses of Israel are frequently mentioned after their separation, which took place in the days of Rehoboam and Jeroboam; hence the prophet Isaiah is taught to say, when speaking of the coming of Christ,—"he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence, to both the houses of Israel." The sequel of the Jewish history has proved the truth of this prophecy. As the rich man was taken to represent the two tribes, Judah and Benjamin, who occupied Jerusalem when the Savior was on earth; it is rational to suppose that the five brethren should represent the other ten tribes who were dwelling among strangers in foreign lands.

The rich man, like the elder brother in the parable of the prodigal son, occupied a favoured position, but was unwilling to welcome the poor man to his hospitalities.

The elder brother had lacked no good thing, and would not have felt the least privation if he had kindly welcomed his poor brother home, and rejoiced with his father;—so the rich man was abundantly supplied with earth's choicest blessings, and would have suffered no loss, if he had granted the poor man's request, who only asked for the crumbs, or like the younger brother, to be a servant but the elder brother—(the Jews,) and the rich man representing the same, would confer no favour upon the poor man (the Gentiles;) but in both cases he is finally exalted, and the rich man humbled. Jesus had come to preach the gospel to the poor, but the rich man, (the Jews) instead of co-operating with him as he should have done, would not receive Christ because he befriended the poor;—like the elder brother, he would not go in to rejoice over lost sinners found, but would rejoice when he found a lost sheep, thus showing that he cared more about saving sheep than sinners,—more about money than eternal salvation.

Whatever view be taken of this parable, it cannot be used to define or represent the punishment of the wicked after the judgment, because the whole scene is this side of that event.

For an explanation of the torment of "the rich man," the Jews, please read Deut. 28; 15-68. In the first fifteen verses of this chapter, the Lord makes great promises to "the rich man," on condition, as he says, "that thou hearken unto the commandments of the Lord thy God, which I command thee this day, to observe and do them." His future history shows that he did not obey, but departed from the Lord and conformed to the manners of the surrounding nations. The Lord assured him if he did not obey, he should be overtaken by the following curses:

"But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee, this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee: Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field. Cursed shall be thy basket and thy store. Cursed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy land, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. Cursed shalt thou be when thou comes in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out. The Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation, and rebuke, in all that thou sets thine hand unto for to do, until thou be destroyed, and until thou perish quickly; because of the wickedness of thy doings, whereby thou hast forsaken me. The Lord shall make the pestilence cleave unto thee, until he have consumed thee from off the land, whither thou goest to possess it. The Lord shall smite thee with a consumption, and with a fever, and with an inflammation, and with an extreme burning, and with the sword, and with blasting, and with mildew; and they shall pursue thee until thou perish." "The Lord shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies; thou shalt go out one way against them, and flee seven ways before them; and shalt be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth. And thy carcass shall be meat unto all fowls of the air, and unto the beasts of the earth, and no man shall fray them away. The Lord will smite thee with the botch of Egypt, and with the emerods, and with the scab, and with the itch, whereof thou canst not be healed. The Lord shall smite thee with madness, and blindness, and astonishment of heart: and thou shalt grope at noonday, as the blind groped in darkness, and thou shalt not prosper in thy ways: and thou shalt be only oppressed and spoiled evermore, and no man shall save thee Thy sons and thy daughters shall be given to another people, and thine eyes shall look, and fail with longing for them all the day long: and there shall be no might in thine hand. The fruit of thy land, and all thy labours, shall a nation which thou knowest not eat up; and thou shalt be oppressed and crushed always: so that thou shalt be mad for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see The stranger that is within thee shall get up above thee very high; and thou shalt come down very low Because thou served not, the Lord thy God with joyfulness, and with gladness of heart, for the abundance of all things; therefore shalt thou serve thine enemies, which the Lord shall send against thee, in hunger, and in thirst, and in nakedness, and in want of all things; and he shall put a yoke of iron upon thy neck, until he have destroyed thee And thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and thy daughters, which the Lord thy God hath given thee, in the siege, and in the straightness, wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee: so that the man that is tender among you, and very delicate, his eye shall be evil toward his brother, and toward the wife of his bosom, and toward the remnant of his children which he shall leave: so that he will not give to any of them of the flesh of his children whom he shall eat: because he hath nothing left him in the siege, and in the straightness, wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee in all thy gates. The tender and delicate woman among you, which would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground for delicateness and tenderness, her eye shall be evil toward the husband of her bosom, and toward her son, and toward her daughter, and toward her young one that comes out from between her feet, and toward her children which she shall bear: for she shall eat them for want of all things secretly in the siege and straightness, wherewith thine enemy shall distress thee in thy gates If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD; then the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues, and of long continuance, and sore sicknesses, and of long continuance Moreover, He will bring upon thee all the diseases of Egypt, which thou was afraid of; and they shall cleave unto thee. Also every sickness, and every plague, which is not written in the book of this law, them will the Lord bring upon thee, until thou be destroyed. And ye shall be left few in number, whereas ye were as the stars of heaven for multitude; because thou wouldst not obey the voice of the Lord thy God And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone.
And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest: but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind: and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear day and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life: in the morning thou shalt say, would God it were even! and at even thou shalt say, would God it were morning! for the fear of thine heart wherewith thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see."

