

Bible Doctrine Of The Soul

www.CreationismOnline.com

Or, Man's Nature And Destiny, As Revealed.

By Charles L. Ives, M.D.,
Late Professor Of Theory And Practice Of Medicine In Yale College.

The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us, and unto our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law. Deuteronomy 29.29.

Philadelphia:

1878.

Copyright.

Charles L. Ives.

Preface.

A SPECIAL interest attaches to a discussion of the nature and destiny of man, in that it involves the question of the future of the wicked.

What that future may be, is now a question rather than a dogma of Christian belief. A hundred years ago, an eternity of "unspeakable torment," of which fire was to be the agent, was the belief of Protestantism; the devil and his angels were to be the inflictors of this misery on man, as well as his companions therein; the suffering was to commence directly at death, and before the judgment; after which latter event it was to be somehow aggravated -precisely how, it were difficult to conceive. Such seems the plain teaching of the Westminster Confession of Faith; though those who subscribe to it now generally understand that the Scripture-threatened -fire is - the remorse of a guilty conscience!

Others still, calling themselves orthodox, believe in some future unrevealed restoration of the wicked, more or less general, after a second or further periods of probation; while yet others believe that the future of the wicked is left in uncertainty; that God has not seen fit to reveal it to those who are most deeply interested therein.

It would seem the simplest solution of the question to take Holy Writ to mean just what it says: that death means death, the loss of existence, as the threatened punishment; that life means life as the promised reward. "The wages of sin is death; the gift of God is eternal life."

This is the conclusion to which the discussion we are to enter upon leads us. Back of any inquiry into the meaning of Scripture declarations of future punishment, we take up a preliminary question: whether the Christian public have not gone astray at the very outset; whether they rightly conceive of the Biblically revealed nature of the soul. Certainly any light that can be thrown upon a question of such vital interest to every human being, and on which such conflicting ideas are entertained, will be gladly received by all.

The question of man's future has of late received much and candid attention from leading minds of all denominations in Great Britain, where the standing opposition of the Dissenting to the Established Church leads to greater independency of religious thought than with us.

One of that country, who this year received a Doctorate of Divinity from the oldest university but one of our own land, has so aptly expressed himself in introducing to the English public a little work * on this subject, by a French Protestant clergyman, that we take the liberty of quoting at length. He says:

"The great doctrines of the Christian faith have such close and organic relations to each other, that it is difficult to investigate a question like that which is raised in this volume, without including in the investigation many other questions. The reorganization of a single doctrine involves the reorganization of that theological province to which it belongs. It is my impression, however, that if the theory indicated by Dr. Petavel can be sustained, as I think it can, its effect on theological thought will be friendly rather than hostile to those great truths which are commonly known as Evangelical. On one or two points the theory may require that the definition of these truths should be slightly modified, but their substance is left untouched; and if I may judge from my own experience, faith in Evangelical doctrine, instead of being enfeebled by the acceptance of this theory, is made more intense and vivid,

"The present condition of thought in this country on the future of the impenitent is very unsatisfactory, and even perilous. The traditional theory of the endlessness of sin and of suffering has lost its authority. It is probably still retained in the creed of an overwhelming majority of the English Church, and in the creed of an overwhelming majority of Evangelical Nonconformists. But its hold on the conviction and on the imagination of those who still believe it, is not sufficiently firm to compel them, if they are preachers, to preach it with adequate earnestness and energy, or to enable them, if they are private Christians, to tolerate the vigorous and relentless enunciation of it by their ministers. There are also many who, while they cannot see how the rejection of the traditional theory can be justified by the New Testament, consciously recoil from it as too terrible to be true. To preach it at all, to listen to it at all, is for these men impossible.

"The result is that, even among those who have accepted neither the theory of universal redemption, nor the theory advocated in this volume, there is a general avoidance of the appalling revelations of the New Testament concerning the wrath to come. Men may listen to Evangelical preaching for years, and never be made to feel that their refusal to acknowledge the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ is likely to be followed by any awful consequences beyond death. The appeal to fear is being silently dropped. Augustine said that it very seldom or never happens that a man comes to believe in Christ except under the influence of terror. This sweeping statement, to whatever extent it may have been verified by his own experience, is flagrantly inconsistent with all we know of the rise of Christian faith and hope in the souls of men in our own times. But the menaces of Christ mean something. The appeal to fear had a considerable place in his preaching; it cannot be safe, it cannot be right, to suppress it in ours."

* The Struggle for Eternal Life; or, The Immortality of the just, and the Gradual Extinction of the Wicked. By E. Petavel, D. D., author of "Bible in France," etc. With an Introduction, by Rev. R. W. Dale, M. A. London: Kellaway & Co., to Warwick Lane, E. C., 1875. (Originally read as an essay before the General Assembly of Pastors, at Neufchatel, Switzerland.)

Besides this great question of the destiny of the wicked, others of no little interest and importance will be found to arise. For all such the serious, thoughtful consideration of the reader is earnestly invoked. And may all personal motives and every prejudice be subordinated to the one great principle which should govern the Christian student of truth. May all be Ad Majorem Gloriam Dei!

Charles L. Ives.

September, 1877.

Contents.

Introduction

1. On Interpretation Of Scripture.

Evidently some statements of popular theology are not in accord with the Bible-
Difficulty alleged to be in the figurative language of the Bible-
Law of the literal and the figurative analyzed, illustrated, applied

2. The Popular Conception Of The Soul.

The Bible our sole and sufficient authority-
The popular conception of the soul has three main elements:

- (1) Exclusively human;
- (2) Immaterial;
- (3) Immortal -

Each essential to the conception.

3. All Animals Have Souls.

Proof that the Bible so teaches

4. Man's Soul Is Material And Mortal.

Bible account of its formation, Gen. 2.7 -

"Breath of life" defined-

The Bible soul the man himself -

The popular soul a part of man -

Even thus defined, Gen. 2.7 shows it formed "of dust" -

That passage not figurative-

Sustained by other Scripture -

A material soul of course mortal -

Real origin of dogma of essential immortality -

The Bible doctrine of man's spirit-

Of ghost

5. The Biblical Soul Has A Resurrection.

Early Christian belief-

Testimony of dying Stephen -

Of our Lord -

Christ's "soul not left in the grave" -

Paul proves the actual resurrection of our Lord -

Its importance as the pledge and type of our resurrection

6. The Bible Usage Of The Word Soul.

Soul denotes the individual man -

Recorded word of Jehovah -

Of writers and speakers of Old and New Testaments-

Soul of Christ, of David, of Hezekiah -

Soul and body destroyed in Gehenna -

"Who saves his soul, loses it" -

"Immortal soul" not in Scripture

7. How Disembodied Soul Is Derived.

Rich man and Lazarus -

Thief on the cross -

Christ's argument with Sadducees for a resurrection-

The transfiguration and its lessons -

Souls under the altar -

"To die is gain" -

Paul's "earnest desire" -

"Absent from the body" -

Spirits in prison -

Raising of Samuel -

"Encompassed by cloud of witnesses" -

The inference of immateriality groundless-

An additional argument against it, the Eng. Version conceals the truth -

Design of this-

The Bible every way condemns the popular conception of the soul, whether as a fact or as an inference

8. The Bible Doctrine Of The Nature Of The Soul.

Our English word, ORGANISM, the present exact equivalent of the Hebrew word translated soul -

Primary and secondary definitions of the word -

This understanding of the word corroborated by a popular mode of speech, which itself contradicts the popular conception-

This language of nature the language of the Bible -

Popular speech still expresses mental emotions by bodily organs, as does the Bible-

Critical difference between soul and body illustrated-

Can man destroy a soul? -
The destiny of the soul-
Immortality conditional -
The soul's new birth in a spirit-body, at the resurrection to life -
Nature of the spirit-body learned from our Lord's -
The selfsame body has not a resurrection -
Popular theology here openly Contradicts the Bible -
The resurrection to judgment

9. Immortality In The Old Testament.

Immortality revealed in Eden -
Conditioned on obedience -
The simple test given by the tree OF LIFE-
God establishes meaning of "life" by his word "lest he live forever" -
And thus is fixed meaning of death as loss of existence -
Modern theology's three invented varieties of death-
"In the day thou eats, thou shalt surely die"-
God did not curse our first parents-
When immortality forfeited, condition retained but deliverer promised-
Significance of Eve's name, Life -
Tree of Life reappears in Paradise regained -
Eve's hope partly realized as yet-
Way of Tree of Life kept for men-
The flaming sword, Jehovah's presence-
The Cherubim, type of future immortals -
The Deluge, type of future destruction, the Ark of future salvation -
Impress of early revelation upon pagan worships-
Seen also in Egyptian embalming-
Unconditional immortality, of paganism and of modern theology, a corruption -
Fallacy of argument from reason so-called-
Christ found immortality taught in the law of Moses -
Meaning of "prolong days" -
The promise to Abraham yet to be fulfilled-
This earth the believer's future place of reward

10. Immortality In The New Testament.

Immortality revealed alike in each-
Study of the word immortality as found in E. V.-
Aphiharsia (incorruptibility), Athanasia (deathlessness) -
Attained by a resurrection -
Conditioned on use of present life -
Our Lord's doctrine of the two resurrections, as given John 5.

11. No Immortality For The Wicked.

Bible proof that the declared penalty of sin is death, as Biblically defined -
Fire the agent by which the second death of the wicked will be accomplished-
Christ's explanation of the parable of the tares -
Scripture illustrations of fate of wicked evaded by modern theology-
Their variety and directness illustrated -
Erroneous inferences of popular theology exposed;
 Everlasting punishment;
 Unquenchable fire; Undying worm;
 Dwelling with devouring fire;
 Smoke of torment forever ascending
Weakness of arguments of modern theology -
Example of illogical reasoning in a prominent champion of eternal misery

12. The Intermediate State.

The first death a sleep in that all are to awake from it; so represented in the O. T.-

Anything but a sleep according to modern theology -

Which claims that its doctrine is that of the N. T.-

This claim shown to be false:

(1) by N. T., speaking of death, using O. T. language;

(2) by N. T. discrimination in the use of *sheol* and *anistemi*;

(3) by N. T. explanation of O. T. types-

The claim of modern theology also negated by correct meaning of *sheol*, upon which depends that of *hades* -

The Biblical meaning of these words fully illustrated Inquiry into Biblical meaning of *Gehenna* -

Origin of modern doctrine of hell t82-209

13. The Soul Of Angels.

Angels exist now in spirit-bodies, as will the saints of the resurrection-

Hence called "spirits"-

The teaching of our Lord and his Apostles-

Good and evil angels, in subordinated ranks, ever about us -

Demoniacal possession-

Spiritual influence is exerted upon one from without himself -

Angels employed to try our characters-

Good angels helping man -

Evil angels tempting; drawing into sin those who yield, but indirectly confirming in holiness those who resist -

When their allotted work fully accomplished, evil angels to be destroyed -

Scripture declares their fate, and shows them aware of it -

N. T. meaning of *abyssos*, rendered *bottomless pit* -

Evil angels and evil men perish together in "the fire prepared for the devil and his angels."

14. The Beneficial Results Of The Bible Doctrine.

1. It glorifies God; exalts his power, justice, wisdom, love -

2. It rescues the Bible from the virtual charge of modern theology that it is not intelligibly nor conscientiously written throughout; also from modern theology's open denial of its truth -

3. It strengthens and explains other Bible truths;

The doctrine of the atonement, in which Christ's vicarious sacrifice is obscured by popular error concerning death;

The doctrine of original sin;

The question of Christ's human nature-

4. It makes the preaching of the word more effective -

5. It refutes Universalism, or universal restoration -

6. It checks infidelity -

7. It subverts Romanism, Spiritism, and Swedenborgian -

8. It helps the work of missions -

9. It insures Christian unity -

10. It promotes our physical well-being

11. It promotes personal holiness

15. Objections From Outside The Bible.

1. This doctrine is annihilationism -

2. It is materialism -

3. It ignores the possibility of moral obligation -

4. It destroys dread of future punishment -

5. The sleep of the dead is repulsive to us-

6. It is not the doctrine of the church generally-

The point overlooked that the Spirit is promised to guide into essential truth -

The recipient of truth must possess a childlike spirit -

Truth in its details perverted all through the ages; Satan corrupting what he cannot destroy -

Protestant Reformation arrested by man-worship -

Denominationalism now represses free inquiry in ministers, in the religious press-

Yet witnesses to the Bible doctrine to be found through the centuries past, even at cost of their lives

16. Summary Of The Bible Doctrine.

Points already elucidated by Bible study -

Christian perfection at the resurrection of the just; shown by example of Christ, and by anticipations of Bible writers-

Destruction of wicked to follow the second resurrection -

Appeal of this Bible doctrine;

- to ministers;
- to the Bible revision committee;
- to commentators;
- to Christian laymen;
- to the sceptic;
- to every impenitent

Appendix.

- A. Bible References To Souls Of Lower Animals
- B. Bible References To Material Nature Of The Soul
- C. Bible References To Mortal. Nature Of The Soul
- D. Bible References To Dead Souls, Visible And Tangible
- E. Bible References To Various Parts Of The Soul
- F. Bible Proof That The Wicked Have A Resurrection

Introduction.

THAT the Bible not only does not affirm the essential immortality of the soul, as all theologians acknowledge, but that, in fact, it positively denies it, was stated by the writer to his Bible class in reply to a requested explanation of Rev. 22.20. Great surprise was of course manifested: one present was so positive that the Bible declares the soul shall never die, that though he could not name chapter and verse, he insisted the teacher's greater familiarity with the Bible must enable him to do so. He was referred to Ezek. 18.4, 20. By request of the class, this point was selected for discussion the next Sabbath, on their promise to look up Bible authority on the subject. On reassembling, it was found that no proof of the soul's inherent immortality had been discovered, though some passages were brought forward from which it had been inferred. The writer presented a number of carefully selected references; and as the subject seemed so new and interesting, he promised another Sabbath, to bring to each a written list of the same. But on reflection, as the class was so large, it seemed easier to print, and better to give the passages in full. And then some explanation of misunderstood passages seemed desirable; and finally a pamphlet of 120 pages was presented to the class, and to the public.

And now after an interval of four years, during which time the work has been extensively circulated in thin country and in England, the demand for still another edition, issued last Fall, has stimulated the writer entirely to rewrite the whole work.

As first issued it was but a sketch, presenting suggestions on the points discussed, rather than extended argument. But the topic itself and the line of thought involved are to many so new and strange, that it seemed desirable that the argument should be given more in detail. This the writer has now endeavored to do, as concisely as possible. It will be seen that the argument rests upon Scripture quotations, which have been given in full, with the reasons for any variation from the popular understanding of the same. It has been the writer's purpose in every inference from a Scripture quotation, to state in full the grounds of such inference, that each reader may for himself test its correctness. All mere human authority for any position has been sedulously avoided. The writer has endeavored to explain Scripture by Scripture, in careful study of the context, and of other passages bearing upon the point at issue. It has been his aim to bring the reader to our only source of precise knowledge on these matters, that he may read and judge for himself.

The need of such a work at this time is most evident. Christians generally are sadly unsettled in their views of many doctrines, directly dependent upon the question herein discussed. They know not what to believe. Ask any lay Christian, what is the punishment of the wicked.

And the ministry are little, if any, better off. It is within the personal knowledge of the writer, that questions perplexing the more thoughtful students of our theological seminaries, are not quieted by the attempted explanations of their professors. And the graduate goes forth to teach others in matters on which his own mind is ill at ease. How little we hear from them of those terrors of the Lord, which Paul preached, "as he reasoned of righteousness, self-control, and the judgment to come! "How many
Introduction.

of our pastors have virtually embraced Universalism, under its less objectionable name, Restorationism? Enough for a Congregational paper in New York city, to style the doctrine of unending misery "a dying belief!"

That very study of the Bible which, thanks to our lay evangelists, and through the investigating spirit of the age, is being developed among us, calls loudly for clearer light as to the true meaning of God's word. As the apparent discrepancy between many of its plain declarations and the popular misunderstanding is made more evident, there is danger lest, if not guided to the real truth, many thinking minds may be led to reject all revelation; lest there be repeated, in many an experience, the history of skeptical France, led by the discovered errors of a corrupt church to deny all religion. The writer has thankfully learned of some, who had denied that the God of the Universe is the God of the Bible, but have been led to accept that truth from studying his former work.

It is for the truth, and as the truth, that the work is now again presented to the public in its new form. If the writer is in error; if he has made any misstatement, in his positions as based upon the Divine word, in his renderings from the original, or in his conclusions, he will be most grateful to be corrected. For he trusts he prizes the truth above all else. But for four years the work has been before the public; in that time no published reply has to his knowledge appeared.

A circulation during that time of 13,000 copies (about 1,500 gratuitously), no publishing house pushing the sale, as the author published it privately, shows the great interest taken in it by the public even with their limited knowledge of the work. The position it takes strikes at the root of many important theological dogmas. And these are thus-assailed not by a sceptic, but by one who writes from a Bible standpoint, whose Christian character has not been assailed, to whose retention of office in a Congregational Church, no objection has been interposed. Certainly if such a one is spreading error he can easily be met, for the Bible is his avowed authority for every doctrine he proclaims. And for so easy and simple a duty, champions should not be wanting.

Why then has no attempt been made to refute his alleged errors, so widely spreading? Can it be that the policy of a "masterly silence" is thought the safest? Not so, indeed, when truth itself is at stake. Silence then is a confession of weakness!

A writer has well said, "When a document is not answered, the author has a certain right to assume it cannot be answered."

To remove any difficulty in the way of a reply that possibly may suggest itself, the writer, for the truth's sake, makes the following OFFER:

If a reply shall be written within two years from January 1, 1878, which by a majority of three arbitrators shall be judged to have refuted the argument from the bible of this work, the writer of this hereby pledges himself, at his own expense, to publish, and to place at the disposal of their author, five thousand copies of such reply.

The arbitrators to be chosen as usual, one by each side, the third by the two thus chosen: the reply not to exceed in length the present work. The writer may be addressed at New Haven, Conn.

A word further. The writer trusts no reader will judge he has written harshly. He has felt constrained to speak plainly, and sometimes strongly of facts as they appear to him. For the great error, which herein he exposes, and which he believes so damaging to the religious teaching of the present day, the Writer acknowledges an intense and growing abhorrence. But he cannot feel harshly, he has the utmost sympathy for those, who mistakenly but honestly still cling to the unrecognized error. He cannot forget how earnestly he once held and would press upon others, those errors of belief, into which he was himself, as they have been, so carefully educated.

And also he may be permitted to express the great satisfaction and comfort, which now he derives from the Biblical doctrine of the soul and its destiny. He finds that now to him, "the word of God is not bound; "the fetters of man's invention, of human tradition, have been broken off. "The darkness is past, and the true light now shineth." Comparing his former conceptions, with his present understanding of the truth, he is reminded of a like contrast in objects seen through an optical instrument out of focus, and the same when a proper adjustment is had. As in the latter case the previous obscurity and uncertainty of definition has vanished, and every object coming within the field of vision appears sharp, clear, and well defined.

And so the writer sends forth this little book, with the earnest prayer that the Spirit of Truth may use it to help others to a like clearer understanding of God's word; that thus may be increased the gratitude and devotion of Christian hearts, and that thus the unbelieving may be aroused to "LAY HOLD ON ETERNAL LIFE."

CHAPTER 1

The alleged difficulty in understanding Bible language is but assumed; it is fully met by the Law of the Literal and the Figurative.

THE entrance of Thy word giveth light," saith the Psalmist. The Book of the Law, found in the house of the Lord during the reign of Josiah, King of Judah, wrought a great national reformation. The high places, where the abominations of the heathen had been worshipped, were taken away, and the people renewed their covenant with the God of their fathers.

And so the Book of the Lord, found by Luther in his monastery at Erfurt, set in motion the great Protestant Reformation of the 16TH century. Many high places, where incense had been burned to the so-called Queen of heaven, were abolished, and the glad tidings of justification by faith in the Crucified One were again proclaimed as it is unto us this day.

And so, in individual experience, the word of God discovered and brought into the heart, effects a wondrous reform in the inner and outer life.

At present, Civilization and the Bible go hand in hand, and we have lately beheld a nation of the far East, with arts and sciences acquired from more favored Western nations, adopting, also their Bible taught observance of one rest-day in seven.

A volume, so elevating to individual and national life, we should expect would not only be highly prized, but so patiently and thoroughly studied, that any question as to the nature of the truth it unfolds, would be definitely settled. Yet this is very far from being the case. A lamentable and surprising ignorance of much of Holy writ prevails even among those, who profess to take it as the rule of their lives. Indeed this may truthfully be said of very many, whose professed life work it is to expound its truth. In physical science its professors are ever alert to make new discoveries. But in theology, though the variance of differing beliefs might stimulate to utmost research, its teachers seem to argue that their own sect is the repository of all truth, and so they have but to hand down to others, what they have received by tradition from their elders. Indeed, it would seem that the feeling is springing up among them, that somehow we have got beyond the Bible, that we are in advance of what the Holy volume is able to teach us.

These are no unmeaning words. In a course of lectures to the students of Yale Theological Seminary, by one of the most brilliant of American preachers, a man of unquestioned intellectual ability, the statement was boldly made: "We, at the present day, know more of spiritual things than did the Apostles." (!) In the succeeding issue of the New Englander, for April, 1872, the statement was quoted and endorsed by one of the theological professors of the Seminary.

Can it be? In our day, after the religious eclipse of the Dark Ages, who claims to know more of spiritual things than those specially inspired to build upon the foundation Christ Jesus, a superstructure of Christian doctrine for all time? Who has advanced beyond Peter and John, or beyond Paul, who says he received the glad tidings not from man, but by special revelation from the Lord? (Gal. 1.12.) In one respect we may have a doubtful advantage over Paul. He was expressly informed by the Spirit, 1 Tim. 4.1, 2 Thess. 2, of "perilous times in the latter days," when "some should depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils." Yet perhaps he did not fully anticipate how prevalent and persistent was to be that falling away from the faith, which history actually records of the Christian church!

What does all this mean? Why is it that religious teachers, secretly or openly, are found undervaluing the writings of the Apostles of our Lord? It is not difficult to give the reason. We find the ancient and the modern teachers are not in accord. They are at variance on just the point we propose to discuss, the nature of the soul. Our modern teachers hold that the soul is essentially immortal. Immortality, they tell us, is already the inalienable possession of every human being. But on the other hand Paul tells us of those, "who, by patient continuance in well doing, SEEK FOR immortality; "Rom. 2.7. Then he does not think they have it already.

A very important, a radical, difference is this. For, in this question of the nature of the soul is bound up the whole question of man's future: what the present state of the dead, whether their sleep be a fiction or a reality; what the real value of the resurrection; what the time and place of reward of the righteous; what the punishment of the wicked; aye, even the question whether God triumphs or fails, in his endeavor to secure a holy universe. The power, the justice, the wisdom, the love of our Heavenly Father are all brought in question. He who has learned to love and trust his Maker may say it all matters little to him, he will trust still and wait. But to the doubter, or the merely indifferent, it matters much whether or not error be mixed with the truth presented for his acceptance.

How do our religious teachers meet this serious difficulty, this so apparent discrepancy between their teaching and that of the Bible? They may not openly take issue with Paul and others, who thus differ from them. The professed believer cannot, as the sceptic, reject obnoxious passages as spurious, but the same end may be virtually attained. The right is assumed of interpreting the language of the Bible writers for them; not to decide what they say, that is plain enough, but what they mean, what they ought to have said. What our Lord actually said, John 3.16, is-very plain: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." He presents it as a question of life or death. But if we thus take the words in their natural sense, it were to teach that some actually perish, not that all live forever. So it is interpreted for us. We are told: to perish does not mean exactly to perish, it means on the contrary, to live forever-in misery; while everlasting life does not mean exactly that, for all have that, but rather everlasting happiness! Well might a novice in Bible study ask: If the Lord meant just that, why did not he say just that?

But how is this elastic principle of interpretation to be sustained, by which a writer is made to say just what we want him to? The plan is a very simple and effective one. Declare that the passage is figurative, that it is not to be taken in its natural sense. Then, we are at liberty to give it the meaning we judge most desirable.

But still the thoughtful Christian will inquire: what right have our religious teachers to declare the passage figurative - to take the words in a sense so far from the apparent and natural meaning? Is the Bible so ambiguously written that it needs human help to make its sentences intelligible? Is there no rule about this, no law of the literal and the figurative, by which for ourselves we may judge whether language be literal or figurative, and so may be able to exercise the Protestant's right of private judgment? Certainly, there is. We find for speaker and hearer, for writer and reader, one simple, invariable rule, governing the verbal expression of ideas. It is that the literal, or natural, meaning of every word holds good till that is proved impossible, then, but not till then, does a figurative meaning come into consideration.

Let us clearly understand so important a point. When we analyze the working of our mind, in determining the meaning of any sentence or word, we observe that necessarily, though perhaps unconsciously, we consider first the literal meaning; if sufficient cause is found to reject it, we then look about for a figurative meaning, i.e. we always pass through the literal to the figurative. E. g. Isa. 55.12: "All the trees of the field shall clap, their hands:" we mentally first inquire, Is this literal? Impossible, trees literally have no hands to clap; therefore we are justified in turning to the figurative. So Isa. 44.20: "Is there not a lie in my right hand?" That also is figurative, because a lie cannot be thus holden. And so our equivalent English phrase, "holding on to a lie," is figurative, as strictly are all expressions transferred from physical to mental action; e. g. the mind reflects. But in all such cases no possible difficulty arises, for the figurative intent is evident beyond all question. If not, the writer or speaker must add some qualifying clause, to show the natural, or literal, meaning is not intended. To illustrate; look at some examples of the figurative use of the word "dead," in the Bible.

Eph. 2.1: "And you hath he quickened [made alive], who were dead" - had the statement ended there, "dead" must have been taken literally, especially in connection with "made alive." But the passage itself declares for the figurative, not literal, meaning of "dead" by the added clause, dead "in trespasses and sins."

Tim. 5.6: "She is dead, while she lives." Had the statement "she is dead," stood alone, it could have but one, the literal, meaning. But here the qualifying clause, "while she lives," shows that the one dead must be so in some figurative sense, to be determined by the context. Observe the verb lives, qualifying the other, is itself used absolutely, and therefore must be literal.

Luke 9.60: "Let the dead bury their dead." Here the same rule applies. The physical act of burying, predicated of "the dead," impossible to the literally dead, necessitates a figurative intent to the word. But when next the word dead is used, since it is without any qualification, the literal meaning again takes precedence, and must be the one adopted.

Rev. 19.8 is an instructive illustration of a Scripture writer recognizing this rule. In that passage, "that she should be arrayed in fine linen," fine linen is intended to be taken figuratively, but lest, even in that symbolic book, the reader should take it literally, the writer feels it necessary to declare his figurative intent; "for fine linen," he says, "is the righteousness of saints."

We have thus analyzed and illustrated what we now present as

The Law Of The Literal And The Figurative:

The Literal meaning takes precedence in all cases; so that the possibility of its being intended must be exhausted before a Figurative meaning can be considered.

A speaker or writer then is debarred from using language figuratively, till either by the well known circumstances of the case, or if need be, by his statement to that effect, the possibility of his language being literal has been exhausted beyond question.

Let us apply this rule to the standing controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants, on the question of the real presence in the bread of the Lord's supper. The question turns on this: Did our Lord speak literally or figuratively, when he said, "This is my body"? His words certainly are literal, unless the possibility of their being so is plainly exhausted. To decide this we ask the simpler question first: Did he say he was speaking figuratively? He did not. Next, we ask: Do the well known circumstances of the case exhaust the possibility of the literal meaning? We reply, They do.

Go back to the occasion when the words in dispute were uttered to the disciples, and to us. The Apostle thus describes the scene: "For I received of the Lord, That which I also, delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks he brake it and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you." Could one of the disciples around that board, at the moment the Lord uttered those words, have imagined the bread was actually his body? Why, they had ocular demonstration that it was not. The broken bread was upon the table, or in their hands; the real body of their Lord itself was

beside the table, before their eyes and unharmed as yet. It needed no verbal explanation that his language was not literal; that they could see for themselves. There had been need of further explanation, if with such proof to the contrary, he had meant literally what he said. Thus strong the case, the language must be figurative. And the figurative meaning, accustomed as they were to types, it was not hard to find: This is - stands for - my body. It presented thus a symbol; to them at the time, of what was to take place; to us now, of what has taken place; it symbolizes His body bruised and pierced for us.

So the strict application of this Law of the Literal and the Figurative clears up verbal difficulties in all such cases.

It were impossible too emphatically to state the fundamental character of this organic law of human speech. It controls every case of speaking or writing. Without it, intelligent intercourse between man and man cannot exist. If impossible to tell with absolute certainty whether one speaks or writes literally or figuratively, we cannot know, we cannot agree upon, what he does mean. Others cannot understand us; nor we them. So universally is the essential character of this law recognized, that the speaker or writer disregarding it, is excused only on the plea of inability to comprehend the first element of clear expression.

And to the level of this mental imbecility, do we in our imagining degrade the writers of the Bible, whenever they speak of the nature and destiny of the soul. Even the Omniscient One, so are we taught, in giving us the revelation of His will (as in Jn. 3.16), has so disregarded this simple, necessary law of human language, that he cannot be understood as he means, by those he addresses, unless some one explains it to them for Him! We wonder not that the Bible, if thought to be thus defectively written, is so lightly esteemed, and so little pleasure found in reading it. Nor can we wonder at the slur cast upon the Bible, that any one may prove what he will from it, if, in the case of this book alone, the reader is at liberty to ignore this law which decides the verbal meaning of every passage.

With this understanding of the Law of the literal and the figurative, we restate the case as follows: Between the Bible statements and those of popular theology in regard to the soul, there is a most apparent discrepancy. That there should be any real difference cannot be admitted, for the popular belief professes to be the same as that of the Bible. The only alternative then is that this discrepancy is but apparent, that it is due to the ambiguity of Bible language, which is figurative, without so being made apparent, and thus is liable to be misunderstood. But is not this a very serious charge to bring against the speakers and writers of the Bible? If actually figurative, the writer intended his language should be so understood, but it is charged that in this he has failed. There was no need of failure; it can only be because he violates that indispensable law of human speech. In one instance quoted, Paul speaks of some "who seek for immortality;" had he exhausted the possibility of his language being literal? Or had it been done in the other instance, Jn. 3.16, where we learn from outside explanation, that perish does not mean to perish, to be destroyed, but figuratively, it is to live forever in misery; and everlasting life means not life but happiness? It were quite as easy, or easier, to have said just what was meant, what possible excuse for such blundering utterances? And note, the charge of such inexcusable stupidity does not lie against merely one, but against every writer or speaker of the Bible, whenever, through a period of fifteen hundred years, they touch upon the subject of the soul! And the more inexcusable is it, that only in this do they violate that law of verbal expression, on all other topics they are most careful to observe it.

Here then is the case stated; what judgment now are we to render? Must not every one decide that this claim of figurative language, involving conclusions such as these, needs to bring forward the strongest possible proof of its correctness? The bare fact of its general acceptance by mankind does not shift the burden of proof from its shoulders. Indeed, when one understands the full bearings of the claim, the very resort to it is presumptive evidence, that not the Bible writers, but those who advance such a claim, are at fault; the very fact of such claim inclining one to believe that the apparent difference between them and the Bible is after all a real one.

But possibly some may have doubts as to this alleged difference between the Biblical and the popular doctrine of the soul, seeing but two proofs of it have been brought forward; but two Bible witnesses, our Lord and his chief Apostle, have so far given their testimony.

Let us then investigate further.

CHAPTER 2

The Question at Issue - Where Answered.

WHAT is the soul of man? Whence is an authoritative reply to this question to be obtained? He, who made the soul, can give the answer.

Have we a statement of the truth from Him? We claim that we have - in the Holy Bible. We believe that holy men of old were moved by God's Spirit to record, what things He intended should be "written for our learning" Rom. 15.4. Through fifteen centuries, many different minds were engaged in compiling this volume, yet if all was under the special supervision of the All-wise, its different parts, the more they are studied and the better understood, the more will they be found in full harmony with each other. Such is the case;

though here and there a verbal inaccuracy, through the imperfection of human transcribers, has crept into the text. And the more marked is such agreement of the different books of the Bible, in that it is to be discovered in the original language, even where the prevalent ideas of any age, or the defects of later versions, have somewhat obscured it. Of no other book could this be said. No work of mere human composition, embracing so many topics as this, and written in parts through a thousand years, would be found in accord with our present advance in knowledge, or even with itself. It is in this agreement of these different parts, and in the evident fulfilment, in the past and in the present, of its predictions, that we find abundant proof of its Divine authorship.

The Bible, as a revelation of the Creator's will, was written for man, and about man. It treats of his nature, his relation to his Maker, his hope for the future. Such its subject, and such its Author, it will speak with authority on the question, what is the soul of man.

The main question then is this:

What Does The Bible Teach Of The Soul?

In discussing this question it naturally divides itself into two: Is the popular conception of the soul the same as that of the Bible? Secondly, If not; what is the Bible doctrine? We then first inquire:

Is the popular conception of the Soul that of the Bible?

Satisfactorily to answer this it is necessary first to define the popular conception of the soul. This it is not easy to do; possibly the popular idea is not a very definite one. We will here state, as best we can, what is generally agreed upon.

According to natural characteristics, as discerned by our senses, Man is classified by Science among animals. The correctness of this no one questions. He belongs to the sub-kingdom of Vertebrates, to the class of Mammals, which embraces both man and animals. But the popular conception seems to place him not in the animal kingdom, at its head, but in a grand division by himself. It represents him as composed of a body, and of a something essential to his existence, so different from anything that pertains to animals, that virtually he stands entirely alone. In fact, in the popular conception, he is contrasted, rather than classified, with animals. This component part of man's constitution, which the animal has not, is the popular soul. It is said to be that which thinks and acts, for we are told that no body, no mere combination of matter however highly organized, can possess intelligence, the faculty of reasoning. It would also seem to be that which has life in itself. We are told, when the soul goes from the body, death ensues. A query will suggest itself: what is that which acts and even reasons in the lower animals? in what is the life of such found? This then is one characteristic of the popular soul; it belongs to man, not to the lower animals.

Secondly, we are told this soul is immaterial. It is not matter, even in any of its marvelously subtle forms. But matter is all that our senses can take cognizance of. With the material body we are sufficiently familiar. But no one ever has, or can, touch an immaterial soul. Nor has such ever been seen. That which is immaterial is utterly beyond the reach of our senses. How then do we know such an immaterial part exists at all? We cannot appeal to universal belief. All the world once thought our round globe a flat plain, but all the world was wrong. Nor does the power of reason or the faculty of memory prove the necessity of an immaterial soul, since both premeditation and memory are displayed by animals, the dog, horse, elephant, etc., who have no immaterial soul. Evidently all knowledge of this immaterial soul must come from that which is beyond our own senses. We can have no actual knowledge of such, except as a revelation from a Higher Intelligence. If then the Bible, the only written revelation which we possess, does not state the existence of such a soul, the fact of its existence stands absolutely without proof.

We observe, by the way, another difficulty. Reason, memory, consciousness, which are said to belong to the immaterial soul, are, as far as we can see, strangely like functions of man's brain. We find they are impaired or obliterated in exact proportion to the impairment of that organ. The brain is said to be an instrument by which the immaterial soul operates; and yet without this instrument, it appears the soul is unable to act at all. Just as far as the instrument is injured, in just so far is the soul restricted in its peculiar province. We may inquire, how would it be were the necessary instrument, instead of partially, to be totally, destroyed?

We accept then, a second characteristic of the popular soul, that it is immaterial.

Thirdly, it is stated that the soul is wholly indestructible by any possible means. Indeed in popular conception it is no soul at all, if not an "immortal soul" That phrase seems to carry with it the idea of an inherent immortality, so inhering in the soul, that, once created by the Almighty, it is regarded as practically independent of its Creator. It would seem to live on by some inherent force of its own. The popular conception of the soul seems to ignore the fact that "it is in Him [in God's power], we live and move, and have our being;" that this power is each moment in constant exercise to sustain us in being, or as the Psalmist expresses it, "to hold our soul in life." We recognize then a third characteristic of the popular soul, it is immortal. This, as a problem of the future beyond our reason and necessarily entirely dependent on the Creator, can be actually known only by a revelation of His will.

We have then before us three essential elements of the popular conception of the soul:

1. It is an exclusive possession of man; the lower animals have not souls.
2. It is an immaterial substance. (If the word substance may be so used, as, the substance of a thought.)
3. It is immortal.

Of these three propositions, the last is the one of paramount importance in its consequences. But all are essential, in that not one can stand without the other two. For, first, if the soul be not immortal, if the soul dies when the body dies, then the other two propositions are not worth considering. Secondly, if the soul be not immaterial it evidently is not immortal, for death leaves nothing material in existence, all the material goes to decay. Thirdly, if such an immaterial, immortal soul be not the exclusive possession of man, then all animals are immortal. So then not one of these propositions can stand without the others. In this respect the popular conception of the soul, resting upon these three propositions, may be likened to a tripod with its three legs. If but one of these be taken away, if but one of these three propositions be shown to be false, the tripod comes to the ground.

The truth or the error of these propositions from the nature of the case is beyond man's natural ken; it can be learned only from revelation. To our only record of revelation, the Bible, we are then to go, as the tribunal of final appeal, and of full jurisdiction. We come before it, not to interpret its decisions to suit ourselves, or to receive them interpreted for us by others. But with, the humble, teachable spirit of little children, in our confessed ignorance of the future, we open the book which Infinite wisdom has put into our hands. Reverently we study its pages, saying with the Psalmist: "I will hear what God the Lord will speak."

CHAPTER 3

The Bible Declares that ALL Animals have Souls.

TO establish this fact, which is brought out only twice in the text of our English version, we need but go to the language in which the Bible was originally written.*

In the account of the Creation, before man himself was created, we read:

Gen. 1.20: "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving [Hebrew in margin, creeping] thing that hath a living soul;" (Hebrew, nephesh, soul, chayah, living, English Version, ' life. ') It will be seen that our English translators in their marginal reading (which readings are of equal authority with -the text, being generally more accurate), have here translated exactly the two Hebrew words, "living soul."

Gen. 1.21: "And God created great whales and every living soul [Hebrew nephesh chayah, Eng. Version, 'living creature'] that moves, which the waters brought forth."

Gen. 1.24: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living soul [Hebrew nephesh chayah, E. V. 'living creature'] after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth."

Gen. 1.30: "And God said, "To every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creep-eth upon the earth, wherein there is a living soul;" (Hebrew nephesh chayah, E. V. has in text, 'life,' in marginal reading, 'a living soul.')

It may be well to mention that the Old Testament was written in Hebrew; the New, with the possible exception of Matthew, originally in the Greek language. The Septuagint version, or translation of the Old Testament into Greek, dating over 250 years before Christ, is valuable as showing what was understood to be the meaning of the Hebrew at that early day. The correctness of renderings, which may hereinafter be given from the original, and which differ from those of our English version, may be verified by any Hebrew or Greek scholar.

Gen. 2.19 "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living soul [Hebrew nephesh chayah, E. V. creature], that was the name thereof."

Numb. 31.28: The Lord said, "Levy a tribute unto the Lord, one soul of five hundred, both of the persons, and of the beeves, and of the asses, and of the sheep." Here our English version translates nephesh, as the soul, of oxen, asses and sheep, as well as of men.

Rev. 16.3: "Every living soul [Greek psyche] died in the sea." Here our translators render the word "psyche," referring to marine animals, by our word, soul. The Greek psych? corresponds to the Hebrew nephesh, and is the only word in the N. T. ever rendered soul.

For further details under this head, see Appendix A.

The foregoing quotations from the Bible totally demolish one essential element of the popular conception of the soul, viz., that it is an exclusive possession of man. And if one essential element, if one leg of that tripod of popular belief, be knocked away, the whole structure falls with it. If the soul is something which Holy Scripture assigns equally to man, and to the lower animals, no one will have the hardihood to claim that it is immortal.

We might here rest our case, but we will continue our Bible study, and see what becomes of the other two supports of the tripod.

CHAPTER 4

The Bible Declares that Man has, or is, a Soul, so Constituted as to be Liable to Death.

Gen. 2.7: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul: "Hebrew nephesh chayah, precisely the same Hebrew words before used in describing the creation of the lower animals.

This account of man's original formation, as coming from God's word, must be reliable. It is just what we need. It is what Revelation alone could supply. Let us then give it our earnest consideration. It is a simple statement of facts. It brings to our notice three objects: the Lord God as the Creator; the material used is dust of the ground; the object formed is man. Into the man after he has been formed, we are told, the breath of life is infused, and he then becomes a living soul.

What is this breath of life? It has been claimed that it denotes an ever-living soul. But then the subsequent statement would have been: and man became possessed of a living soul, not "and man became [i.e. was after that] a living soul." Besides, to put in the soul after the man has been fully formed, were, according to modern theology itself, a physical impossibility. That claims that man is composed of body and soul; he could not then have been first formed of body alone: no compound can be formed of one of its ingredients. But the use Moses subsequently makes of the term breath of life, settles its meaning. He tells us, Gen. 7.21, 22: "All flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beasts, and of every creeping thing, and every man, all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, died." The "breath of life" was the common possession then of all these animals; when they lost it, they died. Evidently, to state that any being has the breath of life, is simply to say that it lives, or is alive.

In this inspired record then of man's creation, we find no statement that the Lord formed a material body, joined to it an immaterial soul, and then called the now compound being, man. Such is the teaching of modern theology, not that of the passage before us. Its statement is explicit that man was man ere life entered the lifeless form. He was first made a man; after which, receiving from his Creator this breath of life, he began to live, he began to be (became) a living soul, a live soul: the very phrase the pen of inspiration had before applied to lower animals.

According to this, it would seem that the man himself as such is a soul; that a man alive, or living, is a soul alive. But this were to make the entire man a soul, which is contrary to our popular theology, which represents the soul as a part of man. That there may be no mistake here about our understanding of the popular belief, we quote from Webster's Unabridged. It defines, "Soul: the spiritual, rational and immortal part of man; that part of man which enables him to think," etc. From Buck's Theological Dictionary the following definitions are taken: "Man: a being consisting of a rational soul and an organic body." . . . "The constituent and essential parts of man, created by God, are two; body and soul."

Yielding now, for the moment, the position that the individual man is the soul, let us follow out this definition of modern theology: "the soul is an essential part of man." Read again Gen. 2.7 "The Lord God formed MAN [not one part only of man, but man, this compound being, body and soul], of the dust of the ground." Does the reader perceive the full import of this statement? It decides the case against modern theology on its own stating of the case. Put the argument in the simplest form:

Man was formed of the dust of the ground:

But man is soul and body:

Therefore, soul and body were formed of the dust of the ground.

The conclusion is inevitable.

And a soul formed of the dust of the ground is not immaterial. Thus gives way another essential component of the popular idea of a soul. A second leg of that tripod comes down, and we have proved it were impossible for the remaining one to stand alone. For, immortality, as a necessary element of a soul, if not restricted to man, claims too much; and if it be not in something immaterial and so beyond reach of our senses, is refuted by our daily observation.

But how does modern theology meet this statement of Gen. 2.7, which if allowed to stand as it is, so completely overthrows its dogma, of an immaterial soul? It has but the one resource. for all these difficulties, figurative language! It can only say, the word man (what was formed of the dust of the ground) in this passage does not mean man, it is used figuratively for the body alone. Let the reader judge if this is aught but the baldest assumption. Read the passage with the context, remembering this is a simple, historical narrative. The word man first occurs Gen. 1.26, 27: "And God said, Let us make man in our image. . . . So God created man in his image, male and female created he them." The word man is literal here, no doubt. Next use of the word is chap. 2.5: "there was not a man to till the ground: "this also is literal, the mere body could not till. Will the meaning of the word, thus established in its literal signification by this usage, be changed in the immediate connection, the next verse but one, to a figurative use, to mean only a part of the individual, and especially when a somewhat minute account of the individual's formation is being given? Such trifling with the sacred record strikes at the root of all reverence for the Bible. How are we to know what any passage means, that it means anything at all, if such license is to be taken with the word of God? In verse 19 we find similar language: "And out of the ground the Lord God formed (same Hebrew as verse 7) every beast;" as well claim the word, beast, is figurative, and means part of the beast!

If further testimony be necessary to sustain the literal intent of Gen. 2.7, it is furnished in God's word.

Gen. 3.19, the Lord God addresses Adam, the man, by modern theology's own definition, a compound of body and soul: "And unto Adam he said, In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it was thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." This solemn sentence of death is the last place for figurative, or anyway ambiguous, language. Indeed, could words be found less unequivocally to set forth the man's material nature?

Ps. 103.14, David says, perhaps with these words of the Creator in mind: "He knows our frame, he remembers that we are dust."

Ps. 30.9: "When I go down to the pit [or grave]; shall the dust praise thee?"

Ps. 146.4, of man we read: "His breath goes forth, he returned to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish."

Nor are we confined to the Old Testament, for the Old and New are in harmony on this, as on all points. The Apostle Paul most explicitly declares the truth of the material origin of the soul; and all the more to our purpose, in that it comes in incidentally in the course of an argument. In 1 Cor. 15 we find him arguing for the resurrection with the doubters of his day. He first proves the fact from Christ's resurrection, then he shows its necessity to the Christian's hopes, then he meets the objection that our present body passes away, by showing, that though in bodily form, it is with another and different body that we are to live again. Ver. 39-42, he says, "all flesh is not the same flesh," as "star differs from star; so also is the resurrection of the dead;" more exactly, the Greek without the article, of dead ones. Ver. 44: "There is sown a natural body [psychikon soma]; there is raised a spiritual body [pneumatikon soma]."

Note here a very suggestive fact. The Greek word translated natural, is made up of psyche, soul, and ikon, our adjective suffix, -ical psych-ikon = psych-ical, i.e., soul-ical. But in English a noun used as a prefix, becomes an adjective, psychikon soma is then, a soul-body. While pneumatikon (pneuma, spirit) soma, is in English, spirit-body.

"There is a soul-body, and there is a spirit-body. And so it is written, the first man, Adam, was made [Greek egeneto, became] a living soul." This soul-body is that spoken of (ver. 42, 43) as sown in corruptibility, in dishonor, in weakness: the spiritual is to be raised incorruptible, glorified, powerful. "Howbeit that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is soulical; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy." That is to say, the first man just declared a living or live soul, is of earth, earthy. Thus does Paul confirm the literal meaning of Gen. 2.7, that soul and body are material. And so Holy Writ, throughout, overthrows modern theology's sole reliance of a figurative intent in Gen. 2.7. That passage must be allowed to stand, as meaning just what it says.

That a material soul should be liable to death follows of course, and in fact. THE MAN DIES; that is, he, who became, and for years past has been a living soul, at length ceases to live, he parts with his life. This living soul dies, as is the language of Rev. 16.3: "Every living soul died in the sea," and is according to the simple word of Ezek. 18.20 "The soul that sins, it shall die." To meet this, modern theology, we here find, actually denying that the man has died! It teaches that body and soul, the two essential parts of man, are separated; this it calls dying. But the theoretical soul, by an incomprehensible stretch of language and fact (yet so are we taught), at that event virtually becomes the man (one part becomes a whole); it cannot die, it still lives on. So death does not pass upon the man, but upon the body. For the man himself, death is simply a change in his mode of existence, or rather place of abode. That we do not misrepresent, is shown by this favorite illustration of modern theology, "Death is but the passing from one room to another."

We call this theology modern, because it is at a comparatively recent period that it has prevailed among believers. But in reality, its peculiar doctrine, the dogma of inherent immortality dates back to the garden of Eden, and wrought fearful evil with those who then accepted it. We read, Gen. 3.4: "The Serpent said unto the woman, YE SHALL NOT SURELY DIE! "A better theological authority tells us, Rom. 5.12: "And SO DEATH PASSED UPON ALL MEN, for that all have sinned." If all living human souls have sinned, all such die. If not, if death be not loss of life, but change of life to another state or place, why did the Lord say, Gen. 3.22: "And now, lest the man put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever?" And we read the Lord took measures to prevent this living forever; - to prevent just what modern theology claims to be the fact with Adam and all his descendants. Were it not more reasonable to conclude that the measures adopted were effectual?

Before we leave this topic, let us briefly inquire as to that breath of life, which we learned (Gen. 7.22) is a common attribute of all living beings. It is an equivalent expression for the spirit. Spirit is the vital principle of all living organisms; it is that mysterious' element, life. In the original languages it was denoted by the word primarily meaning breath, as that is the outward sign or manifestation of the presence of the spirit, or life. It comes from the Great Source of life, vivifying all created beings alike, and every while in them it is Biblically spoken of as still belonging to God.

Job 34.14, 15: "If the Almighty gather unto himself his spirit [Hebrew ruach] and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust."

Ps. 104.29, 30: After the mention of various land and marine animals and man himself, the Psalmist says, "Thou takes away their breath [Hebrew ruach], they die, and return to their dust. Thou sends forth thy spirit [Hebrew ruach], they are created."

Eccl. 8.8: "No man, hath power over the spirit, to retain the spirit."

Eccl. 12.7: "Then shall the spirit return unto God, who gave it." The principle of life, "the breath of life" as Moses calls it, is what returns to its Giver; evidently not a soul, a conscious being. Such could return to God, only as having previously existed with him.

It is in Hebrew, ruach, in Greek, pneuma: the Latin is spiritus (from spire, I breathe), whence our English word, spirit.

The popular misinterpretation of this passage, considering the explicitness of the context, is indeed something marvelous. It is generally understood to read, Then shall the soul return, etc. And so, Webster's Dictionary quotes the verse as an example to sustain its popular, but Biblically incorrect; definition, that spirit is identical with soul. According to modern theology's claim that man lives on after death, it is the soul that lives, which then of course is the man. Now in the very sentence preceding (but one period between, in E. V.), the writer of Ecclesiastes has told us what he thinks becomes of man at death. He thus states the fact of death: "Man goes to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets." Does anyone question what he means by man's long home? when this very writer (Eccl. 9.10) had spoken of "the grave whither thou goes." Repeating and expanding (not contradicting in his next breath), this thought of man's going to his long home, he adds: "Then shall the dust [i.e. man formed of the dust of the ground, Gen. 2.7] return to the earth as it was; and the spirit [the life principle] shall return to God who gave it."

It is precisely the sentiment already quoted from Job, which we quote again: "If the Almighty gather unto himself his spirit, and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." The writer of Ecclesiastes had already written, Eccl. 3.19, 20 "As the one [the man] dies, so dies the other [the beast]; yea they have all one breath [or spirit; Hebrew ruach]. All go unto one place: all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." A careful perusal of this book will satisfy the thoughtful reader, that this attempt to gather any support from it, for the doctrine that man continues to live while dead, can be explained only from a discreditable ignorance, or a willful ignoring, of the whole tenor of the book.

A peculiar expression of our English version needs explaining; - the ghost, what is that? Simply an old Saxon word for the breath, and so for the spirit. To give up the ghost, is simply to expire, i.e. to breathe out the last breath, as is denoted by the Latin composition of our English word expire; viz. ek, from, spiro, I breathe. Such is the composition of the two Greek verbs, so rendered in N. T. The Greek pneuma, spirit, is rendered ghost, in Matt. 27 so, and Jn. 19.30, and so rendered in the phrase, Holy Ghost. The Hebrew word rendered in our version by "give up the ghost," is used in O. T. of lower animals, though the E. V. never so renders it in that case. For example, in passages already quoted, Job 34.15: "All flesh shall perish," Hebrew expire, breathe out; Gen. 7.21: "All flesh died," Hebrew expired; Ps. 104.29, of various animals, "they die," Hebrew expire, or as translated of man alone, they give up the ghost. So according to the Bible writers, all these animals have a ghost, a spirit, or, the sign of its presence, a breath, to yield up, to breathe out. A suggestive commentary on the popular belief in ghosts!

CHAPTER 5

Man's Soul is Like that of Lower Animals in its Liability to Death, but Differs from theirs in the Fact of a Resurrection.

DEATH comes the same to man and to beast. At that event, as far as the actual possession of life, of present existence, is concerned, they stand on a level. Eccl. 3.19, 20: "A man hath no preeminence above a beast; as one dies, so dies the other. All are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." Psalm 49.20: "Man that is in honor, and understands not, is like the beasts that perish." 2 Pet. 2.12: "These [the incorrigibly wicked] as natural brute beasts, shall utterly perish."

Yet in the possibilities of a future life, there is a radical difference between man and beast. There is a living again for the former, not for the latter.

But how is one actually dead, who has lost his life, that is, has passed out of existence, how is such to live again? Evidently, only by Almighty power. And this, the word of God tells us, will be by a Resurrection at an appointed time in the future. The Greek *anastasis*, resurrection, is compounded of two words, *ana*, up, and *istimi*, to stand or cause to stand, a standing up from the sleep, or recumbency, of death to the activities of life. It means then, simply an actual Restoration to Life. At this resurrection, when the good and the wicked death have life restored to them, they are to be rewarded every one as his work shall be. Jesus said, Jn. 5.28, 29: "Marvel not at this, for an hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves [mark, where One who certainly knew, locates the dead who are yet to hear His voice, they] shall hear the voice of the Son of man and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of Life, those that have done evil unto the resurrection of Judgment; "(so we should render the Greek *krisis*.)

The early Christians well understood this truth. Stephen dying prayed, Acts 7.59: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." He prayed the Lord to take his life into His safe keeping till the resurrection, believing as did Paul, 2 Tim. 1.12: "I know in whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day." He entrusts to his Lord, the principle of life he had received; his spirit, not his soul, which were his very self. Of himself another disposition must be made: for, of him we read, "And when he had said this, he fell asleep," - asleep till that promised resurrection. "And devout men carried Stephen [asleep in death] to his, burial."

So on the cross the Lord Jesus himself had prayed, "Father, into thy hands I commend [entrust] my spirit [Greek *pneuma*]. And having said thus, he gave up the ghost;" Greek *ex-epneusen*, he out-breathed, expired. (This from Luke; Matthew writes, "*aphieka to pneuma*," E. V. "he yielded up the ghost," or spirit; comparing the Greek of these writers and the English Version, yielding up the ghost is out-breathing the last breath.) His spirit, the breath of life, the vital principle, our Lord prayerfully entrusted to his Father. This spirit, all may see, was not himself, not his soul (though popular theology makes the two synonymous); if so, then his prayer was not answered, his spirit did not return to God the giver; since at his Resurrection he told Mary Magdalene that he had not ascended to his Father. Nay, we are definitely told the very place where he himself had been. As was Stephen, so he was buried. The angels say to us as to the women at his sepulcher, "Come, see the place where they laid him;" the same "him," the word is, they "should see in Galilee;" Matt. 28.6, 7. So Paul says, "He that descended [into an earthly grave] is the same also that ascended far above all things;" Eph. 4.10.

But we learn that last prayer of our Lord's mortal life was heard by his Father. At the "appointed time" (Job 14.14), for him the third day, this entrusted life, the spirit that returned to God its giver, was given back; the Crucified was restored to life. From the grave, "where they laid him," his soul was raised to an immortal life. So Peter tells us, Acts 2.31, applying the prophecy of the prophet-king, who "spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hades [the grave; see hades Biblically explained, Chapter 12] neither did his flesh see corruption." Note that "to be left in the grave," is the recognized parallelism of "seeing corruption."

The importance of this great fact, that Christ's soul was not left in the grave, but had a resurrection, or restoration to life, is shown by the frequent statement of the fact in the preaching and the epistles of the Apostles. Paul preached, Acts 13.30: "God raised him from the dead; "Greek *Ek nekron*, no article, from dead ones. He writes, Eph. 1.20: "The Father of glory raised him from dead ones." Peter preached, Acts 2.32: "This Jesus bath God raised up." He writes, 1 Pet. 1.21: "God raised him from dead ones and gave him glory." We read Heb. 13.20: "God, who brought up from dead ones our Lord Jesus Christ." At Athens, Paul preached, "Jesus and the Resurrection," and he states to those proud philosophers, as an elementary element of "this new doctrine," that "God bath raised him [Jesus] from dead ones."

Evidently the early disciples believed that Christ actually died, and it was to them a truth of the utmost importance, that God had brought him again to life from this state of death. And why so important? Because if not brought to life again, if he is still dead, we have no Savior. As Paul expresses it, "If dead ones are not raised, then Christ has not been raised. And if Christ has not been raised, your faith [your belief in a Savior able to save from sin, if still he is dead] is in vain; ye are yet in your sins;" 1 Cor. 15.16, 17.

In 1 Corinthians 15, where Paul so sharply argues the fact and necessity of the resurrection, he brings forward the different appearances of Christ after his death and burial, as proving "that he rose again." (See verses 3-8.) Whatever weight as an argument attaches to these appearances of our Lord, and especially of that one to Paul himself, must come from the fact, self-evident as Paul must have regarded it, that Christ could not be living at all, unless he had had a resurrection. He says, "He was seen of Cephas, he was seen of five hundred . . . And last of all he was seen of me also . . . Therefore whether it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye

believed. Now if Christ be preached that he has been raised from dead ones, how say some among you, that there is no resurrection of dead ones? "1 Cor. 15.8-12. If our modern theory had been accepted by Paul and his converts, that dead men are still living in heaven, then Christ's appearing to Paul from heaven, were no proof of his resurrection, but only that he was living that celestial life. The fact that Paul should argue for Christ's resurrection from those appearances of his after his death, is incontrovertible proof that he reasoned that Christ's being alive at all, made it apparent that he had had a resurrection. In other words, he evidently believes that death is' the actual loss of life: one who died, and now is living again, must of necessity have had life restored to him.

This resurrection of our Lord is of the greatest importance to all his followers, because it is the type and the pledge of their own living again. It is the grand fact upon which we, as mortals, rest all our hope of the future. Paul calls it, "the hope and resurrection of dead ones;" Acts 23.6. In the Revelation made after his ascension, the Lord Jesus refers to his own resurrection, and to that of his followers, when he says Rev. 1.18 (so Greek of best MSS.) "I even became dead, and behold living am I for the ages of the ages, and I have the keys of death and of hades" of hades, the grave (see Chapter 12), not hell, as in English Version; that were the Greek Gehenna: would our translators suggest a resurrection from Gehenna? Having the keys (power) of death and the grave, he releases whom he will, he consigns to death whom he will. And so he assures his followers of the fulfilment of the promise, "Because I live, ye shall live also;" Jn. 14.19. That life of "the ages of the ages" he entered upon by a resurrection from death, so are his followers to enter upon the same eternal life.

To repeat Paul's argument with those doubters of the resurrection "If dead ones are not raised [awakened, see Chapter 12]; neither has Christ been awakened; and if Christ has not been awakened [if still dead], vain is your faith, ye are yet in your sins. Then also those having fallen asleep in Christ, are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable" (1 Cor. 15.16-19); that were, in case there is no resurrection, and so, no life beyond this. Note the force of that "also; "-they ALSO perished in death with Christ himself, since if Christ has not been awakened, those having fallen asleep in Christ tan never be awakened; then, there is no awakening to life again. For so the Bible teaches, THERE IS NO LIFE FOR CHRIST ONCE DEAD, OR FOR OTHERS WHO DIE, EXCEPT BY A RESURRECTION, A RESTORATION TO LIFE!

CHAPTER 6

Passages Showing the Bible Usage of the Word, Soul.

CHILDREN acquire the meaning of words from hearing their elders use them; so we learn the Bible meaning of a word by observing how it is used in the Bible. From the language of Genesis already considered, we understand that the word soul applied to a human being, denotes the man himself. If that is the correct meaning of the word, it should be found so used throughout the Bible, by its different writers and speakers. Is such the case? We need but refer to the Bible to establish this point. From it we select a few of many such examples.

The Lord himself is represented as so using the word, and in a way fully to recognize the material and mortal nature of the soul. He says to Moses:

Lev. 5.1: "If a soul sin, and hear the voice of swearing."

Lev. 5.2: "If a soul touch any carcass, and it be hidden from him."

Lev. 5.4: "If a soul swear, pronouncing with his lips to do," etc.

Lev. 6.1, 2 "If a soul sin, and lie unto his neighbor. . . . in any of all these that a man doeth," etc. Here the words "a man" are used as a virtual repetition of "a soul" in the preceding clause. And so, in each of the foregoing instances, "a soul" is evidently the same as "a man."

Lev. 17.11, 12: "The blood makes atonement for the soul. No soul of you shall eat blood."

Lev. 22.11: "But if the priest buy any soul with his money, he [as a household slave] shall eat of" - the holy things. How apparent the contrast here between Jehovah's idea of a soul and our popular conception of it! As He uses the expression, to buy or sell a soul, is simply to buy or sell a human being; the popular notion involves the hypothetical purchase of the "immortal part "of "mortal man! "

Lev. 23.30: "Whatsoever soul doeth any work in that same day, the same soul will I destroy from among his people."

Numb. 15.30: "Whatsoever soul that doeth aught presumptuously, whether he be born in the land, or a stranger, that soul shall be cut of from among his people."

Ezek. 18.4, 20, the Lord says to the prophet: "The soul that sinned, it shall die."

Nor can we find that the Lord uses the word soul in any other way; certainly never, as now used, to signify an immortal part of man. And He changes not. What He said once, is the truth for all time.

Other speakers in the Bible have the same conception of the soul; that it is the individual himself, and is liable to death.

We have noticed, Numb. 15.30, that the Lord speaks of "souls born in the land."

Moses writes, Gen. 46.26:

"All the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, that came out of his loins." Ver. 18: "these sixteen souls she bare unto Jacob."

Compare the language of Heb. 7.10: "For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchizedec met him."

Gen. 12.13: Abraham says, "my soul shall live because of thee; "i.e., they will not "kill me," as is his expression in the preceding verse.

Gen. 19.17: The Angels say to Lot, "Escape for thy life [Hebrew nephesh, soul], lest thou be consumed." In his reply he says, verse 19, 20: "thy mercy which thou hast showed in saving my life [Hebrew nephesh, soul]; lest I die, . . . let me escape thither, and my soul [Hebrew nephesh] shall live."

Gen. 27.21: "Reuben said, Let us not kill him" [Hebrew his soul]. "Shed no blood," etc.

Numb. 23.10: Balaam says, "Let me [Hebrew my soul] die the death of the righteous."

So says Samson, Judges 16.30 "Let me [Hebrew my soul] die with the Philistines."

In Josh. 11.11, the writer tells us that the Israelites took Hazor, and "they smote all the souls that were therein with the edge of the sword, utterly destroying them." So Josh. 10.28, 30, 32, 35, 37, 39.

Take a few from many passages in the Psalms.

Psalms 30.3: "O Lord thou hast brought up my soul from the grave, thou hast kept me alive that I should not go down to the pit."

Psalms 33.19: "To deliver their soul from death, and to keep them alive, in famine."

Psalms 78.50: "He spared not their soul from death, but gave their life over to the pestilence."

Psalms 66.9: "Who holds our soul in life."

49.15 "God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave."

Psalms 89.48: "What man lives, and shall not see death? shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave?"

In Isaiah 53.12, the prophet says of Christ: "He poured out his soul unto death." Compare now Psalm 16.10 and the same in Acts 2.27: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," that is [Hebrew Sheol; Greek hades], the grave. Peter, in Acts 2.31, tells us this was spoken of Christ, who was brought to life again, was not left in the grave; and so, that it was not spoken of David, who, Paul declares (Acts 13.36), did "see corruption;" and who, Peter tells us (Acts 2.34), "is not ascended into the heavens."

In Isaiah 38.17, Hezekiah, on receiving fifteen additional years of life, exclaims: "Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption "- from the grave; referring unquestionably to the threatened loss of his life, for the word brought him from the Lord (same chap., verse 1) admits of no misconception: "Thou shalt die, and not live." There was no continuing to live in any other place for him! Modern theology must find here two very awkward cases: one, David, certainly not gone to heaven; the other, Hezekiah, not to be allowed to live, as it claims all the rest of the dead have been! The latter of these difficulties is not met by adding an explanatory clause: "Thou shalt die, and not live "on earth -i.e., thou shalt still live in heaven. For, if such meaning was intended, why was it not so announced? Certainly Hezekiah did not so understand it. Or, why should he so bitterly mourn his approaching fate, if God had just gent to tell him He was about to call him to His presence, and to the supreme bliss of heaven? And why was such lack of faith rewarded with those additional fifteen years of life?

But not alone is the death of souls referred to as a matter of course; we actually find a soul, as an object lying dead before us, spoken of in the original Hebrew, not in our English version by any means!

Numb. 6.6: Of the Nazarite it is said, "All the days that he separates himself unto the Lord, he shall come at no dead soul;" so the Hebrew, the E. V. has dead body.

Lev. 21.10, 11: "The high priest shall not rend his clothes, neither shall he go in to any dead soul;" E. V. dead body.

(See Appendix D for more examples of dead souls.)

In the New Testament, the language of the Old is found.

Rev. 16.3: "Every living soul died in the sea." It is interesting to find this last book of the Canon adopting precisely the language of near two thousand years before.

Acts 3.23: "Every soul, who will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people."

Jas. 5.20: "Shall save a soul from death."

Matt. 10.28: What means this passage, if not just what it says? In it we are warned to "fear Him who is able to destroy soul and body in hell; "Gehenna, as he elsewhere styles it, "Gehenna of the fire." There is no question as to what destroy means when applied to the body, and as effected by fire; it is a literal destruction. "Destroy" here thus used, is then of course literal. And so the warning is, lest your body and soul be literally destroyed. But modern theology informs us that in fact the soul cannot be literally destroyed; that though, of course, God, as its Creator and the One "holding it in life" (Ps. 66.9), can destroy any soul, yet it is certain that He never will. A queer commentary this on the intelligence, or honesty, of our Divine Lord, if he thus solemnly bids us stand in fear of that which will never take place!

Matt. 16.25: "For whosoever will save his [Greek psyche] life, shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his [Greek psyche] life, shall find it." Ver. 26: "For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his [Greek psyche] soul, or what shall a man give in exchange for his [Greek psyche] soul?" Thus to translate in a continuous paragraph the same Greek word by two different English ones, can only be excused on account of the perplexing difference between the popular conception of the soul and that of the sacred writings. Psyche is the only Greek word, that can be translated soul in the N. T., and of course it is as appropriate a rendering in the former verse as in the latter.- Thus rendering it and other words more exactly, we read: "For whosoever will save his soul, shall [Greek apollumi] destroy it, and whosoever will [Greek] destroy his soul [Luke adds, for my sake] shall find it. For what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and [er. zemioa] forfeit as a penalty his soul, or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? "Luke repeats (9.24, 25) the former verse exactly, but makes a suggestive variation in the second; translating literally, it is: "For what is a man advantaged, having gained the whole world, but [Greek apollumi] having destroyed or [Greek limioin forfeited himself;" where himself is plainly used as equivalent to psyche in the preceding verse, in accordance with O. T. usage. Destroying oneself, or one's soul, is to destroy one's very existence, his life; what advantage the world to one whose very existence is to be taken in exchange, or as a forfeit, for what he has gained?

Pet. 1.24 (quoted from Isaiah 40.6): "All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass: the grass withers, and the flower thereof falls away." The special glory of man, in the estimation of modern theology, must include that immortal soul, which is said to distinguish him from animals - this immortal soul then "fallen away," as a flower decays.

A full quotation of proof texts on the material and mortal nature of the soul, as established by Bible usage, will be found in the Appendix, Arts. B, C, D.

We may conclude this section with the statement of a fact, which must be exceedingly puzzling to modern theology. The Hebrew and Greek words denoting soul and spirit occur some sixteen hundred times in the Bible. "Immortal soul" or "immortal spirit," in the original, or in our translation, we can find NOT ONCE! although so common a phrase in hymn-books, and on our lips!

On the other hand we do find, that Bible usage does not restrict the word soul to a part of a man; but designates by it the man himself, the individual. Instead of declaring or even hinting at the dogma, that the soul is inherently immortal, we find Bible usage treats of the soul, as that which is unquestionably mortal; as that which is about to die, as dying, as dead, and as in the grave, whence it can only be redeemed by the Almighty One.

We have now an answer to our opening question: Is the Bible doctrine of the soul identical with the popular conception of the same? The answer is decided - No! The Bible teaches that the soul is not a part of man: it is not immaterial: it is not immortal: it is not

restricted to man. These are the essential elements of a soul in the popular conception. On these points the Bible is radically at variance with popular belief.

Precisely what is the Bible doctrine of the soul will be considered in a subsequent chapter.

CHAPTER 7

Passages in the Bible, from which the Existence of a Soul, without a Body, has been Inferred.

IF then in the Bible, the soul is neither denominated immortal, nor in any way stated to be such, and if such a conclusion is contradicted by Bible usage, it may well be asked: Has the doctrine of the inherent immortality of the soul, anything at all in Scripture upon which it is founded? And the reply must be, Nothing, absolutely nothing! Strange as it may seem, there is not a text of Holy Writ, upon which such a doctrine may be solidly built up! The most that can be discovered, are certain passages from which such a doctrine has been inferred. To these mere inferences, modern theology, which must find some Scripture support for its peculiar doctrine, clings with a death grasp. And its adherents, as was the writer himself, are educated to accept these inferences, as the only correct or possible interpretation of the Sacred word.

It is necessary, then, carefully to examine each of these passages, and in the light of God's revelation as a connected whole, to determine whether the inference in each case is true or false. Be it understood, these inferences are the sole props of modern theological teaching, as distinguished from the old and Biblical; if they give way, the whole structure gives way. Our examination of these passages then must be critical and thorough. If the important inferences drawn from them be correct, they will stand any ordeal, for God's truth is impregnable: if false, all should rejoice in their downfall.

The Rich Man and Lazarus.

Luke 16.19-31. The parable of the rich man and Lazarus.

To this supposed stronghold, the advocates of separate soul-existence confidently retreat, when dislodged from other Scripture positions. But a careful study of the passage, shows that their position here is utterly untenable.

The story before us must be interpreted in one of two ways. It is to be regarded either as the narration of an actual occurrence, at least of what might occur in the so-called spirit world, or else it is a purely imaginary representation of how dead ones, were it possible, might be supposed to feel and speak in view of their past and future. In the latter case, not the details of the parable, but its moral is the point of the highest interest. Now the question is, which of these is the correct understanding? In its determination we are to rest our belief, not on the authority of man, but on that of the Bible. We are to be guided by the narrative itself, and the light thrown on it by other Scriptures.

Since a parable is not the most satisfactory basis for a doubted doctrine, it has been claimed that this is not a parable at all, but an actual occurrence; and, as in real life the rich man should have a name, seeing Christ did not give him one, the Latin adjective "dives," rich, has been generally adopted as a proper name for this Hebrew. But no proof has been adduced for the suggestion that we have here actual history, except it be the opening words, "there was a certain man;" which prove nothing, as these are precisely the words which introduce the parable of the Unjust Steward, in the very same chapter. Still, if we are to regard this parable as a glimpse given us into the life of the future, by one competent to lift the veil, we must accept it as what were not impossible may take place in the unseen world. And such is its common interpretation. Take then this position, and see where it fairly brings us out.

We encounter the following difficulties:

1. It is very strange, to say the least, that we are informed that Lazarus is carried, not into the presence of God, but to the bosom of Abraham, and where Abraham seems to be the chief personage. It will not do to say, as has been claimed, that Abraham's bosom is a figurative expression for the highest celestial felicity; for, Abraham himself in his own person appears on the scene. And if he himself is present in a literal sense, it is hardly fair to use his bosom, at the same time, in a figurative sense! If his bosom is figurative, then Abraham himself, and so then the whole narrative, is figurative.

2. The beggar receives his reward and the rich man his punishment, immediately after death, and before the judgment day. But this were in conflict with the Apostle who says, 2 Cor. 5:10: "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that [Greek hina, in order that] every one may receive the things done in his body." Or else, there must be a separate judgment at the hour of each one's death, thus making the Master contradict himself in Matt. 25:31, where he says it is "when the Son of Man shall come in his glory." In either case, it contradicts Christ's word in Rev. 22:12: "Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man; "that is, he keeps his reward till he comes, and bestows it then. As he promises Luke 14:14: "thou shalt be rewarded at the resurrection of

the just." And so Paul says, "There is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord will give me at that day" - of his appearing.

1. The rich man is not in hell, as in our English version, the Greek for that is Gehenna, but in Hades, or the grave. (For Bible proof that such is the true meaning of Hades, see Chapter 12) We read, "the rich man died and was buried and in Hades "(the grave), etc. The beggar died; his burial does not receive notice. Abraham had died, and his sons buried him, Gen. 25.8. None of these as yet have had a resurrection, a restoration to life.

Now if we are to understand that our Lord by this parable actually teaches, that dead men are able to hold converse with each other, we make him in this to contradict the plain declarations of those Scriptures, which he enjoins us to search. As for instance, Eccl. 9.5, 6: "The dead know not anything; their love, their hatred, and their envy, is now perished." Ps. 146.4: "His breath goes forth, he returned to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 115.17: "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Eccl. 9.10: "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, whither thou goes." And so is the word of the Master himself, Jn. 9.4: "The night cometh when no man can work." Paul speaks of the dead, 1 Thess. 4.13, as, "them that are asleep; "just the word of Job, chap. 3.13: "For then had I slept." See also Ps. 6.5: 30.9: 88.10-12: Isaiah 38.18: Lam. 3.6: Dan. 12.2, 13. Passages of this kind are too many, too direct, too scattered throughout the Scriptures, and yet in full harmony with each other, to be figuratively explained away. And we may well hesitate to construe Christ's language, so as to make him contradict them, or any other portion of the Divine word.

4. As the time of the parable is between death and the judgment, its characters, if living at all, must be in a disembodied state. For the natural body is in the grave, and the spiritual body of believers is not till the Resurrection. Read Paul's statements, 1 Cor. 15.22, 23, 42, 44, 52; 1 Thess. 4.16.

Now, if we are to believe that dead men live as immaterial existences, then in the only part of the Bible that is supposed to describe such existence, we find that the One thus unveiling to us the unseen, is himself so ignorant, or so oblivious, of the fact of such disembodied beings, that again and again he makes mention of various members of their bodies. In this brief narration he speaks of a bosom, finger, tongue, eyes, while, from the narrative, we are asked to learn that Abraham and Lazarus are in heaven, the rich man in hell, all entirely destitute of anything like a body!

The explanation of this incongruity is that such expressions are figurative. And we have been so fully trained to accept this supposed explanation, that one does not at first sight recognize its utter absurdity. The argument may be briefly stated thus: A. claims that man after his death still exists in an immaterial condition, without a body; B. doubts it. To prove it, A. brings up this parable as illustrating such a mode of life. B. reading it over, exclaims, "Why, all the characters of the story are represented as having bodies." A. replies, "Yes, but you must not understand from that that they have bodies; it means just the opposite, the language is figurative." B., unable to see what figure of speech is used, except it be a falsehood, inquires, "How do you know it is figurative?" And A. can only respond, If any bodily parts are spoken of, that must be figurative, because man's life immediately after death is without a body. Thus simply begging the question, assuming the very point to be proved, and insisting that what conflicts with that assumption, must be figurative. In other words, the existence of an immaterial soul, the point the parable is said to prove, is first assumed to be true; then every detail of the parable which conflicts with this is further assumed to be incorrect and of no account; and then the parable, thus manipulated, is triumphantly held up as full proof of the point assumed! Indeed, is not this an example of that handling the word of God deceitfully, of which we read, 2 Cor. 4.2? To say, that one clause of a given sentence, "being in torment," is literal, and that its conjoined clause, "lifting up his eyes," is figurative; that the request to send Lazarus is to be understood literally, and what he is to do, dipping his finger in water, is to be taken figuratively; this is but playing fast and loose with Holy Writ. It is trifling, not alone with the forms of human speech, but with the words of a Divine Speaker!

5. Taking the story literally, we are constrained to believe that the abodes of the blest and of the lost are virtually one; that, though there is no passing between, yet the suffering class is not only in full view of the other, but that the two are so near as to converse across the dividing line. No wonder that the elder Edwards, taking the parable as literal, logically concluded and actually preached, that the sight of the agonies of the lost, enhanced the bliss of the redeemed!

To repeat then; we have discovered the following objections, some of them insuperable, to the literal interpretation of the parable:

1. We are told, not that the beggar is taken to the presence of God, but to Abraham. 2. The beggar and the rich man receive each their reward at death; thus nullifying the judgment or anticipating its predicted time, and denying Christ's word that he withholds his reward till the time of his coming. 3. It flatly contradicts the universal testimony of Scripture, as to the unconscious state of the dead. 4. It falsely represents disembodied spirits as possessing what from the nature of the case it is impossible that they should possess. 5. It teaches that the saved and the lost are, in the future, in full view of each other.

Surely an interpretation, however, generally though unwittingly it may be accepted, that leads into such a maze of absurdity and contradictions of Scripture, cannot be the correct one. And they must be in sore straits to find apparent Scripture authority for their

traditional belief, who, while decrying others for accepting literally the simple words of God, themselves insist that this parable must be understood literally!

Rejecting then the transparent fallacy of such an interpretation, let us see if the other supposition is more tenable: that it is a purely imaginary representation of how dead ones might be supposed to feel and to speak, in view of their past and future. The truth of the parable lying not in its detail, but in its moral. It will be understood that the speakers in the parable, not only died, but they are actually dead men.

Taking up in their order the difficulties of the other mode of interpretation, we find them solved:

1. It is most natural these dead Israelites should be found where the parable locates them; in Hades, the grave, the house of the dead. And that for them Abraham, not Christ, should be the chief one there. For though our Lord himself died, and went into Hades, or the grave, yet his stay in "the power of the grave" was a short one. As the ever-living One, Hades is no place for him.

2. On this view, neither the beggar nor the rich man have received their reward. They are lying in death, awaiting that voice that shall call forth "all that are in their graves" (Jn. 5.28), to the judgment of the Day that is coming. Thus corroborating the word of the Apostle, 2 Pet. 2.9: "the Lord knows how to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished; "and the still older word of the patriarch, Job 21.30: "Do ye not know that the wicked is reserved to the day of destruction? they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath."

3. Contrary to the other, this view of the parable is fully in accord with the Scriptures, which, while they declare, that the dead know not anything, also in like highly wrought, parabolic imagery, Isa. 14.1, represent the dead actually in their graves, rising up to rejoice over the mighty conqueror who had put them to death, himself now conquered by death, saying, "Art thou also become weak as we, art thou become like unto us? The worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee." No one would think of taking that passage in Isaiah literally; it is precisely the same figure in the parable before us.

4. The absurdities of the other method of interpretation vanish on this. As in imagination we bring the dead into our thoughts, we picture them in their graves as they were before laid away from our sight. And instead of being anyway incongruous, it were most natural to speak of their bodily parts. What the imagination supplies is life, and consequent power of speech and motion. Is not a similar figure of speech most common in every-day life, when we personify, or supply life and speech, to inanimate objects, as mountains, trees, and the like? Is it not common in the Scriptures? for example, Judges 9.8: "The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them, and they said," etc. In all such cases we do not hesitate to recognize the figurative use of language, because it is so apparent. Why is it not here equally apparent to everyone who regards God's word, for otherwise it contradicts the whole tenor of Holy Writ regarding the present state of those dead?

On this understanding, we are not compelled to do violence to the spirit of all written language, and arbitrarily to judge one clause of a sentence means just what it says, while the other part does not mean what it says, but has some concealed meaning by which it is accommodated to the exigencies of a theory.

But someone may ask, if the whole story is figurative, a fiction of the imagination to present a truth, why did not our Lord make the fact more manifest; why did he not state the fact? It might as well be asked, why utter any parables at all? He had a right to assume that, at first sight, we should know the story to be figurative, as in the case of Jotham's parable before referred to. It could not be that we should believe he would utter anything contrary to Scripture. And so evidently does the popular understanding of the parable contradict Holy Scripture, that it would never have been even tolerated, but for the impossibility of finding direct Bible support for an unscriptural belief. In fact the figurative understanding of the parable as a whole, beside being in harmony with Scripture, has the advantage of plainness and entire consistency in its details, which then can be taken in a straightforward, literal sense. In the other case, though we call it taking the parable literally, we actually find in the details a confused jumble of the literal and the figurative in the conjoined clauses of the narrative.

5. On this view, the peculiar feature of the parable, that both the rich man and Lazarus are found together after death, is strictly Biblical. The preacher saith, Eccl. 6.6: "Do they not all go to one place?" Job says of him that lived at ease, and of him that never eats with pleasure, "They shall lie down alike in the dust, and the worms shall cover them;" Job 21.26. "The small and the great are there;" Job 3.19.

But what of the great gulf [Greek chasma, chasm] fixed between the two, so incomprehensible on the hypothesis of immaterial beings, whom a chasm, narrow enough to converse across, however deep, could scarce be supposed sufficient to restrain, what means this chasm fixed between those lying dead? It is that irrevocable division which, the Bible tells us, death fixes between the good and the bad at the close of their earthly probation. In the class in which death finds each, there must each remain till the summons to the great Assize. Though, at present, one may pass from the ranks of the condemned (John 3.18) to the pardoned, yet, when death comes, it is forever too late, the gulf is fixed, so that they who then would pass, cannot. "As the tree falls, so shall it lie." "He that is unjust is still

unjust, he that is righteous is righteous still." Let it be noted, that this gulf, thus "fixed," cuts off the hope of a future probation, with which some delude themselves and others, and also, the more general hope of universal restoration.

But we read, "he lifted up his eyes being in torment," and again he says, "I am tormented in this flame." The former statement, we are told, is literal (unless there be a difficulty about his eyes); the second, which qualifies and explains the former, is figurative! The torment is literal, the agent of that torment is figurative. We allow one might allude to his torment in figurative terms, but in explicitly stating what produces that torment, that one can use figurative language, passes belief. No, if the torment is literal, much more is its agent literal. What then is this literal fire?

Certainly, there is no literal fire in the grave. We have learned from God's word that the sleeper in death is unconscious of weal or woe. But he is represented in the parable as a dead man endued with life, and he speaks as such might be supposed to speak, in view of that which will be his fate after his actual awakening to life. That fearful threatened fire, of which the Gehenna fires outside Jerusalem were a type, which, said our Lord, at the end of this age shall burn up the tares, the children of the wicked one, Matt. 12.40: that fire spoken of by Paul, 2 Thess. 1.7, 8, "when the Lord Jesus shall [literally] appear from heaven, with his mighty [literal] angels, taking vengeance in flaming fire [literal also] on those that know not God;" that fire foretold by the prophet, Mal. 4.1, that "shall burn as an oven, and shall burn up the stubble leaving neither root nor branch; "the awakened sleeper is depicted as already feeling its hot breath, and in his despair he cries out for the smallest respite, though but a drop of water. That fiery doom, that utter, literal destruction, must be his at his awakening to life again; and in imagination raised to life, he is represented as encountering that which thus waits for him. Possibly our Lord here sarcastically rebukes those Pharisees, whom (ver. 15) he was addressing. For since the Chaldean captivity, the heathen dogma of immortality for all, had been creeping into their cold, philosophical belief, and he pictures to them the utter incongruity of a belief in the immortality of the wicked, with God's threatened doom of actual fire, that they should deem possible any should survive in that element, whose province it was to destroy, to consume, to burn up

And how naturally, if dead men are supposed to be speaking, comes in the final appeal, "Nay, father Abraham, but if one went unto them from the dead [Greek apo nekron, from dead ones], they will repent." And how consistent with this the reply, "they will not be persuaded, though one rose from dead ones." But on the common view, what the need of a rising from dead ones, of a resurrection from the dead? Could not the "disembodied spirit," as the phrase is, be sent, as God sends his angel messengers, with the warning word to those five brethren? Why need one rise from dead ones to do this?

To sum up then: if the parable is received as figurative in that those, who act and speak in the story, are actually dead, i.e. without life, then former difficulties vanish, and all the proprieties of time, place, and grammatical construction are strictly observed. We find the beggar is properly in Hades, where are Abraham and all who have likewise been "gathered to their people," according to the Scriptures: that rewards and punishments are not yet meted out, according to the Scriptures: that the dead are not conscious, living beings, but that they are actually dead, according to the Scriptures: that, in imagination, we think of the dead as possessing bodily parts, according to the figurative language of the Scriptures: that the gathering of such, though with differing destinies, into one place, the grave, is according to the Scriptures: that the gulf fixed, the flaming fire, the rising from dead ones, are all explicable according to the Scriptures. And we are not obliged now to accept, and now to alter, the apparent meaning of various parts of the story; for the parable is thus in harmony with itself, as well as with the laws of written language.

One question yet remains, what is the moral of this remarkable parable; why did our Lord utter it? Plainly we find the occasion in the preceding context. We read verse 14, that the Pharisees, who were covetous, derided him when they heard him say, they could not serve God and mammon. They were endeavoring to combine the service of Jehovah with that of mammon. They had brought themselves to believe that the prospered in worldly things, the successful in amassing wealth, were special favorites of heaven, as well as honored of men, while the poor were rightly despised of man and cursed of God. But the Master informs these pleasure-seeking, money-loving men, that the judgment of God who knows the heart is different from theirs; "for that which is highly esteemed among men, is abomination in the sight of God." He also tells them, verse 16, that the kingdom of God is to be attained by those only who strive after it as the great object of pursuit; that, verse 17, heaven and earth should pass away rather than one jot or tittle of the law should fail, the law which they were trying to make void by their traditions. And these truths, after a brief allusion, verse 18, to a special vice of the luxurious ones of their nation and time, he enforces by the parable before us, showing how their vaunted father Abraham himself would uphold this righteous judgment of them, were he to speak from out his silent resting place. In bold, yet strictly Scriptural, imagery, the parable presents the dead patriarch, rejecting his rich descendants, who seek their portion in this world, and accepting to a place by his side, the poor beggar, rich like Abraham in the faith of a world to come. We also see that the choice made in this world is irrevocable; that the dishonored Law makes not the least abatement of its demands; and that inexcusable and hopeless is the state of those, who hear not Moses and the prophets, who live not up to the light they have.

And these lessons of the parable reach also to those in our day, who will not live up to the light they have; who refuse not only Moses and the prophets, but also the kindred teaching of Christ and his Apostles. It were well for such, as they discuss this parable, so generally interpreted as to discredit God's word, to heed its moral: that which is highly esteemed among men, is abomination in the sight of God. And to remember, that the interpretation which so dishonors Christ as a teacher, has been fastened upon us, as suggested in the Latin name of the rich man, by that corrupt church, which is "the mother of the abominations of the earth."

The Thief on the Cross.

Luke 23.43: "And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise."

As generally read, this is a statement that our Lord and the penitent thief were that day to be together in Paradise. If so, the inferences growing out of that fact are, fully stated, as follows: 1st, Christ himself did not die, it was his body only that ceased to live; 2d, the same was true of the thief; 3d, nobody dies, when said to die, the both only dies; i.e. everybody that has died is not living, necessarily in a dis-embodied state. Such inferences we may hesitate to accept, till we ascertain that the statement is certainly what it purports to be.

Examining into this, we find that the received understanding of the passage is after all a question of grammar! It depends upon how the Greek adverb of time, *semeron*, today, or this day, as it is more generally rendered in N. T., is to be construed; whether with the preceding verb, "say," or the following, "shalt be." From its position in the sentence, it may qualify either.

It may be thought the comma decides it. Not at all; the comma is no part of the original Greek. The New Testament MSS. were originally written entirely without punctuation, which was not introduced into the Greek text till the 15th century. Surely, the punctuation of a period just emerging from medieval darkness, when churchly traditions were paramount, and independent thought not tolerated, can scarcely be relied upon to settle a point in dispute, or to build up a doctrine. The Bible Societies have found it necessary, in Matt. 19.28, to alter the punctuation, and in other places it is still in question.

How then shall the true position of the comma, and the consequent correct reading of the passage be ascertained? Evidently, as in the case of the parable just considered, we are to be guided by the light of other Scriptures, and by the context itself.

First, then, if we locate the comma before to-day, and make that adverb qualify "shalt be," thus giving the meaning that Christ and the thief, when they died, did not cease to live (i.e. did not really die), but merely changed their place from earth to paradise, we encounter the fatal objection that thus the passage conflicts with the rest of Holy Writ, which so explicitly, as we have seen, declares that the dead are unconscious, are actually dead.

But besides this, such cannot be the correct reading, since the Scriptures elsewhere tell us where Christ was these three days, and it was not in paradise. On this point we have the united testimony of men, angels, and our Lord himself. In Matt. 28.5, 6: the angels say, "Ye seek Jesus who was crucified. He is not here, FOR he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay." Jesus predicted of himself, Matt. 12.40: "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly,"- Jonah was there himself, was he not?- "so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." An inspired Apostle says, Eph. 4.9, 10: "He descended first into the lower parts of the earth. He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens." Could words be framed more unequivocally to state, that during those days Christ was not in paradise, but in the grave? And who are we, to set aside the concurrent testimony of such witnesses?

Moreover, we find the connection of thought requires that the adverb be joined with "I say." The prayer of the penitent thief is, "Lord, remember me when thou comes [not into, the Greek is not *eis* but *en*] in thy kingdom." This Israelite has recognized in the patient sufferer beside him, the promised Messiah, the Anointed King of his people. The accusation, the King of the Jews, over his head is no unmeaning title. In Him, though now yielding up his life in strange humiliation, shall yet be fulfilled the prediction of the prophet; "Saith the Lord, I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth;" Jer. 23.5. And, looking through the present darkness on to that Coming in triumph, the dying thief prays that the companion of this lowly hour of anguish may be remembered by the Royal One, when he shall come in his kingdom:

"When thou shalt in thy Kingdom come, Then, Lord, remember me."

Does the King grant the humble petition? He returns a clear, direct affirmative; "Verily, I say unto thee this day," an emphatic Biblical form of most solemn asseveration, "thou shalt be with me in the Paradise." Note the Greek article, the Paradise, the Paradise of which thou hast spoken, the Paradise of God with its restored tree of life (see Rev. 2.7, 22.2), the pledge of life everlasting. A right Royal response! In the unending glory and joy of that Paradise yet to be, thou shalt not only be remembered by the King, but thou shalt be with Him, for, the King Himself THIS DAY has said it! "So," says Paul, Thess. 4.17, speaking of that same Second Coming, "so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words."

But on the common understanding, how irrelevant the response, how niggardly the promise! Irrelevant, because it ignores the Royal Coming of which the suppliant speaks; niggardly, because it promises but a few hours of companionship with the Lord. For, if it is assumed that Christ and the thief were that day in Paradise, then he left Paradise and returned to earth, the third day. At that time he told Mary Magdalene (Jn. 20.17), that he had not ascended to the Father; but the Father is in heaven, therefore that Paradise, where we suppose to have been, is not heaven. Afterward he did ascend to the Father and is now in heaven (Heb. 9.24), leaving the thief in that

hypothetical, not the real, Paradise. And so, if we adopt the common reading, we must logically conclude that Christ, whose presence is essential to Paradise, is not in Paradise personally, any more than now on earth.

It has been said, that to connect "this day" with the preceding verb, is but a quibble, a trifling evasion. But where is really the trifling; is it not in that reading which contradicts Scripture, which makes the reply so irrelevant and meagre, and which has so unscriptural a conception of Paradise?

As illustrations of the Biblical use of "this day" qualifying the preceding verb, see Deut. 30.16; "I command thee this day to love" Deut. 8.19: "I testify against you this day, that ye shall perish: "Deut. 15.15: "I command thee this thing to-day: "Acts 26.29: "I would that all that hear me this day, were as I am;" and so everywhere. It is said that in the Septuagint and the N. T., this is far the more common grammatical relation of semeron, today, but the writer has not verified the statement. Enough, surely, has been adduced to show that an inference, whose only footing is, at the most, an open question of grammar, cannot stand against the direct statements of other Scriptures.

Christ's Argument with the Sadducees.

Luke 20.37, 38: "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for unto Him all live."

When the writer was investigating the question of the sleep of the dead, i.e. whether the dead are actually dead, and was even struggling against a growing conviction of its truth, the passage before us decided the question for him. He could no longer doubt that Jesus received and taught the doctrine, since upon it he here constructs an argument which silenced, if it did not convince, his theological opponents. And yet in our day, the passage is used to controvert that doctrine.

What our Lord proposed to prove in this argument with the Sadducees is very evident. He leaves no room for doubt. Here in Luke he states the point, "Now that the dead are raised:" in Mark it is, "And as touching the dead, that they rise:" in Matthew, "But as touching the resurrection of the dead." Now the simple question is: Did he prove that? He thought he did. The Pharisees thought he did. The Sadducees were "put to silence." The multitude "were astonished." And yet, he totally failed to prove his point, if we accept modern theology's interpretation of Christ's argument. That informs us, that what he did prove was that Abraham and other dead patriarchs are now living, of course in a disembodied state. But that was not what he set out to prove. Does "the resurrection,"- that "the dead are to be raised,"- have any necessary connection with that? In fact, the point we are told Christ proves, of a present life for dead patriarchs, as far as it goes, really militates against the probability of a resurrection. For as that old English Reformer and Bible student, William Tyndale, well puts it: "If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good case as the angels be, and then what cause is there of the resurrection? "

One commentator, Rev. J. C. Ryle, in Expository Thoughts on the Gospels, has the frankness to say: "The quotation contained in this passage has occasioned much controversy. At first sight, it does not appear to be any proof of a resurrection, but only of a life to come." And, indeed, that is all there is of it, if the theory of a disembodied existence be correct. He goes on to say: "One thing is very clear, the argument which our Lord used completely silenced the Sadducees, and called forth the approbation of the Scribes." And then he adds, in substance: If we are not convinced, the fault is in ourselves, not in the argument; we ought to be convinced, though we cannot tell why!

It is only as freed from the popular delusion, that dead ones are actually living ones, that we find ourselves also freed from all difficulty in the case. We are not left to suppose that our Lord himself was so lacking in judgment, or the wily Sadducees and Pharisees so stupid, as not to know what was, or was not, proof of a disputed point. Christ's argument for a resurrection is unanswerable; but it is so by virtue of a Biblical premise, which modern theology totally ignores, viz.: THERE IS NO LIFE FOR DEAD ONES EXCEPT BY A RESURRECTION! Christ's argument really is this:

God's words at the bush recognize a life for dead patriarchs:

But there is no life for dead ones except by-a resurrection (or raising to life again):

Therefore, there must be a resurrection: which was to be proved.

This minor premise, no life for dead ones except by a resurrection, is very clearly stated by Paul, 1 Cor. 15.16, 18: "If the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised. Then also those having fallen asleep in Christ, are perished;" aor. passive of Greek *apollumi*, were destroyed, as E. V. renders same Greek in same epistle, chap. 10.9, 10.

The Transfiguration.

There is but one way of understanding it; if there be no resurrection, there is no hereafter to those who die. In that case, death, the loss of life, is a finality.

As Paul's comment on Christ's words, "God is not a God of dead, but of living ones, for to him all live," read Rom. 4.17: "God quickens [Greek zoopoieo, makes alive] the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were." All the living ones of the future are, in the sight of the Infinite One, as though they were living now.

Matt. 17.3: "And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him."

From this scene on the Mount of Transfiguration, is inferred the existence of Moses and Elijah as disembodied beings, or, at /east one of them, as such.

But what was that scene on the mount? An utterance of the Bible is the best authority on any disputed point, and fortunately, an inspired commentator answers this question for tis. The Apostle explains it, 2 Pet. 1.16: "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you THE POWER AND COMING of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty." This, he specifies, was (ver. 18) "when we were with him in the Holy Mount." "It was the power and coming of our Lord" that was in this scene prefigured, that coming in the power of the future kingdom, of whose majesty the apostle could speak as having been an eye-witness.

That the transfiguration scene was a foreshadowing of that future kingdom, is also shown in that statement of our Lord, which (no unmeaning fact) introduces the narration in each evangelist. This statement is a stumbling-block to our modern commentators (difficult passage, says Lange), who sever it from the connection, given by each evangelist and recognized by Chrysostom and early commentators, and then are puzzled how to explain it. The statement is:

"There be some standing here who shall not [Greek double negative, very emphatic, we render, absolutely shall not] taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom; "Matt. 16.28. Mark says, 9.1: "till they see the kingdom of God come with power." Luke 9.27: "Till they see the kingdom of God." Christ here speaks in Matt. of the coming, in Mark of the power, in all three of the kingdom.