This prophecy was delivered while Moses was leading the children of Israel to the promised land, before they had possessed or built any city. How faithfully the Lord has kept his word. After the Jews rejected Christ, he said to them, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—Luke 21: 24. They were to suffer "vexation,"

“madness,” “astonishment” “diseases,” “plague,” “a trembling heart,” and “sorrow of mind.” Here we have a complete description of the torment of the rich man, which has been suffered by the Jewish nation for the last eighteen hundred years. We now come to inquire, who is represented by Lazarus? As already intimated, we answer—the Gentiles. What is meant by the death of the beggar, and bis being carried to Abraham’s bosom? As this is a parable, the death cannot be literal, nor the entrance into the bosom of Abraham. It will be noticed that nothing ns said about the burial of Lazarus.

We understand his death to signify a moral and political change in the condition of the Gentiles, in consequence of the Savior’s work accomplished in breaking down the wall between the Jews and Gentiles, and receiving the latter into the new covenant; for when the Gentiles embraced Christ, they became “Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise.” The Gentiles died to their idolatrous worship, became the followers of Christ, and have been highly exalted, both morally and politically while the Jews have died both morally and politically, and still lie in a buried condition, “trodden down,” or tormented by the Gentiles,—the poor beggar who once sat begging at their gate, but was not even allowed to share the least favour in common with them. The Jews would “have no dealings with the Samaritans” because they permitted Gentiles to have some privileges in their city; but they have since been tormented in their political hades, or grave, for nearly eighteen hundred years; scattered among all nations, denied the privilege of holding offices of trust; in short, they have been placed in the same condition in which they tried to keep the Gentiles; “but now he (the beggar, or Gentiles) is comforted, and thou, (the rich man, or Jews) art tormented.” How perfectly the Savior illustrated the then future history of the Jews and Gentiles by this parable, which completed his answer to the charge preferred against him by the Pharisees at the commencement of the 15th Chap.,—“this man receives sinners and eats with them.” The Jews, like the elder brother in the parable of the prodigal son, had received “good things,” mid Lazarus, or the Gentiles, “evil things,” but for hundreds of years their relative condition has been reversed. We think this truth was the important idea that the Savior wished to communicate by means of the parable.

As is often remarked, “we do not believe that parables should be made to go on all fours;” i.e., we do not think that Jesus intended wo should look for a correspondence between every particular point mentioned in the parable, and that which it represents. For instance, in the parable oi the lost sheep, mentioned in chap, fifteen, we have, 1, one hundred sheep. 2, One strays and is lost. 3, Ninety nine are left in the wilderness, while search is made for the lost one. 4, When found, he puts it on his shoulders and goes home. 5, He calls on his friends and neighbours to rejoice with him. Who can suppose that the Savior intended we should look for an act in the plan of salvation corresponding with each of those five particulars? The simple idea is, that when a lost thing is found, we feel joy.

This is expressed in ver. 7, when he says,—”likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth.” So in the parable of the rich man, we do not expect every little item is to have a corresponding event in that which is represented.

The gulf. If the gulf is to have a correspondence in the history of the Jews and Gentiles, it must represent something that prevents a Jew, while he continues in his Jewish faith and customs, under the old covenant, from joining the Gentile Christians; and at the same time will not allow a Christian, as such, to unite with the Jews. From this consideration, we think the gulf may represent the new covenant, “established upon better promises,” of which Jesus was the mediator. The Jews rejected this covenant confirmed by Christ, and were married again to the law, from which Christ and the apostle Paul most plainly declares they were divorced; consequently, they became adulterers in refusing to come into the new covenant, and be married to Christ, as we endeavoured to show in the first part oi this work. The Gentile Christian cannot join the Jewish church and continue a Christian, because he would be throwing away Christ, and connecting himself with the law, which is divorced; hence the new covenant stands as a gulf between Jews and Gentiles.

The five brethren. As has been already intimated, we understand that they represent the ten lost tribes of Israel, who were carried captive by Shalmanezer seven hundred and twenty-one years before Christ. They were not joined with the Jews (the other two tribes) in condemning and crucifying the Savior; and therefore they are represented as being in a safer and better condition than the rich man.

We think Paul refers to them when lie says,—”Brethren, my heart’s desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved.” When they went into captivity, they took the Scriptures with them, hence it is said, “they have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.” When the request is presented that one may he sent “from the dead,” the reply is made, “if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.” Observe, he does not say, though a spirit or soul come from “the spirit land,” to teach them; but if one rose from the dead." Subsequently to this, the Savior rose from the grave, hut they still continue in their unbelief, thus proving his saying true.

In conclusion, we remark, we can see no reason for believing this parable was given to show the state of the dead between death and the resurrection; because, in the first place, such a view seems to be foreign to the subject then under consideration; and in the second place, it would be contradictory to plain and positive texts of scripture, which describe the condition of man in the intermediate state.

The Thief on the Cross.

This is considered, by many, as the main pillar to sustain the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. We find no difficulty in harmonizing this passage with our views of the state of the dead. In considering this subject, there are several points that demand attention.

1. The question of the thief in Luke 23:42,—"Lord, remember me when thou comes into thy kingdom." Observe, the thief does not carry any idea that he thought of going with the Savior to a kingdom at death, but wishes to be remembered when the Lord comes info his kingdom.

Where will the Savior's kingdom be located? After the seventh angel sounded, John heard "great voices in heaven, saving, the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever." Rev. 11:15. This event is yet future, therefore the thief cannot be in the kingdom yet, for the reason, that our Savior has not yet come to take possession of it. "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth." Matt. 5: 5. When the meek shall inherit the earth, then Christ will have come into his kingdom, and the thief may then have his petition answered. The new earth, Christ's kingdom, and Paradise are evidently used in the Bible to represent the same thing; and we have yet to learn that the saints of the Lord will have a reward anywhere else than on this earth, after the curse is removed; consequently, the thief is not now with Christ in his kingdom.

2. The Savior's answer.—"And Jesus said unto him, verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Ver. 43.

(1.) We will notice first, the place where they fire to meet—in paradise. Where is paradise? Some tell us it is a concealed place in the earth, where souls go at death; that the good in that condition are happier than when here on the earth; that the wicked are more miserable, but the souls of both classes must wait for the resurrection of their bodies before they can enter upon their eternal state.

This may do for heathen philosophy, but wo do not see how the Bible student can adopt such an idea and adhere to the Scriptures! We all believe that Adam was in paradise before he disobeyed his Creator, but we are as well agreed that no such beautiful Harden is in the laud of Eden at the present time; still we find a promise to the faithful Christian, that he shall yet partake of the fruits of paradise; or in other words be restored to the glorious state of the first happy pair, before sin entered. Jesus says in his last Revelation,—"To him that overcomes will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God." This scripture plainly shows that the "tree of life" will again bear fruit in paradise, which we cannot think is some deep cavern, or subterranean place, but the new earth which the meek shall inherit. We think this point is made plain in the Revelation of St. John. In the 21st chap., our Savior gives us an account of a "new heaven and a new earth," and of the holy city, the New Jerusalem, that is to be upon it; and in chap. 22:2, he savs,—"in the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bear twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month." We have now found that the tree of life is in Paradise, and at the same time, in the new earth, which is the kingdom of Christ, where the thief wished to be received when our Savior comes; and hence it follows again, that the thiol is not now in paradise, because it is not yet prepared.