But Peter, in the epistle already quoted, speaks of the power, and coming (2 Pet. 1.16), having introduced the subject of the kingdom in verse 11. Now, when the identical terms in which the epistle states the occurrence, are found introducing the narrative of that occurrence in three gospels, is not that conclusive of their reference to the occurrence itself, especially when no other plausible explanation is offered for their presence there? Most assuredly. Then the statement of our Lord in the gospels, which so troubles commentators, is an announcement that the coming in power of the Kingdom of God, the coming of the Son of Man in his Kingdom, was to be seen after six days (Matt, and Mark), about eight days after (Luke), by some then standing there. But why say "some"? If the kingdom was actually to be set up "with power," if the Son of Man was actually to come "in his Kingdom," why should not all behold an event of such magnitude? And why state they positively should not die, (Greek ou me geusontai thanatou] before the sight?

This brings us to a question essential to our comprehension of the passage: How did they see it? And this, again, to a further inquiry into the actual time of that kingdom.

When, then, is the Kingdom of God really to be beheld, or, in the language of Matthew, when is the Son of Man to come in his Kingdom? It is to be in "the days of the Son of Man," Luke 17.22, at his future "appearing and his Kingdom," as Paul joins the two, 2 Tim. 4.1. Then occurs the resurrection of the just, of the heirs of the Kingdom, those who are to reign with Christ. Then "this mortal puts on immortality." For as Paul declares, 1 Cor. 15.50: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, neither [the same idea repeated in the succeeding clause] doth corruption inherit incorruption." It is in the spirit-body, 1 Cor. 15.44, that the promised "entrance shall be ministered to us abundantly into the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord; "2 Pet. 1.11. As our Lord states it, 3.5, 6: "Except a man may have been born [Greek aor. pass. subj.] of water and of [no article] spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh, is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit, is spirit," is the spirit-body, not the soul-body (see page 118), not flesh and blood, which "cannot inherit the kingdom." That resurrection entrance into the spiritual life, is at Christ's coming, as the Apostle tells us, 1 Thess. 4.16, 17. And that Second Coming, as our Lord himself unequivocally declares, must precede his Kingdom; "And then shall they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. When ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand;" Luke 21.27, 31.

But many, who still pray "Thy kingdom come," have been taught that Christ did establish his kingdom at his First Coming, an "invisible" kingdom, in each one's heart. And rather a limited one, though it might be styled, numerous, one to each man. For proof of this strange doctrine, Luke 17.21 is relied upon; "The kingdom of God is within you."

We must then digress a little to correct the evident misapprehension of that passage. The context makes manifest the meaning. To whom did Christ address those words? Read verse 20 "When he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them, and said, The kingdom of God comes not with observation [the marginal reading, outward show, is contrary to verse 24, and to the Greek, paratersis, close watching], neither shall they say, see [Greek: idou] here, or see there; for see, the kingdom of God is "- within you, does he say? Within those Pharisees, whom, Matt. 23.27, he declares are "full of all uncleanness"? Certainly not! The words should be rendered as our translators have done in the margin, "See, the kingdom of God is among you;" as the Greek entos umin, in the midst of you, properly denotes; i.e. in the midst of the group, not of each individual. The kingdom of God, in the person of the King himself, freely offering all a share in that kingdom, is here in the midst of you, and see, you professed watchers for that kingdom, the religious leaders of the people, you discover it not! Turning from his captious critics in their pride of learning, he tells the true learners, "the disciples" (ver. 22), of a period of waiting ere that kingdom comes, a time when the King personally will not be in the midst of them; "The days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and ye shall not see it." From that verse to the end of the chapter, anyone may read of the time and the manner of the kingdom.

But further, it was impossible that our Lord could have meant to say his kingdom was already "within" any one, for after this "he added and spoke a parable," Luke 19.11-27, to, correct the error of some who "thought the kingdom of God should immediately appear." He again reveals this needful time of waiting, under which we are now living at the present day. "He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return." Christ must first go, and return. And when he was returned and begins his reign, mark the fate of "those his enemies who would not that he should reign over them. Bring them hither, and slay them," is the order. It reminds us of Ps. 2.8, 9: "Ask of me, and I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces, like a potter's vessel." No doubtful kingdom then, it comes in power! No invisible kingdom, needing any "close watching" to discern its coming! "For as the lightning, that lightens out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall also the Son of Man be in his day!"

The thoughtful reader of God's word will perceive that giving two meanings to the one phrase, the kingdom of God, or dividing it into two kingdoms, "the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory," one already come and the other yet to come, is but a mere human invention, to meet those texts which declare the kingdom to be yet future. The gospel, the glad tidings of the kingdom, Christ and Apostles preached (Matt. 4.23, Acts 28.30; and still is it to be "preached in all the world for a witness, and then shall the end come;"- the end of the present ordering of things, the coming in of the kingdom. But the announcement of the kingdom is not the kingdom itself; the herald precedes the king.

Receiving, then, from the lips of Christ and his Apostles the truth that the kingdom of God, as they spoke of it, is something even in our day yet to come, we come back to consider again that statement of our Lord: "There be some standing here who shall not taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power." But all to whom he spoke died long ago, and that kingdom is still in the future. How then could any have seen it then? Only in one way. The sight must have been just what Christ called it, a vision. "Tell the vision to no man, till the Son of Man be risen from the dead; "Matt. 17.9.

Modern commentators, well knowing that the immaterial soul gets very little support from the transfiguration scene, if it be a vision, try very hard to make out it was not a vision. For example, Owen (on Matthew) actually says it was "not a mere vision, but a reality;" but probably Christ knew. Paul also (1 Cor. 15.50) is authority that the kingdom is not for men as now constituted. If been by such, it can be seen only in vision. Labored efforts are made to explain what the Scripture writers intended by the Greek word orama, vision, but one of the evangelists very clearly shows us how he understood the word in his day, when he remarks (Acts 12.9) that Peter, who saw a real angel and was by him really liberated from prison, "was not it was true [real] which was done by the angel, but thought he saw a vision."

Some commentators, to prove that Christ's calling this a vision means nothing, bring forward our Lord's caution, Mark and Luke, not to tell what "they had seen." As if a vision were something not to be seen! Luke however tells us, as already quoted, that a vision was what Peter saw, or thought he saw. Not all commentators so grossly err. Lange well says the disciples were "in a state of prophetic inspiration;" which explains their ready recognition of the two unknown characters of the vision.

We observe, further, that this foreshadowing of "the power and coming" of our Lord, was after the manner of a vision. Like the visions of the Apocalypse and others foretelling future events, it was in type or symbol. Christ the King is the central figure; with him, Moses, as type of the sleeping saints to be raised to life at the kingly coming of Christ here typified; and, Elijah, representative of the saints alive at that coming; both classes, thus represented, then to be in the spirit-body. Let no English reader suppose that the language of our version, "Moses and Elijah appeared unto them," at all implies any active agency on the part of the two. What the Greek actually states is that they became, or were, visible; the verb in the original is passive, literally, "were seen by them."

If a real Moses and Elijah appeared thus to the disciples, it contradicts other Scriptures. At the time, thus foreshadowed, of Christ's Second Coming, all the saints will have their glorified, spirit-bodies, "made like unto His glorious body; "Phil. 3.21. See 1 Cor. 15.43: "It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory:" and Col. 3.4: "When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with

him in glory." So did the two actually appear at this time. Luke says, 9.31, they "appeared in glory." But though it were assumed that Elijah at his translation received his spirit-body, "changed in a moment," 1 Cor. 15.51, as will be those remaining alive at our Lord's coming (1 Thess. 4.16), yet Moses did see death, and at this time was sleeping with h's fathers, as the Lord said he "must;" Deut. 31.14, 16. Certainly, then, if at this time he was raised from the dead and received the glorified body, that contradicts Paul's repeated statement, that "Christ was the first that should rise from the dead," Acts 26.23, that "He is the first born from dead ones," Col. 1.18, that "Christ is the first fruits of them that slept. Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at His coming," 1 cor. 15.20, 23, "that He might be the first born among many brethren; "Rom. 8.29. John, Rev. 1.5, speaks of Christ as "the first born [same Greek] from the dead." It were impossible that Moses, by a resurrection into glory, should thus precede his Lord. Nor can we suppose that he had a temporary resurrection into glory, being supplied, for the time of the vision merely, with the glorified body of the new spiritual life, then to return to a disembodied state; for that new life is eternal, that spirit-body is a deathless one. But difficulties vanish, contradictions disappear, when we accept Christ's word as the simple truth, and consent to recognize the scene on the mount as Peter recognized it; a vision of the Kingdom of God, a foreshadowing of the future "power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; "2 Pet. 1.16.

But, thus accepting it, the inference of modern theology disappears. To a vision, we can hardly look for reliable information as to the actual existence of Moses and Elijah. For, if a vision of Moses and Elijah is to authorize the inference that they are now living in heaven, which does not appear in the account, by parity of reasoning another vision, Acts 10.11-16 as good, if not better, authority for the inference that heaven also contains "all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth," since it is stated that, in vision, Peter saw such "let down from and received up again into heaven."

One point more. Receiving the transfiguration scene as a prophetic vision of a period subsequent to the first resurrection, we discover in that a reason for the injunction, "tell the vision to no man till the Son of Man be risen from the dead." It has been said, this was because of the greater enlightenment of the disciples, at that time, by the gift of the Holy Spirit. But other truths they did not understand till after Christ rose, why should this be kept concealed till then? There is a reason for it, because that, in Christ's own resurrection, they then would have had a practical illustration of that resurrection upon which the coming kingdom, now displayed in vision, is absolutely dependent; the first resurrection, of which Christ's was the type. This was needed ere the three disciples themselves could fully comprehend the vision. Note the language of Mark 9.10: "And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another, what the rising from the dead should mean." Not a question of the rising of the dead, that was a familiar idea (see Acts 24.15); it was not what is the rising of dead ones, but the rising out from dead ones; Greek to ek nekron anastemai.

Modern commentators say, this scene was intended to strengthen the faith of the three disciples, and through them of the rest, in view of the Master's approaching death. Had it been that, why forbid their telling the rest, for that death had been announced to all? why continue the injunction of secrecy after his death till he should rise again? Then, their faith would need but the sight of their risen Lord; even doubting Thomas then exclaimed, "My Lord and my God." No, the special object of the vision was to teach the beholders the great lesson which in time they might teach to others: that he who enters into the kingdom of God must first have died, and have been raised to a new life: he must thus enter a second time into life, he must be born (Greek anothen) from above, into the new life of the spirit-body. For, to repeat the word of our Lord, "that which is born of flesh, is flesh; that which is born of spirit, is spirit."

The disciples needed this lesson, for they were looking for the kingdom in their present lifetime. Though Jesus said, Jn. 18.37, that he "was born and came into the world to be a king; "yet he also says, "his kingdom is not of this world." Note this word, "world." It is not the earth, as many think; a different Greek word, ge, expresses that. In our version, world is the common rendering of two Greek words, aion, age, and, as here, kosmos, order, or arrangement. Its peculiar meaning is seen, 1 Peter 3.3: "whose adorning [kosmos, arrangement], let it not be that which is outward, of plaiting the hair, and wearing of apparel," etc. "Of this world," then, means of this present arrangement of things, this dispensation. "If my kingdom," said Jesus, "were of this kosmos, then would my servants fight." The kingdom of the Son of Man (Dan. 7.13, 14) is to be "set up" (Dan. 2.44) in the next kosmos; and in that kingdom the saints of the Resurrection "shall reign on the earth;" Rev. 5.10. But as Christ must first die, and be raised out of dead ones to an immortal life, so they also must die, and like him, be raised to a new life, ere that kingdom comes.

But this truth, so exclusively had the Jewish mind of that day dwelt on the prophecies of his literal reigning, ignoring those of his literal humiliation, probably they spiritualized and explained away the latter, as we now do the former, this great truth of a resurrection as essential to that kingdom, they could hardly receive, till the King himself had been seen to die, and to be raised to an immortal life; "henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool," Heb. 10.13; and till the Bride, the Lamb's wife, those to be associated with him, should be made ready, "arrayed in the righteousness of saints; "Rev. 19.7, 8.

After their Lord's resurrection, it was all clear to their minds. "And with great power gave the Apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus;" Acts 4.33. They preached through Jesus the resurrection, that "out from dead ones" (anastasin ten ek ton nekron); Acts 4.2. In his Pentecostal sermon, Acts 2.14-40, Peter made known the power and coming of the Lord Jesus, as an actual king, as the one to "sit on David's throne," and declared, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses." He now understands the full import of that vision on the Mount, the seal is off his lips, and to him the glad news of the kingdom, the gospel he was

commissioned to preach, is to him as it was to Paul, "Jesus and the Resurrection" -Jesus the coming King, and at the Resurrection from dead ones His coming kingdom.

Souls under the Altar.

Rev. 6.9: "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 (Greek martyrian) which they held: and they cried with a loud voice."

This is sometimes presented as a case of body-less souls in heaven. But the whole statement itself negatives any such idea. Like the scene on the mount just considered, it was all done in symbolic vision. The seals were symbols of great events or epochs, of "things which must shortly come to pass" Rev. 1.1. The souls crying out from under the altar are in symbol. It is precisely the figure of Gen. 4.10: "The voice of thy brother's blood cries unto me from the ground." "Under the altar" is an evident allusion to the place where the blood of the sin offering was poured, Lev. 4.7: "at the bottom of the altar of burnt offering." And the blood was the recognized symbol of the soul; see Lev. 17.14. It was the blood of those who had been sacrificed at God's altar, as witnesses for him, that was thence calling upon God, as did Abel's blood.

We must not forget that the book of Revelation is largely made up of O. T. imagery, and that its writer uses the word, soul, strictly as in the Hebrew, "every living soul died in the sea." And not alone from their position under (Greek upokata, down under, underneath) the altar, do we perceive that these were not actually living ones, but also from the injunction "that they should rest yet for a little season, until should be fulfilled [the number of] those their fellow servants that should be killed even as they." That cry of unjustly shed blood could not yet be heeded. These slain ones, though recognized as faithful martyrs, must yet sleep on in death, till should come (Rev. 10.18) "the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great."

To die is gain.

Phil. 1.21: "To die is gain."

To sustain the doctrine of separate soul existence, this passage is so often quoted, apart from its connection, that one might almost think it a sententious apothegm, embodying a truth of universal application. The preceding clause, however, limits it to the Apostle, and the well known inference drawn from it is that death to him, as to the Christian, is a gain in that, instead of ending his life and consigning him to the grave, it ushers him into an unending life of unspeakable bliss. So generally is this inference accepted as the real meaning of these words, that possibly the reader will be shocked to be told that they have no reference whatever to such a fact. The question of the possible future of the individual who dies, is not even alluded to in this passage!

It is very easy to decide this. We ask, Does Paul here speak of his death as a gain to himself, or to Christ? To himself, most will reply. And, to draw from it the usual inference, so must it be. But it happens that the context settles this question beyond all controversy. Let us see how.

Going back to verse 16, we learn that, during Paul's present imprisonment at Rome, some there were proclaiming the gospel, not sincerely, but, as Paul tells us, "of contention, supposing to add affliction to my bonds. What then," he says, "notwithstanding every way whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, and will rejoice." Himself, his own profit or gain, is evidently the last thing he is thinking of; he cares not what may come to him, if in any way the glad tidings of the Master he loves, may be made known. And, carrying out this thought, he adds: "According to my earnest expectation and my hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, so now also, Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death." How shall "Christ be magnified" by his living?

He goes on to tell us: "For to me to live is Christ," - is living as he would, and so honoring Christ. How shall "Christ be magnified" by his dying? "To die is a gain" TO HIM. To yield up his life for the Master's sake; is a gain to the Master's cause. Is it possible to believe Paul says, in speaking of magnifying Christ, For to me to live is for Christ's advantage, and to die is for my own!

Ah, indeed, he has not the least thought of himself, except as, whether living or dying, magnifying his Lord; not one word of what he himself may or may not gain in the future: it is what the Lord shall gain from his death, if he sees fit to permit it. And has not the death of his martyred ones ever been of the greatest gain to the cause of Christ, as they seal their testimony with their blood? As our proverb expresses it: "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church I "May not the death of the protomartyr, Stephen, have been one means, by the truth thus testified to, of gaining for the Master his most capable and useful Apostle?

Had we at this day more of Paul's self-denial, of his self-forgetfulness, we should be more slow so to interpret his language here, as not alone to conflict with the context, but also with the spirit of one who reckoned self crucified with Christ, who could say (literal Greek of Gal. 2.20) "I no longer live, but Christ lives in me."

The popular understanding of the passage is also in direct conflict with what Paul himself elsewhere states. For he, whom we misrepresent as saying it is a gain to him to die, further on in this very epistle (chap. 2.27) calls it a "mercy "to a faithful Christian not to die! In 2 Cor. 1.10, 11, he speaks of himself as having been delivered from death, and trusts Christians will pray that he may still be delivered, "that for the gift [of deliverance from death] bestowed upon us by the means of many persons, thanks may be given by many on our behalf." In 2 Cor. 5.1-4, he desires not death; he "would not be unclothed," be found naked, as when this earthly tent is dissolved. In 1 Cor: 15.26, addressing Christians, he styles death, the "last enemy."

And was he not right? To the Christian himself, to die is not gain. Death is our "last enemy." It robs us of life, till the Savior comes again, till that "hour, when all in the graves shall hear his voice." And yet in the final encounter with his adversary, the Christian can, and he should, as the Apostle John expresses it, "glorify God." Jn. 22.19. This was Paul's expectation and desire. May it be ours also!

To depart and be with Christ.

Phil. 1.23: "To depart and be with Christ."

The whole passage reads: "Yet what I shall choose I know not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ which is far better." This seems to be one of the main pillars of the doctrine that souls continue to live at death. Paul's word "to depart," for which he has "a desire," is thought to refer to his death, especially as he is just speaking of living or dying; and if death is "far better," it can be so only in case one is to be immediately with the Lord. The inference here is apparently very strong that Paul expected to be alive when he was dead, but is it actually just what it seems?

First, we notice one point which awakens our distrust; we find the passage is not an exact rendering of the original Greek. Certain words have been omitted, and others evidently modified in meaning, seemingly for a purpose. Doubtful indeed the cause which is upheld by anything like unfair dealing!

Let us compare the English version with the Greek. In verse 23, "for," as a rendering of the Greek *de* of the approved MSS., though unusual, need not be objected to: it expresses a transition with somewhat the idea of cause and effect, as it does for instance in Luke 23.17. "In a strait betwixt two;" no word for "betwixt;" the Greek is *ek*, from, or by, here with genitive of the agent; "two" is "the two," lit. Greek by the two, by both. "In a strait," if we are to understand by that in a perplexity about a choice, is not the meaning of *sunechomai*, and moreover that would require the meaning of *ek* to be changed to *betwixt*. Precisely the same passive present in Luke 12.50, our translators render, in the text, "I am straitened," in the Margin, "I am pained;" Liddell and Scott render, "I am confined, constrained, troubled, distressed"- that is, then, by both. "Having a desire," is having the [definite article, emphatic] INTENSE DESIRE; Greek *epithumia*, elsewhere translated lust, inordinate desire. Next two Greek words are omitted in our English version, though important in the connection, *eis*, for, and to, the; the definite article with the infinitive "to depart and to be," being used as a noun governed by the preposition *eis*, "for the departing and being with Christ." Then *gar*, for, is omitted in our version, "for [this were] by much far better." The passage then rightly reads: "which I shall choose for myself I know not. For I am straitened [troubled] by both; (having the INTENSE DESIRE for the departing and being with Christ, for very much better is this.)"

Now, then, what does "the departing" mean? It is generally believed that by it Paul here refers to his death, as in 2 Tim. 4.6. But this is an evident error, for that would conflict with what goes before. Paul had just said, whether life or death he knows not which he would choose, for he is troubled by both. The one brings him continual trial. (See 1 Cor. 4.13, 2 Cor. 5.4.) The other, our "enemy," robs him of life, which all are loath to lose. Will he in the next breath so stultify himself, as to say that his intense desire, his earnest longing, is for death; - is for one of the two, which are a trouble to him? That cannot be.

What then does he refer to? We shall see. An old man, Paul the aged, alone in his Roman prison (for in dismissing Timothy to the Philippian Church, he sadly tells them (chap. 2.20), he has no one like-minded, all seeking their own, not the things of Jesus Christ), his personal work through such a life of unparalleled labor, suffering, infirmity, nearly or quite done, just now waiting (chap. 2.23) to "see how it will go with him," he says, it matters not whether life or death be before him, for himself he would not care to choose. But no one may think him a disappointed, discouraged man. In one of those parentheses of which his writings are full (e. g., see Eph. 2), he declares the great hope which sustains him. There is one thing he longs for, one thing upon his heart (as the composition of Greek *epithumia* expresses): it is the departing and being with Christ. There is a departing which every man shrinks from, to that land of darkness and forgetfulness (Ps. 88.12), where no man can work (Jn. 9.4), or praise the Lord (Ps. 115.17), the returning to his earth (Ps. 146.4); it is that death which has passed upon all men, for that all have sinned, Rom. 5.12. But it is not for this he has the intense desire; it is for the - note, how the one definite article binds together the thought of the two infinitives as one compound, inseparable idea-for THE departing and being with Christ, that departing which to his mind is inseparably associated with the manifested presence of his Lord.

When is this to be? Need we repeat Paul's own words? He tells us, 1 Thess. 4.16, 17, that the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, to raise to life his sleeping saints, and to change those still living, bestowing upon all their spiritual bodies, in which they "will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and so will they ever be with the Lord." "With these words," he urged the Thessalonians to

“comfort one another.” Thus did he comfort himself in that lonely Roman prison, looking forward to that promised appearing of his Lord, when he should receive the sought for immortality, and when he could be with the Master he had loved and served so well.

That was something to be intensely longed for, “for very far better” were it than present life or than death. “By the two he is confined and oppressed, but he has the intense desire for the departing and being with Christ,”- for that great Day of reward when, forever departed from sorrow and sin, he will forever be with the Lord.

Absent from the body

2 Cor. 5:8: “Willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.”

This passage is another expression for the idea we have just been discussing, the departing and being with Christ. It is the same writer, here, also, looking forward to the reward of the great Day.

But it is claimed that Paul refers to an existence in a disembodied state, with which he says he is well pleased. (The Eng. version, “willing,” by no means gives the full force of eudoke⁵; it is used Matt. 17:5: “My beloved Son, in whom I am [Greek eudokeo] well pleased.”) The context, however, so plainly contradicts the idea that Paul “is well pleased “with the state between his dying and his Lord’s coming again, that all we need is but thoughtfully to read it over.

Paul had just spoken, chap. 4.14, of his assurance of a resurrection like to that of his Lord. “For which cause” (ver. 16) he does not lose heart, as he looks (verse 18) on to the unseen and eternal. Then beginning chap. v., “For we [who are thus to be raised] know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, [if our present body, the natural (psychikon) of 1 Cor. 15.44, were destroyed (as is the usual E. V. rendering) in death, it matters not, for we know that] we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the- heavens.” This eternal building cannot be the disembodied state, for that is by no means eternal, it lasts but till the Resurrection. What is it, then? Evidently, the spiritual body, which is immortal, imperishable, here spoken of as a permanent home in contrast with our present perishable tent, the natural body. This spiritual body, this “building of God “coming direct from his special creative power, “from heaven,” and not as our mortal body through human generation, is yet in the Creator’s hand, that it may be given to the faithful, when he comes to give to every one as his work shall be; Rev. 22.12.

Ver. 2: “For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house, which is from heaven,”-with our spiritual body. Here is the precise Greek endusasthai, of 1 Cor. 15.53; “For it is necessary that this mortal be clothed with [endusasthai] immortality.” What is to be thus clothed? The soul, all will say; and that Paul calls “this mortal;” it is not immortal, till clothed with the spirit-body.

Ver. 3. “If so be that having been clothed [Greek aorist], we shall not be found naked.” Ver. 4. “For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened, not for that we wish to be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life.” To be unclothed, to be without a body, the natural or the spiritual, in other - words, to be dead; that he does not wish. What he does wish is to exchange the mortal for the immortal, as he had before explained to these same Corinthians, 1 Cor. 15.54, when “this mortal puts on immortality, then death is swallowed up in victory.” Ver. 5. Now he that hath wrought us [worked us out] for the self same thing [the swallowing up of mortality by life] is God, who also has given to us the earnest [or pledge] of the Spirit.”

And now comes our passage, “Therefore [ver. 6] we are always confident” [Greek of good courage, good cheer, Matt. 14.27], and verse 8, “and are well pleased [E. V. willing] rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord.” It is as looking watchfully (so the Greek skopeo) to the unseen and eternal, that he is well pleased to be absent from - not a body, as the popular inference would make it, that he has just denied, but from-the body, this temporary tent, and to be present with the Lord. For that involves the time of reward, the coming of the Lord, the Resurrection, when he is to be clothed upon with immortality, with the eternal building of God’s special workmanship and bestowal. That the full context brings out this as Paul’s meaning is too evident to discuss further.

Spirits in Prison.

1 Peter 3.18-20: “Christ suffered being put to death [Greek sarki, dative of manner, no article] according to flesh, but quickened [Greek pneumatⁱ, no article] according to spirit [Greek en ho], in [or, by] which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, who sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing,” etc.

The question here is whether this going and preaching was literal or figurative: i.e., whether Christ did it himself, or did it through others; as we say, one does himself what he does through another, freely translating the Latin maxim, “Qui facit per alium, facit per se.” Those who hold the literal view believe that, during the interval between his crucifixion and his ascension, Christ went in person and preached to certain spirits (disembodied), those who had lived in Noah’s day. Others, taking it figuratively, believe this preaching of Christ was done through Noah, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of that “preacher of righteousness,” as Peter in his second Epistle styles him: 2 Pet. 2.5. They understand that “went and preached” is equivalent to the “came and preached” of

Eph. 2.17: Christ "came and preached peace to" the Ephesians not in his person, but through his ministers; that as it was in one case, so in the other.

Now, is there here any real difficulty in deciding whether the expression under discussion is literal, or figurative? None at all, if we follow the Law of the literal and the figurative. That constrains us to consider first, and to accept, the literal; that Christ himself went and preached, unless such be proved an impossibility. We observe on the supposition that Christ did the preaching himself, it was to those long dead; if he did it through Noah, it was to those living, while the ark was preparing. On the literal view then, the question is as to the possibility of preaching to the dead.

Well, the Bible doctrine makes short work with such a fancy. We read, Eccl. 9.5: "the dead know not anything; "Ps. 146.4: when "he returned to his earth, his thoughts perish; "Eccl. 9.10: "there is no device, nor wisdom, nor knowledge in the grave, whither thou goes;" Ps. 115.17: "the dead go down into silence;" Isa. 38.18: "they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth;" evidently no preaching to them while there, as is the implied declaration in the question of Psalm 88.11, 12: "shall thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave? shall thy wonders be known in the dark? "Our Lord himself has declared that there he himself could neither preach nor do any work. He says, Jn. 9.4: "I must work the works of him that sent me while it is day, the night cometh, when no man can work."

Moreover, men, angels, and our Lord, unite to testify to us that during that interval between his crucifixion and his resurrection, Christ was doing no preaching to living or to dead men. He was simply lying in Joseph's tomb all that time. Our Lord tells us, "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth; "Matt. 12.40. The angels say, "Ye seek Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here, for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay; "Matt. 28.5, 6. And Paul declares, "He descended first into the lower parts of the earth. He that descended, is the same also that ascended far above all things; "Eph. 4.9, 10.

Evidently, the literal sense, that Christ in person preached to the dead Antediluvians, as it is held, is an impossibility; and we must adopt the other view, that Christ preached by his spirit in his servant Noah to them while living, as only it could be done, when formerly the long-suffering of God waited upon them. For that abuse of God's great patience, those, who are said to be now in prison, "reserved unto the day of judgment to be punished " (2 Pet. 2.9), in the day when for them the bars of the grave will be withdrawn, will then have but to give account, and receive their reward. For, with life, ended their opportunity.

And so, this legend of Christ's preaching when in his grave takes its place, as far as Scripture authority goes, alongside of those other apocryphal histories of his childhood.

The reputed raising of Samuel.

1 Sam. 28.3-25 The reputed raising of Samuel.

Like our modern spiritual manifestations, this has so much of deception about it as to be unworthy of serious notice, were it not that it is so generally accepted by our religious teachers as an actual appearing of the dead Samuel. Perhaps they have been led astray by a theory that dead men are still living, for, except there be the desire to interpret the story as sustaining such a belief, there is no difficulty at all about it.

The point in dispute will be, Was Samuel actually there? Either he was, or he was not. If actually there, it was, according to the narrative, in bodily form; "an old man cometh up," verse 14. How came he there as such? for if the popular theory be true, he is a disembodied being. The spiritual body is not "put on" till the Resurrection, when, at the last trump, this corruptible puts on incorruption. See 1 Cor. 15.42-52. This appearance of Samuel in such a shape could be only by miracle, wrought either by the magic power of the witch, or by divine power. That this witch, one according to Israel's law unfit to live, should be able to summon from his abode the great Seer of Israel, if indeed living, into her presence, and to give him a "materialized "body, were too preposterous to argue upon. If, then, Samuel were really there in the shape the narrative presents him, it must have been by a special exercise of almighty, creative power. And for what? Merely, as we find, to declare to the king his inevitable fate. In other words, God's miraculous power was put forth to accomplish just what God had refused to do in the ordinary way!

Nay, more extraordinary still. We learn that Saul had received the kingdom of Israel as the viceroy of Jehovah, but, failing to obey the orders of his superior, he is rejected, until at last his indignant Sovereign refuses to hold any intercourse whatever with him. And then the rebellious king fully reveals his guilty character. Well aware that God had denounced the practice of witchcraft as a special abomination (Deut. 18.9-12), that he had denounced against it the death penalty (Ex. 22.18; Lev. 20.27), which penalty Saul himself had rigorously enforced, he now determines to plunge himself into this abominable wickedness. In contempt of the majesty of law, its appointed guardian presumptuously violates the law. Is this new, startling act of rebellion to render his Sovereign more propitious? Will he, to reward his daring impiety, now grant him the refused audience? Will he send a special messenger to convey to him his will? Nay, more, will the Most High himself become an apparent partner in the crime, doing in effect for the woman what she could not herself, and thus to others actually substantiating her claim of power to raise the dead? To harbor the thought is an outrage! By

every attribute the Holy One is pledged against thus countenancing sin. A man born blind has better insight into the divine character, who tells us, "We know that God heareth not sinners;" John 9.31.

If, then, the witch could not, and God would not, bring Samuel there, the only alternative left us is, he was not there at all: It was a fraud. This woman, whose trade is deception, evidently imposes upon the God-forsaking and forsaken king.

This we learn from the narrative itself. In the darkness of night, three strangers present themselves at the woman's door. One of them, a very giant for stature, states his-not their - errand (his language shows they are but attendants), thus: "Divine for me by the familiar spirit, and bring me him up whom I shall name unto thee." His features are muffled and mean his apparel, yet no disguise can conceal the tall form of one "higher than any of the people, from his shoulders and upward;" 1 Sam. 9.2; 10.23. In the Hebrew of the 20th verse, as given in the margin, the writer of the story himself notices this marvelous height: "Then Saul made haste and fell with the fulness of his stature." And we must not forget that, at this moment, the tent of Israel's tall general was seven miles away. Saul himself at her door May it not be a trap for her life? She states her suspicion, verse 9. Her previous recognition is confirmed, while her fear is quieted, by the solemn oath, not as of a private subject - "I will not betray you;" but as of one whose word was law - "There shall no punishment happen to thee for this thing."

Shrewdly concealing her knowledge till the opportune moment, she arrogantly inquires: "Whom shall I bring up?" "Bring me up Samuel." Her incantations, which gave time for any needed preparation, being completed, she suddenly screams out with every appearance of terror. Commentators strangely tell us, it was because Samuel himself unexpectedly appears on the scene. We have already shown that were impossible. But let the further narrative decide that. The woman herself states the cause of her terror, whether real or assumed: "Why hast thou deceived me, for, thou art Saul?" It is Saul himself, the mortal terror of the Hebrew necromancers. In his very presence has she been unwittingly betrayed into practicing her unlawful art!

She is acting a part; she knows all along it is Saul, and his oath already stands between her and harm. She would have Saul assume that the supernatural power that imparts to her this unsuspected information, can also bring to her Samuel. Saul, who surely could never have imagined her as terrified at what she professed to do any day, recognizes himself as the cause of her terror, and he quiets her with a word, as he could not had Samuel actually frightened her, eagerly bidding her not to be afraid of him, but to go on-"Be not afraid, but what saw thou?" Saul sees nothing, but the woman's artifice has fully succeeded; he is now too well convinced of her magic power to be critical, he will trust her eyes - "what saw thou?" Does she reply, Samuel himself, whom you asked for? Not she! far too shrewd for that, especially where, as here, mystery is essential to success; and preferring, like modern spiritual mediums, to make her credulous victim think he is using his own mental faculties, she vaguely responds, "I saw gods (or as the Hebrew might be rendered, a majestic one) ascending out of the earth." "What. is his form?" asks the king, who still sees nothing. "An old man cometh up, and he is clothed with a mantle," a royal or sacred robe. We read, "Then Saul perceived it was Samuel." How? He perceived from the description given him, evidently from no observation on his part. And, thus a willing victim to this artful woman, "he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself," not the best position certainly for critical observation.

Then ensues a conversation between Saul and either the woman acting as a ventriloquist (as seems to have been customary in such cases; compare Is. 27.4), or with an arranged confederate; of which conversation a commentator, forgetful perhaps that "Satan is transformed into an angel of light," says: "The devout, prophetic utterances are only possible to a servant of God like Samuel." But the language is by no means so devout. A querulous inquiry from Samuel breaks the silence - hardly necessary to specify the fictitious Samuel- "Why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up?" This Samuel seems to have fallen in with the arrangements made, and accepts it as a fact that the magic art of the woman, at the instance of Saul, has thus disturbed his quiet slumber in the grave, and, we should judge, much to his discomfort. Is this the opening word of a special messenger from the Almighty?

As apology for this disturbance, Saul explains that God has entirely deserted him, will in no way deign to answer him, "therefore," he says, "have I called for thee, that thou mayest make known," etc. The response of Samuel. "Why dost thou ask of me?" "seems to Show that Samuel, as well as Saul, recognizes that God has had no agency in this interview.

But it may be asked, Does not the after fulfilment of the prophecy show a divine foresight? By no means. One even less shrewd than this artful woman would have been at no loss to forecast Saul's near future at this juncture. All Israel knew that he had been rejected by the Divine king-maker, and that his successor had been appointed. It was evident that the sceptre was slipping from the grasp that had held it for forty years. Already a confident Philistine host was in the heart of the land. The panic-struck army of Israel was led by a trembling leader (1 Sam. 28.5), so estranged from God as now to be found in the hut of a proscribed witch, who learns from his own lips how far "the Lord had departed from him and become his enemy." And every Israelite knew the fate of his country, or of individuals, when God was arrayed against them.

Her nearness to the contending hosts would apprise the witch of the imminency of an engagement, and under such circumstances she could but recognize the hour then Saul must yield up his kingdom and his life. And in the hopeless contest, his sons with him would no doubt also lose their lives, as most of them did.

But if this were the real Samuel, what shall he said of the language in which he announces to Saul his impending fate? "To-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me." With me! The God-abandoned king to be admitted to the realms of the blest, of which the righteous Samuel, if living at all, must be a resident? Impossible! We cannot say here, as is so commonly said when Bible language contradicts some theory of our own, "In Old Testament times they did not understand these things," for here is supposed to be one who knew all about these things. And yet perfectly natural is the statement, if the speaker professed to be one raised for the moment out of the grave, into which alike the wicked king and his faithful son were so soon to be called. "They shall lie down alike in the dust, and the worms shall cover them;" Job 21.26.

It is worthy of note how exactly all the actors in this story, when speaking of the present abode of dead ones, follow universal Bible usage, instead of the popular usage of the present day. Saul begins, "Bring me him up." The woman inquires, "Whom shall I bring up?" "Bring me up Samuel." She says, "I saw gods ascending out of the earth "-" an old man cometh up." Samuel says, "Why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up "-" tomorrow shalt thou be with me "-" with me, nor my body, in the grave. And a thousand years after the Master himself, who knows, for he really came from heaven, uses the same language: "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall 4-erne forth;" John 5.28.

Thus we see, on the understanding of a fictitious Samuel, the story is consistent and intelligible throughout; while the popular understanding of a real Samuel rests on -what? On two assumed inferences from two statements in the narrative, "When the woman saw Samuel she cried out," and, "Then Saul perceived it was Samuel." It is assumed, that the unexpected presence of a real Samuel frightened the woman; she herself says, it was Saul's presence. It is assumed, that Saul perceived it was Samuel from his own observation: the narrative tells us it was from the woman's description of what he did not see; while the prediction itself was within the capacity of any ordinary intelligence. Nor can any deduction be drawn from calling the one Samuel who personates that individual, for such is the usage of all languages and times. In speaking of one who, as here, acts the part of another, we say, Hamlet did thus, or appeared thus; never deeming it necessary to explain, we do not mean the real Hamlet, but the actor who personates him. We could hardly, in a story told in as few words as this, ask for explanatory details, when such should be patent to every thoughtful reader. Had the writer of the narrative foreseen the desire of after years to misunderstand his words, he might have more fully explained himself.

Thus have we shown that the presence of a real Samuel was impossible, both in the nature of the case, and from the narrative itself. Would that the real spectre in the imagination of Bible readers, and which has so encouraged the wicked abominations of spiritism, might be so laid to rest as never again to be "brought up."

Great a cloud of witnesses

"Wherefore, seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses;" Heb. 12.1.

The preceding context so guards against an erroneous inference, that the writer would not have noticed this passage, had he not recently found a somewhat noted theological authority referring to it as a proof-text in support of the popular theory of disembodied existence. To have any bearing upon that question, the passage must be understood to imply that we are compassed about by the living souls of the ancient worthies, spoken of in the preceding chapter, who are thus represented as looking down upon us, witnesses of the fidelity with which we run the race they have completed.

To the casual reader, our version appears to permit such a construction, and perhaps it was so intended it should, but what says the original? The Greek for "we are compassed about," is, hemeis, we; echontes, having; peri-kei-menon, lying around; heroin, us-"we having lying around us so great a cloud of witnesses." Every definition given in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon to the Greek verb, perikeimai (compound of peri, around, and keimai, to lie), is based upon the idea of lying recumbent, which is the proper meaning of the original verb. And it will be observed that, if it were intended merely to express, as does our version, that we are compassed about by, i.e., we have about us, these witnesses, then the verb keimai in its corn-position here is of no use; for echontes fully expresses that idea with the other Greek words, lameis echontes peri himin, we having around us. In this very verse the verb keimai, in the same participial form, is repeated in composition with another preposition, pro, before, and in its undoubted meaning: "let us run with patience the race [pro-keimenon] lying before us." As that race is (keimenon) lying (pro) before us, so is that cloud of witnesses (keimenon) lying (pen) around us.

Moreover, the Greek martus, or martyr, translated "witnesses," never bears the meaning, apparently given to it in our version, of spectators; of those looking upon, watching our course. The word denotes, solely, one who bears witness, it may be by words, by his life, or by his death; as the first witness specified, Abel, who, "being dead, yet speaks." Some of these witnesses sealed their witness, or testimony, to their faith with their lives, "not accepting deliverance, that they might gain a better resurrection" - the "resurrection to life" of Jn. 5.29.

The precise location at present of one of these witnesses, the word of Inspiration explicitly states: "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. For David is not ascended into the heavens;" Acts 2.29-34. About as precise as language can well be! We understand that David is lying (kei-menon) in

his sepulchre, till the day of which he speaks in Psalm 17: "When I awake, in Thy likeness." Certainly he, at least, is not with that ghostly host which, in the imagination of some, is thought to be looking down upon us.

No such thought, evidently, was in the mind of the writer of Hebrews. For, after speaking of those who desire the "better resurrection," he says, in the verse immediately preceding the one we are discussing: "that they, without us, should not be made perfect; "Greek teleiasthosi, should not be perfected. Paul, in Phil. 3, longing for the same better resurrection (exanastasis ek nekron, verse immediately says, "Not as though already I received it, or already I have been perfected." If those now lying in the sleep of death, were enjoying the supreme felicity of the heavenly world, it were certainly very near our idea of being perfected. And some of our theological friends seem so to understand it, when they quote Heb. 12.23, "spirits of just men made perfect," to sustain their idea that the souls of the dead are now in the perfect bliss of heaven. Could the writer of Hebrew have supposed possible such a misuse of that passage, when he had just before stated that they were not yet made perfect?

We have now examined all the more prominent passages, whence modern theology draws THE INFERENCE that the soul is immaterial and immortal. These inferences we found to be the last, or rather the sole, support of its peculiar dogma, which so many suppose is derived from the Bible. Our study of the sacred record showed us that the dogma itself is not stated, nor is the soul ever denominated immortal; on the contrary, it is spoken of as mortal, material, and as belonging to all animals.

What, then, does modern theology ask of us? It demands that we receive as Bible truth a doctrine so important in itself and in its bearing on other doctrines as the inherent immortality of the soul, when careful investigation shows that the Bible, which alone can reveal the nature and destiny of the soul, not only fails to reveal this doctrine, but most peremptorily; in words at Yeast, denies it. And it demands this of us on the authority of- what? Of mere inferences, which it claims to draw from comparatively few passages of the Bible.

Well, we have now carefully examined these passages. We have sought for the meaning of each passage in the original, and as associated with its context and with other Scriptures. And what has been the result! Each reader must judge for himself. We find that not a single passage examined sustains the inference of an immortal, immaterial soul; but that each, judged by its relation to the context and to other scripture, directly condemns the inference. And these inferences were all that modern theology could hope to find to sustain its peculiar dogma. What then becomes of any Bible standing for that dogma?

But this is not all.

Our study of the word of God discovers to us that, in the English version of the Bible, there has been a deliberate and persistent effort to cover up the truth on this question of the soul, from the ordinary English reader, unacquainted with the original languages in which the Bible was written.

In the first, second, and ninth chapters of Genesis, nine times is the Hebrew for "living soul" applied to lower animals. Not once does it so appear in the English text. In the marginal readings, which in many Bibles are not printed, and which but few carefully read, the fact is brought out in but two of these instances: yet enough to show that our translators recognized the correct rendering, and the application of the original to all animals. Of all instances in the O. T. where the word soul is used of lower animals, in one case only (Numb. 31.28), is it literally so rendered; and there, on account of peculiar surroundings, it was difficult to avoid it. (See Appendix A.)

So, too, our translators of the Bible have largely concealed from us the mortal nature of the real soul, by practically expurgating such passages as bring the natural death of a soul prominent before the mind. Where the Hebrew speaks of the death of a soul by violence, they, as a rule, substitute some other English word. (See Appendix C.)

If, however, the thought in connection with the word soul be that of life, even though it be this present mortal one, they show no hesitation in using the correct rendering. For instance, in Gen. 19.17, 19, 20, the Hebrew nephesh, soul, occurs three times, referring each time to Lot's soul. The first time we read "Escape for thy life; "Hebrew soul: that is in the destruction of Sodom, save thy soul from death; so here nephesh is rendered life. The next time Lot speaks to the angel, who brought him out of Sodom, as having saved his soul, i.e. from 'threatened physical death; so again our English version renders nephesh, life. But in the next verse, the idea of living is prominent, though it is but continuance in this mortal life, and so we have, this third time that Lot's soul is spoken of, the literal rendering: "and my soul shall live." In other cases, as 1 Sam. 22.22: "I have occasioned the death of all the souls of thy father's house," it would not answer to say "death of all the lives;" so we have "of all the persons." We have noted a familiar instance of this double rendering in consecutive verses, Matt. 16.25, 26, and Mark 8.35, 36.

Again, we find that the Bible, as originally written, speaks of dead souls as tangible objects, lying dead before one's eyes. But not the least hint of such a fact is allowed to appear in our English version. (See Appendix D.)

The design of this concealment of the meaning of the Hebrew is most apparent. And it furnishes a most convincing proof, if such were needed, of the radical difference between the doctrine of the Bible and the doctrine of modern theology, in reference to the soul. Our

translators recognized the fact, that if they translated the Bible into its equivalent English, this radical difference were made apparent to every mind. And so the question came up, they could not evade it: - Must we put into the hands of the common people a book which will stultify our own doctrines? In translating from the original languages in which the Bible was given to man, shall the Bible doctrine, or our own doctrine, of the nature of the soul give way? The result we have before us. On this question, Bible truth went to the wall; it was crushed out of sight!

Are any among us so hardy as to defend this course? Do the International Committee on Bible Revision propose to follow this example, or will they honor God's word and themselves by boldly standing for the truth? That remains to be seen, not only here, but in a Day that is coming!

We have now obtained a full answer to the question of the nature of the soul, in the form in which it was first considered. Our inquiry was: "Is the Popular conception of the soul that of Holy Scripture?" Most emphatically are we answered, NO. Popular theology teaches that a soul is immaterial, immortal, and the sole possession of man. The Bible teaches that a soul is material, mortal, and does not appertain solely to man. And our English translators have clinched the argument as against modern theology, by their evident endeavors to cover up the truth on these points!

We now proceed to the further question, what actually is the soul, as taught in the Bible?

CHAPTER 8

The Main Question Answered. Statement of the Bible Doctrine of the Soul.

OUR inquiry into the Bible use of the word soul has brought out the following facts: Soul is a term applied alike to man and to all animals. It denotes what is material; what is liable to death, and while in the state of death, for a time at least, visible and tangible. A very peculiar feature of its use is that while usually it denotes the entire being or individual, at times it would seem to denote something which the being possesses; in Biblical phrase, we may say of man or of any animal, each is, or, each has, a soul. For example, we read, Gen. 2.19: "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every fowl 'of the air, and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them; and whatsoever Adam called every living soul [so Hebrew], that was the name thereof." And again, Gen. 1. 20: "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the creeping [so margin] creature that hath a living soul;" so Heb., as in margin.

In some cases of its use in the Bible, soul might be thought a synonym for body, as in Numb. 6.6, and other instances where our translators themselves render Hebrew "dead soul," by Eng. "dead body." In other cases we recognize a difference, as where Paul writes, 1 Thess. 5.23, "the whole of you, the spirit, and the soul, and the body." We observe also from this quotation, and from Heb. 4.12, which speaks of "the dividing asunder of soul and spirit," that soul cannot be the same as spirit. That we have learned is the vital principle, or breath of life; as being that which gives life to what without it were dead, the idea of life cannot be dissevered from spirit, as it can be from soul.

What then is this Biblical soul? Such marked peculiarities in its use, must guide us to the meaning of the word beyond a question.

In our language there is a word, which, as we use it, presents the precise counterpart of the Hebrew word for soul. All the marked peculiarities of the Bible use of the latter are exactly reproduced in our use of the English word. That word is ORGANISM. All that the Bible has to say of a soul, we say of an organism. It appertains to man and to all animals. It is material, it is liable to death. Like the dead soul of the Bible, a dead organism is visible and tangible. In our modern use of organism, we find that striking peculiarity of the Bible use of soul; it denotes either the entire animal, or what the animal possesses; the animal is an organism, or,, we may say, it has an organism. And we use organism as the Bible does soul, as a practical synonym for body; the dead organism of an animal is its dead body. When animated by the presence of life, the animal becomes a living organism, as Adam became a living soul.

Surely, here is the exact equivalent in our language of the word soul, in Bible language. And it shows the felt need of just such a word, that when the word soul was perverted - may we say?- to another meaning, the need for what soul formerly expressed was so apparent, that. this new word, organism, was coined to take the place of that otherwise appropriated. We may rightly say misappropriated, for, from being a pertinent and useful word, it was carried off to express something of which we can know nothing except through revelation, and which we find revelation does not even mention.

Can we hesitate, then, to accept the one word as the proper equivalent of the other? If, in any language, ancient or modern, we find that a special word, whose meaning is in question, is used precisely as a special word is used in our own, all that is predicated of the one being also of the other; and especially, if certain striking peculiarities of the former, in relation to the verbs to have, and to be, and

also in its relations to a third word in that language, are exactly reproduced in the similar relations of our own word, is it not beyond all controversy, that we have here the exact word by which the hitherto doubtful foreign word is to be rendered into our language?

With such facts before us, we come to the conclusion, judging from Bible usage, that the English word ORGANISM is the exact equivalent of the Hebrew word nephesh, and so is the exact equivalent of the word soul, by which the Hebrew is rendered into English.

Organism is defined to be.: "A structure composed of or acting by means of organs; an organized being." The word expresses the idea of the orderly arrangement and 'association of organs in one structure, with differing functions, and yet mutually dependent upon each other. This, then, is the original, or primary, meaning of the Biblical soul.

Out of this have grown certain secondary meanings. These organs are formed, and thus related for a special purpose, to receive and carry on life. Hence the thought of life, though not absolutely indispensable to it, is suggested by the thought of organism. For when the organism is destroyed, or its functions arrested, life ends; on the other hand, when life is taken away, the organism comes to its end. Hence in the Bible, a second or derived meaning of soul. It is used to convey the idea of life, which cannot be manifested without a soul, or organism, to receive and retain it. This secondary meaning, life, is sometimes found in the Hebrew language, though it is more frequent in the later Greek, as would be expected of a derived meaning. When the Greek psyche, soul, denotes life, it does so with a manifest allusion to the manner it acquired this meaning; it expresses what we might call organized life. So the Greek bios denotes life, with reference to the means of subsistence; bios being the same word as, and probably deriving its meaning of life from, the Greek for bow, which, in early days, provided the means of subsistence. While the Greek zoe denotes life in the abstract sense of the word.

But, further, as an outcome or result of a vitalized soul, or organism, there are mental manifestations, thought, feeling, will, desire, and the like. The Hebrew nephesh, soul, sometimes expresses these, as Gen. 23.8: "If it be your nephesh," Hebrew soul, E. V. mind. So also 1 Sam. 18.1. "The soul of Jonathan was knit to the soul of David." In this case the word soul is used precisely as we use one of the bodily organs, the heart, to express emotions that arise from the action of the whole organism.

We may here note that a similar metaphorical meaning of spirit is common in our own and in all languages. As it is the spirit, or vital principle, which sets in operation the functions of the organism, producing thought, feeling, etc., when then these are powerfully manifested, we call it an exhibition of spirit; - we say, he is a man of spirit. And so the opposite. When the Queen of Sheba saw the magnificence of Solomon, we read: "there was no more spirit in her" (1 Kings 10.5); or, to go back to the earliest meaning of spirit, it took her breath away, as is still our English expression.

We find, then, that the Bible gives us as the original, the primary meaning of soul: the organism of man and of all animals; the conception embracing the organization, as making up one entire individual. This is by far its. most frequent meaning. It is found everywhere in the Old Testament, and to a considerable extent in the New, even where the original is not translated soul in our version.

A secondary, or derived meaning, is life; not abstract life, but organized life, dependent upon, or connected with, an organism. This is more common in the New Testament, though we find examples even in the earlier portion of the Old; as Gen. 24.18: "As her soul (life) was in departing, for she died." Also 1 Kings 17.21: "Let this child's soul (life) come into him again."

As a more remote meaning we find occasionally the word soul stands for the emotions, which it originates, as in the examples already given.

A remarkable corroboration of this primary Bible meaning of soul, as denoting an organized individual, we note in a mode of speech prevailing among us, which so contradicts our present modes of thought as to be indeed utterly inexplicable, but for its agreement with Bible usage. Notwithstanding it is almost universally taught, and as universally accepted, even among disbelievers in revelation, that the soul is something immaterial and absolutely indestructible, in daily speech, in daily papers, we find expressions like those: "Some hundreds of souls perished in that shipwreck," or "by disease, by fire or flood, of famine, or by the devastation of war, so many souls were destroyed;" evidently meaning so many individuals were destroyed.

So thoroughly is this Biblical mode of expression interwoven with the conception we form of ourselves, that it comes out even when one does not intend it. A noted American preacher, declaring to his congregation his belief in the migration of souls to another sphere, exclaimed: "When I die, and I am buried in Greenwood, let none of you standing before my grave say, Here lies . Thank God, I shall not lie there 1 "etc. He contradicted his theoretical belief even in the stating of it; - I die and am buried, when I am buried I am not buried. Does not the "I" of the same sentence denote in each case the man himself?

At the funeral of a little child, the officiating clergyman administered the usual consolation to the bereaved parents, informing them it was "not their child lying there before them; that was but the lifeless case, or shell; their boy himself was gone to a brighter land, a

cherub form before the throne," etc. (Little idea, apparently, have our religious painters or teachers of the four-faced cherub of Holy Writ!) The exercises concluded, the afflicted mother, who no doubt thought she believed what had been said, leaned over the coffin to take a last look at what had been her child. Kissing its cold forehead, she sobbed out, as she addressed the lifeless form before her: "Oh my child, my child, shall I never see you more?" She felt it was still her child lying there in death. The heart reversed the verdict of the head. A mother's love rising up against a false theology, claimed the dead child as its own!

It was the language of nature; it is the language of the Bible. How touchingly the aged patriarch says: "As for me, Rachel died by me in the land of Canaan, and I buried her in the way of Bethlehem." It was the dearly loved wife, for whom his seven years of service had "seemed but a few days for the love he had to her," whom he left buried there. And he charged his sons: "Bury me with my fathers in the cave of Machpelah: there they buried Abraham and Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac and Rebekah his wife; and there I buried Leah."

How does modern theology meet this language of nature and the Bible? For it holds that the man is not buried in the grave; it declares that those are all wrong in fact, who, with the Bible, say that souls are destroyed by any physical means. It has here the assurance even to assert that this popular use of the word soul, which contradicts the popular conception, is, in reality, a confirmation of the correctness of its theory. It says to us: "There, you see, in common speech, in the daily records, those who believe in the essential, inherent immortality of the soul, say souls are destroyed. You know they do not mean what they say. So is it in the Bible."

But, how do we know they do not mean what they say? It is because so often we hear them categorically expressing the opposite belief. How comes it then that not one of the Bible characters, under any circumstances, through fifteen centuries, is ever found expressing the opposite belief, if really they held it? Without exception, their testimony is all one way. Still more 'perplexing, how comes it about that men of the present day could have been taught to say just what they do not mean; to make the statement that souls are destroyed, when they actually believe the destruction of a soul is one of the most impossible of things? How could they ever universally acquire so heedless, so false a way of expressing themselves? There must be some reason for this. Will it be said, they learned it from the Bible? Then who taught Bible characters to utter themselves so regardless of fact? And Moses represents our Creator Himself as using this remarkable language.

In reply, modern theology has but one resource; it falls back upon its one refuge of figurative language! A figure of speech, it calls it. But what figure? by what name is it known? What figure of speech can that be, where a man says one thing and means another, and never gives us a clue, as Bible speakers do not, that they intend other than the most natural meaning?

The writer has heard of but one figure of speech actually suggested, viz., synecdoche, where a part is put for the whole, or vice versa; such verbal interchange of the two being permissible as a figure of speech, on the basis that what is true of the one is true of the other. We are told the soul is put for the whole man. But here, there is no possible synecdoche; it is rather one part put for another part. The statement in question does not apply either to the part specified, or to the whole; it is simply untrue, according to modern theology. We were told, so many souls were destroyed: modern theology says they cannot be destroyed; that we were meant to be told, so many human bodies were destroyed. That is, a speaker intends to state that a man's body, the shell of his real self, was destroyed; he goes to work to do this by stating that the real self, the soul, which he believes indestructible, was destroyed, and says nothing of the body itself. Is it needful to illustrate the absurdity of this? It is as if a father, instructing a son, were to say of a pile of walnuts: If you plant the shells, you will have a crop of young trees; or, as if a housekeeper, thinking to speak by synecdoche, should inquire of an oyster dealer, how many shells her guests would be likely to eat! In fact, the latter supposition does not involve the utter physical impossibility, which, on the popular conception, attaches to the statement of the destruction of souls by physical disaster.

Here is indeed an enigma evidently beyond the power of modern theology to solve. It cannot give us the origin of this peculiar habit of using the word soul strictly in accordance with Bible usage, and yet so totally at variance with modern theology's teachings, and the universal acceptance of the word; how men soberly should say one thing, and by general consent be understood to mean just the reverse of what they say.

The simple solution of the difficulty is that we here meet with a relic of ancient days. The very language in which from generation to generation men have been taught to express themselves, herein sustains the Bible doctrine of the soul, and protests against the theology we have rightly denominated modern. This form of speech has been handed down to us from a period antecedent to modern theology, when the fact was universally accepted, and indelibly impressed upon human language, that the soul, or organism, is the man himself, and perishes in death. And it still holds its own against later innovations, a most telling witness of the present corruption of old-time truth.

We may also note here, as further corroborating this view of the truth, what will be more fully noticed elsewhere (see Appendix E), that the Bible speaks of the various bodily organs as parts of a soul, or organism. It uses one or more of these parts, as the liver, bowels, kidneys, or one of them together with the whole, to express the emotions or affections, which belong to the whole organism. This peculiarity of ancient times is still found, in the like use popularly made, in these days, of one of these organs, the heart, and in the occasional use of another, the spleen, and of the bile, a secretion of a third organ. The circulating fluid, the blood, is also spoken of

by us as the seat of, or as giving rise to, certain emotions; as when we speak of a deed done in cold blood, in hot blood, or of bad blood between two foes. And so the God of Israel selected the blood as the emblem, or representative, of the individual life which results from the action of the conjoined organism. As, Lev. 17.12, 14, 11: "No soul [nephesh] of you shall eat blood. For it is [or, represents] the soul [nephesh, E. V. life] of all flesh: the blood of it is for the soul [nephesh, E. V. life] thereof. I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; "nephesh.

But it may be objected that 1 Thess. 5.23 does not fall in with this Bible meaning of soul. In that passage, Paul prays that "the whole of you, the spirit, and the soul, and the body, may be preserved blameless [not unto as in E. V., but] in the appearing [Greek parousia] of our Lord Jesus Christ." It is claimed that this enumeration, "and soul and body," argues a distinction between the two, greater than our definition permits, which, as we have seen in certain cases at least, would make the two almost synonymous.

First, however, permit us to note that the same objection applies with fatal force to the popular theory. For, according to that, except in some secondary meanings, soul and spirit are the same; no distinction exists between the two. And so, Webster presents the two as absolutely identical. Spirit is defined: "the soul of man, the intelligent, immaterial, immortal part of human beings." Soul is defined: "the spiritual, rational, and immortal part in man." Moreover, Heb. 4.12, speaks of "the dividing asunder of soul and spirit." Two things which thus generically can be divided asunder, belong to two different classes; they are not the same identical thing.

But now for the objection that, if we define soul to be organism, we fail to recognize the distinction between it and the body, which the Bible requires.

Let us first understand how much distinction the Bible really makes between the two. One who has not given the subject attention, will be surprised to learn how little this is. We give, in Appendix D, a number of instances where our translators themselves fail to recognize any difference, for in those instances they actually translate the Hebrew word soul by the Eng. word body. And so the word flesh, which popularly is thought to be as distinct as possible from soul, sometimes in the Bible is used as another term for human beings, soul and body. E. g., Gen. 6.12, 13: "All flesh had corrupted, his way upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, the end of all flesh is come before me, for the earth is filled with violence through them." And so "flesh" stands for soul, in Matt. 19.5, where our Lord quotes, "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they two shall be one flesh," or, as is the equivalent expression, Acts 4.32, "were one [not of one] heart and one soul." Yielding up the individual interests of former days, the married couple are henceforth to be one flesh, that is, one soul, in the emotions, desires, purposes, that proceed from one soul, or organism. Note still another example. When our risen Lord, would convince his disciples that it was really their Lord who stands before them, he appeals to what? "Behold," he says, "my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see." In handling him, they handled flesh. The Word was made flesh.

But still it is evident 1 Thess. 5.23 presupposes some difference between soul and body. What is it, then? Precisely the difference, no more and no less, that in our English tongue exists between body and organism. Though both terms denote the material frame, yet they give us quite different ideas of it, as the observer looks at it from two different standpoints.

The term body, as applied to man, critically used with regard to the distinction between it and the organism, brings him before us in the more rudimentary idea of a physical mass, made up of so many material elements, or particles, agglomerated together. As a body, the physicist takes cognizance of the man as of any structure, in his relations to the laws of matter.

The term soul, or organism, brings before us a higher idea of man, embracing what is the peculiar study of the physiologist. We regard him as the highest type, yet known to us, of the orderly assemblage of different yet mutually dependent organs, which, by their joint association, form one. individual, capable of receiving and sustaining life. In this light, thought and action regarded as the product of these organs, he becomes a subject of study also for the moral philosopher and the theologian.

The distinction here stated is recognized in the language of our Lord, Matt. 6.25: "Take no thought for your soul [Greek psyche, E. V. life], what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on." The soul, here, is that assemblage of organs for which food and drink are required as a condition necessary to the exercise of its functions, and to the existence of the whole. While by contrast the body is viewed as a form of inert matter, which is invested with clothing, as it is displayed upon the wooden figures in our shop-windows; and, in some cases, it may be for no higher purpose.

But still it may be urged that this distinction is rather a verbal than a tangible one; that it must ever be impossible to present such a soul without a body. That may be; for the idea of soul is so bound up with that of body, that in 1 Cor. 15.44 our present earthly body Paul denominates "psychikon soma," a psych-ical or soul-ical body; in other words, an organized body. Yet let us see if this distinction may not be evidence to outward sense, as well as to our inward perceptions. If a soul cannot be presented without a body, can we not present a human body without a soul?

Let us suppose a healthy man falls into the water, and is rescued just as life seems to be extinct. You make every endeavor to resuscitate him; you alternately compress and expand the chest to supply needful air to the lungs; you omit nothing, if so be the vital

principle, or spirit, may not really be lost. But at last you give over effort; it is all in vain. God has taken away that which he alone can restore. What is this which lies before you? A dead body, you say. Yes; and it is likewise, in Bible language, a dead soul. The organization is intact; every organ is in place, and in such condition that the vital spark alone is needed to set the human machinery in motion again. A dead soul, as was Adam when our Maker formed him of the dust of the ground, ere he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, by which he became a live, a living soul.

But now suppose, again, that a man has been caught and drawn through between the heavy rollers of some powerful machinery. Every organ is pressed into a shapeless mass; the very bones are comminuted. Hastily you stop the machinery; you gather up tenderly the undistinguishable fragments; you enclose them in a proper receptacle, that you may give them decent burial. What have you now? A dead body, you say. Yes, it is all there: but not now, as before, is it a dead soul. It was, but is no longer organized matter; the organism, the soul, has been destroyed. The former body needed but the word of the Almighty calling back to it the breath of life, and, like the widow's son of Nain, the man would "sit up and begin to speak;" this latter body requires first the creating hand of the same Almighty power to form anew the destroyed organs.

But it may be asked: Can man literally destroy a soul? What does the Bible say to this? It replies: Temporarily, relatively to this life, Yes! "They smote all the souls with the edge of the sword, "utterly destroying them." But permanently, in relation to absolute existence here or hereafter, it replies, No! "Fear not them who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy soul and body in Gehenna." From man's destruction, there is a returning to life again. "In an hour that is coming, all that are in their graves shall hear the voice" that shall call them forth from their silent resting-places. But in the destruction from God's hand, in his Gehenna fire, there is no return to life. The wrath of God will abide upon those who encounter that. Well may we fear him who thus destroys!

Having thus stated the Bible doctrine of the nature of the soul, we advance to an inquiry of practical interest, which already has been glanced at. It is the great question of man's destiny. What does the Bible teach of the future of the soul? Has it a future? Can it possess the immortality for which we long? It can. **CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY** is within reach of all.

It is evident that man, a human soul, as the Bible defines it, by the mere fact of his creation does not possess immortality. Adam was made capable of it, but he forfeited it through his failure to observe the prescribed condition. In consequence, mortality was stamped upon each of his descendants; and as each in turn fails to obey the Lord's commands "which, if a man do he shall even live in them," each one dies. Ceasing to exist, "his thoughts perish;" Psalm 146.4. Yet it is but for a time. The Infinite Creator keeps that soul in remembrance, and in the "appointed time," at the Resurrection, he restores it again - restores the man himself, with his own character, his old emotions, habits of thought and purpose, and his memory, in fact, the same individual as before. If his name is written in the Lamb's book of life, if in this world of his probation he has fulfilled the conditions of life eternal, then the Almighty bestows upon him immortality in a body made like unto his Lord's glorious body; Phil. 3.21.

The precise nature of this "glorious body" has not been revealed. Evidently some wonderful change takes place, beyond the reach of present sense. The grosser elements of our present earthy body are replaced by others more subtle, more highly vitalized, more fully endowed with spirit, or the vital principle, and so called a spirit-body. We may form some conception of this spirit-body from the record of our Lord's resurrection body. In that, "born [Greek, anōthen] from above," Jn. 3.3, he entered upon his immortal, spiritual life, as "the first born from the dead," Col. 1.18; "the first born of many brethren," Rom. 8.29; the first of those who, like their Lord, by a similar **NEW-BIRTH**, are to enter upon the same spirit-life.

This is not the common idea of the new birth. That, popular theology asserts, is but another name for conversion, or what the N. T. calls in the Greek *metanoia*, repentance, or more exactly from its composition, change of mind or purpose. But conversion is evidently not the new birth, only the first step towards it. It is but the conception; not the completed birth, which, as in the first birth or entrance into our present life, is yet dependent upon many a contingency. To sustain its assertion, modern theology actually teaches a palpable perversion of Christ's words, one which with strange simplicity has been generally accepted by us. Yet see how plain is the case against it. Our Lord said to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born of water and of [no article] spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit. The wind blows where it lists, and thou hears the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goes; so **IS EVERY ONE** that is born of the spirit." Our Lord here presents a well known characteristic of the wind; unseen, it can come and go, thou knows not whence or whither; so, he tells us, so is every one that has been born of .the spirit, thou canst not tell whence he cometh or whither he goes! Certainly, that is what our Lord said. But modern theology has the hardihood here to interpolate, or substitute, a word. It tells us this statement, "so is everyone," really is "so is [BORN] every one that is born of the spirit; "that is, the manner of his birth is like the wind! Yet the word actually spoken was - "so is everyone." If modern theology takes such liberties with Christ's words, it raises a question as to the actual value it assigns to what he may have said on any subject!

From this human invention, which so evidently "makes void the word of God," turn now to an inspired explanation of the birth "from above," this spirit-birth. Paul, testifying to the Jews of the resurrection of Jesus (see Acts 13.30), declares, verse 33: "God hath raised up Jesus, as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee," or rather, brought thee forth to

birth; the Greek *gennao* bears both meanings, and the latter, in this reference to Christ's resurrection, to his entrance on the new spirit-life, is evidently the correct one. (Certainly, Christ was not that day begotten in the sense of being conceived.) The same fact is alluded to in Rom. 1.4, where Paul speaks of "Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection from the dead."

And the illustration our Lord gave Nicodemus of the manner of life of those born by the new spirit-birth, answers to the record of his own life after his resurrection. He did then come and go like the unseen wind. Appearing and disappearing at will (Luke 24.31, 37), no one knew his abiding place. Again and again he comes to the disciples, when "the doors were shut [firmly, no doubt] for fear of the Jews," Jn. 20.19, 26. On occasions he partook with the disciples of ordinary food, as on the evening of his resurrection, Luke 24.43, and at the Sea of Galilee, Jn. 21.13; as did Jehovah and the two angels at the tent of Abraham, Gen. 18.8. And yet we cannot believe this as essential to his existence as during his mortal life. Read the suggestive allusions of our Lord to the future life, Matt. 26.29, Luke 22.30. We observe he speaks of himself as possessing flesh and bones, Luke 24.39, but Paul says, "flesh and blood [note, he does not say flesh or blood] cannot inherit the kingdom of God," which is to come when "this mortal puts on immortality." What, in our Lord's spirit-body, took the place of the circulating fluid, of earthy, mortal blood? We are not told; probably we could not now understand it. No less comprehensible is this, than the fact that, in the spirit-body, he came into an apartment closed against human intrusion, or that he should vanish from human vision while the eye was fixed upon him. As one, before "born of water, and [now] born of spirit" (Greek *ek*, from water, from spirit, genitive of material (as Jn. 9.6); our present body nine-tenths "of water," our next, a spirit-body), he had entered into the spirit-life; he experienced at his Resurrection that change foretold of all then redeemed from death, who then "put on immortality."

For, such will be the saints of the Resurrection. "We know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him,"

Jn. 3.2. As those early disciples, we also "wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus (1 Thess. 1.10), who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body; "Phil. 3.21. "For the earnest expectation of the creature waits for the manifestation of the sons of God; "Rom. 8.19. Then our organism, or soul, in a spirit body becomes capable of powers as yet to us unknown: powers of intellect in the receiving, tracing put, storing up knowledge; of capacity for enjoyment; of motion; of un-wearying exertion. "They that wait for [see Isa. 25.7-9] the Lord, shall renew their strength, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint; "Isa. 40.31. "The redeemed of the Lord SHALL RETURN, and come with singing unto Zion; and everlasting joy shall be upon their head: they shall obtain gladness and joy, and sorrow and mourning shall flee away; "Isa. 51.11. Then they receive "the gift of God, eternal life."

This "Resurrection to life," Jn. 5.29, which alone is detailed to us by the Apostle in 1 Corinthians 15 is a resurrection of the soul, or organism: it is not a resurrection of the body; either of that which the man had at death, or which he had ten, twenty, forty years before. The elementary particles of matter which go to make up the body are ever changing, no two days exactly the same. The resurrection is of the organism, on which the life of the individual depends, but then in an entirely different, a wonderfully changed body.

Here again we find ourselves at variance with modern theology. The Westminster Confession of Faith declares: "All the dead shall be raised with the self-same bodies."

This question must be decided by the word of God. So explicitly, in 1 Cor. 15, does Paul discuss and state this very point, that we need but quote his words:

"But some one will say; How are dead ones [no article] raised up, and with what body do they come? Thou foolish one [Greek *aphran*, without, or not using reason], that which thou sows is not made alive [*zoogpoico*], except it die, and that which thou sows, thou sows not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other grain. But God giveth it a body as it bath pleased him, and to every seed its own body . . . So also is the resurrection of dead ones. It is sown [impersonal Greek, there is a sowing] in corruption [corruptible], there is a raising in incorruption [incorruptible]. There is sown a natural body, there is raised a spiritual body. As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we [disciples of Christ remaining alive unto the coming of the Lord, 1 Thess. 4.15] shall be changed."

This change of the living is in what? In their bodies. It is the change which occurs when this mortal puts on immortality: it is the change from the natural to the spiritual body, from the body corruptible to the incorruptible. But Paul tells us that the dead are raised incorruptible; it is, then, thus changed that they are raised, with this incorruptible spirit-body. Then their old body has been left in the grave, and so IT IS NOT "with the self-same body "that they are raised; and yet the Westminster Confession of Faith says that it is!

Strange that our religious teachers can uphold so palpable a contradiction of Scripture. Possibly they do not allow themselves to think about it. But for those whose duty it is to know "what saith the Scripture," will that excuse avail in the day of account?- with him who said to his ministers of old; "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts;" Mal. 2.7.

Why is it that modern theology so plainly contradicts the Apostle? It is the inevitable result of the dogma that the soul never dies. For, if the soul does not die, it cannot have a resurrection. Life cannot be restored to that which never lost it. Yet something has a resurrection. This something must be the body then, if the body is all that dies. And thus is deliberately falsified the word of an Apostle! An awkward position surely, a very uncomfortable one, for modern theology on the question of its own reliability. The only possible way out is to assume that the Apostle Paul was not fully acquainted with all the facts in the case; or, to repeat the statement of two of our religious teachers, as quoted Chapter 1, "No doubt at the present day we know more of spiritual things than did the Apostles." Let others profess greater knowledge; we prefer to receive the truth from one who delivers to us that which he received from the Lord himself. Compare Gal. 1.11, 12, and 1 Cor. 15.3.

Possibly, modern theology may think to defend itself by Isa. 26.19: "Together with my dead body shall they arise." But that were grasping a sword by the blade, in the effort of self defence. Read the whole passage: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust." Now, will modern theology tell us, on its theory, who they are, and where they are, any "dead men," so dead that their life is yet future, who may be expected to "awake" to life? But the expression "my dead body" presents no real difficulty to the earnest seeker for the truth. Scripture does not contradict itself. Paul does not contradict Isaiah. As Paul's statement is so much more detailed and specific, and as he no doubt was as familiar as we, and more, with the passage in Isaiah, it is fair to assume that he understands the prophet to use the word "body" precisely as we often use it, for organism, that is, the man himself, as "flesh" is again and again used in Scripture for man himself. E.g., Gen. 6.12, 1 Pet. 1.24, etc. As, on the other hand, soul or organism is used to denote the dead body, as where our translators so render the Hebrew *nepesh*, soul. (See Appendix D.)

No, indeed, Holy Scripture does not teach the fiction of the resurrection of the body, which is set forth in the standards of the church of today. Everyone knows that the so-called Apostles' Creed did not originate with those whose name it bears, but not everyone observes that one passage in it not only is not expressed in Bible language, but that it contradicts the recorded belief, or creed, of the Apostle, when it declares, "I believe in the resurrection of the body." In the words of inspiration it should be, I believe in the resurrection of the dead (or of dead ones, *anastasis nekron*), - as, very possibly, it was originally written. It is in evidence, as a matter of history, that in that Creed the phrase, "he descended into hades," which already had been expressed by "was buried," is an addition of later times.

We desire to call attention to an important corollary from the doctrine of the resurrection of the soul, organism, as set forth in 1 Cor. 15. Already (Chapter 4.) we have had the testimony of Paul showing that the soul was made of "earthy" material. There we showed he denies that it is immaterial; here, again he declares: Neither is it immortal. The argument is very simple. Take it even on modern theology's own ground, which defines man to be part body and part soul. The question then will be: Which of these parts of a man has a resurrection, a restoration to life? It is not the body, as Paul declares, 1 Cor. 15.35-53. There is a change, not a resurrection, of the body. A new spirit-body takes the place of the old one. Then it is the soul to which the resurrection appertains-it is that which is restored to life. But for this to be possible the soul must have once lost its life; than it is not inherently immortal.

The argument as such is now complete. We have considered the question, Is the popular conception of the soul that of the Bible? We found it was not. We next inquired, What, then, is the Bible doctrine of the soul? The results of that inquiry are now before the reader. We have stated what we believe Holy Writ teaches of the nature of the human soul, and of its future destiny for those who attain the prize of immortality. Many a reader has doubtless started back at statements and conclusions so utterly at variance with popular ideas, and some may loudly assert such a doctrine cannot be true. Why not? What will you believe? Do you cling to the dogma that the soul never dies? In this chapter alone you have sufficient evidence that that dogma cannot be true. You perceive that it necessitates either a denial of the resurrection, or else it must assume, as it does, that the resurrection is a resurrection of the body, which is explicitly denied by the word of God. There is no middle ground. One clear, explicit Bible contradiction of the dogma of inherent immortality, which distinguishes modern theology from the old and Biblical, one such contradiction is fatal to it. Has there been but one shown you?

Whatever conclusion, reader, you may come to, remember these indisputable facts. This doctrine of the nature and destiny of the soul has been evolved from the Bible itself; not a position has been taken, but it has been substantiated by full Bible proof, and more was at hand if needed; not one that was in conflict with a single clear statement of Holy Writ: while on the other hand, it has just been proved to you that the generally accepted, popular theology, in its best known Creed and its Confession of Faith, openly teaches a direct and palpable contradiction of God's word.

But there are souls of whose future we have not spoken; those who, in this world of trial and testing, this mere preparation-world for one to come, have given themselves only to present and selfish gratification, who have abused their exalted powers and their great opportunity. What resurrection shall theirs be? Not a "resurrection to life," but a "resurrection to judgment." They will be raised with mortal bodies, for they are to die, -to die the second death. Created rational yet choosing to be irrational, "as animals irrational by nature [*aloga zoa: physika*], made to be taken and destroyed, they shall utterly perish;" 2 Pet. 2.12. When the decision was in their own

hands, they by their life here "judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life." Raised to judgment, on trial had, they shall be adjudged to death, as unworthy indeed to live.

But more detailed testimony in regard to the revealed future of the soul will be desired. And in the succeeding chapters we shall more fully consider man's destiny; seeking to learn how and what the Bible has taught of immortality for the righteous, and also what it teaches is in reserve for the wicked.

CHAPTER 9

The Destiny of the Soul. The Doctrine of Immortality in the Old Testament.

IT is no easy matter, concisely and yet satisfactorily, to set before the reader a subject on which the Bible has so much to say. The doctrine of a future life is the great truth which the Holy Scriptures are specially intended to reveal. The Bible is the book of life, or, more exactly, the book of the way of life. As there is a popular misapprehension that this truth is but obscurely recognized in the Old Testament, let us first go to that, and learn how the Creator revealed this fact to men of a former age. In the very outset of revelation, **CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY**, life dependent upon obedience, appears its great fundamental truth. We open the sacred volume, and read its grand introduction; how "that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear," they were spoken into being by the word of the Almighty; how the earth was formed, and clothed with verdure and animal races, till finally man himself appears upon the scene, and into his hand all is given. Then comes the subject-matter of the book. In successive detail we are told of immortality, conditionally offered, but lost through disobedience; of the promise of its restoration through a coming deliverer; how this truth of the way of life was held up to view through the ages; how in the time appointed the deliverer came, to give his life for the forfeited life of the race; how his sacrificed life was restored, a life immortal; how he is now engaged in preparing for the restoration to a similar life of those who comply with the prescribed condition; and finally, in prophetic vision, is set before us the great consummation of redemption's work, the promised immortality, life eternal, bestowed upon the adopted "sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty."

The record of the fitting up a place for man's abode discloses the simple yet decisive means by which the Creator set before our first parents this truth of immortality conditioned on obedience. We read:

"And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the Lord to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil;" Gen. 2.8, 9.

The test of obedience was thus provided. The man is told he may freely eat of all the trees of the garden with the exception of the last mentioned. If he disobeys this simple restriction, he must die; but as long as he eats not of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, so long he may eat of the tree of life. The decision is thus left in the creature's own hand. Innocent and pure was our first parent as he came into being; what shall be his character, whether holy or sinful, is for him to choose; for not yet has he the knowledge of good and evil. That will come either as, on the one hand, he steadfastly resists, or, on the other, he yields to, the temptation set before him. That trial of his obedience was not a hard one; but in it he failed; he ate of the tree of which the Lord commanded he should not eat. And the fancied tree of happiness proved to him a very tree of death.

It is the same testing that, in one form or another, has been going on through the centuries since-its present and its ultimate result the same. By it, the character of each is determined holy or sinful, and by it is decided the destiny of each hereafter. As then, so now, life is set over against death, and each one chooses for himself.

The exact meaning in this connection of the words, life and death, the sacred record here puts beyond all question. In popular religious speech, in theological writings, there is some ambiguity as to the meaning of these words; none whatever here. "Life "is simply life; it is used in its primary sense of existence; and its opposite is the loss of that life. When the man had sinned and forfeited his life, we are told of the means used to prevent any possible arrest of impending death. We read, Gen. 3.22:

"And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil [he knows what it is to be sinful, what it was to be innocent]: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and LIVE FOREVER; - therefore the Lord sent him forth from the garden."

There is no possible mistaking or misstating, here, the language of Holy Writ. It is on record that it was not to deprive him of those trees, "pleasant to the sight and good for food," that Adam was sent out of Paradise: it is expressly stated that it was to take from him one special object, the tree of life. It was to take from him the power to thwart that sentence of death by a continuous eating of the tree of life, and thus to "live on forever;" it was to prevent such indefinite continuance of his existence.

We cannot overestimate the importance of this to the point under discussion. It is really decisive. In this opening of revelation, it defines, once for all, the Biblical meaning of the word life; and, as it shows us what the life lost in the Fall, so it shows us what the life regained in redemption. And as the details of that great work are successively disclosed in the Bible narrative, this must be the life which is constantly referred to. The word here declares the reward of obedience; it expresses that which was lost by disobedience; can we believe that, anywhere in the book of life, that word arbitrarily and without warning departs from this established meaning? Could the word life be changed, as some assert, to mean happiness, which may or may not be a concomitant of life? When the Lord Jehovah says to Adam's descendants, "Hear [with the implied idea, obey], and your soul shall live," Isa. 55. 3, does he mean, Hear, and your soul shall be happy? When the Lord Jesus says, Jn. 6.35, "I am the bread of life," does he mean bread of happiness? Or, when he says, verse 58, "Your fathers did eat manna and are dead, he that eats of this bread shall live forever," does he mean, shall be happy forever? Then it should read, your fathers did eat manna, and are unhappy!

Establishing thus the Biblical meaning of life, establishes also the Biblical meaning of its opposite, death. When the latter word is used independently, that is, without any accompanying modification of its meaning, it must then bear, in the Bible, its primary meaning of loss of existence. If ever used figuratively, that fact, according to the universal law of human language already (Chapter 1) noted, must be made apparent beyond a question.

Contrast, now, the simplicity of the Bible conception of death with that of modern theology. The word of God recognizes death as the literal loss of life: the first death, when man dies, or loses life, the first time; the second death, when the wicked man loses life a second time, after it had been restored to him by a resurrection. In the first as in the second death, the word holds the same, its natural, meaning.

But modern theology, to meet the exigencies of its theory that man does not actually die, has invented three theological kinds of actual death, not one of them actually death, or loss of existence. 1. Temporal death, or separation of its hypothetical soul from the body. No actual death here; the individual lives on, according to modern theology. 2. Spiritual death, in which are all mankind by nature. This is not actual death, it is but figurative. The man is living, but is dead to spiritual things. Modern theology tells us he has lost the favor of God, while in fact he is receiving from him wonderful favor and mercy! 3. A death, which modern theology substitutes for the second death in the Bible, following the judgment. This, again, is no actual death, or loss of life, for the wicked dead. Nor is it for them even a loss of happiness, for that was lost before. Instead of being any death at all, it actually is life forever, in aggravated misery. These three varieties are all of modern theology's actual deaths (so-called) that apply to man. Of course, it also recognizes a fourth variety, a bond fide loss of existence, for the lower animals; but human beings, it claims, have nothing to do with that. (The first and third named deaths are further considered, Chapter 8, section 3.)

Now, we are told it was the second variety of these deaths that Adam suffered as the penalty of sin; that it was this which was intended when death, or loss of life, was threatened him as the penalty of disobedience. But, certainly, it was not so stated with any definiteness, and it is difficult to understand how Adam could have so understood it, with the meaning of life already defined to him by the tree of life, which gave continued existence.

To sustain itself on this point, modern theology quotes the words of the threatened penalty: "In the day thou eats thereof, thou shalt surely die; "Gen. 2.17. It says: "In that twenty-four hours day, Adam, we know, did not die as we usually understand the word [i.e., theological death, No. 1]; therefore, the word die must have a different [a figurative?] meaning: he died a spiritual death "[i.e., No. 2]. (Here modern theology itself appeals to the Law of the Literal and the Figurative, as laid down in Chapter 1.) But it should be remembered that, in Gen. 2.17, our version attempts to render a peculiar Hebrew idiom into English. Our translators, recognizing the difficulty of thus rendering exactly the Hebrew infinitive and verb combined, give more nearly the original in the margin, "dying thou shalt die." We observe in this very passage that a corresponding expression, as given in margin, "eating thou shalt eat "(Hebrew infinitive with verb), is rendered in text, "thou mayst freely eat." Evidently, some freedom of translation, then, is required in a correct rendering into English. Just what then does the Hebrew mean?

Fortunately, we have exactly this expression used in the Hebrew of 2 Kings 2.42, in circumstances where its English meaning is apparent beyond a question. In his interview with Shimei, King Solomon says: "Did I not protest unto thee, saying, know for a certain on the day thou goes out [of Jerusalem], that thou shalt surely die; "Hebrew dying thou shalt die. It is most evident that at their first interview, neither Solomon nor Shimei understood that Shimei should surely die within the identical twenty-four hours in which he should transgress. The Jewish day ended at sunset; he might go forth a few minutes before its close. At that second interview, some days had passed since Shimei broke through the restraining law, yet the words of the previously announced penalty are quoted as still bearing upon the case. Plainly, their meaning was that Shimei, on the day he transgressed, should bring himself under the penalty of death; he becomes one doomed to death. Precisely so it is, when the same. Hebrew words are used in narrating the penalty threatened Adam. And that the Lord so intended to be understood, and referred to literal death, we perceive in his announcement of the sentence of death for Adam's disobedience: "Forasmuch as thou hast eaten, . . . dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return;" Gen. 3.19. Returning to dust, he must die; he must lose his life, his existence.

We observe, in passing, that the modern theological belief that the death penalty for sin is spiritual death, or loss of God's favor, in its attempts at consistency, leads to harsh views of God's character, such as would delight the Evil one himself, whose first step in tempting Eve was to malign the goodness of God: "Yea, path God said ye shall not eat of all the trees of the garden?" -is he so unkind as to wish to deprive you of so slight a gratification? We have heard, not alone in popular speech, but from religious teachers, that the Heavenly Father cursed those who had sinned, who, we are told, had lost his favor. But, how untrue! In Infinite mercy, the God of all grace came to seek his fallen creatures, who, as so many now, sought to hide themselves from the love that would save. The great adversary himself received a direct curse; - he might be called spiritually dead in the technical sense, he had actually lost the favor of God; - but no curse fell upon Adam. The ground was cursed "for his sake." Why? In evident mercy. "Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth," that man henceforth may gain his livelihood by the sweat of his face, for the merciful reason Oat idleness in sin would insure the total ruin of Adam and of all his posterity; labor, now that he has sinned, is a blessing indeed. And the woman was brought into the pains and infirmities of maternity, and into subjection to her husband, that she too might find occupation, and also protection from the sin and violence henceforth to rule in a fallen world. Indeed, it was in Infinite love that the Almighty came near to the fallen ones. His own Son was to be born of the race; He could not deal harshly with them.

In the very sentence pronounced upon the tempter to evil, in that declaration of his coming destruction, is embodied the word of mercy and deliverance for his deluded victims. The seed of the woman was promised, who, though the adversary should crush his heel, should himself crush the head (the vital part) of the serpent, thus delivering those the evil one had brought into bondage to death. All that passed between the Creator and the sinning pair is by no means recorded in Gen. 3.9-19; yet from what follows we perceive how they understood the announcement made to them. Immediately following the word of the death sentence, "unto dust shalt return," we are abruptly yet significantly told that Adam gave his wife a new name. He calls her "Life," who had just brought this death upon them.

Is there not meaning in this? He intended it as a name of honor, as were the new names of Abraham, Sarah, Israel. It was to comfort and cheer the deceived and now crushed woman, no doubt reproaching herself as the guilty cause of their great trouble. It was a reminder of the great Promise just given them. As often as the word Eve, Hebrew Havah, life, passed from husband to wife, it turned their thoughts from the past, with its bitter memories, from their present, with its sin and impending death, to a future immortal life. For a higher life was to replace the life lost in Eden-the Paradise of innocence was to be restored a Paradise of holiness. She, who had been an instrument of ending in them and in their posterity the present life, was yet, through one who should call her mother, to be the means of giving them the future life. "And Adam called his wife's name, Eve [Life], because she was the mother of all living ones," not the mother of all human beings, but specially of all who should have that glorious life. It was a name of promise; in that sad hour, it brought to them a gleam of hope and of coming joy. It reminded them that that tree of life was not utterly lost to them.

And yet in the years to come, more and more deeply was impressed upon the ageing pair their present loss of that tree of life. As disease and the gradual decay of their natural powers came creeping over them, as sight, hearing, muscular power, were found to fail, how often must their thoughts have turned to that great gift, once theirs, now theirs no longer, that could have remedied these advancing infirmities, the precursors of a final arrest of all the functions of the organism, or soul.

And so the remembrance of, and the longing for, that tree of life abides in the thought of the race. In Holy Writ it is brought before us in the sayings of the wise man, who tells us how it may be again attained. We read of it in the completion as in the beginning of God's revelation. In the Apocalypse, "that revelation of things which must shortly come to pass," as, in prophetic vision, Redemption's work is disclosed in its final accomplishment, when what was lost in the Fall will be restored, in the Paradise Regained the long lost tree of life reappears. There is "a pure river of water of life, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. And on either side of the river, the tree of life;" Rev. 22.1, 2. In the verse immediately preceding, we read of those who partake of that life-giving water and fruit; it is "they who are written in the Lamb's book of life." The simple, natural significance which inspiration has already attached to the word life, as connected with the tree of life, fixes its meaning here. For it is the same word for the tree, the river, the book of life.

And as in the earlier Paradise, this life is still conditioned on obedience. He who reveals that future declares: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life;" Rev. 22.14. They receive "the gift of God, eternal life." They live forever, when the disobedient and unholy, who have lost all right to the tree of life, have forever passed out of existence.

But just when that coming restoration of life was to be received, just when that coming deliverer was to appear, the first pair evidently knew not. As it is now, they were to hope and wait, and hope still. When her first-born came into the world, Eve thought she had gotten the promised deliverer, and so she named the little stranger Cain (in the Hebrew gotten), saying: "I have gotten the man, even Jehovah; "not, from Jehovah, as in our version. She thought it was the promised Yahveh, or Yehovah, the coming one, "He who will be," as is the literal Hebrew of the name the Lord gives himself, Exod. 3.14: "I will be that I will be," not, as in E. V., "I am that I am." She found herself disappointed, and her bitter disappointment finds expression in the name of her second son, Habel, vanity.

That the Hebrew future should here be rendered as a future, not a continuous present, is evident from Exod. 6.3: "And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty [El Shaddai]; but by my name, Jehovah, was I not known to them." But, Gen. 22.54, we read Abraham used the name of Jehovah in giving name to a locality. In reality, the Hebrew word

rendered known, Exod. 6.3, has the meaning perceived (as E. V. renders it, Isa. 6.9), or comprehended. In his personal dealings with the patriarchs, God was to them rather the Almighty than "He who will be" to help, a Deliverer, as he was now to manifest himself to Israel in delivering them from Egypt. The Septuagint renders Exod. 6.3: "My name, Lord, I did not manifest unto them." See The Memorial Name, by Alex. MacWhorter; Gould & Lincoln, Boston, Massachusetts.

But since that day her expectation has been fulfilled, in part, at least, though, in the sleep of death, as yet she knows it not. "When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under law, to redeem them that were under law, that we might receive the adoption of sons;" Gal. 4.4. The coming one, "He who will be" has been born into the world - to die for his redeemed. And the rest of Eve's hope has yet to be fulfilled. "For the earnest expectation of the creature waited for the manifestation of the sons of God; "Rom. 8.19. The sacrifice of atonement has been offered. The great High Priest has carried the blood of it -" his own "(Heb. 9.12) - into the most holy place (Lev. 16.15), and "to them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation; "Heb. 9.28. At his first coming, in his death, his heel was crushed by Satan's malice; at his appearing the second time, he will crush in utter destruction the head of his adversary. Redemption's work will be accomplished, when he shall give to the redeemed the promised immortality; that "salvation ready to be revealed in the last time," for which some have waited, though unconsciously, so long.

But the great truth of a future immortality was yet more vividly revealed to the men of that earliest dispensation. We read, Gen. 3.24:

"So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, cherubim, and a flaming sword [not which turned every way, but literal Heb.], turning itself, to keep the way of the tree of life."

What was the object of this? It has been supposed it was to keep all intruders from the tree of life, but that by no means exhausts the full meaning of the statement. If it was to keep, to guard, the tree itself, why was it not so expressed? or, why was not the tree, if now no longer needed, destroyed, or taken away. But observe, the tree is left standing, and these special preparations, we are told, were made to keep, or guard, the way of the tree of life. Evidently it was the WAY OF LIFE itself, which was thus so carefully kept before, as well as for, the race that had lost it. This will be still more apparent, if we learn the nature and purport of these objects, by which the way of life was preserved.

What was the flaming sword? or, literal Heb., the flame of a sword turning itself, as if instinct with life. It is easy to see this was the same mysterious emblem of Jehovah's presence, which in later years manifested itself in the burning bush and in the cloudy pillar. The infinite mercy of the Almighty thus manifested itself; keeping the tree of life from the sinning, to whom endless existence were an endless curse, and yet keeping it in remembrance now, in promise hereafter, for the holy, to whom only that life were a blessing.

And what the cherubim (not cherubim's, it is Hebrew plural of cherub); what the story they unfolded! The allusion to them here in Genesis is of the briefest. What definite knowledge we have of them comes from writers of a later day, who wrote for those to whom their forms were less familiar. The cherubim are presented to us as images) or as seen in prophetic vision. They are next referred to in the tabernacle, the dwelling-place (Exod. 25.8) of the God of Israel. Moses was ordered to make of beaten gold two, one on each end of the mercy-seat which covered the ark. As no directions are given for making them, but only as to their position, we may judge their appearance was too well known at that day to require description. Besides these, two colossal ones of olive wood covered with gold were in Solomon's temple, making four in all.

Four cherubim appear later in the visions of Ezekiel, and are described chapters 1.5-24, 10.1-22. We learn they had the general "likeness of a man," but with four faces apiece, of man, ox, lion, and eagle, four wings, a man's hand on each side under their wings, straight feet, the soles of their feet like the sole of a calf's foot, their body, back, hands, and wings full of eyes. To go in any direction they, needed not to turn themselves; they "ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning."

The four cherubim of Ezekiel appear again in the visions of the Apocalypse, though that fact is obscured by our translators, who call them "beasts." The Greek so translated, zoa (from zoe, life), is the word in the Septuagint for Hebrew hayoth, Ezek. 1.5, etc., which our version there renders "living creatures," as it should also have done in the Revelation. The beast of Rev. 13. is Greek therion. As if to suggest to us that these strangely complex creatures are not actual beings, we have in the Revelation a variation in their appearance, as might be permitted to a mere symbol. The four faces are distributed, one to each cherub or living creature, and they have each six, instead of four wings; in other respects they are alike.

And here, in the Revelation, we discover beyond question what they symbolize. Addressing the Lamb, they say, "Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth;" Rev. 5.9, 10. They symbolize then, we see, not angels, but men, not redeemed individuals, but the entire class, "redeemed out of every kindred and tongue." But why are such figures used to shadow forth the redeemed? What means this strange collection of incongruous emblems in one complex whole? It is a pictorial representation of an idea, a hieroglyph of abstract qualities, such and so many, as could not be presented to the eye, except by combining different representatives of these mental and physical attributes; in which combination, the symmetry or beauty of the whole is completely subordinated to the

expressiveness of the symbol itself. In the cherubic symbol we behold the patient, steady industry of the ox, the courage of the lion, the lofty flight and keen sight of the eagle, the intellectual capacity of man, the operative dexterity of the human hand, the quick and comprehensive vision of numberless eyes, the unwearied motor power of many wings: all betokening a future existence for the redeemed man of a nature so far beyond our experience or conception, that it could be expressed only by thus crowding type on type, emblem on emblem.

We recognize the cherubim, then, as in the absence of written language, a necessary means of revealing to the race what man in his redeemed, glorified state will be. To the men of primeval days, silently yet unceasingly, they preached the gospel of faith; the old, old story of a Deliverer to come, and of the high exaltation he has in store for those who live in expectation of his coming. For, as an essential element of the cherubic story, stands forth the strangely intimate association that redeemed man is to have with Deity Himself. In Eden after the fall, the cherubim first appear; beside that sword of flame, "turning itself," as if with life, the symbol of Jehovah's presence, as were the flame of the bush and the inner fire of the cloudy pillar. In tabernacle and temple, God's earthly dwelling, their station is in the most holy place, even on the Mercy-seat itself. Jehovah is addressed: "Thou that dwellest between the cherubim." Ezekiel in vision never sees them, except as with the glory of the God of Israel. And as the beloved Apostle beholds them, it is even "in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne!" Rev. 4.6. Wonderful, indeed, that revelation of man's coming future; inconceivably grand and glorious! "For since the beginning of the world, men have not heard or perceived by the ear, neither bath the eye seen a God beside thee, who doeth so for him that waits for Him;" Isa. 64.4, margin..

Deeply indeed we may believe the truth these strange figures portended, was engraved upon the expecting hearts of our first parents. In the next generation but one, we read of a clearer perception of the truth, Gen. 4.16: "Then began men to invoke by the name Yahveh" (or Yehovah); He who will be, the Coming One. They began to pray in the name of the Coming One. They now recognize and address their God as Himself the coming Deliverer from death, who "brings to light life and immortality." Our present English version of Gen. 4.26 is but nonsense: "then began men to call upon the name of the Lord;"- as if they never prayed before!

But how long did that prohibited garden and its tree of life remain a memorial of original innocence, and of forfeited life immortal? How long did those symbolic figures there abide, in conjunction with the token of Jehovah's presence, as a pledge of a yet more glorious immortality, that "forever with the Lord"? How long? Surely, till the deluge. It was not for Adam and Eve alone that the cherubim were there set up, and that Jehovah's presence kept the way of the tree of life. It was for all who had faith in his word. It was the place where men of that age might resort for worship, and, in the symbols before them, gaze upon the pictured story of an immortality of surpassing glory for those living now in faith of the thus revealed future.