(2.) The punctuation of this verse demands attention.

It should be borne in mind, that our system of punctuation was introduced by "Manutius, a learned printer, who lived at Venice, in the loth and 16th centuries;" and that the Scriptures were written originally without, any pauses, hence any one has a right to punctuate the Bible as the sense may demand. We will instance some examples where the meaning is changed by the use of the comma. "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God." Heb. 10: 12. In many Bibles the comma is put after sins, instead of forever winch would make the passage declare that Christ had "forever sat down," and therefore will never rise up again, to return to this world to set up his kingdom; but such a view would be a palpable contradiction of the Bible; but if the comma is placed after forever, then the verse teaches that he is never to offer himself as a sacrifice again, but that this one is sufficient, which is the true meaning.

Again, in Matt. 19: 28 is a passage where the power of the comma is shown. "And Jesus said unto them, verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." We have frequently seen the comma placed after regeneration, instead of me; and when this is done, the passage teaches that Christ was regenerated, (which many understand to mean converted,) and that if we will follow him in regeneration, then we may all sit on twelve thrones, and judge the twelve tribes of Israel; but if we put the comma after me, then the verse teaches that the twelve apostles, who had forsaken all and followed Christ, shall, in the regeneration, or when they rise from the dead, sit with him in the throne of his glory, which gives the true idea.

Now we will return to our text,—Luke 23: 43. If we put the comma after to-day, then to-day qualifies the verb say, which makes this passage harmonize with the whole Bible; but if w« leave it where it is, then it qualifies shall be, and would go to show that the Savior and the thief both went to Paradise that day; but we have already seen that Paradise is in the new earth and yet to come; consequently, the present position of the comma gives a wrong idea to the verse. The Greek adverb seemeron, here rendered "to-day, n may be translated by the word now, and we think the sense of the original would be much better expressed, if it read, now I say unto thee, thou shalt be with me in paradise, not between death and the resurrection, but when Christ comes into his kingdom.

If our readers will observe the common use of language, they will notice that all classes of persons frequently use today, tonight, this day, and this night, in the same sense that to-day is used in the text, provided it qualifies say. I am informed that one of the be6t translators places the comma after "to-day." Some may object, by saying that to-day is superfluous in our arrangement—no more so than in many cases in the Bible.

The Lord instructs Moses to say to the children of Israel, "I command thee this day."—"I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish." Deut. 30: 11, 18. He does not mean that they shall perish that day, but declares the denunciation that day; which fact was perfectly apparent without stating it, but it is a common mode of expression.

Again, the Lord says in Deut. 15: 15,—"I command thee this thing today." Here, today is used in the same sense as in Luke 23:43,—"verily 1 say unto thee to-day, thou shalt be with me in paradise." If the phrase, to-day, is superfluous in Lk. 23:43, if made to qualify say, it is equally so in Deut. 15:15, and in the following extracts from the speeches of Daniel Webster and Mr. Choate. Says Mr.

Webster, on the 7th of March, 1850,—"I speak to-day for the preservation of the Union." All knew he was speaking that day, without his declaring the fact. Mr. Choate at another time said,— "Today fellow-citizens, we also speak for the Union." These distinguished orators use to-day in the same sense as it is used in Luke 23: 43, where the comma is placed after the phrase.

We remember hearing an intelligent minister, say:—"I expect tonight, to go into the kingdom." If we put the comma after expect, instead of tonight, and emphasize night, then we make him say he will get into the kingdom before morning. He made the remark in a conference meeting, and was only speaking of his present expectation. We have observed that similar expressions are very common.

This verse is one of the strongest to support the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and is more frequently brought by our opponents to prove their position, than any other; but we see that their whole argument rests upon the very doubtful position of the comma. Besides, there is not a word about the soul or spirit in the whole account. If the pause be placed after today, then this verse is in harmony with the whole Bible. Shall we make this doubtful comma the corner stone of our foundation, and set aside plain and positive scripture?

(3.) Again, if it could be proved that the thief went to heaven or paradise the day of the crucifixion, it was forty three days before the Savior ascended. The Savior says, "thou shalt be with me in paradise." Three days subsequent to this, after the Savior had risen from the dead, he says to Mary, "touch me not, (the same me) for (the same one) am not yet ascended to my father." He remained on earth forty days longer, and then ascended to Heaven.

From this brief examination, wo conclude that the prayer of the thief is not yet answered, and cannot be, until Christ comes into his kingdom, when paradise will be restored; consequently this passage is in harmony with the doctrine of the sleep of the dead.

Souls Under the Altar

Sometimes, Rev. 6: 9 is presented as evidence that man has, or is, an immortal soul, that "never dies." Let us look at this candidly for a few moments:—

"And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony, which they held." The two verses following read, "And they cried with a loud voice, saying, how long O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should res/ yet for a little season, until their fellow servants also and their brethren that should be killed as they were should be fulfilled."

There are four points that should be noticed in the account.

1. What was seen?
2. Where seen?
3. Their cry.
4. Their condition.

1. What teas seen? We are told by some that "it was their disembodied immortal spirits"; but the word psuche, here translated soul, is not rendered spirit once in the Bible. Another says, "it was their disembodied immortal souls." We have not yet been able to find any proof that such exist as conscious entities, nor any evidence that such were ever seen, or can be seen, unless it is found in this passage. The souls say, "our blood," but they do not speak as though their bodies had been killed, and they, the souls, had escaped unharmed. We have many examples where nephesh, the Hebrew word corresponding with psuche, is rendered person; and in Prof. Whiting's translation of the New Testament, psuche is rendered person in this passage. Prof. Whiting has the reputation of

being one of the best Greek and Hebrew scholars in America, and is now employed in the new translation by the American Bible Union. If this be rendered person, it will be in harmony with the whole Bible; whereas, if we use the word soul, in the popular sense, we make the Scriptures contradict themselves.

2. Where were they seen? “Under the altar." Where was the altar? Dr. Clark, when speaking on this passage, says:—”The altar is upon the earth, not in Heaven.” It could not have been either in Heaven or hell (hades), for they were slain neither in the one nor the other. It seems that John saw in vision the great slaughter field, where the martyrs were to be slain upon earth, and calls it “the altar,” on which millions were butchered for their testimony in favour of Jesus. Let it be remembered, these souls (persons) are seen about the altar, which was upon the earth.

3. Their cry. If they were alive, it appears they were in a very uneasy and suffering condition: in which case, it must have been their cry as they were led by the thousand to the altar for slaughter; but there is another sense in which they cry. As Dr. Clark says, “Their blood, like that of Abel, cried tor vengeance.” Says the Lord to Cain, “The voice of thy brother’s blood CRIES unto me from the ground." It is said of Christ, that his blood speaketh better things than that of Abel.” Thus goes the blood of the martyrs cry. It should be observed that the account is clothed more or less in symbolical language, and should not be so interpreted as to contradict plain and literal Scripture, which would be the case, if this passage was made to teach that the souls of men are conscious when the men themselves are dead.

4. Their condition. They are not only “under the altar,” which is upon earth, but they are “killed." It is that very part that John saw; that part which cried, that was "killed." This same class is mentioned again in Rev. 20: 4. “And I saw the souls (persons Whiting’s trans.) of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished.” This is so plain it seems to need no comment. Some of these souls, or persons, had been beheaded, which of course killed them. Then they could not reign with Christ till made alive; hence we read they lived, and “this is the first resurrection." “But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished.” Why say they “lived not,” if they were all alive in hades, in torment?