For we perceive that the cherubim were not, as so many suppose, angel-guardians of the tree of life. They were symbolic figures or images; and, as we gather from the pattern shown to Moses in the Mount and followed in the tabernacle, they were placed in the attitude of deepest attention and worship, on each side of that lambent, lifelike column of flame; in a position, not to receive man's homage, like idol images of heathendom facing those who came to worship, but reverently turned to that which symbolized his presence, who alone is worthy to be praised. So in Rev. 4.5, their attitude and occupation are that of adoring worship.

To that holy spot we may believe Cain and Abel brought their offerings. And as often in the history of the chosen people the descending fire attested the Lord's acceptance of his people's gift, so here, doubtless, from the column of flame, the fire leaped forth to take that sacrifice, which displayed the humble faith of the offering, as it typified the coming Lamb, who was to die in the stead of his sinful yet penitent worshipper. It was to that presence Cain refers, as, going forth a fugitive and a wanderer from these familiar scenes, he says: "And from Thy face shall I be hid."

Certainly, it is but reasonable to conclude that this early sanctuary in Eden remained Earth's holy place until the deluge. He, who so fully reveals himself and his plan for our salvation, would not leave that dearly purchased salvation without a manifest witness. But with the ending of that dispensation, the abiding column of fire withdraws, and with it disappear those cherubic forms. In that seven-day interval between Noah's entrance into the ark and the coming flood, when we read, "the Lord shut him in," we may believe that living fire kept its guard over the ark, protecting its inmates from the intrusion or malice of scoffing foes without. For "the Angel-Jehovah encamped round about them that fear him, and delivered them."

And now rises before the world's gaze another pictured story of the coming future. We behold the old pledge of safety and life, but it shows out against a darker background; - the loss is now, not of privilege and opportunity, but of existence itself. No symbolic figure here mutely appeals for a nobler, higher life: it is an instalment of the coming doom itself! Its thunder tones startle those who heeded not the long waiting call to life and immortality. A deluge of water wipes out a guilty world; while above that scene of death peacefully floats the ark, bearing on in life only those who believed the warning given. Their salvation was through faith. "By faith, Noah, warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with holy fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house;" Heb. 11.7. And his preservation, and that world's destruction, utter, to all time, the word God speaks from Sinai and from Calvary: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you that I have set before you life and death; therefore choose life, that thou mayest live;" Deut. 30.19: "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life;" Jn. 3.16.

Need we trace the detail further? Profane history testifies to the same truths. There also appear the sacred emblems of that primal dispensation of grace; though changed, perverted, corrupted, we recognize their likeness still. The fire-worshipping Parsee recalls the tradition of that early pillar of fire, the visible sign of the unseen God. The sculptured slabs and images of Nineveh exhibit to us to-day the cherubic idea; the winged bull, associated with the sacred tree of Assyria, repeats the very scene in Eden beside the tree of life. In the monuments of Egypt also, we find many variations of the cherubic type. The multiple heads and arms of the gods of Oriental polytheism, the multi-breasted Ephesian goddess, recall to us that earliest symbolization of abstract thought in the world's first sanctuary, and also show man's perverse tendency through all time to "worship the creature rather than the Creator, who is God over all, blessed forever." While the incarnation of the Hindoo god reminds us of the promise in Eden, and of the period a little later, when men began to realize that the One to be incarnated, the Seed of the woman, was their Savior and their God.

Although our earliest records of revelation do not explicitly mention the doctrine of a resurrection, yet, evidently, it was fully understood by the men of that day. For it was absolutely essential to their idea of a future life. To them, life signified actual existence, and death the cessation of such existence. After the execution of that sentence of death, "unto dust shalt thou return," life could be only by a resurrection, or restoration to life. The promised deliverer brought hope, because he brought the promise of a future release from death, the promise of life from the dead. Believers then reasoned, as Paul afterward reasoned: "If dead ones are not raised, then, those having fallen asleep in Christ are perished." No less than the Apostle did they esteem "the hope and resurrection of dead ones;" "Acts 23.6. To Abraham, the announcement of his death, Gen. 15.15, did not impair the promise that he "should inherit the land," Gen. 13.17, because he looked forward to a promised resurrection: Although his belief is not mentioned in the narrative in Genesis, yet the writer of Hebrews recognizes it as a necessary article of his faith. He tells us, it was displayed in his offering up Isaac as commanded, "accounting that God was able to raise him up from the dead, when also he received him in a figure;" Heb. 11.19.

And so Job, in one of the earliest books of the Bible, announces his belief, chap. 14.14,15:

"If a man die, shall he live again? [Rather, not a question, he shall live again. If it were a question, he answers .it himself.] All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come. Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee; thou wilt have a desire to the work of thy hands."

The Psalmist says, Psalm 17.15: "As for me, I shall behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness."

Isaiah tells us, chap. 26.19: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead."

Ezekiel prophesies, chap. 27. "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live."

And Daniel tells us, chap. 12.2: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life; "theirs is the resurrection to life of Jn. 5.29.

Now this ancient doctrine of a resurrection to life finds a striking confirmation of its early acceptance in the oldest history outside the Bible. In ancient Egypt, the dead were embalmed, that they might be ready for that life to which they were to be recalled. Every Egyptian mummy tells of an early period, when men had not yet departed from that revealed truth, No future life without a resurrection. We are surprised to learn from the early religious records of that nation how much of revealed truth was still preserved amid much corruption. We quote from a standard authority:

"Although all bodies were to descend into the lower world, they were not, however, all assured of resurrection. To obtain this, it was necessary never to have committed any great sin either in act or thought. The deceased was to be judged by Osiris and his forty-two assessors: on this judgment depended the irrevocable lot of the soul. If the deceased was convicted of inexcusable faults, he was decapitated by Horus on the nemma, or block, of Hades. Annihilation was believed by the Egyptians to be the punishment reserved for the wicked." Lenormant and Chevallier's Ancient History of the East.

It is not difficult to understand why, in the progress of time and ever-widening departure from the truth, every nation but the Hebrew dropped this original restriction of immortality for the faithful alone. It is far more flattering to his pride, that immortality should be recognized as the possession of man as man; while such a belief gives greater power over the masses to their religious teachers, who even in our day, in proportion as revelation is ignored or lost, assume to have the whole future virtually at their disposal. And so, as the religions of the world diverged from that early revelation to the race, they grew more and more corrupt, till, retaining but a semblance of the true, "they sacrificed to devils, not to God," 1 Cor. 10.20; and, in place of the God-given truth of an immortality conditioned on faith in the Coming One, they substituted the very doctrine which the Father of lies promulgated in Eden, when he declared, "Ye shall not surely die;"- he, the first teacher of the now world-wide dogma, that immortality is the inalienable possession of every man!

And thus also appears the utter fallacy of that argument from reason, so called, which religious teachers of our day, in lieu of Bible arguments, bring forward to prove an unconditional immortality. They claim to sustain their doctrine by pointing to the evident craving all have for it, and by the fact that all nations are found to believe in it. We see how the nations first obtained the idea of immortality for a sinful race; it was promised in Eden on the essential condition of faith in One to come: we see how that condition, originally accepted in the far past, came to be universally dropped. And it is easy to see why God implanted within us a craving for immortality. It was not because we already have it, but to lead us to seek to attain the object of our desire; for Paul tells us, "To all who, by patient continuance in well doing, SEEK FOR honor and glory and IMMORTALITY, God will render eternal life."

Owing to their failure to comprehend the Bible meaning of life, our religious teachers of recent times have been led into a most palpable error. They generally believe that, in the law which God gave to Israel by Moses, the doctrine of a future state of rewards finds no place. This strange idea originated with an English Bishop, some hundred and fifty years ago. It met with much opposition at the time, and its general acceptance since illustrates the power of mere speculative belief, combined with ignorance, or neglect of the Divine word.

It would seem that the truth in relation to that law had been set forth with sufficient clearness by the Giver himself, Ezek. 20.11: "And I gave them my statutes, and made them to know my judgments, which, if a man do, he shall even live in [or, by] them." One may, however, seek to evade the force of this word, live, by assuming that it refers only to this present life.

But One, whose authority is unquestionable, so states the truth on this question of Moses' law, that his word may not thus easily be set aside, for in this case he speaks of the life eternal. Turn to Luke 10.25-28. A certain lawyer, or teacher of the law of Moses, stood up and tested him: (was it not to see whether the Lord's teaching agreed with that of Moses?) He asks, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" For answer, the Lord refers him to that law of which his inquirer was a professed teacher, the very law now thought to contain no reference to a future life; - "what is written in the law, how reads thou?" He might well ask that question to-day! But the lawyer well knows how Moses answered his question, and he quotes Deut. 6.5: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, soul, and strength, and mind; "and Lev. 19.18: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Our Lord acknowledges the correctness of the reply, and adds, from Lev. 18.5, in the very words of the law: "This do, and thou shalt live;" showing that he recognizes this passage from Leviticus as a promise of future life.

So, Luke 18.18, a ruler asks, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Him our Lord likewise refers to the law: "Thou knows the commandments." As much as to say: "They are for the very purpose of leading you to that which you seek," "in keeping of them is great reward," even the "blessing of life for evermore."

Turning again to the lawyer's reply, we find that the context of the passage, he so promptly quoted from the law, shows us why he selected it. For in Deut. 6.I, 2, just preceding his quotation, is the explicit statement of eternal life as the reward of obedience:

"Now these are the commandments, the statutes, and the judgments, which the Lord your God commanded to teach you, that ye might do them in the land whither ye go to possess it: that thou might fear the Lord thy God, to keep all his statutes and his commandments which I com' mand thee; thou, and thy son, and thy son's son, all the days of thy life; AND that thy days may be prolonged."

This prolonging days as a reward of obedience is not the lengthening out of this mortal life. That does not follow as a result of obedience; often, indeed, the very opposite. Stephen inquired: "Which of the prophets have they not persecuted? and they have slain them," - because indeed of their unflinching fidelity to God. The expression, "that thy days may be prolonged," following as it does "all the days of thy life," can only refer to the future prolonging of existence after the character has been formed and tested by a life of obedience here.

This is fully corroborated by the language of other Scriptures. As prolonging of days is promised to the righteous, so the opposite is threatened to the disobedient. Again and again are we told, "he shall be cut of" In Eccl. 8.13, it is declared of the wicked: "He shall not prolong his days; "- note, the original has no possessive pronoun; it is simply "prolong days." But the meaning of the expression is put beyond question in Isaiah 53.8, 10. The prophet says of Christ, "He was cut of out of the land of the living," but "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin," - when (ver. 12) he has "poured out his soul unto death," - "he shall prolong days," etc. We know how our Lord's days were prolonged after death; it was by a resurrection to life, to a life never to end. And thus is fulfilled the word of Psalm 21.4: "He asked life of thee, and thou gayest it him, length of days forever and ever."

Thus understanding the word of the Lord, we find the law of Moses is full of this truth. As, Deut. 30.19, 20: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, a blessing and a curse, therefore choose life [what life? see Matt. 16.25], that both thou and thy seed may live. [Is it not in the life everlasting?] That thou mayst love the Lord thy God, and may cleave unto him; for he [the Eternal One] is thy life, and the length of thy days." Compare 1 Jn. 5.12 "He that hath the Son hath life, he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." Deut. 12.28: "Observe and hear all these words which I command thee, that it may go well with thee, and with thy children after thee, forever." Is it not "with thee "forever, as well as "with thy children"?

But it may well be asked: If as plain as this, why have Christian scholars so missed the meaning, as to have concluded that the law of Moses never refers to a future life? It is partly because so few investigate for themselves, and especially because of the training they receive. With some of these promises of prolonging of days there is an added clause, the meaning of which they fail to grasp. In one already quoted, Deut. 30.20, we read on: "that thou mayst dwell in the land which the Lord swore unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to give them." The writer understands that this promise is yet to be fulfilled; God is yet to give this land to them. We read, Heb. 11.8, 9, 13, of "Abraham called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange country, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise. These all died in faith, not having received the promises." Their descendants, if found obedient, as were these patriarchs, may dwell with them in the joy of that future state. That such will be but a remnant we learn from Isa. 10.22: "the remnant of Israel shall return," or, as it is quoted Rom. 9.27: "the remnant shall be saved."

Modern theology understands that the promise has been fulfilled to the patriarchs, that the land was given to them when given to their seed for a dwelling-place in this mortal life; that is, it mistakes a time of probation for the time of reward! But most explicitly the martyr Stephen, "full of the Holy Spirit," contradicts this theological notion. Speaking of Abraham, he says, Acts 7.5: "And he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on; yet he promised that he would give it to him, and to his seed after him." Stephen here declares the promise of Gen. 13.17 has not been fulfilled, modern theology claims it has; whence so radical a difference on a question of fact?

Well, it is this dogma of inherent immortality, again, that makes all the trouble. Modern theology, having adopted the fiction, as we have found it, of immaterial, immortal souls, must provide some place for them, i.e., for its living part of Abraham. and others, and so it has contrived a kingdom in the skies for such souls. But no such doctrine is found in the word of God.

What does that say of the place of future reward for earth's faithful ones? Jesus said, "I go to prepare a place for you; "-- where is that place, and when is it to be prepared, according to God's word?

John tells us in prophetic vision: "I saw a new heaven and a new earth. And I, John, saw the new Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them;" Rev. 21.1-3. Peter says, "According to his promise, we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness;" 2 Pet. 3.13. We understand that as the earth was once swept by a deluge of water, the ark bearing in safety above it the few redeemed from destruction, so once more it shall be swept over by a deluge of fire, that, renewed and purified, it may henceforth be the dwelling of the righteous.

Read also Prov. 11.31: "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth." 10.30 "The righteous shall never be removed, but the wicked shall not inhabit the earth." 2.21: "For the upright shall dwell in the land (or earth), and the perfect shall remain in it."

Psalm 37 is full of this anticipation of the earth as the place of reward for the righteous; verses 9, 11, 22, 29, 34, declare, "they shall inherit the earth." And we are told, verse 18, "their inheritance shall be forever."

Modern theology may hardly assume all this means nothing; that these early Bible writers did not exactly know what they wrote about; for it is but the same doctrine that the Apostles of our Lord teach us. Nor can it venture here to call in question the inspiration of these Old Testament writers, for the Lord Jesus himself has set to their word the seal of his authority. He repeats the very words of Psalm 27.11: "The meek shall inherit the earth;" Matt. 5.5. Nor can it assume to tell us what the Lord Jesus meant, and did not say. He knew the laws of human speech, and he meant what he said. "The meek shall inherit the earth!"

And so, with the Lord Jesus for our teacher, we accept the word of Deut. 4.40, as stating the literal truth: "Thou shalt keep therefore his statutes, that it may go well with thee, and with thy children after thee; AND THAT thou mayest prolong days upon the earth, which the Lord thy God giveth thee, forever." "The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's, but the earth has he given to the children of men;" Psalm 115.16. And so we understand the promise of the Fifth Commandment, "that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee," to mean that, in a future life, thy days may be prolonged on the earth. It was "the first commandment with a promise," Eph. 6.2: as obedience to parents is the first step toward that obedience to the Heavenly Father which brings the eternal reward. Certainly it was not the good children only in Israel whose mortal life was prolonged. The wicked Jeroboam lives on, while his son, Abijah, in whom "there was found some good thing toward the Lord God of Israel," dies before him; 1 Kings 14.12, 13.

But, it may be asked, are not Christ's people to be caught up from earth to meet the Lord in the air? Certainly, so Paul teaches, 1 Thess. 4.17, and we might presume they would not again be on earth, if it were not that all Scripture shows (some of such passages already given) that the earth is to be their future home. Here the kingdom promised is to be established, here the redeemed are to "reign on the earth;" Rev. 5.20. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. And this is the name whereby he shall be called, Jehovah our righteousness" (Jehovah-tsidkenu); Jer. 23.5, 6. "The Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his

ancients gloriously;" Isa. 24.23. "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David;" Isa. 9.7. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David;" Luke 1.31, 32. "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth in that day;" Zech. 14.9: the scene of his humiliation will be the scene of his triumph!

CHAPTER 10

The Destiny of the Soul. The Doctrine of Immortality in the New Testament.

IF the Old Testament and the New are a revelation of God's will, it is impossible that the two should be as unlike as some seem to imagine. The manner of the revelation may differ, but the matter itself, the purposes of God as unfolded, must be the same in each. The Bible, as a revelation from God, is one connected whole. Of the two testaments, or, more exactly, covenants, the latter is the outgrowth and fulfilment of the former. The Lord Jesus says, he came not to destroy, but to fulfil the law and the prophets; Matt. 5.17. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh "(through human inefficiency), God accomplished for us, "sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us" (Rom. 8.3, 4), and its reward obtained. That righteousness of the law, the perfect obedience of our Lord to its demands, is set to the account of those who believe in him. And the reward of the Old Covenant is the reward of the New. It is life under each. In the Old Testament dispensation this truth was clearly revealed and fully recognized, but, in his fulfilling of the law, our Lord Jesus, by his own sacrificial death, and his resurrection to, life, "hath abolished death, and hath brought to light life and immortality" (2 Tim. 1.10); "who, verily, was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last- times for you, who by him do believe in God, that raised him from dead ones;" 1 Pet. 1.20, 21.

Taking up, then, the New Testament, let us see how the word immortality is there used. By it our version renders two different Greek words, *aphtharsia* and *athanasia*. The former, sometimes differently rendered in E. V., denotes incorruptibility; as applied to that not liable to corrupt, to spoil, to fall into decay. It comes from Greek *a*, negative, and *phtheiro*, to corrupt. As our word corrupt is now so restricted to moral decay, perhaps a better rendering were imperishability. The other word, *athanasia*, denotes deathlessness; from Greek *a*, privative, and *thanatos*, death. It is the exact equivalent of the English immortal; from Latin *in*, negative, *mors*, death. With this understanding, we can better see the force of the quotations below.

Twice we find *aphtharsia* rendered immortality, once its adjective, *aphthartos*, immortal:

1 Tim. 1:17 "The King eternal, immortal;" Greek *aphthartos*, imperishable.

2 Tim. 1.10: "Jesus Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought to light life and immortality [Greek *aphtharsia*, imperishability] through the gospel." The gospel (glad tidings) of salvation from sin and its attendant physical corruption, brings to light, for dying, decaying human beings, life and imperishability, which are to be had on the conditions of the gospel, viz., belief in its message, and repentance; Greek *metanoia*, exactly, a change of mind or purpose, involving a change in the manner of one's present life. As we read:

Rom. 2.7: "To them who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for honor and glory and immortality [*aphtharsia*, imperishability], God will render eternal life."

In two passages only is *athanasia* found:

1 Tim. 6.16; "Who only hath immortality; "athanasia, deathlessness: God only hath this.

1 Cor. 15.42, 50-57: "It is sown in corruption [perishable]; it is raised in incorruption [Greek *en aphtharsia*, imperishable]. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, [cannot receive that kingdom yet in the future, which we pray may come], neither doth corruption [the perishable] inherit incorruption [the imperishable]. Behold, I shew you a mystery: we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible [imperishable], and we [those then not sleeping in death] shall be changed. For this corruptible [perishable] must put on incorruption [imperishability, *aphtharsia*], and this mortal [Greek *thneton*, deathly] must put on immortality [deathlessness, *athanasia*]. So when this perishable shall have put on imperishability, and this mortal [deathly] shall have put on immortality [deathlessness], then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law."

For one in his sins, death has indeed a fearful sting. The first death is but the prelude to a second, an eternal death. But those "accepted in the Beloved "may now say: "Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus .Christ I "Over them the triumph

of death and the grave is limited, for the Lord Jesus has promised to ransom his own from the power of the grave at the RESURRECTION TO LIFE. Thanks indeed to God for that Resurrection! And yet are there not in our day those of whom Paul asks, "How say some among you that there is no resurrection "- of dead ones? 1 Cor. 15.12. Modern theology teaches this; for it knows no actually dead ones, none without life, none not immortal!

But 1 Tim. 6.16 shows us that athanasia, deathlessness, immortality, is strictly an attribute of God alone. And from 1 Cor. 15 we have learned that some who have suffered death will after that receive life again, and be endowed with athanasia, immortality. But this appertains to a portion only of created beings. The wicked will not be endowed with immortality. "Eternal life is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord;" Rom. 6.23. Though the proud philosophers of this world and our modern theologians claim that immortality is the inalienable possession of every human being, it is by the Divine Giver limited to "those who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for it;" and it is not to be "put on "by them, until the day of our Lord's appearing, when they all receive the spirit-body, when mortality is swallowed up of life.

Thus, everywhere, does the word of God hold out to us a future immortality, conditioned upon the use made of the life here given us.

The teachings of our Lord Jesus are full of this truth. They lose simplicity, directness, harmony, if we ignore it. He proclaims himself "the resurrection and the life." Again he says, "I am the bread of life; "that which sustains life, its staff. As he says, "The bread of God is he who cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." He offers life to us, "that whosoever believeth in him, might not perish, but have everlasting life." And how sadly he says to those rejecting him, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." In the fifth chapter of John's gospel, this truth of a future life is so minutely detailed that we quote at length. Surely, on this point, the word of One who "speaks that he does know," ought to be decisive, unless, like some in his own day, we "will not receive his witness."

Let us then open our Bibles at the place, and read the verses in their connection.

Jn. 5.21: "For as the Father raises up [Greek egeiro, arouses, awakens] the dead, and quickened them [Greek zoopoia, makes to live]; even so the Son makes to live whom he will." The words "dead," and "makes to live," modern theology may claim are figurative, but too strong is the case already made out against it; the burden of proof rests upon its shoulders, it must prove its claim before it can be allowed. But such attempt were useless here; the context decides against it. In verse 25, our Lord again speaks of the dead, and again in verse 28; but in the latter case, instead of using the word dead, he defines its meaning by its equivalent, "all that are in the graves." As, then, the One giving literal life to the literally dead, he says:

Jn. 5.24: "He that believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life, and comes not into judgment; "- Greek krisis, which E. V. inconsistently renders condemnation; but note its own testimony as to the real meaning of Greek krisis, which it renders condemnation three times, damnation three times, judgment forty times; as it is necessarily in this very context in verses 22, 27, 30 - "but is passed from the death into the life; "from those, over whom death is impending, to those who have the deathless life in promise, to be "put on "at the Resurrection to Life. This first resurrection is referred to in the next verse.

Jn. 5.25: "An hour is coming, and [or, even] now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." In that passing hour, some, but not all, of the sleeping dead heard that voice of power, that, from among them called back to life Lazarus, and the widow's son of Nain, and Jairus's daughter. So in the coming hour, not all the sleeping dead shall hear the glorious call of "the first resurrection," Rev. 20.5, "the resurrection of the just," Luke 14.14, the Ex-anastasis, "resurrection from among dead ones," that typified by our Lord's glorious resurrection. But those of the dead who hear shall live.

Jn. 5.26 "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Having life in himself, he hath power to call dead ones into being again, to give life to "whom he will." And not only has he power to give life; he says, verse 27, he has "authority to execute judgment also "(Greek krisin poiein, lit. to make, i.e., sit in judgment), upon those to whom he does not give life. And then he proceeds to announce a resurrection also, for this latter class, as well as that for the former.

Jn. 5.28, 29: "Marvel not at this, for an hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto THE RESURRECTION OF LIFE: they that have done evil unto THE RESURRECTION OF JUDGMENT; "Greek krisis. A resurrection to life, for all who come to him for life, for, though such meet the first death, they will not the second. For our Lord tells us, "It is the Father's will, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day; that everyone who believeth on the Son may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day;" Jn. 6.39, 40. It is at the last day that Christ brings back into life his own who trusted in him, and bestows upon them life everlasting. Their future life is assured by his. He is "living for the ages of the ages," Rev. 1.18, and he has said, "Because I live, ye shall live also."

And a resurrection also is there for such as came not to Jesus for life; a resurrection not to life, but to judgment. Then he who once gave his life for us, that he might make us partakers of his life, "partakers of the Divine nature," 2 Pet. 1.4, he, then, sitting in

judgment over those who did not accept that blood-bought pardon, will pronounce the inevitable sentence of the law, "The soul that sinned, it shall die." "Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death" (Jas. 1.15), death, final, fearful, irremediable!

This great offer of life, of immortality through our Lord Jesus Christ, is the glad tidings, the message which the whole Bible brings to all "those who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage; "Heb. 2.15.

CHAPTER 11

The Destiny of the Soul. The Bible Doctrine of the Future of the Wicked.

IN an hour that is coming, they that have done evil shall hear his voice, and shall come forth to the resurrection of judgment;" Jn. 5.28, 29. What does the Bible tell us is the penalty of the violated law, to be executed upon those found guilty in that judgment?

This is by no means, as some think, one of "the secret things which belong unto the Lord our God." It is clearly of "those things which are revealed, that belong to us, [in order] that we may obey all the words of the law; "Deut. 29.29. As life, in its primary, natural significance, was held out as the reward of obedience, SO DEATH, the loss of that life, IS THE REWARD OF DISOBEDIENCE.

Ezek. 18.20: "The soul that sinned, it shall die."

Rom. 6.23: "The wages of sin is death."

Jas. 1.15: "Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death."

All Scripture unites to declare this truth. The Lord Jesus tells us of "Him who is able to destroy soul and body in hell; "Gehenna. Compare Deut. 32.39: "See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no God with me; I kill and I make alive; neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand."

Peter, Acts 3.23, preached to the people: "" Every soul, who will not hear that prophet [the Lord Jesus], shall be destroyed from among the people." Thus. Peter explains Deut. 18.18, 19, whence this quotation is taken, "whosoever will not hearken, I will require it of him; "-will require it of him at the cost of his life.; he shall be destroyed.

The same Apostle writes, 2 Pet. 2.12: "These, as natural brute beasts, shall utterly perish."

Paul tells us, Phil. 3.18, 19, that "the end of the enemies of the cross of Christ is destruction."

As he says, 2 Thess. 1.9: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction."

So we read, Jn. 3.36 "He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God [as expressed in his destruction] abides on him."

The same truth, also, we read in the Old Testament.

Psalms 145.20: "The Lord preserves the righteous; but all the wicked will he destroy;" preserving in life contrasted with destroying in death.

Isaiah 1.28: "The destruction of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together, and they that forsake the Lord shall be consumed."

Psalms 104.35: "Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked be no more."

Psalms 37.10: "For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be."

Obadiah 1.16: "They shall be as though they had not been."

Certainly, if language means anything, the future which awaits those condemned in the Judgment has been revealed to us. They are to be destroyed, to lose their life, at the hand of One who is able to and will, in the appointed time, destroy soul and body in an utter and everlasting destruction.

We next inquire, How is this destruction to be brought about?

On this point Holy Scripture gives no uncertain sound. From every part we hear the fearful warning cry, Fire, Fire! It tells us of a future burning, from which there shall be no escape to the wicked: they shall be burned up.

The loving Master himself, who gave his life to ransom ours, set before us this truth in unmistakable language. His disciples came to him, saying, Matt. 13.36, "Declare [Greek phrazo, give us to know, explain] unto us the parable of the tares of the field." They request that, dropping the parabolic, figurative language in which he had clothed the truth, he would now make it so plain to them that they could not mistake his meaning. He grants their request; minutely he explains each point to them, and surely we may believe it could not be more simply clone, for it is a Divine Instructor who makes it plain. "He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man; the field is the world [Greek kosmos]; the good seed are the sons of the kingdom, but the tares are the sons of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the age [Greek aion]; and the reapers are the angels."

It is as one explaining an allegorical painting on canvas; he points to each figure, and gives its meaning in language so simple and direct that none could mistake. In the same simple, direct language, he continues: "As therefore the tams are gathered and burned in the fire, SO SHALL IT BE in the end of the age;" Greek aion.

Why are the tares gathered and burned? A careful husbandman roots up noxious weeds to clear his ground of their presence; and, in order that he may rid himself of future trouble from them or their seed, he completes the work of destruction by gathering and burning them. "So shall it be in the end of the age. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend [Greek skandala, all causes of sinning], and them that do iniquity, and they shall cast them into the furnace of the fire; there shall be the wailing and the gnashing of the teeth." Can words be plainer than these? Can circumstances be imagined calling for greater simplicity of speech? Can a declaration of the future fate of the wicked be more explicit than this? Can it be enforced by a more apt and unequivocal illustration? Can a speaker be found of higher authority? Why then do we not believe him? A religious teacher once said to the writer, "Did that passage stand alone, I should believe, as you do, that the wicked are to be burned up." But did Christ make a statement to be contradicted by his past or future utterances? Though the statement is corroborated by the rest of Scripture, at the time of its utterance it did stand alone, and it must, and does, stand on its own merits.

How does modern theology evade the force of these few simple words? Behold, and wonder! It teaches that the angels are literally sent forth; they literally gather out the wicked; they literally cast them - where? Into a figurative furnace of fire, so figurative that, literally, there is no fire about it at all! For, if we understand the present position of modern theology, -and so little has the pulpit of the present day to say on this subject, that the writer may be pardoned if he cannot be positive, - it would seem that, for its teaching of a hundred years ago of literal fire, peculiar in not consuming, there has been substituted of late a figurative fire. It has somehow been discovered that it is the fire of a guilty and remorseful conscience. This must be another of the points where we are thought to "know more concerning spiritual things than the apostles." In the present advance of our spiritual knowledge, literal fire, we are told, is too gross and material a conception; and, besides, material fire could not harm the soul, which modern theology teaches is immaterial and immortal. So, lest this un-biblical dogma be overthrown, we are told that the Divine teacher, while seeking to speak with the utmost simplicity, and while we have reason to believe he is still speaking as literally as possible, gets so mixed up in his language, that, having just used the word fire in its natural meaning, he uses it again the next moment and without explanation, in a different sense. . Indeed, our Savior is not one thus weakly to violate the necessary laws of human speech. His statement is direct and unequivocal as possible: "As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of this age." The tares are literally gathered out, so shall the wicked be; the tares are literally burned, so shall the wicked be; and as the result of that burning, the tares are literally consumed; "so shall it be in the end of this age" with the wicked!

Some may have inferred that "the wailing and the gnashing of teeth" imply an eternity of torment. Not at all; the duration of that misery is no way here referred to. Ps. cxii. to presents an inspired comment on this passage: "The wicked shall see it [the exaltation of the righteous], and be grieved; he shall gnash with his teeth; and melt away." How protracted may be the act of dying in each case in that furnace of fire, the Lord does not reveal. It is the time of the wailing and the gnashing of the teeth, a terrible agony of mind and body, fearful to contemplate. But it has an end. The penalty of the broken law, the full wages of sin, will certainly be received. Death, sooner or later, comes to every one, silencing every cry of pain, every shriek of despair, every groan at the thought of what might have been. And at last that Scripture is fulfilled, "The wicked shall be silent in darkness;" 1 Sam. 2.7.

The word of the Lord by his prophet Malachi brings before us the same picture:

Mal. 3.r8; 4.1, 3: "Then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked; between him that serves God, and him that serves him not. For, behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, SAITH THE LORD OF HOSTS, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, SAITH THE LORD OF HOSTS."

The same warning of impending fire is uttered by the one who was foretold by this prophet (Mal. 4.5), as coming in the spirit and power of Elijah. He says:

Matt. 3.10-12 "The axe is laid unto the root of the trees; therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. . . He will baptize in fire. . . His fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."

Utter destruction by fire is also the alarm sounded out by the Apostles of our Lord. Paul writes of that burning in the end of this age:

2 Thess. 1.7, 8: "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with the angels of his power, in flaming fire [Greek in a flame of fire] taking vengeance on them that know not God, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction."

2 Pet. 3.7: Peter foretells the same event: "The heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against a day of judgment and [Greek apoleia, as translated, same chap. verse 16] destruction of ungodly men." Away back in the past, Job held the same truth, Job 21.30: "The wicked is reserved to the day of destruction; they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath."

The author of Hebrews writes (Heb. 10.27) of "a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation [Greek puros silos, zeal of fire], which shall devour the adversaries."

Psalms 21.9: "Thou shalt make them. as a fiery oven in the time of thine anger: the Lord shall swallow them up in his wrath, and the fire shall devour them."

Psalms 11.6: taking the marginal rendering of the Hebrew, "Upon the wicked he shall rain quick, burning coals, fire, and brimstone, and a burning tempest: this shall be the portion of their cup."

Jer. 23.19, 20: "Behold, a whirlwind of the Lord is gone forth in fury, even a grievous whirlwind: it shall fall grievously upon the head of the wicked. The anger of the Lord shall not return, until he have executed, and till he have performed the thoughts of his heart: in the latter days ye shall consider it perfectly."

Thus we have the testimony of Psalmist, of Prophets, of Apostles, of Christ himself, that fire will be the agent of the final destruction of the wicked, in the end of this age.

The illustrations of the future of the wicked, which the Scriptures present, are very decisive as to their ultimate fate. Written statements, it is claimed, may be differently interpreted by different minds, but a picture held up before the eye has but one story for all beholders. Its intent is made still more evident, if many different pictures are brought forward to illustrate the lesson taught.

Now such illustrations abound in Scripture, but in the religious teaching of our day, little, we may say no, use is made of them. The great effort seems rather to explain them away! It is very significant that an advocate of unending suffering, if he wishes to illustrate a doctrine which he professes to take from the Bible, for his illustrations goes not to the Bible, but to heathen mythology, it might be called demonology. We all know the hard service to which the well-worn fable of Prometheus and the Vulture has been compelled, to illustrate the so-called Christian doctrine of 'unending suffering. Why should modern theology thus shun the illustrations of Scripture? Because these inspired pictorial representations are not what it wants. They carry not the idea of continued existence in suffering, but of the very opposite; they tell of an ending of all existence, a complete, literal destruction

But let us see what these illustrations of Scripture are. Certainly, there is no lack of them. The prophet Hosea crowds four different images into one sentence:

Hos. 13.3: "Therefore they shall be as the morning cloud, and as the early dew that passes away, as the chaff driven with the whirlwind out of the floor, and as the smoke out of the chimney."

Comparing the wicked in their ultimate fate to worthless chaff and stubble, fit only to be destroyed, is very common.

Jer. 23.28 "What is the chaff for the wheat? saith the Lord."

Psalms 1.4: "The ungodly are like the chaff, which the wind drives away."

Isaiah 5.24: "As the fire devoured the stubble, and the flame consumed the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust."

Isaiah 33.12: "And the people shall be as the burnings of lime; as thorns cut up shall they be burned in the fire."

Isaiah 47:14 "Behold, they shall be as stubble, the fire shall burn them; they shall not deliver their souls [so Hebrew, as given in margin of our version.] from the power of the flame: not a coal to warm at, a fire to sit before!"

Jer. 13.24: "Therefore will I scatter them as the stubble, that passes away by the wind of the wilderness."

Prov. 10.25: "As the whirlwind passes, so is the wicked no more."

Psalms 67.2: "As smoke is driven away, so drive them away; as wax melted before the fire, so let the wicked perish at the presence of God." Compare 2 Thess. 1.9: "who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord."

Nahum 1.9, 10: "What do ye imagine against the Lord? He will make an utter end; affliction shall not rise up the second time. For, while they be folded together as thorns, . . . they shall be devoured as stubble, fully dry."

We have already seen the illustrations of the forerunner of Christ; the axe laid at the root of the trees; the tree hewn down and cast into the fire; the chaff burnt up with a fire no one may quench. John the Baptist did not fail to "persuade men" by the terrors of the Lord; he preached to the wicked their utter destruction, unless they repented.

We have also considered one of our Lord's illustrations of the same truth, the tares burned in the fire. But that passage does not stand alone; it is corroborated by every word of the Great Teacher.

Luke 13.2-5, in speaking of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, and of those on whom the tower in Siloam fell, Jesus says to his hearers, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Were they also to have their blood mingled with their sacrifices, and to be crushed by a falling tower? No; the emphasis is on perish. They also shall perish, shall lose their lives, their existence, if they repent not; if they come not to him for life.

Luke 17.26-30: Our Lord speaks of a sudden, total destruction in the days of Noah, "the flood came and destroyed them all; "in the days of Lot, "it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of Man is revealed." The illustrations our Lord here makes use of we find likewise used by Peter and by Jude (2 Pet. 2.3-9, Jude 1.7); it seems they were not driven to the rubbish of heathen mythology.

Luke 20.18 "Whosoever shall fall upon that stone [the headstone of the corner], shall be broken," stumbling upon it, he shall suffer damage as one in falling breaks his limbs; "but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." What does our Lord here foretell but the utter destruction of the rejector of Christ, that which in the day of the Lord shall come upon him "as a destruction from the Almighty" Is. 12.6. And how completely does our Lord here refute the notion of modern commentators, who, dropping the idea of literal fire, inform us that the threatened doom "is represented not as something external to the sinner, but as consisting of his sins, and proceeding from himself." (So says Lyman Abbott's Commentary on Matthew, page 183; note on the fire, into which sinners "shall be cast.") And in this connection, read what our Lord announces as the words of his final sentence, Matt. 25.41 "Depart from me, ye cursed, INTO eternal fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

Some allusions in Scripture to the book of life serve to set forth the fate of the wicked. We read of the Lamb's book of life, Rev. 21.27; of that book of life to be opened at the judgment, Rev. 20.12; of the remnant in Jerusalem, that are holy and written among the living, Is. 4.3. The names thus written are of those who, having had life in this world, are also to have it in the hereafter. But we also read, Rev. 3.5: "I will not blot out his name out of the book of life." Ps. 69.28: "Let them (the wicked) be blotted out of the book of life, and let them not be written with the righteous." How is this? Are there any whose names once in the book of life are afterward to be blotted out of it? Never, from the Lamb's book of life. Those whose "names are written in heaven," "whom he will confess before his Father and the angels," as purchased with his blood, to whom he gives eternal life, "shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of his hand." It is evident that "book of life" (as we have already shown of the tree of life) is used as a symbolic, or figurative, expression for those who have life, whether it be in the future or in the present. And those living now in this world, those whose names are in the book of this passing life, their names "shall be blotted out "altogether, if they are found unworthy of eternal life. Such blotting out from the number of those who have life, who live, can signify nothing but the blotting out of life itself, the final ending of their existence.

In Prov. 24.20, the future of the wicked is both stated and illustrated, so clearly that it seems to have given our translators some trouble. The passage is in our version. "There shall be no reward to the wicked man; the candle of the wicked shall be put out."

No reward to the evil man! Evidently that word is not correctly rendered. The Lord declares, Deut. 32.41: "I will reward them that hate me," We read, Ps. 91.8:

"Thou shalt see the reward of the wicked." The Hebrew of Prov. 24.20, a different word from that in the last two quotations, our translators have elsewhere rendered end. And this might have just suited their views here: "There shall be no end to the wicked man,"

but that the latter clause of the verse contradicts this, "the candle of the wicked shall be put out; "i.e., there shall be an end to him. The same Hebrew word is found, Numb. 23.20: "Let me [Hebrew my soul] die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his." Prof. Bush renders it "my after hood, my hereafter," or perhaps we might more definitely say, my aftertime. And so Gesenius gives it.

With this corrected rendering, Prov. 24.20 declares, "For there shall be no after-time to the evil man; the candle of the wicked shall be put out." The corrected rendering is thus corroborated by the parallelism of Hebrew poetry; no after-time for an evil man corresponding to the candle of the wicked put out; i.e., he, the evil man, will be extinguished. In Prov. 24.14, the Hebrew for after-time is rendered reward, but it will readily be seen that after-time is the appropriate rendering.

And so we read, Psalm 27.37, 38: "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the [not end, as in E. V., not death, but the] after-time of that man is peace. But the transgressors shall be destroyed together; the after-time [E. V. end] of the wicked shall be cut off."

We have thus briefly considered the Bible doctrine of the punishment of the future: what it is, how effected, and how illustrated in Holy Writ. We learn that an unending "destruction shall be to the workers of iniquity; "it will be effected by fire; and as illustrations we have set before us the most complete fiery destructions of the present life.

But the question must arise: Is there nothing in Scripture which the advocates of the more popular belief may quote, to sustain their side? For a doctrine of such magnitude as the unending suffering of the wicked, is there not, in all revelation, one direct announcement of that stupendous fact, if such it be? Not one; there is not a single one! As in the question of separate soul existence, each so-called proof-text rests upon inferences merely. A few passages of Scripture have been found which have been thought to warrant such an inference. And while the advocates of unending suffering completely ignore the Scripture illustrations of the fate of the wicked, they make such constant use of these few passages, as to give the impression that the Bible has little else to say on the subject. Let us then carefully examine these passages, that we may determine the value of the inference derived from them.

Prominent among these passages stands the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. We call attention to the fact that the duration of future suffering is not even hinted at in that parable; and that its scene is laid between death and the judgment; before trial is had and the sentence is pronounced, "Depart, ye cursed, into eternal fire." Moreover, it represents torment as produced by fire, not by a guilty conscience, which in this world the guilty man carries about with him. But we have already (Chapter 8.) so thoroughly exposed the absurdities and contradictions, both of fact and figure of speech, in the popular interpretation of the parable, that it is not worth while to linger upon it here. Let us turn to other misrepresented passages.

Matt. 25.41: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

Matt. 25.46: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal."

We have already been compelled to notice how our translators have managed to cover up the truth with regard to the use of the word soul in the Scriptures. Here we observe a somewhat peculiar manipulation of the Greek in our Eng. Version. The ordinary English reader would not be aware that it is one and the same word in the Greek, which in verse 46 is translated everlasting and eternal, and everlasting in verse 41; when qualifying punishment it, is everlasting, qualifying life it is eternal. The Greek is *aionios*, adjective from *aion*, on, age. We acknowledge that *aion*, except in the form "the ages of the ages," does not absolutely involve the idea of eternity. But still, in N. T. Greek, it often does convey that meaning. And here it is only fair to understand that the punishment "aionian" of the wicked is of equal duration with the life "aionian" of the righteous. We have the right to insist, for simplicity's sake, that one English adjective shall be used for the one Greek; and as the word eternal is so often used elsewhere, we shall use it here.

What then is meant by "eternal punishment"? The Greek for punishment is *kolasis*; in its original meaning, a cutting off, pruning, as of trees. As the expression to "cut off" is so frequent in the Old Testament, we may presume this was intended as the Greek equivalent, and that it is properly rendered "an eternal cutting off." But it is not necessary to insist upon this; we retain our English word punishment.

It is held by some that punishment cannot be eternal, unless eternally felt by a conscious object; and so the wicked must have an eternal life, that they may suffer eternal punishment. But the fallacy of this is most patent. What is the punishment taught in the Bible? As we understand it, it is death. Is this death eternal? It is. Then the punishment is eternal. Or to put the argument in the simplest form:

The punishment of sin is death;
But that death is eternal;
Therefore, the punishment is eternal.

No question would ever have arisen, but for the unbiblical conception of the soul. For the Bible uniformly denominates that eternal which is eternal in its necessary results. We read of eternal judgment (Heb. 6.2), of eternal redemption (Heb. 9.12), of eternal sin, as the oldest MSS. have it in Mark 3.29. This is not eternally judging, eternally redeeming, or eternally sinning; but in that judgment of

the great Day, in that redemption Christ accomplished for us, in that blasphemy against the Spirit, in all these, the results are eternal; and in this respect, the judgment, the redemption, the blasphemy, are eternal.. No more may one claim that eternal punishment is eternally punishing. In its results the punishment is eternal; for it is eternal destruction; 1 Thess. 1.9.

And the same Biblical mode of speech holds good with regard to "eternal fire." To be an eternal fire, it is not necessary that it should be eternally burning, but that its results, as with the judgment and the redemption, should in like manner be eternal. It is eternal in that it accomplishes the foretold eternal destruction of the wicked. Consumed in fire, "they shall be no more; "" they shall be as though they had not been."

Matt. 3." He shall burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."

Nothing could better illustrate the straits to which the advocates of unending suffering are reduced, than the discreet use they make of this passage. Its "unquenchable fire" "is often enough on their tongues, but how seldom we hear of the rest of it, of "the chaff burnt up" The latter is one of those inconvenient illustrations so studiously shunned. For the fire of modern theology does not "burn up," notwithstanding experience, and the Bible, declare that fire in burning consumes; and that this special fire is significantly spoken of as "a day that shall burn as an oven."

The simple question with this passage is: Does the expression "unquenchable fire" carry with it any implication of eternal duration? Not the least whatever; neither in the language of the Bible, nor in that of common life. What is stated is that the fire cannot be put out. Whether, after nothing remains to feed the flame, it shall then go out of itself, is an entirely different question. From all we know of fire, we should anticipate it would.

As an example of Bible usage, we read, Jer. 17.27: "I will kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched." This was fulfilled, as the same prophet testifies, Lam. 4.2: "The Lord hath kindled a fire in Zion, and it hath devoured the foundations thereof." But that fire "not quenched" "is not now burning on. It went out when its work was done; but not till then.

Such also is the language of everyday life. Suppose an isolated wooden building takes fire. You afterward inquire, "Was the fire put out?" "No," is the reply, "it could not be put out; we had no supply of water." "It could not be put out" - that is not to say the fire will never cease to burn, but that, no means being at hand to quench it, it burned on unchecked till there was nothing left to burn; that is, till it had entirely consumed the building. The unquenchable nature of the fire, that it could not be put out, simply speaks the utter destruction of that on which it fed. So of the fire of the great day; it is unquenchable, no one can hope to extinguish it; it will continue to burn, till its work is thoroughly accomplished in a like destruction of the sinner.

Mark 9.47, 48 "It is better for thee, one-eyed [so Greek], to enter into the kingdom of God, than, having two eyes, to be cast into the Gehenna of the fire, where the worm dies not, and the fire is not quenched."

Certainly, the fact is very suggestive, that the double repetition of this illustration of the worm and the fire, in verses 44 and 46 preceding, is spurious. It is not in the earlier MSS, but is an addition of later centuries. It tells of a felt difficulty that so little in the Bible should even appear to sustain the dogma of unending suffering.

But poor support, indeed, except with the thoughtless, does this passage give to that dogma. It is virtually the same as the preceding passage, except that two instruments of destruction are brought before us instead of one. Strange, indeed, that the indestructible character of these instruments of destruction should be deemed to infer the indestructible nature of that which they destroy! An inference of the unending life of that which is being consumed, from the statement that nothing can arrest the work of destruction! And yet, such is force of early education, that we fail to notice the absurdity of this idea till it is pointed out to us. For the argument on the preceding passage applies here also. As the fire cannot be put out, so the worm cannot be destroyed; they must complete their work. And such understanding of this passage is confirmed by that whence the figure here is quoted, Isaiah 66.24: "And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against Me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched." It is upon those already dead that the fire and the worm are to feed. The figure is taken from the fire of the Gehenna outside Jerusalem, where the fire and the worm completed the destruction of the refuse brought thither from the city. It tells not only of the sinner's loss of life, but of the utter destruction of what may be left after life is extinct. Instead of in any way suggesting unending life, it is an image of uttermost destruction.

Isaiah 33." Who among us shall -dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?"

It is inferred that there are those who will. But were it not a more natural response to the inquiry, who shall dwell with the devouring fire?- None, most certainly, none! The question is like that in Ps. 76.7: "Who shall stand in thy sight when once thou art angry? "For, in "the great day of his wrath "is it that devouring fire will be kindled. In the verse but one preceding, Is. 33.12, it is stated of those who, modern theology infers, are to abide that consuming fire; "And the people shall be as the burnings of lime, as thorns cut up shall

they be burned in the fire." No thorns can abide the fire, we all know; so no human beings can survive that future devouring fire. The words of the prophet Nahum fitly answer to this question of Isaiah:

Nahum 1.5, 6, 8, 9: "The mountains quake at him and the hills melt, and the earth is burned at his presence, yea, the world, and all that dwell therein. Who can stand before his indignation? and who can abide in the fierceness of his anger? His fury is poured out like fire, and the rocks are thrown down by him. What do ye imagine against the Lord? He will make an utter end: affliction shall not rise up the second time. For, while they be folded together as thorns, and while they be drunken as drunkards, they shall be devoured as stubble fully dry."

Rev. 14.11: "And the smoke of their torment ascended up forever and ever."

Many take this as the literal declaration of unending misery in store for the wicked. But we must not forget that the passage is from the Revelation of St. John, a book so full of symbols as to be the stumbling-block of commentators. And no quotation from so symbolic a book can override the simple statements of other Scriptures.