We think it plain that John saw in vision the martyred saints during the Papal persecutions, as they lay weltering in their blood, which, like Abel’s and Christ’s was a witness against their cruel tormentors. They remain in the embrace of death till the vision passes on to Rev. 20: 4, where he sees them live again and commence their reign with Christ, and are pronounced “blessed,” because they have “part in the first resurrection.”

Death of the Soul.—Matt. 10:28

There is one more text that needs a passing’ notice—Matt. 10; 23. The passage reads—“Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” The same caution is given in Luke 12: 4, in the following language: “And I say unto you, my friends, Ire not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; fear him, which after he has killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him.” The word rendered hell in this passage is Gehenna. This word originally represented “the valley of Hinnom,” a place near Jerusalem, where sacrifices were offered by the Jews. It became a filthy place, and fires were kept burning to destroy or consume the filth there deposited. Worms assisted in devouring the carcases left there for consumption. Nothing was thrown among this mass of corruption which they wished to preserve; and when the Savior would illustrate the final, future punishment of the wicked, he refers to this Gehenna or valley of Hinnom. Nothing could show more clearly that the wicked were not to be preserved alive eternally; for whatever was cast alive into the fire of Gehenna, soon had its life destroyed. And to make the case as strong as possible, and their entire destruction beyond all doubt, he says, the fire shall not be quenched. An unquenchable fire always consumes the burning object. If the fire could be quenched, a part of the burning body might be saved from the “devouring fire;” but if unquenchable, it must be burnt up All beings cast into an unquenchable fire, must lose their lives and have their bodies destroyed.

In Matt. 10: 28, we learn that we should “fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” Does anyone suppose that the bodies of wicked men would be preserved by being cast into a fire that could not be extinguished? Certainly not.

But the soul is destroyed in this case as truly as the body. It reads, “destroy both.” This cannot mean destroy the one, and preserve the other from the effects of the fire. Fire either purifies or consumes. It is employed in purifying gold and silver, and for consuming thorns, briars, stubble and tares. The wicked are compared with the last four objects mentioned, but never with anything that would not be burned up if cast into fire.

The word rendered soul in this text, is rendered life and lives forty times out of one hundred and five that occur in the New Testament. We know of no reason why it may not be translated life in this passage as well as in any other. In one transition, the “Emphatic Diaglott,” we notice it is rendered life. This makes the passage harmonize with the whole Bible. Is it safe to put a construction up: n this text which will be in opposition to all the rest of the Scriptures? This is the only passage we can find which stems to teach that there is anything about man that cannot be killed by Iris fellow; but the question arises, what does the word

psuche in Matt. 10: 28 represent? We think it does not mean this present soul or life, for the reason that the destruction threatened is not in this life, but in the world to come. Man can and does take this life, according to many records in the Bible. Is there any other life? “This is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life.”—1 John 2:25.

Can man take that, or kill it? Nay, verily. “Be not afraid of them that kill the body, [or take this life,] and after that have no more that they can do.” It is certain, then, that man cannot take from us our future life, now “hid with Christ in God.” If we should attempt to put the popular construction on Matt. 10: 28, making soul mean the real man, it will be seen from examination, that it overthrows the position assumed, and makes the Bible contradict itself. Let us suppose that soul in this passage represents the real man,—the man David if you please; and in order to make the point plain, we will put the word David in he place of soul, premising that David and soul are synonymous.

Then it will read, “fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill” David; “but rather fear him which is able to destroy both” David and his “body in hell.” This makes a full destruction of the whole of David. No part escapes from the destruction.

But we return to the first clause of the verse. Admitting that soul and David are identical, permit Peter to say a word about this matter. “Men and brethren let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried—David is not ascended into the Heavens.”—Acts 2; 29, 34.