In dealing with symbols we need a key, not one supplied by any human invention, but by the word of the Spirit. And in Isaiah 34.10 we are happy to find the key needed here; for thence is evidently taken the figure of the ascending smoke. In foretelling the Lord's judgments on the land of Idumea, the prophet declares: "It shall not be quenched day nor night, the smoke thereof shall go up forever." No traveler finds, in the present condition of ancient Idumea, the literal fulfilment of Isaiah's poetic prediction. Desolate indeed is the land, totally ruined are its cities; but they are not now sending up the smoke of their burning. And yet the poet-seer is no false prophet. That doom which, in the highly-wrought language of poetry, he foretold, has overtaken those cities. We behold it in a destruction, which is not only total, but ever continuing; and so fitly symbolized by the ever ascending smoke of their burning. Here then is the key required. The literal meaning of the poetic symbol is unending destruction. And this is its meaning, when, in the Revelation, the symbol is again brought before us.

But one may object; - Everything in the Revelation is not figurative, may it not be an assumption thus to regard this passage? Well questioned; for no passage may be adjudged figurative, except the proof be incontrovertible. What, then, is this proof? It is as follows:

1. Thus only can the passage be made to accord with the declarations in the rest of Scripture of the unending destruction of the wicked.
2. The probability of its being figurative is confirmed by finding in Isaiah the same language unquestionably figurative, as already shown.
3. This torment is said, in verse preceding, to be "in the presence of the holy angels and of the Lamb." Are their pure eyes never to be free from the sight of unutterable, because eternal, agony? Impossible. Such a statement must be figurative.
4. Elsewhere in this book of the Revelation its writer uses the expression, "torment forever," so as to place beyond question its necessary symbolic intent. We read: "The beast and the false prophet were taken, and cast into a lake of fire, burning with brimstone;" Rev. 19.20: and again, "where the beast and the false prophet are, and they shall be tormented [plural Greek] day and night forever;" Rev. 20.10. It is evident the beast is not a literal brute beast, but a symbol, as is the associated false prophet. From Dan. 7.3, 17, 23, we learn that "beast" is the Biblical symbol of a kingdom or government of this present world, or dispensation. Can it be that the government here symbolized is to exist forever, as it must, if literally forever tormented? Certainly not; for we learn, Dan. 2.44, that our Lord's kingdom "shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms." We have then abundant proof of the necessary figurative nature of the expression.

What then is the import of this established symbol? As we learn from Isaiah's use of the figure, it calls attention to the unending nature of a destruction already accomplished. As applied in the Revelation to the fate of the irretrievably lost, it tells us that that fearful ending of existence, whenever it rises before the mind of the surviving beholders, is as if the smoke of that burning were still ascending before one's actual vision. As it is figuratively said of Abel, Heb. 11.4, "He, being dead, yet speaks;" - he speaks to us whenever we think of him. So, in memory, that fate of the lost abides a warning to the redeemed, ever continuing, against any turning to that sin which has brought about such hopeless, perpetual destruction.

Having thus examined carefully, and we believe candidly, the passages whence is derived the inference of unending suffering, we find that, so far from bearing the construction put upon them, they all agree in asserting the utter literal destruction of the wicked. We therefore judge that, in Holy Scripture, there is absolutely nothing on which to rest the unauthorized dogma of eternal misery.

And, indeed, it is impossible to understand how, on a thorough and impartial investigation, anyone, capable of giving a reason for the faith that is in him, can come to any other conclusion. Unless it be, that the believer in eternal misery is so convinced of the truth of the doctrine, that no question of the fact can enter his mind, and so all his thought is absorbed in strengthening his position or in meeting objections to it. In some such way only, can we explain the weakness of arguments often advanced, and readily accepted by Christian people, who substitute the authority of others for their own judgment.

The most prominent champion at present of the doctrine of unending misery is Rev. S. C. Bartlett, D. D., formerly Professor of Intellectual Philosophy and Rhetoric at Western Reserve College, late Professor of Sacred Theology at the Chicago Theological

Seminary, and just called. to the Presidency of Dartmouth College. In the *New Englander* of Oct., 1872, he publishes what he must have believed a sound argument in favor of the doctrine he holds. Referring to an evidently difficult point for his doctrine, those illustrations of Scripture, the chaff, stubble, thorns, tares, all consumed in the fire, in which cases the object selected as the example is utterly blotted out of existence, he declares very correctly these are "simple images of a terrific overthrow." But then he goes on to explain that the idea of literal destruction embodied in these Bible images is not intentional, and should not be accepted. It is an error, he tells us, due to the necessary imperfection of imagery drawn from nature around us. But then could not the All-wise have found illustrations less misleading? Or may it not be possible that the reverend writer assumes his point, and then unconsciously argues from that assumption? We quote his own words: "Perhaps the shortest, as well as most palpable and most incontrovertible reply [italics our own] to the annihilationist use of these comparisons, is to produce a living man in the Scripture employing nearly every one of them (and more also) to describe his own present wretched condition. We will introduce the patriarch Job."

Then follow the utterances of Job contained in the following references: Job 6.4; 7.8; 9.18; 13.25, 28; 16.9, 10, 12, 16; 17.1; 19.8, 9, 11; 30.14, 15, 19, 22, 28-30, with the triumphant summing up: "If these utterances of the living Job are not an annihilation of the doctrine of annihilation, what could be? "[Well, we' agree in that; nothing else could be!]

Let us then examine this supposed crushing argument from these utterances of Job.

First, however, we do not say that Pres. Bartlett intended to convey such an impression; yet, from his statement respecting the Scripture images of future punishment, that "Job employs nearly every one of them, and more also," if, from that, any one takes the suggestion that Job's language describing his suffering is any way more comprehensive, or more terrible, than is the Scripture presentation of the fate of the wicked, or indeed that it other than falls immensely short of it, such a one is grievously led astray; as will be seen by comparing these references from Job with Scripture quotations already given in this chapter. But let that pass.

The first position of Pres. Bartlett must be that this language of Job cannot be literal. Job was not a "leaf driven with the wind," or "dry stubble," 13.25; his days were not literally "extinct," 17.1; neither was he "broken asunder," or "shaken to pieces," or, his "reins cleft asunder," 16.12, 13. Granted, most readily. The rule of figurative language already given (Chapter 1.) decides the matter: The possibility of the literal meaning must be exhausted before a figurative meaning is adopted. Here it is exhausted in the circumstances of the case. No living man can literally say his days are extinct. And in a book like that of Job, all of which is poetry but two chapters and a half, we look for great poetic license, to a degree inadmissible in prose, and yet never to violate the strict rule, that the figurative intent shall always be made most evident. Granting, then, this evident fact of figurative language, what conclusion is sought to be drawn from it?

Certainly, it was not the intention of Pres. Bartlett to prove merely that it were possible such expressions could be used figuratively, which is all that Job's language legitimately proves. That all would allow, and that is no "most incontrovertible reply" "to the so-called "annihilationist use" of these Scripture illustrations; for such use never denies the figurative use of these expressions on other proper occasions. It was intended these quotations from Job should go beyond this. They are of no avail here, unless they are held to prove that the Scripture illustrations of future punishment are to a like degree figurative; and so, for that reason, they cannot be held to teach the idea of absolute destruction involved in them. If this "incontrovertible reply" is to be of any account, it can only be because it carries this conclusion, viz., That because Job once used certain language figuratively, therefore, when other Scripture characters use similar language, they likewise use it figuratively. To be sure, Job speaks on one topic, his own case; they speak on another, the punishment of the wicked; yet because one uses the words figuratively, we are bound to conclude that the other does also! Here is the gist of the argument; a "most palpable" non sequitur, it would seem to anyone.

Let us apply this style of argument. Job says, chap. 19.10 "He hath destroyed me; "he speaks figuratively, for he exists while saying it. Moses writes, Gen. 19.29: "God destroyed the cities of the plain." If the figurative use of "destroy "by Job is to govern our understanding of the word elsewhere, then it "incontrovertibly "proves that these cities were figuratively destroyed, and literally continued to exist. Perhaps that is an explanation why Jude uses the fate of those cities as an illustration of what we are now told is the figurative destruction of the sinner! Or, to suppose a case; let the question be, Did Mr. X make a certain statement by word of mouth, or by sign language? This style of logic thus argues upon it.

Mr. X made a certain statement; But we know that Mr. Y, at another time, and to another audience, made the same statement, using sign language; Therefore, it follows that Mr. X's statement was made in sign language.

What Mr. X here has to do with Mr. Y, is what no one can find out. No more can we discover the connection between Job speaking of his discomforts and our Lord foretelling the fate of the wicked; except that, in their speech, one uses an illustration similar to that used by the other!

Perhaps it may be thought this case of mistaken argument is not worth the space given to it. But it is useful as showing the Christian public how their leaders go astray on these questions, and that the "incontrovertible" conclusions of such as hold that the law of the literal and the figurative does not apply to God's revealed word are to be received with caution. .

CHAPTER 12

The Destiny of the Soul. The Bible Doctrine of the Intermediate State.

HOLY Scripture reveals to us that the righteous, after their special resurrection ("the first resurrection," Rev. 20.4, 5; "of the just," Luke 14.r4; "to life," Jn. 5.29), are to receive their reward in eternal life, then bestowed upon them as "the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord;" Rom. 6.23. While the wicked, after their subsequent resurrection (Rev. 20.5; "to judgment," Jn. 5.29), are to be judged and condemned to eternal death, "the second death;" Rev. 21.8.

The intermediate state of the dead, that between death and their resurrection, according to the Bible, is a state of unconsciousness through years or through centuries, till the resurrection of the special class to which the sleeper belongs. His state, meanwhile, is not yet one of joy or of woe. He remains in his grave till the "voice, which all in the graves shall hear," Jn. 5.28, summons him forth to his reward.

Such is, unquestionably, the doctrine of the Old Testament on the intermediate state. It is while all are thus waiting that we read, "There the wicked cease from troubling, and there the weary be at rest;" Job 3.17. (A text which the writer has seen quoted at length in a child's catechism, as an answer to the question, "How does the Bible describe heaven?")

But such is not the doctrine of the intermediate state held by the church generally at the present day. In the theological seminaries of our land, where our religious teachers are supposed to be indoctrinated into the real meaning of the Bible, a doctrine the exact opposite of this is generally, if not universally, inculcated. It is taught that when a man dies he does not cease to live; he merely steps out, as it were, into an enlarged, conscious existence somewhere else. If a faithful follower of Christ, he receives his reward forthwith, only without a body; if impenitent, he in like manner receives his reward; and this, apparently, without a judgment to decide what that reward should be. For although Paul does say, "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that [Greek in order that] each one may receive the things done in the body," yet this judgment seems to be now understood to be a matter of no essential importance, a mere ceremonial, or pageant, with no practical result, unless it be as regards our bodies.

That we may not be thought to misrepresent, we quote from the Westminster Confession of Faith, published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia, Pa.

"The bodies of men, after death, return to dust, and see corruption; but their souls (which neither die nor sleep), having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them." (The text quoted to prove this destination of souls is: "Then shall the spirit return to God, who gave it;" on which, see page 39.) "The souls of the righteous, being then made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast [Italics ours] into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day." From Questions 88,89 of the Assembly's Larger Catechism, we learn that after the resurrection comes the day of judgment, when "the wicked shall be cast [Italics ours] into hell, to be punished with unspeakable torments, body and soul, forever."

What idea, if any, did the framers of that Confession get from the misapplied text, "Then shall the spirit return," etc.? They tell us, the souls of righteous and wicked alike return to God; when the righteous, made perfect, are received into heaven. Is it meant, that they remain in heaven, and the wicked, who returned to God in heaven, are cast out of it into hell; or, that the great God goes out of heaven, his dwelling place, to meet each individual soul as it singly returns? For, certainly, the idea of personal meeting is involved in such application of the text; otherwise, they return to God no further than they are now with him here.

But the question will come up: How is it that the only Bible which Christ had, which he studied, and with which he showed himself so familiar (see Matt. 4.4, 7, 10), how is it that this Bible should hold out to us a doctrine of the intermediate state so opposed to that taught in our religious schools, and by their graduates? Both cannot be right. It is indeed a serious question, Does the Bible teach falsely on this point, or do our religious teachers?

It is expected we shall be quieted, as so many Christians are, with the following reply: "It was the gospel which brought to light life and immortality; it is doubtful if they knew much about that in Old Testament times. Those old patriarchs, prophets, psalmists, and seers, with whom their Maker held such free converse, did not, after all, get very clear ideas of what comes after death. Those holy men of old, moved by the Holy Spirit, though with no intent to deceive us, gave us but the reflection of their own personal views." Then we are not to take it that the Bible is an infallible rule of faith and practice? Certainly not, we are virtually told, unless the New Testament is put alongside to correct the errors of the Old I And so the larger portion of God's Word is actually contemned and put aside, because it contradicts modern theology's doctrine of the intermediate state.

In so doing, the popular theology of our day claims that it is built upon the doctrine of the New Testament. Very well; let us then see if this claim is correct. Let us interrogate the New Testament on this point, and see whether indeed one part of God's word does contradict the other! For, if the Old Testament teaches that the intermediate state is one of unconsciousness, with neither knowledge, nor wisdom, nor thought, a state of silence and darkness; and if the New Testament teaches, with modern theology, that this state is in reality one not only of full consciousness, but of knowledge and powers exalted beyond our possible conception; then there is here no possible agreement between the two: one directly contradicts what the other asserts, which is hardly probable. Or else, modern theology goes down on its own showing.

On examination, we find that this charge which modern theology brings, that the New Testament contradicts the Old, is not sustained.

We learn this:

1. From the fact that our Lord and his Apostles use Old Testament language, the Biblical phraseology of their day, in speaking of the death of believers. For example, Jesus says, Jn. 11.11: "Our friend Lazarus [literal Greek] has fallen asleep, but I go that I may awake him out of sleep." Certainly, he, who spoke as never man spoke, has here no thought of perplexing his disciples with a verbal ambiguity. He seeks to impress upon them, and so upon us, that death to a follower of his, is what the Old Testament represents it, a sleep. We may trust him in this matter, for where we might mistake, his loving heart assures us, "If it were not so, I would have told you." With this agrees his language, Jn. 9.4: "The night cometh, when no man can work." And so we understand why Lazarus, so many days dead, should have no revelations to make of a "spirit world; "he had nothing to tell. In that undisturbed, dreamless sleep in his rock sepulcher, he "knew not anything "(Eccl. 9.5) till a voice calling "Lazarus, .come forth," aroused him, as in the Resurrection the same voice will arouse all the sleeping dead; Jn. 5.28.

At the raising to life of Jairus' daughter, our Lord said to the weeping mourners, "Weep not; she is not dead, but sleeps. And they laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead; "this latter clause given us only by the physician-evangelist Luke. Why did the Lord here use the word sleep? It can only be explained in that, to his foresight, the interval between death and the judgment is but a sleep, as the Old Testament represents it; there is to be a waking again to consciousness. His words are equivalent to: "Weep not; she is not dead, never to live again; this is but a temporary loss of life; it is indeed a sleep, a brief period of unconsciousness." But when one dies the second death, that is death in its reality - a permanent loss of life; it is perishing, indeed. Such a fate for themselves or others might indeed call forth those boisterous demonstrations of grief, but not when we may be comforted by the fact that the death is virtually but a sleep, a temporary cessation of existence. Even Lange, on Matt. 9.24, confesses that " Jesus declared death is but a sleep." But what kind of sleep is that of modern theology, where the sleeper in death is wide awake, and with his intellectual powers more active than ever?

We find, then, that our Lord, instead of correcting what modern theology calls an Old Testament error, actually adopts and enforces it I Surely this is enough to overthrow the preposterous charge that the New Testament contradicts the Old. But let us look further.

Matthew, the Evangelist and Apostle, uses similar language. "Many bodies of the saints, who slept, arose; "Matt. 27.52.

Luke, the writer of Acts, in relating Stephen's death, says: He fell asleep. And devout men carried Stephen to his burial; "Acts 7.60. In recording Paul's speech at Antioch in Pisidia, he uses the peculiar language of the Old Testament: "For David, after he had served his own generation, fell on sleep, and was gathered to his fathers; "Acts 13.36.

The Apostle Peter writes in the same way: "For since the fathers fell asleep;" 2 Pet. 3.4.

Such is Paul's favorite mode of alluding to the death of believers.

1 Cor. 7.39: "If her husband be dead [Greek same as above, should fall asleep], she is at liberty to be married."

1 Cor. 11.30: "For this cause, many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep,"- that is, have died.

1 Cor. 15.6: "The greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep."

1 Cor. 15.18 "Then they also, that are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished."

1 Cor. 15.20: "Christ is risen from the dead, a first fruits of them that slept."

1 Cor. 15.51: "Behold I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep."

1 Thess. 4.13 "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them that are asleep." "Them that ARE asleep"- did not Paul mean what he wrote? You say, "It is their bodies alone that sleep." Will you stand by that interpretation? Then, if the body is spoken of as asleep, it is the personality: it is referred to by the personal pronoun "them,"- "them that are asleep."

1 Thess. 4.14 "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them that sleep, will God through Jesus (so Greek) bring with him." That is, as Jesus was bought from death to life, so will God bring them.

1 Thess. 4.15: "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we, who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not [Greek phthanifl come (or, be) before them that are asleep,"- those still living shall not come before, in other words, shall not leave behind them that have died.

1 Thess. 4.16: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain,"-THEN, and not till then, does the promised change occur, and "this mortal put on immortality." These Thessalonian Christians, being in much tribulation, were eagerly "waiting for" (1 Thess. 1.10) their Lord from heaven. To quiet their anxiety for friends already dead, no longer waiting with them, Paul gives them assurance from the Lord that such, when the Lord does come, will not be left behind. "Wherefore," he adds, "comfort one another with these words."

How could they have had any anxiety about their dead friends, if Paul had ever taught them that they were still living, and in God's presence But when Paul would comfort and reassure the bereaved, he speaks to them of that which he tells us (Acts 24.15) was his hope; it was the coming of Jesus and the Resurrection. When our Lord himself would comfort those sorrowing over their dead, he 'turns their thoughts to the Resurrection, and to himself, "the Resurrection and the Life." How different this from the consolation usually administered by the ministers of religion in our day That which is the burden of their comfort, the present conscious felicity of sleeping saints, Paul has not a word of it; in fact, he explicitly contradicts it. He declares, 2 Tim. 4.8, that for himself and others, the time of reward, the crown of blessedness and glory, is at the day of our Lord's appearing. He tells us it is "at the revelation of Jesus Christ," 2 Thess. 1.7; "at his appearing and his kingdom," 2 Tim. 4.1. With his statements agree those of Peter, 1 Pet. 5.4, and of John, 1 John 3.2. They could fall asleep in peace, being "persuaded that he is able to keep that which they had committed to him against that day;" 2 Tim. 1.12.

2. That the New Testament writers teach that the first death is a sleep, appears also in the significant meaning of the two verbs, by which they express the bringing the sleeper first to consciousness, and after that to the active exercise of his awakened faculties. For the awakening they use "egeiro;" the subsequent action they express by "anistemi." This marked distinction our English translators either failed to recognize, or at least they utterly ignore it; they render the two different Greek verbs by the same English word, to raise.

The meaning of "egeiro," as given by Liddell and Scott, is, primarily "to awaken, wake up, rouse, stir: "in a secondary or derived sense, it is applied to the raising a sick man from his bed, or a building from the ground. We note its simple meaning in Matt. 8.25: "His disciples came to him and awoke him, saying, Lord, save us, we perish." And the distinction, between the simple and the metaphorical sense, is well shown in the record of Christ's conversation with the Jews, Jn. 2.19-21: "Jesus said unto them,"- they had asked a prophetic sign, "destroy this temple and in three days I will awaken it;" egeiro in the future and in its primary sense, though the E. V. gives the secondary, "will raise it up." The evangelist explains in verse 22 "But he spoke of the temple of his body," that real temple in which Deity actually dwelt. In their reply, the Jews, mistaking the temple spoken of, their minds on the typical one of stone and wood, take up "egeiro" in a metaphorical sense: "Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou raise it [Greek egeiro, awaken it into existence, E. V. rear it up] in three days?" See by contrast the report of the false witnesses, which our English translators seem to have adopted in their "rear it up:" "This one said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and build it [Greek oikodemeo, lit. to build a house] in three days."

The other verb anistemi, with its noun anastasis, resurrection, is a compound of ana, up, and istemi, to make to stand. The action it denotes is entirely subsequent to that of the preceding verb "egeiro;" the individual, first roused from sleep, is then made to stand up-is set upon his feet, in the exercise of all his faculties.

We observe that the New Testament writers, with their clearer perceptions of the nature and importance of the resurrection, keep in mind and carefully note this distinction. In Mark 12.25, 26, Christ says: "When they shall rise [anastemi] from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels in heaven." In this verse the reference is evidently to the life in a completed resurrection state. In the next verse, where no reference is had to the activities of their future life, the question being simply whether they are to be awakened at all, the verb changes in the Greek, though, unfortunately, not in the English translation: "And as touching the dead that they rise," - egeiro, lit. are awakened. And such future awakening Christ proves solely on this conception of death, as we have shown on page 69.

So, in the account given in Mark 5.41, of the bringing Jairus' daughter to life, we read: "And he took the damsel by the hand, and said unto her, Talitha cumi, which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee [Greek egeire] awake [E. V. arise]. And immediately the

damsel arose [mark change of verb in the Greek, from egeiro to anistimi, expressing action beyond that of simple awaking] and walked; for she was of the age of twelve years." When life was restored to the widow's son of Nain, Luke 7.14, the word was: "Young man, I say unto thee [Greek egeiro, in passive], be awakened." And in the 22d verse of the same chapter, when Christ desired to call attention to the fact that life was given to the dead, he says: "Go, tell John . . . that the dead [Greek egeirontai] are awakened,"-are aroused into life. We observe the succession of thought in Jn. 5.21: "The Father raises up [Greek egeirei, awakens to life] the dead, and quickened them [Greek zoopoiēi, makes them to live]."

And so likewise in the 15th of 1st Corinthians, where Paul's argument is not concerning the nature of the resurrection life, but of the fact itself, whether there be any resurrection, any awakening at all, the Apostle invariably uses egeiro, not anistemi. For instance, verse 35, the inquiry is: "How are the dead awakened? and with what body do they come?" Surely, had our translators rendered egeiro, when referring to the state of death, by this its New Testament sense of awaken, the modern error on this question would have been much less prevalent.

Thus we see that not alone in the Old, but in the New Testament, the intermediate state is regarded as a sleep; and in pursuance of this idea, the first bringing back the sleeper to consciousness and life is appropriately termed awakening him.

3. In the New Testament explanation of the types of the Old, we find the same thought sharply set before us. Christ's sleeping saints are not with the One who has been awakened (Acts 13.30, Eph. 1.20, 1 Pet. 1.21) from dead ones, and has entered into immortality. In the 11th chapter of Hebrews we read: "Into the tabernacle, called the holiest of all, went the high-priest ALONE every year." Turning to Lev. 16.17, we find God had expressly commanded: "There shall be no man in the tabernacle, when he goes in to make an atonement in the holy place." Here is the type; how is it fulfilled? We learn from Heb. 11.24 that thus was foreshadowed the present mediatorial work of Christ: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself; now to appear in the presence of God FOR us." Christ is now our high priest, now at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens; Heb. 7.24 to 8.2. He has gone there, as went the high priest into the earthly tabernacle, "not without blood; "but it is "his own." And so the other conditions of the type must be fulfilled in him. He must go there ALONE! We learn from Acts 2.34, that even David, that man after God's heart, has not ascended into the heavens. Even to his disciples the Lord Jesus said, as he had to the Jews, "Whither I go, ye cannot come." But soon after he adds: "Let not your heart be troubled . . . I will come again and receive you unto Myself." From the tabernacle of old, his atoning work, in its prescribed type, completed, came forth the high priest of Israel to bless the people waiting outside. "And unto them that look for him, shall Christ appear the second time, without sin [a sin-offering], unto salvation" (Heb. 11.28); that salvation (1 Peter 1.5) "ready to be revealed in the last time." As the true High Priest, he is now gone from the sight of his people. He has entered within the veil. He will yet again come forth, a King to reign; and whether in that day we be sleeping in dust, or be "alive and remain unto his coming," as we catch the sound of that welcome voice, reaching even into the grave, the utterance of our "satisfied "hearts will be, "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him: this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation; "Isaiah 29.9, where see the preceding context.

In view of all these facts, can anyone, whatever may have been his early education, fail to perceive the baseless-ness of the assumption that the New Testament contradicts the Old? The two are in the fullest harmony with each other. They must be so; for they are the revelation of the one true God.

But what then becomes of modern theology's claim that its doctrine of the intermediate state is founded upon the New Testament? It is founded upon neither the Old nor the New. It has no footing whatever in the Bible. It is, in so many words, the lie of the great adversary, "Ye shall not surely die." Adopted by the authorities of the church in days of greater ignorance of God's word, it is still sought to be sustained by labored but inconsistent interpretations of Holy Writ. The facts on this question are here before each reader. Let each use the reason his Maker gives him, and judge for himself.

A point yet remains unsolved. It may be asked, "Where, on this view, do you put Enoch and Elijah, who did not see death? "The full answer to that question has not been revealed to us. No better reply can be given than the words of good old Tyndale: "What God doeth with then: that shall we know when we come to them." We read, Jn. 3.13 "No man hath ascended up to heaven; "-we understand, into the heaven of heavens, where God dwells; Psalm 115.16.

But, further, the place, or state of the dead, is denoted in the original Hebrew of the Bible by the word Sheol; in the Greek, by the word hades. Now, if we can determine the real meaning of these words, the question of the intermediate state of the dead is decided. Our theological authorities seem inclined to seek for the meaning of hades in the classic Greek, and from that, as a starting point, to reason back to the earlier Hebrew word. But, on a question of Christian doctrine, hades has its value only so far as it is the exponent of the Hebrew sheol, upon the meaning of which its Biblical meaning is wholly dependent.

It is then a primary question, What is the meaning of sheol, as used in the Bible? To decide this, we have but to study the Bible examples of its use.

The question is much simplified in that it really lies between two meanings, so opposed to each other that both cannot be right. Two renderings, the grave and hell, are used by our translators, each in nearly equal proportion. Sometimes both renderings are given—one in the text, the other in the margin.

Beginning with the books of Moses, we find the question is there virtually decided. Sheol occurs in these books seven times. The first six times it unquestionably means the grave. Would any writer, having thus by usage established a meaning, on using it again give to it a totally different meaning, and without any explanation? Yet on its seventh occurrence our translators, in defiance of the context, render it hell. Thus:

Gen. 27.35: "I will go down into sheol (E. V. the grave) unto my son, mourning."

Gen. 42.38: "Then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to sheol" (E. V. the grave).

Gen. 44.29: "My gray hairs with sorrow to sheol" (E. V. the grave).

Gen. 44.31 "His gray hairs to sheol" (E. V. the grave).

Num. 16.30: "If the earth open her mouth and swallow them up, and they go down quick [alive] unto sheol" (E. V. the pit, evidently meaning the grave).

Num. 16.33: "They went down alive into sheol" (E. V. the pit).

Deut. 32.2 2: "For a fire is kindled in my anger, and shall burn unto the lowest sheol (E. V. hell), and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains."

In Genesis, it would hardly do to make Jacob say he was going down to hell, or for his sons to say it of him. In the passage from Numbers, if one were to translate sheol hell, he must accept the inference that as these wicked men went into that hell "alive," they went not as "disembodied spirits," but carrying their bodies with them, which entirely does away with even that limited resurrection (of the body only), allowed by modern theology. That could not be, and so Deut. 32.22 was the only opportunity to influence the English reader by putting the word hell into the books of the law. And in this instance it is strangely at variance with the context, and also with present orthodox ideas; for the Lord is speaking of physical fire, which shall consume the earth and the foundations of the mountains; as is foretold, 2 Pet. 3.10.

Sheol next occurs 1 Sam. 2.6: "The Lord killed and makes alive: he bringeth down to sheol (E. V. the grave), and bringeth up "from sheol, the grave; certainly, there is no resurrection, or bringing up, from the hell of modern theology. And, according to the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, "bringeth down to, and bringeth up from sheol," corresponds to "killed and makes alive."

2 Sam. 22.6: "The sorrows [margin, Hebrew cords] of sheol (E. V. hell) compassed me about; the snares of death prevented me." Here the parallelism of Hebrew poetry demands the rendering "the cords of the grave," to correspond with the "snares of death."

1 Kings 2.9: "His hoar head bring thou down to sheol" {E. V. the grave; here certainly not hell).

Job 7.9: "Goes down to sheol" (E. V. the grave).

Job 14.13: "O that thou would hide me in sheol" (E. V. the grave; Job would hardly select hell as a hiding place).

Job 17.13: "Sheol [E. V. the grave] is my house; I have made my bed in darkness."

Job 21.13: "Sheol" (E. V. the grave);

Job 24.19, "Sheol" (E. V. the grave).

But space will not permit us to give all cases of the Bible use of sheol, as, thus far, consecutively. In those already quoted, it is evident that sheol is the grave, not hell. So apparent is this that it can hardly be possible our translators would have had any difficulty with the word, had it not been for the need of some support for the popular idea of hell. Has it never occurred to the reader that the Scriptures never once mention the eternal dwelling in misery of numberless human beings, which is a doctrine of "the church standards" of the present day? That a Divine revelation of man's future should ignore anything so tremendous, is almost, if not quite, fatal to the trustworthiness of the doctrine or of the revelation! And now, if the Bible does not mention, or give any name for, any place, where all this is said to occur, the existence of such a place may well be doubted. If our English version thinks to find the popular hell in this

word, it is sadly out of its reckoning, for the Bible speaks of not the wicked only, but of the righteous also (as already quoted), going to this place; this "house appointed for all the living."

We note a few more examples of the Bible use of sheol:

Psalm 139.8: "If I make my bed in sheol" (E. V. hell); evidently referring to the grave, the bed in which we sleep till the resurrection morning, as is expressed in both clauses of Job 17.13, above quoted.

Prov. 7.27: "Her house is the way to sheet [the grave, E. V. hell], going down to the chambers of death." The correct rendering preserves the exact parallelism, "the way to the grave," answering to "going down to the chambers of death."

Ps. 55.15: "Let death seize upon them, and let them go down quick [alive, living] into sheol" (E. V. in the text, hell, in the margin, the grave). The most enthusiastic believer in the hell of modern theology will hardly claim that any can go there alive; they must go as dead persons-death is the only portal to that abode. Then certainly sheol, into which one goes, living, smothered alive, buried alive (Numb. 16.33: "they went alive into sheol"), this sheol cannot be the popular hell! The misgivings as to the correctness of their preferred rendering, our translators here manifest by their marginal reading, the grave.

We find our translators had a similar difficulty with Psalm 86.13 "Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest sheol" (E. V. hell, or, margin, the grave).

Ezekiel chapter 31 is well worth careful study, for here the inconsistent rendering of our translators serves to establish the correct rendering of sheol. In verses 3 to 12, the Lord compares the Assyrian monarch to a cedar tree in Lebanon, and his fall to the fall of this mighty tree. Verse 24, of other kings, styled "trees by the waters," we read, "they are all delivered unto death, to the nether [lower] parts of the earth, in the midst of the children of men, with them that go down to the pit." Verse 15, referring to the Assyrian king: "Thus saith the Lord God, in the day that he went down into sheol [E. V. the grave], I caused a mourning. I caused Lebanon to mourn for him, and all the trees of the field [i.e., other mighty men] fainted for him." Verse 16: "I made the nations to shake at the sound of his fall, when I cast him down to sheol [E. V. hell] with them that descend into the pit, and all the trees of Eden shall be comforted in the nether parts of the earth." Ver. 17: "They also [in the nether parts of the earth, mark you] went down into sheol [E. V. hell] with him."

Here our translators, in rendering "sheol," as it occurs in two consecutive verses, and in reference to the same act In one verse, "the grave," in the next verse, "hell," unmistakably use these two words as synonymous terms! But in modern thought, there is a radical distinction between the two. Then one of these renderings is an error - which? In every case already before us, we have found the grave an unexceptional rendering; to the other, hell, often insuperable objections exist. Besides, if we accept the rendering hell, then we acknowledge it located "in the lower parts of the earth! "

In this connection, read Ezek. 32.18, 21: "Son of Man, wail for the multitude of Egypt, and cast them down unto the nether parts of the earth, unto them that go down to the pit. The strong among the mighty shall speak to him out of the midst of sheol [the grave, E. V. hell]; they are gone down; they lie uncircumcised, slain with the sword; "i.e., they are lying, slain, in the grave.

In this and the preceding extract from Ezekiel, sheol evidently is located in the nether (lower or under) parts of the earth; those "delivered unto death" are delivered "to the lower parts of the earth;" those in sheol, "gone down the pit," are in the lower parts of the earth. How is this? We perceive that sheol means not the separate grave of each individual (a different Hebrew word expresses that thought), but that it is a general term for the state of all the dead, whether they lie in careful sepulture, or, as Jacob imagined of Joseph, they are torn and devoured by beasts of the field. And this general state of the dead was conceived of as a vast pit in the darkness of "the lower parts of the earth; "a vast burying-place, or, as we call it, cemetery (cr. koimeterion, sleeping chamber), beneath the homes of the living, where are gathered the dead of all times past, who, slain by the sword, Ezek. 32.21, or dying in their beds, Isa. lvii. 2, lie stored away, like mummied forms, "in the sides of the pit;" Isa. 14.15.

With this conception agrees the language of Isaiah 14.9-11: "Sheol [the grave, E. V. hell!] from beneath [i.e., in the lower parts of the earth] is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming; it stirred up the [sleeping] dead for thee. All they shall speak and say unto thee, Art thou also become as we? art thou become like unto us? The worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee." Surely, these speaking are not living beings, actually existing without bodies in an imaginary hell; we have here a figurative allusion to the grave, where, in the bold imagery of Oriental poetry, those actually dead are represented speaking one to the other, covered with worms. Precisely the same imagery Christ makes use of in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, where he represents the dead as speaking to each other. And let the reader not forget that the Old Testament, comparatively contemned and certainly neglected now-a-days, was the Bible Christ studied; and which he enjoined his hearers to search, whose language was to him as household words.

The New Testament repeats the very language of the Old on this point. In Matt. 12.40, Christ speaks of his future rest in the grave as being "in the heart of the earth." In Eph. 4.9, to, Paul thus refers to this rest of our Lord in the grave: "Now that he ascended, what is it

but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all things."

These citations of Scripture might be greatly extended, but enough has been brought forward to establish the following facts:

The Hebrew sheol is rendered the grave, or hell, indiscriminately (we note thirty-two times the former, twenty-eight times the latter); even where the word is used consecutively in the same passage, it is rendered at first the grave, and then hell (e. g., Ezek. 31.15-17); with the rendering hell in the text, the grave is given as a substitute in the margin (e. g., Psalm 55.15, 86.13).

Such interchange of the two renderings is only allowable if the two are evidently synonymous terms. But such is not the case. Whatever may have been the meaning of the old Saxon whence our word hell is derived, the grave and hell now convey two very different ideas to the popular mind, as also they did at the time our English version was made. That the Hebrew word expresses one of these ideas, no one questions. Which it is, is decided by the fact that, in some instances of its use, the circumstances of the case shut us up to the rendering the grave; which they never do with the other rendering, hell.

Thus, it is made apparent that the grave is the correct rendering of the Hebrew sheol.

We may here note the correct reading of a mistranslated passage, Psalm 9.17: "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." The word here rendered hell is sheol, the grave; "turned" is in the Hebrew returned. (See Lange on Psalms.) So this passage, by which Sabbath-school children and others are taught the existence of hell as popularly understood, in reality declares the Bible doctrine that the wicked, after their final judgment, shall be returned to sheol, the grave, the state of death. From that return to death-the second death-there is no resurrection. Never again shall they come forth.

Establishing thus the Bible meaning of sheol, establishes also the Bible meaning of its Greek substitute, hades. This is evident on a consideration of the few cases where the latter is used in the N. T.

Matt. 11.23: "Thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be brought down to hades" (the grave, E. V. hell.) This prophecy has been fulfilled in so bringing that city to destruction, to the grave, that the place of its sepulcher can scarcely be determined.

Luke 10.15: The same as preceding.

Matt. 16.18: "On this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hades [the grave, E. V. hell] shall not prevail against it." The gate, to the Hebrew, was the emblem of power or dominion, as God says to Abraham, Gen. 22.17: "Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies." In Job 28.17, Psalms 9.13, 107.18, we find the expression, "gates of death," which the Septuagint renders "gates of hades." In Rev. 1.18, the Lord Jesus, announcing his submission to death, and his subsequent resurrection and immortality, declares that he has the keys of hades and of death. Thus he can release when and whom he will. And so his people, now or yet to be under the power of the grave, within the gates of hades, shall not be permanently held there. The grave cannot prevail against his church, for at "the appointed time" (Job 14.13, 14), he who holds the keys will open the gates, and from their graves bring forth his people to glory. He has said, Hosea 13.14: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave" (Hebrew sheol, Sept. Greek hades). In Ezek. 27.12, 14: "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves . . . And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and put my spirit in you, and ye shall live."

Luke 16.21 "The rich man died, and was buried, and in hades [E. V. hell] he lifted up his eyes, being in torment." Here we have the poetic figure, already quoted from Ezek. Chapter 31, where the dead in hades were represented as "comforted in the lower parts of the earth" "over the fall of the mighty one who had brought them to ruin. There, dead ones were represented as comforted; here, a dead one is represented as tormented; both in the grave; for we are told the rich man was in hades; it is explicitly stated that the same one died and was buried.

No one questions but that those Old Testament passages are highly wrought, dramatic representations of how dead ones might be supposed to feel and to speak. Certainly, it is precisely the same figure in Luke. And to interpret it in like manner is strictly following the rule that a figurative meaning may not be accepted till the possibility of the literal is exhausted. Such possibility is exhausted in these cases. For in Ezekiel and Isaiah it is dead ones, those lying slain, who move and speak; literally, that were impossible; therefore, it is figurative. The same is the case in Luke; dead ones in hades, in the grave, converse; then that is likewise necessarily figurative.

Acts 2.27: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hades [the grave, E. V. hell]; neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption;" "quoted direct from Psalm 16.10, where sheol is the Hebrew for hades in Acts. "Leaving in the grave" "corresponds to "seeing corruption;" "what the latter clause means we learn from Acts 13.36, 37: "For David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption; but he, whom God raised again, saw no corruption," because "His soul was not left in the grave."

Rev. 1.18: "I have the keys of hades and of death" (E. V. hell).

Rev. 6.8: "A pale horse, and his name that sat on him was Death, and Hades [the grave personified, E. V. hell] followed after."

Rev. 20.13: "Death and hades delivered up the dead who were in them." Hades here is plainly the grave; for what hades delivered up was the same that, in this verse, the sea delivered up, toms nekrous, the dead ones, who were in them. Our translators use "hell" "in the text, "the grave" in the margin.

But in the next verse they omit this important marginal correction; Death and hades [the grave, E. V. hell! is hell cast into itself?] were cast into the lake of fire; "-thus symbolizing the end of death, and of the state of death, for any of the living ones. It is the fulfilment of the prophecy of Hosea 13.14: "O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction," in which the Hebrew sheol, grave, is in Septuagint Greek hades.

One more instance of the N. T. use of hades remains, 1 Cor. 15.55. Here, as elsewhere in both Testaments, death and the grave are associated and personified. The whole line of argument in that chapter is so evidently upon a resurrection, or restoration to life, from the grave, that our translators could not venture here to render hades hell. Thus, they were forced to the correct rendering: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave [hades], where is thy victory? "Yet, as if it gave some relief under this pressure, they arbitrarily insert their favorite rendering hell in the margin.

But the repugnance they here manifest (and in Rev. 20.13) to the mole natural meaning so evidently manifests the bias of our translators, that it doubly strengthens our claim that the grave is the correct rendering of hades. We may be sure they would never have accepted a rendering so opposed to their chosen rendering elsewhere, could they have resisted it. So we have their reluctant testimony that the proof that the Apostle uses hades in the sense of the grave, is too strong to be disregarded.

We find, then, on investigation, that Bible usage declares that sheol, or hades, the place of the dead, is the grave. And if the dead are in the grave, they are not in heaven and hell, nor in the pagan Elysium and Tartarus. The intermediate state is not one of conscious existence, but of death. Instead of being alive and conscious, the dead are simply dead. "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave [Hebrew sheol], whither thou goes."

It is evident, then, that the original word in the Hebrew and Greek for the intermediate state has no reference whatever to the reward of the righteous or the wicked. It is simply the grave; a place of unconsciousness, of silence and forgetfulness, of darkness, where the dead are represented waiting for their reward, which the Lord will give when he comes; Rev. 22.12.

But the popular conception of hell is largely built up out of the incorrect renderings of the Hebrew and Greek word for grave. Is there, then, no such thing as hell? Do the original languages of the Bible contain any word expressive of a place of future punishment? Nothing of the kind is found in the earlier portions of the Book of revelation. What is there threatened is the simple penalty of sin, death, destruction, a cutting off. But in later times, especially in our Lord's day, a word appears appropriated to that foretold destruction by fire. That word is Gehenna. It was borrowed from the example of a similar destruction, familiar to every Jew who attended the national feasts at Jerusalem. Outside that city was the defiled valley (2 Kings 23.10) of Hinnom, which was used as a receptacle for the refuse from the city. The fires there burning to destroy the accumulated rubbish, presented a suggestive type of the final burning at the end of the age; of that fire into which our Lord says (Matt. 13.41) "shall be cast all things that offend, and them that do iniquity," as out of God's kingdom they are gathered by the reaper-angels. The place of this destruction of worthless things outside Jerusalem was in the valley of Hinnom; Greek Ge-Henna. And so this word "Gehenna" came to be used as a name for that threatened destruction of worthless things at the end of the age.

Yet we should note that this name was strictly local. It never appears in any of the N. T. writings except those addressed to Jews. We find it in the three earlier Gospels, and in the Epistle of James, which was addressed "to the twelve tribes scattered abroad." John, writing for those not familiar with Jewish customs, does not use it in his Gospel, nor in the Apocalypse. And so it is not used by Paul or by Peter in their writings.

Gehenna- Its Meaning. 205

Here is a very suggestive fact. This word (in the original "Tophet," or "the valley of the sons of Hinnom," in its Greek form, "Gehenna") is the only word in the Bible which answers at all to the popular conception of hell, in that it is the only word which can be viewed as in any way denoting a place of punishment. And yet, if anything so stupendous beyond conception be really true, that there exists a place where, since the world began, untold millions have been gathering in to suffer on for eternity, the exceedingly limited use of this special word is all we have in revelation to set forth such a place!

Here are all the instances of the use of Gehenna in the N. T.:

Matt. 5.22: "Shall be in danger of hell-fire" (Greek, shall be one liable to the Gehenna of the fire).

Matt. 5.29, 30: "Should be cast into hell" (Gehenna).

Matt. 10.28: "Able to destroy soul and body in hell" (Gehenna).

Matt. 18.9: "To be cast into hell-fire" (Greek, into the Gehenna of the fire).

Matt. 23.15 "Twofold more the child of hell" (Greek, a son of Gehenna, like John 17.12, "the son of [one devoted to] perdition").

Mark 9.43: "Into hell [Gehenna], into the fire that never shall be quenched." As a writer well says, "The word never is a contribution of our translators to the original asbestos," which is literally "unquenched," or "unquenchable."

Mark 9.45: The same.

Mark 9.47: "Into hell-fire" (Greek, into the Gehenna of the fire).

Luke 12.5: "Hath power to cast into hell" (Greek, into the Gehenna).

Jas. 3.6: "Set on fire of hell" (Greek upo, by the Gehenna).

But further inquiry shows that the description of Gehenna is something radically different from the popular idea of hell. Not continued existence in misery, but actual destruction by fire is presented to us.

Our Savior speaks of it as "the Gehenna of the fire" (Greek to Gehenna tau puros); Matt. 5.22, 18.9. He calls it "going away into the Gehenna, into the fire unquenchable;" Mark 9.43. He tells us, Matt. 18.9, men are to go into that fire bodily: "It is better for thee one-eyed to enter into life, than, having two eyes, to be cast into the Gehenna of the fire;" - better far to go through this world with but one eye, than, having every bodily faculty, to lose all, even life, itself. For that fire, our Lord tells us, destroys soul and body; "Fear him who is able to destroy soul and body in Gehenna;" Matt. 10.28.

In the visions of the Apocalypse, the place of the final destruction of the wicked appears to the Seer as a "lake of fire," as we say, a sheet of fire, "burning with fire and brimstone;" Rev. 20.15, 21.8. Isaiah thus prophesies of Tophet (the O. T. name of Gehenna): "Tophet is ordained of old; for the King it is prepared; he hath made it deep and large; the pile thereof is fire and much wood; the breath of the Lord like a stream of brimstone doth kindle it;" Isa. 30.33.. The purpose of this burning we have already been made familiar with. "For behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it leave them neither root nor branch.. And they [the wicked] shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts;" Mal. 4.1, 3.

As illustrating this doom of fire, Jude cites the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them, "set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." Our Lord tells us, Luke 17.29, 30 "The same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of Man is revealed." In Matt. 13.40, he declares: "As therefore the tares [representing the sons of the wicked one] are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of the age."

Precisely what this terrible burning, THE GEHENNA OF THE FIRE is to be, Peter states, 2 Pet. 3.7, 10: "The heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against a Day of Judgment and Destruction of ungodly men. The Day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise [lit. Greek, with a rushing sound], and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works therein shall be burnt up," - or thoroughly burned over. We have already read of that fire spoken of in Deut. 32.22, which "shall burn unto the lowest sherd, and shall consume the earth with her increase, and shall set on fire the foundations of the mountains."

Thus clearly speaks the word of God.

But our religious teachers, in general, now teach that all this threatening of a fearful, overwhelming fire is but a symbol, that the fire is but "a metaphor of the punishment of the wicked." It is a figurative way of expressing the remorse of a guilty conscience! They would have us believe that the foretold sentence of the Judge (Matt. 25.41) "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire," is the imaginative way in which he would say: "Depart, ye cursed, into the everlasting remorse of your own consciences, prepared for the devil and his angels."

Rebuking the impiety of these professed expounders of God's word, who dare thus to explain it away, Science comes before us, from actual observation telling us that a world actually wrapped in flame were no unlikely thing. More than once have fixed stars, suns of other systems than ours, been observed to blaze forth with a luster so exaggerated as, at such a distance, to betoken a conflagration of terrific proportions. Such as, if it occurred with our sun, would utterly destroy all vestige of life on this planet. In the most recent instance of the kind, November, 1876, occurring in the constellation of the Swan, our modern spectroscope showed most of the prominent spectrum lines of that star to be identical with those of our sun; revealing thus a similarity of constitution, and, so far at least, the possibility of a like catastrophe!

"Nevertheless we, according to his word, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." A world, henceforth, all holy, for that fire of destruction is a fire of purification as well.

Perhaps we are here met with the common but utterly irrelevant objection: "This is material fire of which you speak; that cannot harm an immaterial soul." All that may be; we do not know, nor does anyone else, what would or would not affect an immaterial soul. What we are discussing is the Biblical soul, that which the Bible teaches us is material. Our Lord tells us that the soul is destructible in Gehenna [Matt. 10.28], and Peter tells us that coming day of fearful burning will be "a day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men;" 2 Pet. 3.7.

It is easy to see how the popular doctrine of a place of confinement for the wicked grew into shape. In common with the other errors of modern theology, it is based upon Satan's lie, "Ye shall not surely die." If, really, men do not die, that is, if all are immortal, then the punishment of the wicked is something abiding, and of course there must be a permanent place for it. For an abiding place, not much satisfaction is found in the descriptions of Gehenna. So, from it and from the general statement of Scripture, is taken the fire which, till within a recent period, was the acknowledged agent of punishment; while further recourse was had to the Bible statements of sheol and hales, with a suitable admixture of heathen mythology, whence came into the church that dogma of universal immortality. We have seen that Sheol was located "in the lower parts of the earth; "just where heathen mythology located both its Elysium and its Tartarus. And there, also, is where one of our modern terms for hell locates it - in fife infernal regions; the word infernal derived (says Webster) "from Lat. infernalis, from infernus, that which lies beneath, the lower."

CHAPTER 13

The Nature and Destiny of the Soul-of Angelic Beings.