“For David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep and was laid unto his lathers and saw corruption.”— Acts 13:36. If soul represents the real man David, then it is plain, according to the Bible, that he is both dead and buried, and is not ascended into the Heavens. We think it plain that the word soul in Matt. 10: 23 does not represent the man, but the future life, over which man has no power. He may cut us off from this present existence, but cannot from the life to come, which .is promised through Christ, as a gift to be received when He “who is our life shall appear.” We find the words rendered die, death, dead, etc., occur twenty- five hundred and eighty-two times in the Bible, not one of which intimates that the being is alive between death and the resurrection, unless it be the one under consideration. Is it fair to interpret this one so as to make it contradict twenty-five hundred and eighty-one others? We leave the reader to judge.

“In the Day.”—Gen. 2: 17.

It has been claimed that the penalty threatened Adam was a moral death, because he did not die a literal death “in the day” he sinned. Spiritual death, or sin, could not have been his penalty, unless the crime and penalty are alike, which is too unreasonable to believe. Were it so, it would be like requesting a thief to continue stealing as a punishment for his theft. It is more probable that the death is spiritual; i.e., a day for a thousand years, than that the penalty should be like this crime. Besides, if the penalty were a spiritual death, then that which dies must be spiritually mortal; and the spiritual death of a spiritual thing must as truly kill, or cause it to cease, as the literal death of a literal thing; so that in either case, there must be a cessation of conscious existence.

The margin reads:—”In dying thou shalt die.” Dr. Clarke remarks on this passage: “From that moment thou shalt become mortal and shalt continue in a dying state till thou die. This we find literally accomplished.” The Greek of Symmachus reads:

“Thou shalt be mortal.” Likewise the Syriac, which is approved by Jerome and Grotius. The Arabic reads:—“Thou shalt deserve to die.” The Targum of Jonathan,—“Thou shalt be subject to death.” Vatabulus says:—"Thou shalt be subject to death, both of body and sold.” Had Adam died the day he sinned, our race would have ended there, as he had no children at that time. It is certain, however, that his Creator did not intend he should die the day he disobeyed because he said to him;—”In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground.” The grand difficulty in this passage centres upon the little Hebrew word. The Hebrew preposition be, translated “in,” is rendered in thirteen different ways, one of which is after. When prepositions are translated, we choose from the varied renderings the one which is thought to convey the true idea of the writer. In this case our translators believed in the immortality of the soul, and concluded that the punishment threatened was a moral death, experienced the day Adam sinned, and hence rendered the preposition be, by the word “in,” instead of after. If they had used the latter word, it would have harmonized with all the facts, and made the matter plain. As it now is, with the claim that the death, or penalty, on Adam was a moral one, the Universalist has the argument, when he quotes 1 Cor. 15: 22—”As in Adam all die, (a moral death,) even so in Christ shall all be made (morally) alive,” and hence be saved. Their reasoning is correct, if the premises are sound. But we find it impossible to harmonize the Scriptures when we take the position that the death is a moral, instead of a literal and real one. Death comes upon us because Adam, by his sin, became mortal, and hence all his children must be mortal, till the Life-giver comes to give eternal life to all that have obeyed him, and thereby shown that they wish to be his subjects in the coming kingdom. Gesenius says we should render the preposition be by the word after, “where the mind rests more upon the end of a period, and spoken therefore of time already past.” This is precisely the case in Gen. 2: 17. The passage shows that the mind of the Lord was resting upon the end or results that would follow Adam’s disobedience. Death must certainly follow; but he is to live awhile, and earn his bread by “the sweat” of his face, “till" he should “return unto the ground.” This is now accomplished and Adam sleeps in death because he would not obey God.

In Num. 28: 26, we have this preposition rendered both in and after in the same verse.—"Also in the day of the first fruits, when ye bring a new meat offering unto the Lord, AFTER your weeks be out, ye shall have an holy convocation." When the preposition be occurs in the original, we can use either of the thirteen words employed to translate it, which we think best conveys the idea of the writer. In the example now under consideration, we are fully satisfied it should read, "After the day thou eats thereof, thou shalt surely die" hence we read, "All the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and he died."

There the death penalty is executed: and, if there were no resurrection promised through Christ it would be "eternal punishment but as man is to rise again, the first death is only a temporary punishment. When raised from the dead, and found guilty, not for Adam's transgression, but for their own sins, if they suffer the "second death" it is eternal punishment, because they are never raised to life again, but are buried forever beneath the waves of oblivion, and shall be as though they had not been."