A FURTHER inquiry suggests itself, bearing upon our future, and upon our present preparation for the future. What is the nature of angelic beings? what their relation to man and his destiny?

Does the Bible throw any light on this subject? In its full detail, the question is entirely beyond our present capacity, but, surely, the Bible furnishes some information of this higher order of beings, that we may comprehend.

The popular ideas of angels are very crude, being derived mainly from the conventional traditions of medieval art. One point seems to be generally accepted; they have wings! an idea traceable to the prevailing misapprehension of the cherubic symbol. Our Lord, however, when on earth, assumed that in his day, the angelic mode of life was sufficiently well known to be used by way of illustration; and, in so doing, he certified to the general correctness of that knowledge. In discoursing to the Sadducees of the future life, he says:

Luke 20.35, 36: "But they who shall be accounted to obtain that world [aion], and the resurrection from the dead [Greek that from dead ones], neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto [or, the same as, Greek isangelos] angels; and are sons of Gods being sons of the resurrection."

Angels, then, are now what "sons of the resurrection "will be. And of what this is, we have gained an idea from the record of our Lord's life after his resurrection; for, "when he shall appear [to awaken the sleeping dead, to change the living, 1 Thess. 4.16], we shall be like him;"

Jn. 3.2. We learn he was still in human form, yet possessing a new, and to us incomprehensible, power of passing into rooms secured against mortal intrusion, and of becoming visible or invisible, at will. And other like inconceivable powers of knowledge and of motion belong to that spirit-body, in which our Lord has had, and his followers will have, a resurrection from dead ones.

In a spirit-body, then, in the likeness of men, we learn that angels now exist. This fact is corroborated by the recorded visible appearances of such. In the visions of Daniel, chap. 10.5, he speaks of an angelic messenger as "a certain man; "verse 16, "one like the similitude of the sons of men." So, chap. 8.15, "Behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man." In Gen. 18, Moses records

the appearance unto Abraham of the Lord and two angels; he describes them as "three men." Ver. 22: "And the men turned their faces from thence, and went toward Sodom." Chapter 19.1: "And there came two angels to Sodom at even, . . . they turned in unto" Lot's house. And verse 4: "The men of the city called to Lot, Where are the men who came in to thee?" "An angel of God" appeared to Cornelius, Acts 10.3, who, verse 30, thus describes him, "a man stood before me in bright clothing," - "an angel of light;" "2 Cor. 11.14. We read in the angelic vision of Zechariah, chap. 1.7 to 6.15, of "a man with a measuring line in his hand; "also, Ezek. 40.3, of "a man, whose appearance was like the appearance of brass, with a line of flax and a measuring reed in his hand." Rev. 21.17 is very decisive; we read of an angel who "measured the wall thereof, an hundred and forty and four cubits, according to the measure of a man, that [Greek ho, which] is of an [so Greek] angel."

In that spirit-body the angels of course have the same power of unseen motion that our Lord had after his resurrection - able to come and go like the wind (Jn. 3.8), able to disclose or conceal their presence at will.

They who in the spirit-body thus live this peculiar spirit-life, so different from our present mortal life, are themselves called spirits. "Are they not ministering spirits?" Heb. 1.14. And in that sure-coming future, so sure, that figuratively it is spoken of (Heb. 12.22) as already come, when the redeemed shall be gathered in the city of the living God, which the writer of that epistle declares, 13.14, is "one to come" (i.e., at the resurrection), those in that city will then have passed into this new spirit mode of existence. And so, those to have that future life, though as yet "not made perfect," Heb. 11.40, when spoken of as in that "city to come," and so in the future spirit-body, are themselves called spirits, or spiritual beings; as they then will be, being "the same as the angels." Hence, in looking forward to that future we find them called "spirits of just men made perfect;" Heb. 12.23.

The Scriptures give us further information of these angelic beings. They are disposed as a vast host in orderly arrangement, with their special leaders, and with specified duties and spheres of action. This Paul alludes to, Eph. 3.10: "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in the heavenlies might be made known, by the church, the manifold wisdom of God." And Peter makes a similar reference, 1 Pet. 3.22, speaking of our Lord, "Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God, angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto him."

Not only are there good angels, there are also evil angels, living like the former in spiritual bodies, and so called evil spirits. In the sentence which the Lord declares he, as Judge, will finally pronounce upon the wicked, he speaks of a fire prepared for the devil and his angels, Matt. 25.41; for the devil's messengers, as is the primary meaning of the Greek *angelos*, his emissaries.

But there are those who deny that there is any literal "devil and his angels." The original words, *diabolos*, devil, and *daimonia*, demons, they consider are but figurative expressions for the personification of evil. But is it possible to understand that what the Scriptures speak of as done by devils or demons, is actually done by an abstract personification? Paul, in Eph. 6.12, writes of his fellow Christians: "The wrestling [contest] for us is not against flesh and blood [in the comparison human tempters are of no account]; but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual of the wickedness [E. V. renders, spiritual wickedness] in the heavenlies: ." it is a contest with spirit emissaries of evil, in subordinated ranks arrayed against us. In Col. 2.15, he speaks of Christ, in his own contest with such, as "having spoiled [disarmed] principalities and powers, triumphing over them." The language, which declares the existence of good angels, is in like manner used to express the existence of angels of evil.

Evidently, Paul states. what was a general belief among the Jews in our Lord's day. It was believed, not only that evil spirits existed, but that also it was possible for them to gain such control of a man's faculties as to use them at their will. Can it be that our Lord, by act or word, would have confirmed and perpetuated so gross an error, if it be such? For example, Mark records (v. 8): "He said to him, Come out - the spirit, the unclean-from the man." Does one thus address an abstract personification? It seems many had taken possession of this man, and, Mark says, verse 12: "The demons besought him, saying, Send us into the swine. And Jesus gave them leave." Again, Luke reports (4.41): "And demons came out of many, crying and saying, Thou art the Christ, the Son of God. And he, rebuking them, suffered them not to speak, because they knew him to be the Christ." So also Mark 1.25. Knowing him to be the true Messiah, they hoped to injure his influence by seeming to testify in his favor, which may indeed have suggested to the Pharisees their charge that he cast out devils by collusion with the prince of the devils. We observe the same evil design in Paul's experience, recorded Acts 16.17.

In these passages from the life of our Lord, if he pretended thus to recognize the existence of beings who actually do not exist, his agency in thus promoting a popular error cannot be reconciled with his perfect truthfulness. Till we can do that, the law of the literal and the figurative compels us to accept his words as literally true, both on these occasions and in Matt. 25.41, where his language agrees with that of Paul, as he speaks of "the devil and his angels;" hosts of evil marshalled under a central authority.

Accepting, then, the revelation which God gives us in the words of Christ and his disciples, we must believe that there exist spiritual beings, who have sinned, and are now bent only on evil; for whom no Savior has died, "he took not hold of angels;" Heb. 3.16, margin. These powers of evil are now permitted to be the means of testing us, as by the struggle with temptation our characters are confirmed in holiness. And when the problem of sin has worked out its legitimate results, and at the same time in-directly has secured

a generation to serve God, then that which has been foretold, "destruction to the workers of iniquity," shall overtake these spiritual agents of evil, in the fire prepared for them.

Some believe in the existence of evil spirits, and yet doubt the possibility of demoniac possession. They think there must be some mistake about those cases, whose apparent cure Scripture records. But, as has been said, if the cases are not what they are reported to be, the charge of imposition lies against our Lord. Certainly, there is nothing unreasonable in the supposition that such powers of evil should obtain control of one in full sympathy with them, who yields himself to them; the question can only be as to the extent of such power. And it should not be forgotten that the powers of evil, in introducing sin into our world, have thus brought upon us all the diseases to which man is subject.

Possibly the popular misunderstanding of the Bible meaning of soul may have much to do with this difficulty in recognizing demoniac possession. It is imagined the evil spirit is of a nature like what the soul is fancied to be, something immaterial, which is thought actually to enter into one's body, and to thrust aside man's spirit, or soul, from its rightful seat. (Old anatomists thought a saddle-like process in the brain was the actual seat of the soul!) But to take possession of a man it is not necessary actually to get inside of him. In every-day life we see a human being exerting so powerful an influence over another, that we say one is captivated by the other; he will do anything the other wishes. We behold a most suggestive form of spiritual, or mental, impression in so-called clairvoyance, wherein, as the writer is convinced from observation and study of the phenomena, one in a peculiar condition of the nervous system, of which but few are susceptible, is able to recognize the unspoken thoughts of another, who voluntarily puts himself in communication with the former. Exactly how this mental impression is communicated from one to the other, is a mystery to the one receiving it; and the fact that it has been so much used for purposes of deception, should stimulate to, rather than repel from, its careful investigation by men of science. A special object of here alluding to it, is to put the reader on his guard, since so effective and pernicious a use is made of this ill-understood faculty to further the arrant impostures of spiritism, or, as it is improperly called, spiritualism.

In fact, spiritual influence, as being that which is exerted upon a person from outside, is what all Scripture and religious writers fully recognize. We read: "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith," Eph. 3.17; "If Christ be in you," Rom. 8.10. How can Christ, a person "made like unto his brethren," be in one of them, or dwell in one of them? It is by his spiritual influence over that one. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his;" Rom. 8.9.

So, on the other hand, spirits of evil exert an unseen yet powerful influence upon the man from without his system; the extent of which is largely a question of other restraining influences. And when the man is wholly under that malign influence, we say the evil one has entered into him. As it was said of Judas, Jn. 13.27: "And after the sop, Satan entered into him." So we understand how the demons entered into the swine, Mark 5.13. It was not by an actual bodily entrance, but by such an impression made upon the nervous system, or, to use Biblical language, upon the soul or organism of the animals, that they followed, not their own natural will, but that of the demons; "the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea; "precisely as cattle now may do, when stampeded by some exciting cause of terror.

It is suggestive to note that thus to influence the brute creation, the demons had to ask permission. With the higher race, the choice is in their own hands; it is given to us to yield to, or to resist, at our own will. "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." In experiments by means of animal magnetism, so called, if the one to be influenced determinedly refuses to submit his will, the attempted results cannot be attained. As with spiritual influences for evil, so with those for our good.- The spiritual possession, or indwelling of a soul by the Lord, is brought about by that one submitting himself, his own will, entirely to the will of Christ; voluntarily and wholly yielding to the gentle, loving, spiritual influence that proceeds from him. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God;" Rom. 8.14.

We understand, then, that we have continually about us, in this life, an order of beings higher than our own. They exist in spirit-bodies, unseen by mortal eyes, and yet with the possibility of disclosure, as it was with our Lord's body; and in the "angels' visits," rather appearing, of former days. They are divided into two classes-the good, very good; the bad, only evil. What power they have over the brute creation, it would seem from the case referred to, must be specially given them by the Creator. They have power over man, only as the intelligent creature yields to, or resists, the suggestions of good or evil, which from them may come to him, unconscious of the origin of such suggestions. Precisely how they operate upon our mental faculties we know not, yet we have already shown the possibility of the fact itself, which Scripture so fully reveals. "Are not they [God's angels] ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" Heb. 1.14. "And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man, and he saw: and behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha;" (2 Kings 6.17)-a Hebrew paraphrase for angels, in reference to their bright, shining appearance. And on the other hand we read: "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel;" 1 Chron. 21.1. Peter said to Ananias, "Why hath Satan filled thy heart?" Acts 5.3. That Apostle tells us: "Your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, goes about, seeking whom he may devour;" 1 Pet. 5.8. Paul writes of "the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience;" Eph. 2.2.

The human race, in their present life, are in a formative stage of existence. As before their first, or physical, birth, they were in process of being formed, prepared for, this present life, so, in respect to the spiritual life, a similar process is now being repeated. We are being

formed in character, prepared for the new birth; that from above, the resurrection to life, the entrance upon the spirit life. As an actual fact, the vast majority of those starting out with this possibility of life, will never come to the birth. The germ of life in them is blighted in the process of its development here. It is the story we see repeated in all nature around us. Myriads of seeds drop from our forests. Each contains within it the possibility of a living tree. How very, very few attain to that reality! The same is true of all animated nature; it is seen in the spawn of fishes, and in the germs of insect life. From the infinite source of life springs this superabundant provision for perpetuating life.

A holy God has wished for holy beings. With such alone can he be in full sympathy-with such alone can his universe be preserved in harmony and peace. But such cannot be spoken into being. God creates, in lavish abundance, innocent beings; but holiness of character results from deliberate, continued choice in the free moral agent, at liberty to choose the right or the wrong, at will. Hence the possibility, in one sense the necessity, of sin. Angels, exalted in knowledge and power, were created moral agents, at liberty to choose for themselves. A part stood firm when tested, and holiness and immortality were the prize. A part, we know not how many, failed in their hour of trial, and now they await the destruction which inevitably must follow their violation of the law of their higher being.

Man also was created a free moral agent, with the same liberty of choice the angels had. Our first parents failed to stand their test. But the loss has not been irretrievable to them or to their posterity. A ransom has been found. God's own Son, in the infinite love which has been bestowed upon us, "was made flesh; "he became "the seed of the woman; "he took our place, that he might raise us unto his. "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God," Jn. 1.12;-"heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ!" Rom. 8.17.

The same testing, the same question of obedience "unto life," Acts 11.18, comes to us now as it did to our first parents. And as then, the angels who sinned are now used in the test. In the exercise of their freedom of choice, their free will, they are now doing their utmost to mar God's fair work in the creation of man. How well they have succeeded with multitudes to-day, and in the centuries past, we need not tell. But while they are thus bent upon their fell design, they are also unwilling instruments in bringing to completion God's great plan of love and mercy for the man who abides faithful. By temptations resisted, which they set before the man, they serve but to strengthen and establish him in his high purpose of steadfast obedience; they confirm him in holiness, and help thus to make him "meet for the inheritance of the saints in light," for that "exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

Our Lord's life itself was no exception to this method of preparing man for immortality. In the outset of his public career, we read of unseen agents of evil striving to draw him from the way of life. And, in the ending of his earthly course, the same unseen foes strove, as we may believe, to draw him back from the awful sacrifice he was about to make for our sakes. "And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him; "Luke 22.43. Spirits leagued against him, spirits ministering unto him! And yet he says, "Think thou that I cannot pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?" Ah, himself he would not save - that he might save us! "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all that obey him;" Heb. 5.8, 9. And in his triumph over the hosts of evil, we behold the assurance of our own victory.

For these emissaries of evil cannot harm a hair of one's head, but as the man himself gives them leave. In all their temptations we have the assurance "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will, with the temptation, also make the [so Greek] way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it;" 1 Cor. 10.13. "They that be with us are more than they that be with them;" 2 Kings 6.16. "If God be for us, who can be against us? We know that all things work together for good to them that love God;" Rom. 8.31, 28.

And when, in its season, God's great work of redemption is accomplished, when he shall thus have "taken out of the nations a people for his name," Acts 15.14, when he shall thus have served himself of these spirit workers of iniquity, who would not voluntarily serve him, then will he cast them away as the vile things they have chosen to be. Then at last the penalty of the violated law shall be executed upon them, and also upon the foolish ones of earth who have yielded to their allurements to sin. For the soul that sinned, it shall die. Tempters, with the tempted, shall then pass out of existence forever. They wait now but to see that their vile purpose has been wholly defeated. For God's universe will then be all holy, it will be furnished with, not merely innocent, but holy beings; those established in holiness by this very wrestling with the unseen powers of evil. The very trial here, that fitted some for immortality, but made more manifest the unfitness of those overcome by the temptation; whose sad fate, the eternal loss of life, will, through coming ages, utter its endless warning against any thought of sin. Henceforth the great law of God, love to the Creator, and to all his creatures, will be supreme, governing and uniting all; a love patterned after that love which prompted the Son of God to sacrifice himself for his redeemed. And from the grateful hearts of those thus "tried and made white." once defiled with sin yet now made whiter than snow, shall unceasing praise ascend "unto him who loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

What must be the fate of him who abides in his sin, has been fully revealed to man. Has it also been revealed to those lost angels? It has. From sacred writ, we learn of their gloomy forebodings, of the fearful anticipations, which now disquiet their wretched existence. They are now looking forward to their own destruction; they know that a time for this has been appointed. Mark (1.24) and Luke

(4.34) record their encounter with our Lord, as he dispossesses them of one of their captives. Snarling out "ea," (phonetically, y-ah, a Greek interjection, E. V. renders, let us alone,) they captiously ask (literal Greek), "what for us and for thee," i.e., what have we to do with each other now? "Did you come [aorist] to destroy us?" Evidently they knew of a coming of his, when they will be destroyed.

In Christ's interview with the Gadarene demoniac [Greek daimonizomenos, a demonized, bedeviled one], as recorded Mark 5.7, Luke 8.28, at the first, the cry was "torment me not." (The Greek word rendered torment, from its derivation, means to rub upon the touchstone, hence to try judicially by torture or the rack, and so it acquires a combined meaning of suffering and punishment.) The demons know they are in the presence of the Judge himself, and that deferred yet sure-coming sentence looms up before them. In Matt. 8.29, they make the suggestive inquiry: "Did you come here before the time to torment [or, punish] us? "Already we have learned from them what their punishment will be-it is to be destroyed; here they speak of the appointed time.

At the last of this interview, a suggestive modification of this fear is expressed by them. Mark 5.10: "They besought him much that he would not send them out of the country;" Greek chora, more exactly, the proper place of a person or thing. (See Liddell & Scott.) Luke (8.31) uses a word which expresses their meaning, "that he would not command them to go out into the deep;" Greek eis tin abysson, into the abyss. The Apostle Paul gives us the N. T. meaning of this word, Rom. 10.6, 7 "Who shall ascend into heaven, that is, to bring Christ down? Who shall descend ..into the [abyssos] abyss, that is, to bring up Christ from dead ones?" Evidently, the abyssos, out of which one is brought from those dead, expresses that state or condition in which dead ones are; it is the state of death. The demons beseech him, who has the power of life and death, that he will not command them to death; will not send them out of the place they occupy, by sending them out of existence.

This definition of abyssos, which Paul gives us, throws light on Rev. 20.2; and the latter in turn explains this. There we are told that, after the King of kings comes forth in his might to "judge and to make war," Rev. 19.11, "the dragon, the old serpent, who is the devil and Satan, is bound a thousand years, and cast into the bottomless pit." So our translators arbitrarily vary their rendering. The Greek is abyssos, a word which, Paul shows us, denotes the state of death. In that unfolding of the future, which in prophetic vision passes before the eyes of the Revelator, the "appointed time "has arrived, when the hosts of evil, here represented in their leader, are to descend into the abysses. They are to die; their work of death is to be arrested; they shall "deceive the nations no more till the thousand years are fulfilled." (Are these symbolic years, as elsewhere a day represents a year?)

This death of evil angels, limited to the thousand years, answers to the first, or temporary, death of human beings. It is evidently what the demons refer to, when they pray not to be commanded to go into the abyss. But as the wicked men, so the wicked angels have a resurrection. Ver. 7: "But when the thousand years are expired, Satan [here standing for all the host] shall be loosed out of his prison [from the abyss, from death] for a little season." The resurrection of wicked men is revealed (John 5.29, Rev. 20.12) to be unto judgment; we may presume the resurrection of wicked angels is for the same purpose and at the same time, since the record of the judgment of wicked men is in Revelation in this connection. After which, both wicked men and angels are to meet their foretold doom, to be destroyed by that "fire prepared for the devil and his angels." This is the punishment in view of which the demons cry out, "destroy us not," "torment us not before the time." It is the second death, a death unending.

And thus at last is reached the fulfilment of that ancient prophecy of Gen. 3.is. The seed of the woman crushes the head of the serpent, the vital part, which one strikes for in killing it. Paul gives us his idea of this, where we read, as our version has it, "The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet; "Rom. 16.20. The Greek is suntribo, which Liddell and Scott render, "to rub together, to shatter, shiver, applied to pottery, to make a jelly of, generally, to destroy utterly:" the word well expresses the entire stamping out of the great agency of evil. Thus also is fulfilled the declaration of Heb. 2.14, where it is stated to be the intent of the Son of God to "destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil." And so, finally and forever, in a universe, into which sin shall never again rear its polluted head, God, the all holy, shall be all and in all, God over all, blessed forever.

CHAPTER 14

Granting that the Bible Teaches the Mortal Nature and Final Death of all Souls, except those whom Christ Redeems, what Advantage has this Doctrine over the Popular Belief?

IF we have recognized the fact that the Bible teaches it, that, itself, is enough to commend it to our acceptance. But the practical benefits of the doctrine are manifold, and of the greatest value. To specify:

I. It Glorifies God, As The Truth Ever Does.

God's power is exalted. Sin is not to be eternal. In his own time, God will display his power in a full triumph over it, thoroughly rooting it out from his dominions. The sight of the abominable thing, which he hates, the All-seeing will not suffer to be forever before

his eyes. Christ is to "destroy the works of the devil; "and not, "upholding all things by the word of his power," is he to use that power to perpetuate the devil's work through the coming ages.

God's justice is exalted. Few, if any, are now to be found, sufficiently venturesome, on any basis of justice, to argue for the infliction of eternal misery in any form. It is plainly out of reason that the sins of this finite life - in itself but a moment compared to eternity, but the flash of a weaver's shuttle-should be visited with infinite, for such is unending, suffering. Nor can such excess of punishment be passed over to the account of the future, as a just retribution for sins then to occur; for, in that hypothetical hell, the wicked can do nothing but sin, if, indeed, any moral character appertains to actions which are at the time unavoidable. The hymn tells us - it seems we have to go to hymns for information on such matters-

"In that lone land of deep despair,
No Sabbath's heavenly light shall rise,
No God regard your bitter prayer,
Nor Savior call you to the skies."

But Scripture has settled all this for us, declaring that future punishment is not for the sin of a future life, but "for the deeds done in the body;" 2 Cor. 5.10.

God's wisdom is exalted. This is impugned by the popular belief that God, in creating human beings, made them immortal, when he knew they would be exposed to sin; that myriads would sin; and that eternity itself was but the limit of the consequent wretchedness and woe. Indeed, it were hard to say, in such a case, whether his wisdom or his mercy were more at fault. But the Bible doctrine of the soul puts the matter in a different light. Immortality in sin was just the thing the Creator determined to prevent. We read his resolve, after man's fall, in Gen. 3.22, 24: "And now, lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever, therefore the Lord God drove out the man," away from the tree of life - from that forbidden immortality.

It is evident that God desired the companionship of holy creatures. Though he could create innocent beings, he could not create them holy. Holiness is the expression of a character established in habits of obedience. It is the result of intelligent choice, and for that his creatures must be left free to choose. There must be a possibility that some should choose to sin, that any might choose to do right. Those who make the right choice, and endure to the end, shall be saved as worthy of everlasting life; those who choose evil, and so "judge themselves unworthy of everlasting life," will have that judgment affirmed in the great day. They shall pass away forever-literally perish-in such manner as shall justly express God's abhorrence of their sin. And their wretched fate, with the sad, sad story of all the fearful results of sin, will forever remain a sufficient warning against the least turning to sin. It is but the fulfilling of that law of being, which the past history of creation reveals; the extinction of the unfit, and the survival of the fittest. That law, to whose discovery in the world around us men of science now point with pride, has stood for ages in the written record of God's truth. And when the great problem of life has been worked out, when our finite experience shall grasp the end actually accomplished, as it now exists in the Infinite Mind, then will the survivors thankfully acknowledge that the relatively few years of earth's suffering and woe were well worth an eternity of assured holiness and happiness, which follows as the result of their trial here.

God's love is exalted. It was not to save from an eternity of wretchedness and woe, which the mind staggers and trembles to contemplate, that God sent forth his Son, to be made like unto us "his brethren," to suffer and to die. It was to save us from perishing, from losing the blessing of life; it was to give life to those who would believe on him, who were willing to become holy and fit for that glorious hereafter. And how deep and strong the obligation of the redeemed to their Redeemer, as they remember their very existence through all eternity they owe to his dying love!

[2. The True Doctrine Of The Soul Honors The Bible.](#)

It relieves it of the reproach now resting upon it. For, as already shown (Chapter 1), modern theology accuses the Bible of violating that law of human speech, which insists as indispensable to clear expression, that whenever language is to be used figuratively, or in any other than the most natural sense, such intent shall be manifested beyond a question. Any speaker or writer who violates this law, convicts himself of intellectual incapacity -he cannot write or speak intelligibly. This modern theology charges upon the writers and speakers of the Bible when - and only when - they refer to the soul and its destiny. Its exponents tell us: "On that subject you cannot understand the Bible without help. You would not recognize its figurative intent, except as we point it out." And so, taking the Bible as its professed friends represent it, it is generally said, "You can prove what you will from the Bible. It is written so blindly, so incomprehensibly, one cannot hope to understand it." Will anyone who thinks the book to be thus wretchedly written, be likely intelligently and fully to accept it as a work of inspiration?

But, not content with this, modern theology virtually impugns the integrity of Bible writers. Its expounders tell us: "You cannot rely upon what Old Testament writers say of death and the hereafter. God's revelation was given them correctly, but into it they have infused their own ignorant ideas of the future. For example, they say man is unconscious in death; they even represent the Almighty as so expressing himself. Let us point out these errors, so get at the truth God really meant to reveal." "Precisely so," says the infidel, "do

the New Testament writers color their statements, and mix in error. For example, Christ did not claim to be divine - that was added by his disciples. Let us point out these errors, and so get at the real truth." Thus believer and unbeliever join hands in attacking the revealed word. For what in each case is it, but the actual withdrawal of confidence in the reliability of these writers, and so in the record they give us?

How comes it that our religious teachers thus lead off in this joint effort to break down Scripture? It is on account of the antagonism existing between modern theology and God's word.

Need we again explain this? God said in Eden, If ye disobey, ye shall die; as he says to us, The soul that sins, it shall die. But the devil said, Ye shall not die. The devil's word was taken; sin and death followed. And yet to-day that lie is uppermost in men's minds. Sinful, mortal man says, I shall not die; only my body. Death does not reach me; /do not cease to live.

And modern theology repeats this lie of the father of lies-does it not?-declaring to all men, "Ye shall not die, ye are immortal. Though death is loss of existence to the lower animals, it is not death, or loss of existence, to the higher animal, man." But confronting it stands the volume of God's word, sturdily protesting in his name, Ye shall surely die. Will modern theology yield? No; in spirit it rises up against the Bible. But, with the tactics of the great adversary, it dare not directly meet the Bible; it appears to bow before it as supreme, but it adroitly questions its inspiration on points where the two differ. It thinks just here there has been some mistake, not caring to see that what it calls a mistake here and there so interpenetrates Holy Writ, that to tear it out pulls to pieces the whole fabric.

This method of dealing with the Bible is exemplified beyond one's expectation in a work entitled "First Principles of Ecclesiastical Truth, Essays on the church and Society," by J. Baldwin Brown, a prominent English divine (so called), at present (1877) chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. Our attention was first called to the work by the high commendation it received from one of our religious journals, which prides itself on its orthodoxy. This one of the modern school of the prophets, discussing "the doctrine of the infallible," is not pleased with the idea that the Lord should, by his servant Samuel, have ordered Saul to exterminate the Amalekites. Such wholesale destruction he thinks inconsistent with God's "name and nature, in the light which Christ casts on it; "though, would he object, had the nation been swept off by deluge or pestilence? Very summarily does he dispose of God's agency in the affair. He denies the inspiration of God's prophet in this particular instance. We give his words: "We are bound 'to believe that Samuel, in that terrible commission of slaughter, mistook patriotic passion for the divine fire!"

Anyone who wishes for more of what is recommended to young theologians as "First Principles of Ecclesiastical Truth," may turn to the book itself, pages 94, 95, of English edition, Hodder & Stoughton, 27 Paternoster Row, London, 187. Mr. Brown charges that the Protestants tend to idolatry of the Bible!! Not very generally, we think.

Indeed Let us go to the inspired record for the facts. In Exod. 17.14, just after Israel's coming out of Egypt, Amalek attacked them; - is it. not a type of the hosts of evil assaulting one just delivered from the power of Satan? We read: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua, for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven." In Deut. 25.17-19, Moses reminds the people:

"Remember what Amalek did . . . how he smote the hindmost, all that were feeble behind thee, when thou wert faint and weary, and he feared not God: therefore, . . . thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven, thou shalt not forget it." In 1 Sam. 15, we are told of the execution of this foretold doom, verse 1-3, 11, 18, 23, 26, declaring it to have been done at the special command of the Lord, and that, on account of Saul's failure to obey the command to the letter, the Lord rejected him from being king, to the great grief of Samuel. And now a modern religious teacher tells us we are bound to believe it was all a blunder, well meant, no doubt, on the part of the prophet! He thought the Lord sent him, when he had not. Was Mr. Brown ignorant of those previous facts of Hebrew history, or does he reject them as spurious? Let us hope the former.

But how could he thus give away the entire basis of Scripture authority? For, if an accredited prophet of Jehovah is himself unable to distinguish between the moving of God's spirit and his own excited imagination, we have nothing whatever to depend upon. All confidence in any inspiration is gone; we can never know in any case whether we listen to the word of the Lord, or of a prophet who does not know his own mind. how came a religious writer of such ability ever to consent thus to attack all belief in revelation.? It can only be explained by that ignorance of God's word, and the low estimate of its inspiration, which modern theology has fostered in the minds of its followers. It painfully shows us whither we are drifting. "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Luke 18.8.

Let no earnest-minded Christian think the preceding an isolated case. Modern religious literature is full of this line of thought. Before the writer lies a late number of a religious quarterly, the New Englander, for April, 1877. On page 350, a writer states: "As early as the end of the Persian period, 333 B.C., the Hebrew mind was unconsciously nearer the true Messianic idea than when David wrote his Messianic Psalms and Isaiah uttered his Messianic prophecies." What does he judge from? From those psalms and prophecies, surely. What then does he mean? Why, as we learn from the article, that the Hebrew nation, as their faith weakened in the actual, literal fulfilment of those prophecies of Messiah's reign, were thus brought nearer the actual truth than "holy men of old who spoke as they

were moved by the Holy Spirit;"- for modern theology teaches us that a literal acceptance of the words of those holy men would lead us astray. -But what becomes of the idea that David and Isaiah were inspired to utter these prophecies? When God sets about to make a revelation of the future, does he do it thus imperfectly? We would not reflect upon this New Englander writer - he but reasons as he has been taught, on the basis of modern theology, which, we repeat, but lightly esteems the inspiration of the Bible.

And so, the Bishop of Manchester, England, a man of high literary repute - we quote the London Spectator -lately "declared point blank to a medical audience, that he did not expect them to believe in the historical accuracy of the chapters in Genesis, which relate the creation and fall of man."

But full proof lies before everyone, if he will but heed it, of the wretched work modern theology makes with God's word. Take, for example, the language of Jehovah, recorded Gen. 3.17-19: "And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened and thou hast eaten in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground, for out of it was thou taken, for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Modern theology reads this: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou [Adam] eat bread, till NOT thou [Adam] but thy body returns to the ground, for out of it was NOT thou but thy body taken," etc. In like manner, where the Bible states "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground," modern theology again puts in its negative. It tells us to read: "The Lord God formed not man, but his body, of the dust of the ground." If, in the account of man's creation and fall, it thus takes the liberty of flatly denying whatever conflicts with its peculiar dogma of immortality for all, does not common fairness demand that it grant the same privilege to the sceptic - that he may reject whatever he will?

But, is it a light thing, thus to tamper with the word of the living God? We read, in the days of Malachi, of priests who said: "The table of the Lord is contemptible." Of them God declared "Ye despise My name; ye have departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law." Mal. 1.6, 7; 2.8. What, in a day to come, will be his judgment of those who now practically say, The word of the Lord is contemptible?

How is the Bible studied in our theological seminaries? As a book of occasional reference, 'rather than a text-book. The creed and approved dogmas of that particular school of the prophets are carefully stated by the professor of divinity. Proof-texts are then referred to, and then the endeavor is made -not always with recognized success - to explain away texts opposed to the doctrines laid down. The student is virtually taught that for the Bible to make any statement is no assurance of its reliability. The real question is, How does the professor, or the commentators, regard it? And the graduate goes forth, knowing much of what men have said of the Bible, - comparatively little of the book itself, to indoctrinate others in what he has been taught. Little inducement has he afterward to investigate that peculiar volume for himself. He fears to run against difficulties, which have been but dubiously smoothed away for him-felt difficulties, a too intimate acquaintance with which might unfit him for the work he has been licensed to perform. It is easier and safer to keep on, as he has been led, to study into what others think, and to seek to interest others rather by the brilliancy of his intellectual efforts than by the depth of his Biblical research.

Is such the training to fit one to reverence the Bible as the book above all books, or to grapple with and master its sublime truths? Is it any wonder that we find a half concealed - sometimes expressed - skepticism among those who are thought to be specially "set for the defense of the Gospel." When Bishop Colenso gives utterance to the doubts of Bible inspiration, which modern theology actually engenders, Dean Stanley sustains him, declaring his belief that "the Pentateuch is not the work of Moses," that the Bible "narratives of historical incidents are not unfrequently colored by the necessary infirmities" of the writers; that is, in reality, though not in intent, they are untruthful. He speaks of Stephen, when full of the Holy Spirit, as making errors in his speech. Our Lord had promised, "When they shall deliver you up, take no thought beforehand, neither do ye premeditate; but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit." Upon whom rests, then, the responsibility of those "errors"? But the Dean is at least consistent, as well as frank. For, what is it, that modern theology should insert its negative, for example into the Lord's sentence upon Adam, "Dust thou art [not], and unto dust shalt thou [not] return; "what is this, but actually denying the Divine authorship of the speech, and the truthfulness of the recording historian, whoever he may be?

A grave accusation indeed it is, which our defense of the Bible has constrained us to bring against modern theology. We do it in all seriousness, and we leave the verdict with every lover of God's Word. Do, or do not, the facts sustain the indictment?

Surely every thoughtful Christian confesses to having been perplexed, if not discouraged, by the evident ambiguity of Bible language, as modern theology interprets it to us. For instance, our Lord, having used the word death in its ordinary sense, as the loss of life, even when in the presence of death itself, at the same time, so are we taught, uses the identical word to express life eternal in its misery, and that without a hint of intending to change the meaning of the word. Formerly, studying the gospel of John as a Sabbath-school superintendent, the writer knew not how to explain it to his teachers, except that Christ often purposely spoke ambiguously, to give exercise to greater faith. But our Lord asks no blind, unthinking faith. God's truth, as he gives it to us, is so reasonable that it commends itself to the strongest intellect, so simple that the feeblest may grasp it. But we must take it precisely as God gives it to us.

We should not omit to notice that sometimes there is an ambiguity or misunderstanding, not in the original, but in the words our translators adopted. The evidences of design are so many and so apparent, that we cannot but believe those good men thought it their

duty, in giving the Word of God to the common people, to make the English Bible, at least, teach those doctrines they thought it ought. For instance, Jn. 11.25, 26, reads: "He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever lives and believeth in me shall never die."

As it stands, here is an inexcusable ambiguity; our Lord fails to discriminate between the first and the second death, as in speech he passes from one to the other. Or else it is a clear endorsement, as far as believers are concerned, of that original lie of the evil one; if believers now living are never to die; if they themselves live on, while their bodies die. On the latter understanding, it were indeed a strong point for modern theology, if our Lord said it. But did he? We appeal from our translators to the original. The Greek is on me apothane (two negatives more emphatic), he shall by no means die, eis ton aiona, for the mon, age, for eternity, as is the meaning the word often carries. (Liddell and Scott define eis as a preposition "of time, to determine a period," giving as an example, eis aei, forever.) So John 8.51: "He shall never see death," is in the Greek, he shall by no means see death for eternity, the death forever, from which there is no resurrection. Christ's language could not have been more precise. He says not the believer is never to die, he does die as other men; but he tells us he dies not the second death, the death forever of those who have not life through Christ.

3. This Helps Us To Understand Bible Doctrines.

Look, for example, at that cardinal doctrine of our faith, the Atonement. That it is vicarious in its nature, that Christ died in the stead of, or as a substitute for, the sinner, is clearly set forth to the apprehension of the Bible student, in both type and statement.

The ceremonies of the Levitical law pictured this to its worshippers. Under the law of the sin-offering, Lev. 4, in each form of that offering, verse 4, 15, 24, 29, it is specified that the transgressor, "shall lay his hand upon the head of" the victim. The meaning of this form, if question there were, is definitely declared in Numb. 8.

where the substitution of the Levites in place of the firstborn of the children of Israel was denoted by the latter laying their hands on the former. See also Lev. 1.4. So, in figure, the lamb takes the place of the sinner, its innocence becoming his, his sins laid upon the head of the innocent creature; and then what follows? The death of the victim. The penalty of the law is carried into execution before the sinner's eyes; "the soul that sinned, it shall die."

Those sacrifices, we know, derived all their meaning from being types, or figures of the great Sacrifice for sin, "fore-known [Greek pro-egno-smenos] before the foundation of the world," 1 Peter 1.20; "the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world," Jn. 1.29; he who "appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," Heb. 9.26. As we read, "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many," Heb. 9.28, "who himself bare our sins in his own body on the tree," 1 Pet. 2.24, on the instrument of death. As Paul told the Corinthians, "For I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures;" 1 Cor. 15.3. It would seem to be beyond question, then, that our Lord takes the sinner's place, and so the sinner, accepting the transfer on the condition required, in his judicial standing takes the place of his Lord. "He has made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might become the righteousness of God in him;" 2 Cor. 5.21.

But on this point, which the Bible seems to make so clear, we find theologians are at variance. There is some difficulty. No little discussion has arisen as to the precise nature of the atonement, and some, who profess to be guided by the word of God, entirely deny its vicarious, or substitutional, nature. What is the difficulty? Simply this. If Christ, the holy one, stands in the place of the sinner, if he takes on him the latter's sin, he must likewise take the punishment due to that sin; he must bear the penalty of the broken law. But, did he? Did he actually endure the law's penalty? Though modern theology may profess to assent to this, it actually denies it. It teaches that Christ did not meet the penalty of sin. That, it tells us, is not death, though so called, but eternal suffering. And so, we find that the fact that some modern theologians call Christ a vicarious sacrifice, does not make him such in the estimation of others, who recognize that logically they have been taught, and are themselves teaching, that he is not a vicarious sacrifice-he did not take the sinner's place in so far as to meet the penalty of sin.

Here, then, we see in this great doctrine of the atonement the workings of that leaven of evil, which, as the dogma of universal immortality, is incorporated into the teaching of modern theology. If one wishes to understand what confusion of thought and language Satan's lie has brought into modern theological ideas, let him analyze its doctrine of the first and the second death.

We observe that two deaths, you would say, ought at least to resemble each other. Two things of the same name, distinguished from one another by simple numerals, "second," should be enough alike to belong to the same class. But, on the common theory, there is no resemblance at all between the first and the second death.

According to Webster, death, in its primary and in all its secondary meanings, is "the termination of existence." In a note we have a sort of exception in case of spiritual death, but absolutely nothing is found answering to modern theology's definition of the first or the second death. For the first death of modern theology is not the termination of existence; it is the separation, the tearing asunder of two parts of man's complex being. As a rebuilt of this, one part decays, loses its organization, and so ceases to exist; the other part continues to exist in unspeakable torment. At last comes the resurrection, when that part which passed out of existence is again

brought into being, and the suffering part is united to it. But stop! do we understand that the body, which is all that has a resurrection on this theory, that the original body is brought into being at such a time? It is not imperishable; it cannot endure the unending torture before it. This hypothesis then must suppose that it also is changed and made immortal, like the bodies of the righteous, although no warrant in Scripture is found for this, and this change in the bodies of the righteous, the putting on of immortality, their bodies made "like unto his glorious body," is spoken of as "the gift of God through our Lord Jesus Christ;" 1 Cor. 15.54, 57. Does he indeed bestow the same gift upon the wicked?

But, if we accept this unwarranted supposition, what then? The two parts re-united appear before the judgment-seat; they or the individual is judged according to the deeds of the life on earth; the verdict of condemnation is pronounced, and the second death is now inflicted; 2 Cor. 5.10, Rev. 20.11-15, 21.8. How does this second death resemble the first? In no respect; the two parts of the man are not torn asunder again; but, on the contrary, joined together; they are cast into that torment which, on this theory, one part has long been enduring without even the formality of a trial. We might stop here to inquire what the need of the judgment on a question already irrevocably decided? and why this apparently needless restoring of the body?

But the point is this: comparing the first with the second death, we find no analogy whatever, rather a contrast, between the act of tearing asunder two parts of a being, and the act of casting into torment the two reunited. The two operations evidently are radically unlike. And yet to these two entirely different processes, we are to understand, so modern theology informs us, that the Word of God gives the same name, death; and, as if one were actually a repetition of the other, designates one the first, the other the second, death. Who dares to say, who dares to ask anyone to believe that God's Word is guilty of such abuse of language?

An expounder of the popular theory may seek to evade our conclusion, by objecting to the definition of the first death as already given. He may claim that it is not the simple separation of the two parts of a man; but that it also necessarily involves the idea of suffering in the part still existing. In that case he confounds the result of dying with the death itself. And, if the idea of future suffering be essential to the conception of death, then Christ has not died, and since Christians are not thus to suffer, they do not die. But we know, and Paul declares, "in Adam all die."

But perhaps the objector may claim that the popular definition should be more exactly stated - that the first death embraces the separation of the two parts of man, together with the consequences to the part still living, according as the previous life had been a righteous or a wicked one. If this be correct, not only have we the before-mentioned confounding of results with that whence they proceed; but if death be not only the setting free the living part, but also the results that follow-the actual carrying of it, for the righteous, to inconceivable bliss-how can Paul (1 Cor. 15.26) call death their "last enemy," and speak of it (2 Cor. 1.10, 11, Phil. 2.27) as a thing they should pray to be delivered from? Such an evident absurdity forces an objector back to our previous statement that the popular theory represents the first death as simply the separation of two parts of a human being.

And this, modern theology declares, is the death that Christ died; something entirely different being the true penalty for sin which the unpardoned sinner is to undergo. In fact the only resemblance between the two is in the name of death, assigned to each; but it will be observed that words have no definite meaning to modern theology, when it discusses the nature or fate of the soul.

How sharply does the Word of God cut through all these sophistries of those who labor, unwittingly, it may be, to reconcile the irreconcilable; to adjust the truth of God with the lie of the adversary! The penalty, it declares, is death. And death means what mankind understand death to mean. The terms of a law is the last place to look for other than the most natural use of words. We question the sanity of one who honestly supposes that the penalty of death, in human jurisprudence, means imprisonment for life! And is the law of God less clearly expressed? No; the pretense that ambiguously figurative language is used to declare the penalty of his law, is a libel on the great Lawgiver himself, deserving of the severest condemnation, which it will receive in a day coming!

Death, in the language of the Almighty, means what he knows it to mean in human language, the termination of existence, the loss of life. "Without shedding of blood is no remission of sin;" Heb. 9.22. Life was forfeited by disobedience; another's life must go for that forfeited life. It is the old, old story, which has come down to us through the ages, which modern theology would set aside. It was the atonement by blood on which Abel rested his faith, when he was accepted in the presence of Jehovah- "God testifying [not of him, but] of his gifts." It was the atonement by, blood that Cain rejected, for that spoke of his sinfulness, of his forfeited life, of the innocent dying in the stead of the guilty. He rejected that, and he was rejected. When that last fearful judgment was thundering over the land of Egypt, waking a cry of agony from every household of that sinful nation, there were those there dwelling in safety and peace. On their door-posts was the sprinkled blood that told of a life yielded up for theirs; for the Lord had said, "When I see the blood, I will pass over you."

Through the death of another came pardon and life to them.

And when, in the fulness of time, our Great Passover was crucified for us, our Great Substitute himself then met the penalty of the broken law. He gave his life for ours; he gave himself for us. "He died, he was buried, he rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures;" 1 Cor. 15.3, 4. He died, not the first or the second death of popular theology, but an actual death, he ceased to live. He

was buried, - himself, not a part of himself, - for the Apostle tells us, "He descended first into the lower parts of the earth." (So the Scriptures speak of the grave. See Ezek. 31.14; 32.18.) And he adds, "He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens."

The manner in which life is taken away does not affect the actual fact of death. By the headsman's axe, the bullet, at the stake, in various ways, the guilty one meets the penalty of the law, which declares that its transgressor shall die for his sin. To fulfil the requirement of God's law, calling for the death of the transgressor, there evidently is no necessity that the manner of the death of the substitute be precisely that of the unpardoned sinner. The law's demand was death. This our Lord fully met by his death on the cross. He entered completely into our place. He was "made like unto his brethren; "he was tempted in all points like as we are, apart from sin; he took upon himself, on the cross, our guilt and its penalty. Thus, he was a perfect substitute for the sinner, and his atonement was truly vicarious, according to the Scriptures. "He was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification; "Rom. 4.25.

He stood in our place. Then the converse, grand and marvelous as it may be, is also true. We may, if we will, enter into his place. Who can tell the wonders and the future glory of this mystery? We are "accepted in the Beloved." Of him the Father says, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus." At present, he who by death descended into the grave, has ascended up above all. At the right hand of God is now his place, yet in our nature still, our representative, our great High Priest, bearing our names upon his breast, "now to appear in the presence of God for us;" Heb. 9.24. Now our Mediator, but what will he be to his redeemed in the coming "manifestation of the sons of God," in "the glory that shall be revealed in us" (Rom. 8.18, 19), as we then take our full standing in him? Prophecy tells us, "As the bridegroom rejoices over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee;" Isa. 57.5. Oh, the height and depth of the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord!

And so this doctrine of the soul helps to a better understanding of that doctrine of original sin, which so puzzles the simple (not theologically trained) layman. He hears the new-born infant spoken of as a sinner; that somehow sin pertains to it through Adam. He remembers that distich of the old primer:

"In Adam's fall, We sinned all."

He revolts against the idea; against the possibility of sin in a creature who knows not good or evil. But, going to his infallible standard, in God's own commentary on the atoning sacrifice of Christ, he finds (Lev. 4.5) two divisions of sin offerings: -one, the offering for sins of ignorance, that is, for sin according to the Divine, not human, knowledge of it-for sin not known to be such at the time of its commission; and a second, the trespass offering, for sin according to man's own knowledge, on his lower standard. He reads that "God condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8.3); not sin in thought, word, or deed, in any of its manifestations or working, but in the flesh; that Paul says, "In me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing;" Rom. 7.18. Does not the Bible, then, teach this mysterious, perplexing doctrine of original sin, or total depravity? What does it all mean? Can one, after all, be a sinner, and yet have never sinned?

In his perplexity, the Bible doctrine of the soul brings to him truth, helpful in solving his difficulty. He learns, first of all, that the soul is no distinct, separate, immaterial entity, created by Almighty power, and infused at some period of his bodily existence; but that the soul is the organism itself, in the forming of which he himself was formed. And so, instead of the moral nature belonging to a soul, and the physical to a body, the two are alike evolved from one and the same organism. And hence, the working of the organism in the one case, in the more evident - the physical - gives a clue to its working in the other - the moral.

For example, let us suppose that the physical disease of the organism known as cancer, has just made its appearance in a man forty years of age. The history of the case shows the disease is traceable to inheritance all his progenitors have had it. Now, the question comes up: Has that man had the disease these forty years since his birth? We say, certainly not. He has not been a cancerous patient all that time-this is the first of it. And yet the disease was somehow there, after all. There was some condition, some peculiar make-up of the elementary particles of his organism, constituting a predisposition to the disease, which no physiologist's microscope can detect. All his life he has had what is termed a cancerous diathesis, some constituent condition of his organism, which insures the manifestation of the disease, when an appropriate time and exciting cause are reached. And in this sense, the taint of cancer has been on him since his birth.

Thus is it with the moral disease of sin in man. The infant organism, as at birth it first emerges into an independent life of itself, has no more moral character than a kitten. And yet it has a sinful diathesis, inherited from sinful parents. It has the taint of sin upon it -a taint which manifests itself in due time. It has been transmitted from the first of the race. "Behold, I was shaped in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me. Behold, THOU desires truth in the inward parts;" Psalm 51.5, 6. The pure eye of the Holy, All-seeing One can but recognize that sinful taint, and the need of the cleansing blood to wipe out the stain.