Absurdities of Modern Theology.

In a work published by L. Lee, on the soul, he says, on p. 33, the soul is "without figure, form, colour, impenetrability, extension, divisibility, gravitation, attraction, or repulsion We can hardly conceive how nothing could be better defined. He says:—"The mind in its present state is dependent upon the bodily organs for primary ideas." How that which has no "extension'' can depend upon matter for ideas, remains to be shown. "The soul" he says, "is an immaterial spirit." And then says; the soul is a simple, spiritual essence, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible, it must be immortal in itself." As well say nothing is immortal! For that, which is immaterial, uncompounded and indivisible cannot possibly be a living being, either praising the Lord, of wailing in agony.

As soon as a sound is made, it is proof positive that something material is in motion. He says:—"Frost will kill the body, but no one will contend that an immaterial spirit can be frozen to death." Of course not. "It will not be pretended," he says, "that an immaterial, intangible, indivisible soul can be cut to pieces with saws, knives or axes." Certainly not. He goes on to say; "An immaterial, uncompounded spirit cannot be affected by material fire, any more than it can by frost; it could dwell alike in the sun or in the polar regions." In summing up his arguments, he says:—"By all the conclusiveness, then, by which we have sustained the immateriality of the soul, does its immortality follow." If nothing has a conscious existence, then we might conceive how it could be immortal.

He further says: "The argument drawn from the immateriality of the soul, not only proves that it is immortal in itself, living forever, if left to the operations of the laws of its own nature, but it proves that God cannot destroy it." "If God himself has made the soul immaterial, he cannot destroy it by bringing material agents to act upon it. God cannot destroy that which is uncompounded, or divide that which is indivisible." We think it needs no laboured argument to prove that nothing is indestructible.

Mr. Lee introduces an argument from Drew, a very able writer on the subject. When arguing for the immateriality of the soul, and its nature, he says:

"As an immaterial substance has no surface, it is a contradiction to suppose that matter can ever be brought in contact with it. To suppose such a contact possible, is to suppose a surface in an immaterial being, which at the same time is excluded by its natural immateriality. Whatever has an exterior must have an interior, and what has both, must be extended. An immaterial substance has no surface, and that which has no surface can never be brought into contact with that which has; it therefore follows that the soul must be inaccessible to all violence from matter, and that it cannot perish through its instrumentality." Let the reader strain his imagination to get some idea of such a being as described by these writers, and when most successful, he will find he has only been trying to conceive nothing to be something. But we are told this "immortal soul" "is the real man." We are also told in a recent work, entitled "Spirit Life," by Rev. T. Spicer, D. D., that "there is no conceivable connection between matter and thought." We would like to inquire of this highly esteemed and venerable minister of Christ, what causes derangement in case of brain fever or from any other cause, if there is no "connection between matter and thought?" And why do old men, when their physical systems are nearly worn out, manifest such imbecility of mind?

Why does a blow on the head stop the thinking, and render the individual insensible?

Why does intoxicating liquor produce delirium tremens?

Why has not the idiot with his low, sloping forehead, the same strength of mind as he who has a well developed brain, if there is no "connection between matter and thought? Again, Dr. Spicer says:—"The soul exists wholly independent of the body which it inhabits, although there are certain actions it cannot perform without using the body to which it belongs. It can neither "see, hear, nor speak, without using the body." Then it follows that, when this soul gets out of the body, it is deaf and dumb and blind. Hence, if it goes to Heaven, it can hear no one's voice, sing no praises, and see no one there. Who would desire to be in such a gloomy state? We dread to be deaf much more to be deaf and dumb; but to be deaf and dumb and blind is so near being dead, that life must be but a burden, almost intolerable to be borne, by one who has Once enjoyed the full possession of his faculties.

We leave the reader to his own reflections; praying that, if we meet not in this vale of sighs and tears, we may unite in joy and praise, where sorrow, pain, sickness and death, are felt and feared no more.

www.CreationismOnline.com