If each human being came into existence as a new, independent creation at the time, and if the immaterial soul of modern theology were the man, and the body its tainted case, then that soul, which is first put into the body, must be innocent and pure. But the Bible doctrine teaches that our existence, as separate souls or organisms, is by the power of God operating in the way of his appointment, by

second causes; it is by human generation, comprising the whole process of conception on to birth. It is the same law of God which governs all organized matter about us, which, in the account of the creation, is first thus stated: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, the fruit tree yielding fruit, whose seed is in itself, after its kind; "Gen. 1.12.

As Paul says, "And to every seed its own body. There is one flesh of man," etc.; 1 Cor. 15.38, 39. "Being begotten again, not of corruptible seed;" 1 Pet. 1.23. See how explicitly the Lord Jehovah states the place of the creation of the prophet, Jer. 1.5; see also, Isa. 49.i, 5, 15. And we must inquire with the patriarch, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" Job 14.4.

Such being our actual origin, as the Bible doctrine sets it before us, we can understand whence and what the taint of sin that comes to us through Adam's transgression, and how naturally we ourselves become sinners by our own voluntary act.

And so, the true doctrine of the soul clears away another theological puzzle: Had Christ a human soul? Though modern theologians confidently declare he had, as a religious teacher once said to the writer, Why, the Church settled that long ago! - yet their explanations of what the fact involves, leads a thoughtful mind into serious difficulties and doubts. They tell us "the Second Person in the Trinity, being conceived in the Virgin Mary" (so Westminster Confession of Faith), "by the power of the Third Person, took to himself a true body and a reasonable soul." That is, then, he took into union with himself a complete, independent man; for certainly body and soul together are one man. Now here is the difficulty about this. Notwithstanding it is stated "that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures were inseparably joined together in one person," yet, in practical operation, the two are presented to us disjoined, and acting separately. In some sayings of our Lord, for instance Mark 13.32, we are told it was the man who spoke, in other cases it was the Divine One.

If, then, whatever theoretically may be stated, we are practically informed that Christ is a compound of two beings capable of acting separately, then the question is, which performed the actual work of redemption? It must have been the human one.; he alone could be tempted to sin; God cannot be tempted. He alone died for us; he only could suffer death; modern theology's death, the separation of soul from body, appertains solely to a human being. Then the actual Savior was the human, not the divine one; this latter, as it were, but stands by and assents. We had rested our hopes on a divine being, who alone could be mighty to save and able to accomplish so great a redemption. But if we are to follow modern theology's theory, we are constrained to cry out, with Mary Magdalene: "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him."

Helpful indeed to us conies now the true, the Bible doctrine. Had Christ a human soul? Certainly; for a human soul, so the Bible tells us, is the human organism. For Christ to have or to be such, to have or to be a soul, was essential to his existence as flesh. "The Word was made flesh "(Jn. 1.14), was "made like unto his brethren," Heb. 2.17, "he emptied himself [auton ekenbse], taking the form of a servant, being made in likeness of men;" Phil. 2.7. And so, though the Spirit was given without measure unto him, he was wholly conformed to the law of our being; his life, as ours, depended upon the formation and sustenance of his physical organism or soul. He was born as we; he lay helpless on his mother's knee; he "grew in wisdom and in stature," in one as in the other. When he says, "Now is my soul troubled," he means his very self. After his resurrection, the divine man says to his doubting disciples, doubting if he himself, their own Savior, were really alive again: "Handle me, and see that it is I, myself." And with joyful trust our hearts respond, as even the most incredulous of them all exclaimed, "My Lord and MY God! "We might pursue the subject further, but it is holy ground on which we tread.

And so, not alone are other doctrines set forth in their true light by the Bible doctrine of the soul, but also Bible stories and allusions, involving the nature of the soul, we find become more intelligible.

A singular story, on the popular view, is that of Moses' death, with its attendant circumstances. He had been forbidden to go into Canaan, and sorely grieved does he show himself by the prohibition. Four times in his recorded addresses to the children of Israel does he I:mdc to it (Deut. 1.37; 3.23, 27; 4.21, 22; 31.2), telling how he had besought the Lord that he might go over, and might "see the good land," till the Lord forbade him to "speak more of this matter; "promising him, however, that he shall see it in the distance, from the mountains of Moab. And so we read in the last of Deuteronomy how he went up to Pisgah's top, and there the Lord showed him the land of promise. Now, if Moses' desire was really to see the land his people were to possess, why did the Lord promise him-this sight, and then take him to the mountain-top, and kindly point out to him the localities, if, on the popular theory, Moses was just about to have so much better (if we may reverently say) a bird's-eye view of the whole land from the heavenly heights? No; the bitterness of Moses' disappointment, and the scene on Pisgah's height, flatly contradict the popular theory. Yet they are perfectly intelligible when we accept literally the Lord's words to Moses, Deut. 31.16: "Thou shalt sleep with thy fathers." He could not with spirit vision follow the Israelites in their passage through Jordan and in the future conquests. He could not be near, as modern theology suggests (probably, no "thus saith the Lord "for that!), a ministering spirit to those he had loved and cared for. The language of Job must henceforth apply to him; "His sons come to honor, and he knows it not; they are brought low, but he perceives it not of them." The same fact prevented his beholding his people's coming triumph, which, by the 'word of the Lord, should later prevent King Josiah from beholding the calamities to overtake Israel: "Behold, therefore, I ,will gather thee unto thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered into thy grave in peace; and thine eyes shall not see all the evil which I will bring on this place;" 2 Ki. 22.20.

It is, moreover, difficult to understand how, though it might be a disappointment to Aaron and to Moses not to accompany the children of Israel into Canaan, their foretold death could be to them the penalty it is represented to be (Numb. 20.24; 27.14; Deut. 32.30, if as, on modern theology's showing, that death but directly brought them into their reward, into the supreme bliss of the eternal world!

That the natural method of interpreting God's Word tends to its better comprehension, is well shown by an incident which came under the writer's own observation. A theological professor, lecturing to his class upon heaven as the glorious abode of saints already departed, when he came to consider Acts 2.34, "For David is not ascended into the heavens," frankly confessed, "I do not understand it." While admiring his candor, we can but exclaim: Not understand it! He should have understood it. It was spoken not to a company of metaphysicians and deep thinkers, but to the common people. It was an important step in an argument which convinced three thousand of the truth of Jesus' claim to the Messiahship. No doubt they were more familiar with the Old Testament, which was all they had, than are we; but for us, with the additional light of the New Testament, not to understand the passage, is by no means creditable, to say the least. What is the key to its comprehension? Simply this: take the passage literally, acknowledge that it means just what it says, and all is plain. If it contradicts your cherished theories, throw them, not God's Word, aside!

4. The Preaching Of The Word More Effective.

Before Felix, Paul "reasoned of righteousness, self-control, and a judgment to come," till the careless Roman governor trembled. To the Corinthians the apostle writes of "the terror of the Lord." How little of that do we hear at the present day!

And yet there is need of such preaching. We need to be reminded that there is a penalty for sin, and what it is. God is a God of love, - we rejoice to know it, - but he is also a God to be feared by evil-doers. We need to be reminded of that also. He is terrible to his adversaries! When he would bring the Israelites out of Egypt, to make of them a people to his name, he must first impress upon them this lesson. And this he did, by the judgments on Egypt, by the terrors of Sinai. "The sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the mount, in the eyes of the children of Israel;" Exod. 24.17. Twice, in their desert history, do we read of that fire leaping forth from the enshrouding cloud to devour the rebellious.

The fear of the Lord is the beginning. of wisdom. The thunder of Sinai must awaken the slumber to his condition, ere the love that would rescue can enter the heart. The pulpit of to-day presents but one side of the truth. Its ministers shun to declare the whole counsel of God. But were they to reject the false dogma that all are immortal, they would no longer hesitate to proclaim the Bible-declared punishment of the wicked. For the literal, utter destruction of the unworthy, does violence neither to our reason nor to our sense of justice.

And, on the other hand, the reward of the future is more clearly declared and comprehended, if presented as in the Bible. The Word of God plainly holds out the promise of life to those found worthy. It is life instead of death. The gospel (glad tidings) of peace announces pardon, and the restoration of the life forfeited by disobedience. An old-time preacher declares: "Behold, I have set before thee life and death; therefore choose life;" Deut. 30.15, 19. The weakest intellect can comprehend that. Its appeal touches a responsive chord in every heart, for the desire of life is implanted deep in our nature. "Yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life." The Word of God represents even the angels of evil, at the approach of the Lord of life, crying out in terror, "Art thou come to destroy us?" Milton suggests the same thought:

"For who would lose,
Though full of pain, this intellectual being,
These thoughts that wander through eternity?"

Yet here he weakens his verse by the error of supposing their pain already begun. Though they may suffer remorse, yet the actual anguish of their coming death is not "before the time "appointed.

But how indefinite, unsatisfactory, we might almost say evasive, the preaching of future reward in our day. It is not too much to say that many of our religious preachers appear to believe, what one of them, as reported in a New York religious weekly of May 16th, 1877, frankly, though incorrectly, declared of heaven: "We have a revelation which reveals nothing." The preacher explained to his people that no doubt it is something nice, but that the language in which it is revealed, expresses merely what the people of a former ruder age would choose; and so, in so far as our ideas differ from theirs, the actual language of revelation on this point is of no account. And this attack on the revealed word goes forth also, in a so-called orthodox paper, to an audience of some fifty thousand-people, as a Christian exposition of the Bible! Oh, that our ministers might reverently bow before the simple word of God, accepting, it just as it stands; not encumbering and covering it up by human tradition! "The entrance of Thy word giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple."

And so, but little do we hear of the great motive which our Lord and his disciples use to stimulate to promptness and diligence in the struggle for a life to come. Our preachers warn us of death, its certainty, its possible nearness. Prepare to die, we are told; you know

not when you may die. The Holy Word warns us by a far grander thought, "Prepare to meet thy God." It passes by the negative losing of life, over the unconscious sleep to follow; it seizes upon the moment of awakening, and the grand scenes then to open. "Watch ye, therefore, for ye know not when the Master of the house cometh." "Be patient, therefore, brethren, for the coming of the Lord draws nigh." It is the Christian watchword, "Maranatha" -the Lord cometh! The Bible doctrine teaches that to every man his next conscious moment after this life ends, the awaking from the sleep of death, is at that Coming: and then the Lord dispenses his reward, which "is with him to give to every man as his work shall be." How sadly confusing the teaching of our modern theology: that every man still continues to live, and enters upon his reward of weal or woe, as he ends his life; and then, years, or it may be centuries after, comes the day of reward, when he is to be given the reward, which already has long been in his possession!

And the Bible doctrine gives us to understand what constitutes the punishment of the future. The attendant pain of dying does not come into prominence in God's sight. Fearful, indeed, that will be, for "then shall be the weeping, and the wailing, and the gnashing of the teeth." That this suffering is all that is involved in the idea of future punishment is the traditional error we imbibe from mediaeval times. But to the infinite mind, the great thought is the infinite loss of life, of existence - the loss of what we might enjoy, the loss of what we might have been. That is the eternal punishment.

When human jurisprudence threatens capital punishment for the highest crime, it recognizes the fact that death is the highest of all known penalties. Circumstances of pain and of shame may attend its execution, but death itself, the loss of life, is the greatest penalty of the violated law. So it is with God's unerring tribunal. When the great day of reward actually comes, when he who once died for the guilty shall sit upon the throne of judgment, to pass sentence upon the guilty, it will be to pronounce them unfit to live. The Judge will award the extreme penalty of the law. That sentence is-death, irrevocable, endless. "The wages of sin is death, the gift of God is eternal life; "-life, that which men prize most; its loss the greatest conceivable loss.

5. Subverts The Tendency To Universalism.

Formerly, when human authority was paramount in shaping religious beliefs, the popular doctrine of future punishment passed unchallenged. It was taught that the Creator called into existence myriads of human beings, whom he knew were to violate his law, purposing for their transgression to keep them in being, that he might torture them forever. Thank God, the Bible teaches no such libel on our All-wise and Infinitely-merciful Father, nor anything like it! Such a belief proved too horrible for Romanism; so it reserved that fate for heretics and the like, constructing a purgatory for the final restoration of even the chief sinners of its own communion. This, being without Bible authority, Protestantism rejected, retaining the Papal belief without its mitigations.

But as men began to think more for themselves, this current belief underwent a change. In some measure, to relieve God from the responsibility of this felt injustice, it was denied that the fire which the Bible so plainly foretells is literal fire. Somehow it was found out to be the fire of a remorseful and guilty conscience. Yet the main fact remains, as taught by that theology which styles itself orthodox, that for finite transgression an infinite penalty is provided: for misery, which knows no end, is infinite misery. The Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church of America, subscription to which it requires as a prerequisite to preaching the glad tidings, declares that "the wicked are to be punished with unspeakable torments of body and soul forever; "unspeakable in quantity, if not in quality.

But human faith is breaking down under this load. It were interesting to know precisely how many, who subscribe to this libelous statement, can fully accept it in their hearts. Certainly very, very many of Protestant laymen and ministers are turning to what they cannot find in the Bible, but what they judge less dishonoring to God. They think to save his character at the expense of what they profess to reverence as his Word. They secretly accept a modified form of that. Universalism which so-called Orthodoxy openly condemns. But they call it Restorationism. The wicked are to be punished with suffering of a limited duration, and then - then somehow, for we have no revelation on the subject - they believe they are all to be restored to holiness and to God's favor. It is virtually the old Romanist theory of purgatory, perhaps somewhat improved, and it rests upon an equally sound foundation.

A pleasing fancy it were; but the important, practical question for those it concerns is -Is it true? To decide this question, man's limited reason is of no avail; it can, only bow before that revelation of his purpose which the Almighty has graciously given us. This has been fully quoted in Chapter 11.

That sin should entirely be done away and holiness everywhere prevail in all God's universe, no reasonable being can doubt is desired by the Holy God. Nor can we doubt he will strive to accomplish this -and can aught stay his hand? Certainly not. Then he will do what he desires and is able to perform.

Evidently there are but two ways by which sin can be arrested. Either the sinning one must cease to sin, or must cease to be. Either he must become obedient - and this of his own free will, for holiness results from the voluntary choice of a free moral agent - or else the power that sustains the disobedient will cease to continue his being, to continue him in sin. That power may wait upon him, up to a certain point, to give full opportunity for voluntary obedience. Beyond that, it must destroy.

Has God revealed to us how sin shall come to its end; how his universe is to be made holy? We believe he has. We read in his Word that those who in this life choose to forsake sin, to them he will give eternal life in the holy hereafter; that those who in this life prove to be incorrigible, he will destroy; that man is now on probation, being tested; and that the summing up of this probation in the awards of the judgment day will be final.

This latter conclusion the Restorationist denies. We will note some of his objections. He shows that the Greek adjective *aionios*, in the phrase "everlasting punishment," of Matt. 25.46, does not necessarily and always mean everlasting. Right there, certainly. The question is, does it mean everlasting in this case? A critical Greek scholar, well known to be such, well states the meaning of the word *aionios*:

"It uniformly denotes, not 'duration without end,' but permanent duration; permanent according to the nature of the subject, covering in one case merely the period during which a blasted fig-tree stands, and in another the eternity of our Lord. To affirm that it always implies duration without end, is as contrary to fact as to affirm that it never does."

See page 16 of "Is Eternal Punishment Endless? By an Orthodox Minister of the Gospel; "Lockwood, Brooks & Co., Boston, 1876. The author shows himself a thorough scholar, conscientious and fearless, scrupulously guarding against the common fault of assuming too much from any Scripture. His work is clear, concise, and admirable as far as it goes. He concludes that the duration of "aionian" punishment is unrevealed.

Here it is acknowledged that the word *aianios* may express duration without end. Whether in any given case it does or does not, is to be decided by the attendant circumstances. In the passage from Matthew, "And these shall go away into eternal [*aionios*] punishment, but the righteous into life eternal "(*aianios*), the Greek adjective *aionios*, qualifying the life of the righteous, confessedly takes its strongest meaning of endless duration. Does not this fix the meaning of the word in the adjoining clause, where it is used likewise to qualify the punishment of the wicked? Is it reasonable, or indeed conceivable, that in the one sentence the word should present two meanings the most opposite possible - in one instance denoting duration finite; in the next, duration infinite? And this, when the antithesis of the sentence evidently rests, not on the qualifying word, but on punishment, as opposed to life. And, moreover, in what the Bible defines the punishment to be, viz., death, there is nothing in "the nature of the subject "necessarily forbidding to the word, in this instance, its strongest meaning, endless.

Another difficult passage for the Restorationist is John 3.36: "He that believeth .not shall not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him." This is explained to mean no more than that "he shall not see life while he remains in unbelief; the wrath of God abides on him while he remains an unbeliever." But what if he die in unbelief?

To extend the opportunity of exercising saving faith into the next world, is certainly to go beyond what revelation has given us. Nay, if we say that all are then to believe and be restored, it is to deny it. For the Lord Jesus has told us, Matt. 7.17, "Wide is the gate [*Greek pyle*], and broad the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat. Because strait is the gate and narrow the way that leadeth unto life, and FEW THERE BE THAT FIND IT." If all were, sooner or later, to find the way of faith leading unto life - be their course more or less direct - our Lord would not, could not, thus have spoken. Again, when he was asked, Luke 13.23, 24; "Lord, are there few that be saved [exactly, if few are those being saved]?" he replies, "Strive [*Greek agonisethe*, agonize] to enter in at the strait gate [*Greek thura*, door], for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in and shall not be able, when [*Greek aph'ou*] once the master of the house is risen up and hath shut to the door "[*Greek thura*]. If ever that door were to be opened to them again, even in a far off age, to the query "if those being saved are few?" so absolute a reply could never have been returned, "Many, I say unto you, shall not be able to enter in." Or, if that door is, in reality, never to be shut in the future, how could the Lord so minutely detail the future pleading and peremptory dismissal of the "many "shut out?"

No, there is no escape for those who accept the false dogma of unending immortality. If all men are immortal, if all live forever, the doctrine that all may, or are to be restored finally, however preferable to the doctrine of unending suffering, cannot take the place of the latter, except by recklessly rejecting much of the revelation God has given us. If the punishment is suffering, not literal destruction, it is endless suffering. The few find the way of life, Christ tells us - the few receive the gift of God, eternal life. The many will not be able to enter the shut door, shut upon those who would not enter while it was open to them, who would not seek for mercy, till the Judge pronounces sentence upon them.

And yet does not the Bible declare the times of "the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets since the world began? "Is there not a time to come when rebellion against God's authority shall be quelled, "whet! he shall have put down all rule, and authority, and power," and when "God shall be all in all," and "every curse shall be no more "? Who can doubt it? And as clearly does God's word tell us how this glorious consummation, utterly hopeless on the so-called orthodox view, is to be brought about. "Every soul, who will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people;" Acts 3.23. These, as natural brute beasts, shall utterly perish; 2 Pet. 2.12. "Whose end is destruction;" Phil. 3.19. "Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death," (Jas. 1.15) - a death, which ends forever the sinner and his sin.

6. Removes A Great Cause Of Infidelity.

We charge against the popular theology that it tends to make men infidels. So hard and untruthful are its presentations of our loving Father in heaven, that some who believe in a Supreme Being, deny that the God of the Bible, as he is taught to them, can be that One. So contradictory the interpretations it gives of the Holy Word, that men deny it can be a revelation from the Supreme one.

Erroneous, at best, is the idea our fallen humanity forms of its Creator and constant Benefactor. It is not that the Father has to be reconciled to us by the sacrifice of his Son, it is we that have to be reconciled to God. "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation: to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself;" 2 Cor. 5.18, 19. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but should have everlasting life;" Jn. 3.16. Yet, if God is what popular theology represents him to be in his treatment of the wicked, what becomes of his mercy and love, or of his wisdom?

Many a rejector of the Bible has been trained amid Christian surroundings. He confesses that doubts and then denial of that theory of future punishment taught him was the starting-point, whence he was led entirely to deny the Bible as a revelation from God. He recognizes a God from his works; he cannot deny that he has sinned against him; but so great a Being must also be good, and in the future life he trusts all will be well.

Strange that one priding himself upon his reason, too wise to be blinded as others by religious errors, should not use a little more of that reason on the problem before him. If really the independent thinker he fancies himself, it would seem he ought to have hit upon the correct solution of his difficulties. Those very Bible contradictions, of which he complains, might give him a possible clue. May it not be there is some mistake in his understanding of the Bible? May it not be that of a book, which has such a history and has wrought so marvelous results, such as would lead one to investigate whether it be not of God, may it not be he has taken his ideas of it too much at second-hand? This independent thinker declares he is not going to believe anything on mere hearsay, anything he cannot see a reason for. We confess to a feeling of respect for the position he assumes. He is the last one to accept an important doctrine on insufficient grounds. But what becomes of the pride of his reasoning, when we find his idea of the future is based on his belief in inherent immortality? He believes that which confessedly cannot be known except through revelation, and of which he confesses to have no revelation. Ask him why he believes, The only reason he can give is because mankind generally have believed it; that is, he believes because others have believed. it, because others say it is so! O empty reason!

It may be he will say that he and others rest their faith on the evident unfinished condition of things here, and especially on the feeling deep within us, that we are made for immortality. But what does all this prove? Or at most, what more than that all are created with the capacity, for a future life, which, if endless, reason would judge should only be given to those found fitted for it? Certainly endless existence, to those who do not make a right use of it, is no blessing either to them or to others. And all nature around us proclaims the survival of the fittest, the extinction of the unfit.

If, then, instead of irrationally rejecting the Bible as unworthy of credence, the sceptic will review his own traditional belief, he will certainly make such use of his God-given reason as may lead him to a fitness for the future world. If he will consent to investigate and reason for himself, and not take the Word of God as others have thought it out for him, or as modern theology presents it for his acceptance, he will find its contradictions and ambiguities vanish. He will find it denies the dogma of unconditional immortality; and that rejected, it stands forth in harmony with itself, and with our sense of what is reasonable. He will find the God of the Bible is indeed a God of mercy and of love infinite, a love so passing knowledge that our feeble reason quails before it. He will find the Almighty, as revealed, is also a God of justice and of infinite holiness, who will not endure sin when the hope has passed of the sinner's reform. And he will behold the infinite wisdom of God's plan of redemption, how he can be "just, and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." And, seeking pardon for his sins in God's appointed and revealed way, he may become an heir of the inheritance of the holy ones in the life forever, which is revealed unto those who now have the opportunity to prepare for it.

7. The Errors Of Romanism Are Utterly Refuted.

That Church well knows it loses all hold of one who reads the Word of God for himself, believing it means just what it says. Therefore it is so careful to keep the Bible from the common people. And those who would put it into their hands, like that old English reformer, Tyndale, it persecutes and burns at the stake, where it has the power. In the early days of printing, it did, not hesitate to manifest its antagonism to God's Word by publicly burning all copies of the Scripture in the common tongue which it could lay hands upon. To the Church, which virtually worships our Lord's mother, and other holy ones of the past, the Bible is indeed a dreaded book, for it declares these objects of its worship to be now unconscious in death.

It is not difficult to understand why the Protestant Reformation was stayed in its onward career - for it gave up its vantage ground, it surrendered to the enemy. Although professing to hold up God's Word as supreme, it yielded that great principle, and with it largely the truth itself. It bowed before the authority of man, and accepted again Satan's false assertion that all men are immortal.

And now the so-called orthodox Protestant finds his hands tied in his contests with the Romanist. Certainly the latter has the advantage of him on the question of the invocation of dead saints, which leads to that worship. Thus he inquires, "May we not ask a friend on earth to pray to God for us? "Certainly." And as David says, 'If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me,' then the holier and freer from sin that friend, the more may I seek his intercession?" Certainly. "Then, assuming that friend is now perfectly holy and in the immediate presence of God, why should I not all the more ask him to pray for me, since you find no precept in the Bible to forbid that?" The argument is irresistible on that assumption.

But show him that the Word of God declares that the dead are now in the sleep of death, in the grave, where is neither thought, nor work, nor device, nor wisdom, nor knowledge, and he is silenced. Prove to him that the Word of God shows that the corner-stone of his ecclesiastical edifice is in reality the lie of the Evil one, "Ye shall not surely die;" and if he prizes God's Word above human tradition, he will come out and separate himself from the coming ruin, which must surely overtake that great system of error.

So also with the errors of Spiritualism, as it is called; and so with the vagaries of Swedenborg, in which the so-called orthodox method of allegorically, or figuratively, interpreting the words of Holy Writ seems to have blossomed out, and run to seed. Both together read their death-warrant, if the Bible is understood as it has been written.

8. A Great Help to Missions.

Not alone in the encounter with these false religions, but also in the WORK OF MISSIONS generally, this reformed belief would be found most helpful. It puts the missionary at a fearful disadvantage to be compelled to tell, for instance, an intelligent Hindoo: "The true God, whom I declare unto you, offers to make you eternally happy; but your father and all your ancestors, because, as you confess, they did wrong, although not at the time realizing their peril, he is now tormenting, and will to all eternity." "How can I be sure," he may well reply, "that such is the true God? Why, your own showing makes him worse than our Juggernaut, who slays, but doh not torture eternally, his victims. I prefer to take my chances with the millions who have gone before me."

The story is told of a priest in Siam, who asked an American missionary how long his God tormented bad men in a future state. When answered "Forever," he replied, "Our god torments the worst of men only one thousand years, so we will not have your American God in Siam."

Nothing but the religion of Christ could have stood this strain which man has put upon it! But let the missionary be able to say: "I bring you glad tidings of a life to come, to be obtained only through a loving Savior. For your parents this good news has come too late, and they have lost the life; but, at the resurrection, God will not punish them above what they deserve." The thought of their second death, with its attendant pain of dying, mercifully moderated according to their guilt, he can endure; but he cannot bear the thought of their suffering to all eternity. Such a message brings hope to him, without the accompaniment of unending despair and woe for his loved ones.

Moreover, to us all, the Bible doctrine gives a more correct, and so a more hopeful, view of what we are to expect in mission work, whether at home or abroad. For some reason, the interest in the work thirty years ago has not been sustained; certainly it has not kept pace with the enlarging field, and the increasing financial ability of the churches. May not this, in part at least, be due to disappointed, because mistaken, expectations? The writer remembers when, anticipating that the world was to be made subject to Christ before his coming, he fancied he saw that result almost attained. But more sober thought beholds a thousand millions (say) on earth- two hundred millions in India, three hundred millions in China, and a little skirmishing on the outside of this mighty mass. Turning to nominally Protestant lands, how few with an eye single to the Master's work! And the end would seem far off.

But we look into the Word of God, and we learn what he really is now doing: "visiting the Gentiles, to take out of them d people for his name; "Acts 15.14. We see it is all foretold; "in the last days perilous times shall come" for our faith; - "when the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Luke 18.8. As the flood came upon an ungodly world, as the tempest of fire on Sodom (Luke 17.26-30), so his coming will burst upon those the least expecting it. It is "By the brightness of his coming, that the wicked one," in Paul's day yet to be revealed, "shall be destroyed;" 2 Thess. 2.8. And with a new light we now read the entire promise of the world to Christ: "Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen [the nations] for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. THOU shalt break them with a rod of iron; THOU shalt dash them to pieces like a potter's vessel;" Psalm 2.8, 9.

And so we hopefully plod on, nothing daunted by present small results, knowing what we are to expect, and that God's great purpose is being carried out. If he so patiently waits through the centuries, bearing with all the fruits of sin, amid seeming disappointments and reverses, while his work for this present age, the testing, the selecting and rejecting, still goes on, as he is taking out of the nations a people to his name, we also are content to work, and wait, and watch; - working with him to reach the perishing; watching for him till, his preparatory work completed, he comes to triumph over every foe!

9. The long-sought Christian unity.

The Bible doctrine of the soul will also be found most helpful in its influence upon our Christian churches themselves. With the simple, literal method of reading God's Word just as written, which its adoption permits, it brings to us the long-sought Christian unity.

The existence of so many Christian denominations, whatever mitigations there may be of the evil, is a sad reproach to our Christianity. Infidels take occasion to decry our faith, and the inexcusable ambiguity of its standard, which can be understood in so many different ways. Christians mourn over the needless expenditure of denominational force, and the animosity and rivalries between those whose great duty it is to love one another. Christ prayed that his people may be one; and the answer to that prayer, though long delayed, must yet come.

What is the cause of all this diversity in Christian belief? It is traceable to the presence in the Christian Church of that fruitful source of evil, the dogma of unconditional immortality. To sustain a doctrine so explicitly denied in Holy Writ, it has become necessary to reject the natural meaning of many passages, and to search out some allegorical, or figurative, meaning which may be assumed to lie hidden in the passage. Thus license is given to interpret all doctrines of the Bible after the same allegorical fashion, and it may be with the greatest divergence of views. For the literal, or natural, meaning is but one; if that is rejected on insufficient grounds, the figurative meaning adopted varies according to the bent of each individual. Thus also the habit is formed, no doubt unwittingly, in our religious teachers of every denomination, of passing over the natural meaning of a passage, and of reasoning out some derived meaning. One might almost think that the Bible, like the Eleusinian and other mysteries of the ancient mythology, had one meaning for the common people, another for the initiated.

There is a remedy for this variance of denominational beliefs. It is very simple, and yet very radical. However much it may conflict with creeds and theories of human formation, let individual Christians agree that they will be governed in their understanding, of Holy Scripture by the simple rule they follow with regard to all other writings, viz., that they will not accept of the figurative meaning till the possibility of the natural meaning is unquestionably exhausted. If the Bible be thus accepted in the natural meaning of its language, it will everywhere agree with itself, and thus, their standard of truth no longer variable, Christians will likewise agree with one another. Will you thus consent to do your part towards the fulfilment of Christ's prayer, or, will you endeavor to make it and his word void, through continued subserviency to human tradition?

10. A True Interest In Our Physical Well-Being.

We all approve the sentiment that "The proper study of mankind is man." "Gnothi seauton," know thyself, was a favorite maxim of Greek philosophers. In this study of ourselves, all will agree that it is needful that we start right, that we get a correct conception of what we actually are.

Now it is impressed upon us from childhood that we are compound beings, made up of a body and a soul. The soul- the real man, something immaterial, which thinks and acts- is imprisoned, so it would seem, in the body, and is thus restrained of its full powers, till death releases us from this imprisonment. The body, on this view, is of comparatively little account, deserving of but little care or thought. It may expect to receive more or less abuse, for it is but a shell, or case, in fact, an incumbrance, which we must be hampered with, carrying it about with us, till our time comes to "shuffle off this mortal coil," and we immortals are free at last.

We note, on this way of thinking, an undesirable sequel to this liberty, that after all it is but temporary. At the inevitable resurrection we must return to our former prison, which, though beautified and improved, has then immortality conferred upon it, and so it becomes our prison eternally. No wonder, with such views, we hear so little in Christian conversation, sermons, or prayers, of that resurrection of which Paul says, "If, by any means, I may attain unto it," in his "seeking after immortality."

Now, we find in Bible study that this despising of the body as a clog, a hindrance to us - this universal degrading of the material, and exaltation of the immaterial -which some seem to think essential to true religion, all this belongs to our modern, not to the ancient, theology. The Bible knows nothing of it! When God surveyed his material creation, the work of his hands, he pronounced it "very good." Are we better judges than he? Though man's normal powers had been weakened by the sinful excess of generations past, yet the Psalmist says, "I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made, and that my soul knows right well; "Psalm 139.14. What did he mean by "I"? Certainly not the immaterial nothingness, to which the word soul is to-day applied. For he goes on to say, "My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth." Is not his reference here to the creating in ages past, deep in Nature's laboratory, of the very particles of matter, which the Divine mind foresaw would be brought forth, in later years, to form the man himself? Surely all the Life we have any experience of in this world is in a material body; and it is in a body still, that we enter upon the new life of the next world, when it shall come. "There is a natural [soul-] body, and there is a spiritual [spirit-] body."

And, moreover, this human organism we so disparage and condemn, how highly has it been honored, and what bright gleams of the future glory are reflected upon it, in the marvelous fact that "The WORD was made FLESH! "

John 1.14. "He, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery [Greek harpagmon, freely translated, a thing to be grasped and retained, as a robber his prey] to be equal with God, but . . . was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he became obedient unto death;" Phil. 2.6, 8. And now, having risen from the dead, he has entered as our High Priest into the holiest of all, in fashion as a man, "to appear in the presence of God for us." "And unto them that look for him shall he appear [in like manner,' Acts 1.r i] the second time without sin unto salvation; "Heb. 9.24, 28. Then taking his promised, everlasting dominion, King of. kings and Lord of lords, it is in human form still that the "SON of MAN shall sit upon the throne of his glory;" Matt. 25.31. Thus hath God honored and exalted our material organism. And yet the simple Christian, who reverences his Bible, and trusts its literal statement that the soul is formed of material elements, is opprobriously termed a materialist, as if that were the same as an infidel! Now what practical results ensue from a correct knowledge of ourselves, of our physical being?

As we reflect upon the marvelous skill with which God has constructed this material frame, and how highly he has honored it, even entering himself into its nature, we can but highly esteem that which its Maker so highly esteems. And the Bible reveals to us that the body is not a vile case or prison which invests our independent and noble self, but that it is through the body that we exist at all. We recall the words of the Master: "Handle me, and see that it is I, myself!" If we realize that the man is the soul, that is, Biblically, the organism, and that upon the integrity of his organism his existence depends, then shall we care for and cherish it as we have had little thought of doing heretofore. What we are, what we can do, depends upon the vigor of our organism. And if we accept the Bible truth, that "there is no work or wisdom in the grave," Eccl. 9.10, not only should we be more in earnest to "do with our might what our hand finds to do," but also would we see to it that, by proper care and discipline, the organism is every way well fitted for its work. Parents and teachers would not neglect physical training for the mental, but will act upon that maxim which old-time experience recognized; "Hens sana in corpore sano," a sound mind in a sound body. Laws of health will rise to their due importance, and the individual will recognize his personal amenability to those laws. For unreasonable indulgence of the appetites, excess in eating or drinking, is sin and folly; sin, which evidently is visited upon the soul itself; which affects the well-being of the organism. And so of sinful indulgences of youth, which the world heedlessly styles "sowing of wild oats; "of such Peter speaks: "Abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul," the organism, and so the integrity and existence of the man. The voice of wisdom warns us: "He that sinned against me wronged his own soul; all they that hate me love death;" Prov. 8.36.

11. It Tends To Develop Personal Holiness.

Last, but not least, we note that the Bible doctrine of the soul arouses a deeper interest in our moral welfare. Like all Scripture truth, it tends to develop personal holiness.

"Be not conformed to this world;" "come out from among them and be ye separate," is the command of our Lord to "his people," whom he would "purify unto himself, a peculiar people, zealous of good works." But where is the church of the present day? Is it not so far below Apostolic standard and example that, were Christ now to appear, he might ask of many of us, "What do ye more than others?"

Why is the prevailing type of piety so low? It is "through the deceitfulness of sin." The arch-deceiver's original lie, the influence of which we have been tracing and combating in these pages, is found also exerting its baleful influence in the formation of Christian character. Each one who believes that if he sin he "will not surely die," for immortality is his by virtue of his creation, is too ready to think that a God of mercy will not condemn an immortal being to endless torment, if only in this life he can obtain the slightest semblance of yielding to his authority. And the formal act of acknowledging the supremacy of Jehovah, by uniting with his visible church, seems to him to have fulfilled such condition.

But the Bible-what has it to say on this point? "To those who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for immortality, God will render eternal life;" Rom. 2.7. Even Paul, towards the close of that wonderful life of self-sacrifice, could say (Phil. 3.14) "If by any means [if possibly] I may attain unto the resurrection of the dead: "attain to that Ex-anastasis, the resurrection from out the dead ones, "the first resurrection "of those who shall not be hurt of the second death. ,For this he is yet to strive and press forward in the race, to reach the prize, "the gift of God, eternal life," lest when he had preached to others, he himself should be found unapproved. It is they who are worthy, the Lord says, who shall walk with him in white (Rev. 3.4).

God is now choosing out of the Gentiles a people for his name (Acts 15.14), to whom he will give life through Christ, the Life-Giver. To these who shall be "accounted worthy to attain that world, the children of God, the children of the resurrection," (Luke 20.35, 36); to them "shall be given the kingdom, and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven;" Dan. 7.27. For such high stations of honor and usefulness, God will not accept of any whose character does not stand the test of its trial here. He is not under obligation, as we have been virtually taught, to glorify us, or else to torment us forever. Those found not worthy, he "will blot out their names out of the book of life; "an everlasting destruction, which leaves "neither root nor branch."

Solemn, indeed, the thought! Molding our character here day by day, as death finds us, so will that character be, when, at the great Day, God restores to us "the breath of life." "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; he that is righteous, let him be righteous still;" Rev. 22.11.

"As the tree falls, so shall it lie." That solemn moment is ever near. The true doctrine of the soul teaches, that to the individual his next conscious moment after death is the resurrection morning. Death may befall us at any moment. The next conscious moment, and that great Day has come. Ah! on this view how near the Judgment "Behold, the Judge stands before the door!" "Watch ye! watch ye! is continually ringing in our ears; give all diligence to make your calling and election sure! For it is the Master's word: "Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven."

CHAPTER 15

Objections to the Bible Doctrine, from without the Bible.

THE objections to the Bible doctrine of the soul, which purported to be based upon the Bible, have already been carefully examined, and the fallacy of their pretensions exposed. It was found they were nothing better than inferences, deduced 'from a few passages, which, in some cases, were incorrectly rendered, and that the inference, in every case, was in conflict with the context, and with the uniform testimony of other Scriptures. But there are some objections from outside the Bible, which, though thus from outside the only source of any real authority, may be thought worthy of notice here.

1. Annihilationism.

An objection is suggested, rather than expressed, in the name "annihilationism," popularly given to this doctrine.

This objection has its origin in a confounding of two shades of meaning in the word. In two ways, anything may be said to be annihilated: either the particles of matter of which it is composed are themselves destroyed, or else is annihilated the present form under which it exists, as a mass of cohering matter, or as an organized object. We know nothing whatever of the former, the absolute mode of annihilation. We have no examples of such. It is but an abstract conception of that return to nothing, out of which, we suppose, all material things were spoken into being. The second mode of annihilation embraces all cases of actual destruction with which we are familiar. Take the example used by John the Baptist, to illustrate the doom of the wicked - the tree hewn down and cast into the fire. No one imagines the elementary particles of the tree are absolutely annihilated; it is the organization, that which gives existence and individuality to the tree, which is totally destroyed; it is as a tree that it is annihilated. So a block of marble, reduced to powder, is annihilated as to its existence in a block. Had that block been shaped into a statue, reducing it to powder annihilates the statue.

If the word were always taken in this sense, as only practically it can be, there were no objection to its use in this connection. But it is not so taken. When applied to our doctrine, the absolute meaning is claimed for the word. We are told: "You believe in annihilation, when matter never is annihilated." And further, it is asked: "Where do you find annihilation in the Bible?"

Under these circumstances, one is surprised to observe the word adopted by Pres. Bartlett, to whose logic, or rather lack of it, we were constrained to call attention in Chapter 11. In his elaborate treatise in favor of eternal torment (Life and Death Eternal, Am. Tract Society), he insists that he will call those annihilationists who themselves, as he Confesses to know, protest against the word, as so likely to be misunderstood, that it does not fairly present their views. This is especially surprising in that writer, since, from his freedom in judging the motives of others, whose views differ from his own, one might suppose that he held the monopoly of honest dealing on these questions. On page 5 of his work we read that he considers "annihilationist" "as (not simply a convenient, but) "indeed an indispensable term." Why indispensable? Is it a confession that his argument needs some outside help? that it .puts it into a more hopeful shape, if by using the word annihilationist, with its usual misunderstanding, he can thus assume to array against his antagonist both science, which denies absolute annihilation, and the Bible, wherein the word itself is not found?

But it is evident that science finds no fault with the word annihilate, used in the sense in which alone it expresses the views of the literal destructionist. For such is the language of every-day life; it is the only way in which the word annihilate can be practically used.

And though the word annihilate is not in the Bible, the omission is but verbal. The idea which the word carries in its Latin derivation, ad, to, nail, nothing, is literally expressed. For example, Jer. 10.24 "O Lord, correct me not in anger, lest thou bring me to nothing." The Vulgate, or Latin Version, here presents the word annihilate in its constituent elements: "ne forte ad nihilum redigas me." See also Isa. 29.20; 41.12: "They shall be as nothing, as a thing of naught." Obad. 1.16: "They shall be as though they had not been."

The writer we have quoted may say that the absolute sense is the only one in which the word annihilate can be used in reference to the soul, which, he claims, is immaterial and without organization. But it is the material and organized Biblical soul which we are

considering, not the ideal creation he would substitute therefor: In fact, in his claim that there is no matter in the make-up of the soul, he has already annihilated it in the absolute sense; he thus brings it literally "to nothing."

We are then strictly following Bible usage in our understanding that the execution of the sentence, "The soul that sinned it shall die," will be, not that the elements of which it is composed will be annihilated (no one claims that, nor can it be so inferred), but that its organization will be totally destroyed; so that the individual, as such, no longer exists. He is brought to nothing; in the Biblical sense, he is annihilated.

2. It is materialism.

Again, it is objected: This doctrine is materialistic; it is materialism.

In reality, this is merely an unfounded appeal to prejudice. It is an endeavor to affix to the Bible doctrine the stigma of a name, appropriate perhaps in itself, but which has come technically to include that which this doctrine denies. Webster defines "materialism: the doctrine of the materialist; "and "materialist: one who denies the existence of spiritual substances, and maintains that the soul of man is the result of [rather is] a particular organization of matter in the body." According to Webster, then, the doctrine we are considering is not materialism. It conforms to the latter part of the definition, but not to the former; it does not "deny the existence of spiritual substances."

But we may ask: Is that definition of Webster correct in the broad sense of the word? Is there any essential antagonism between materialism and the existence of spiritual substances? It is notorious that our theological teachers endeavor to impress upon us such a belief, but in this, are they not themselves in antagonism to the inspired Apostle? Paul writes of a "spiritual body; "thus combining in one phrase the spiritual and the material: as there is our present material body, so there will be a future spiritual body; 1 Cor. 15.44.

In the broad sense of the word, in the Biblical, the Apostolic sense, our doctrine is materialism. But who can say aught against it?

"The Lord God said to Adam, Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return; "Gen. 3.19.

Moses tells us, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground; "Gen. 2.7.

The Psalmist writes, "He remembered that we are dust;" Psalm 103.14. And again (Psalm 30.9), he says, "Thou hast kept me alive, that I should not go down to the pit. When I go down to the pit, shall the dust praise thee?"- that lifeless dust, which I then shall be.

Paul reminds us, "The first man (Adam, a living soul) was of earth, earthy;" 1 Cor. 15.45, 47.

And now, what do modern theologians give us instead of the Bible doctrine we here quote? Immaterialism! That man himself, the real man, is formed of-no matter, of nothing. They decry matter, "that of which the sensible. universe and all sentient bodies are composed "(Webster), as if it contained an inherent essence of evil; though its Maker, at the completion of his work, pronounced it "good." And in its place they seem trying to substitute something, or more exactly a literal nothing; at least, that which is utterly unrecognizable by the senses God has given us; of which, therefore, we can have no possible knowledge save through revelation, and of which revelation says nothing! Revelation teaches that our future (spiritual) life is to be in a body, as is the life of the angels now (Luke 20.36), and as was our Lord's after his resurrection. Paul tells us that those in the spiritual body are to be in the image of the Lord from heaven. See 1 Cor. 15.47-49.

But our teachers may ask, Is there nothing in Revelation teaching immaterialism? Does not Jn. 4.24 say, "God is a spirit," that is, an immaterial being? They assume thus, for the Bible does not teach it, that spirit is a synonym of what is. immaterial. Spirit-body, then, were an immaterial body, composed of im-material matter! But that solitary passage in John has no bearing whatever on the question. At best, it rests on a question of translation, with the immediate context against it. The Greek is pneuma ho theos; no article with spirit, which is then to be translated without any article, or with our indefinite article, according to the sense and context. Translated, then, as the same word is translated just before and just after, and in direct connection, we read: "The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth. God is spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit [not, in a spirit] and in truth." God is spirit, life itself; and so must the true worshipper worship him, with that life which proceeded from and returns to God, its giver.

Ere the leaders of religious thought, in our theological seminaries and elsewhere, venture to teach the immaterialism of the present day, or apply to the contrary doctrine epithets appealing to a prejudice founded on misconception, it would seem their duty to account in some reasonable way for the materialism of the passages above quoted, and so many like them. It is but a questionable compliment to the hearer's intellect, to tell him that in those passages the word man, and those personal pronouns, refer only to man's body, unless they are prepared to allow that the body is the man himself!

Some there are who have contemptuously termed this Bible doctrine of the soul dust-theology. We simply say, Let it stand as that, or as materialism. For we have shown that it is the materialism of the Bible. It rests upon an authority man cannot assail. "Let the potsherd strive with the potsherd of the earth; woe to him that strives with his Maker! Shall the clay say to him that fashioned it, What makes thou?" Isa. 45.9.

3. The immoral tendency of this doctrine!

ANOTHER OBJECTION, growing out of the preceding, and a favorite with those who cannot find Bible arguments, is the immoral tendency of this doctrine!

This objection is thus set forth, by Rev. N. L. Rice, D. D., in a publication of the American Presbyterian Board. The doctrine, he informs us, "logically, involves the denial of the possibility of sin and holiness in man. For matter," as he says, "is incapable of voluntary action, and, of course, of moral action."

Perhaps, where that writer says "logically "he might have said theoretically, for, practically, the doctrine has not been found to "deny the possibility of holiness in man; "rather, it tends to develop holiness, as shown Chapter 14, section 2. Evidently, he has overlooked an essential element in logical reasoning: - one's premises must be correct, before his conclusion is a "logical "one. It is his opinion that "matter is incapable of voluntary action." Ere he establishes the correctness of that premise, he has a little controversy to settle with Holy Writ, wherein we read "To dust shalt thou return;"- "When I go down to the pit, shall the dust praise Thee;" - "He remembers that we are dust."

Then, he must annihilate the position, held by so many physiologists, and which facts seem to sustain, that thought is generated by the brain. The developing faculties of the child, keeping pace with the development of its maturing brain; its intellect developed and strengthened by exercises, as other bodily functions; the vigor of a man's intellect proportioned to the depth and extent of the cortical, or cell portion, of his brain; injury of the brain attended by limitation of the mental faculties: all go to show the absolute dependence of our thoughts upon the function of this material organ; as we learn, from the revealed Word, that they perish altogether when this organ ceases to act; Psalm 146.4. And then, he may be asked to explain what are known as strictly automatic actions, performed entirely without one's consciousness; as in the familiar instance where a writer, reviewing his MSS., finds that, for the word he intended, he has substituted another, correctly written and spelled, of which he had' not a thought. And then, he must account for the fact of any "voluntary action" at all, in the. lower animals, which, his theology tells us, are purely material; and, especially, for the premeditation and reason displayed by the dog, the horse, the elephant, and .other lower animals; which reasoning faculty, as in man's case, is developed by education. Surely, he will not assign an "intellectual soul" to these animals!

The same writer argues for an immaterial entity in matt by the assumption, contrary to the experience of every one, that the mind (by which we judge he means the "ego," the personality), is never unconscious in sleep. But wo know better; we know we have been unconscious. How often one sleeps for an hour or two, and, on awakening, supposes he had just fallen asleep; where was consciousness all that time? He brings forward what he thinks two proofs of his position: first, the abnormal condition of somnambulism, where one portion of the brain is aroused even to exalted action, while the functions of other portions are held in abeyance. Does he claim to demonstrate to us the facts of ordinary, healthy life from this diseased condition? That, in some cases, would prove as well a dual existence for the individual; so strangely different are his mental powers and moral instincts in the one state, from what they are in the other. His second proof is the fact that we dream in sleep, in which state, then, he would assume, that we are all the time conscious, and sometimes are conscious of it! But is it not well known that sound sleep is dreamless? One does not dream, except from some cause he is disturbed; then the brain is partially roused to consciousness and activity; and yet even then but partially, as shown by the usual confusion of thought in dreams.

But take his proposition that sleep affects the body only, not the mind, and see where it brings us out. The argument then is:

Sleep acts on the body, not on the mind;
But profound sleep takes away consciousness;
Therefore, consciousness is an attribute of the body, not of the mind!

A query thrusts itself upon us here, whether indeed the study of modern theology, involving the unavoidable necessity of awkwardly reconciling the doctrine of inherent immortality with opposing Bible statements, does not tend to restrain habits of close observation and exact reasoning, which otherwise one might possess. Surely, it cannot be beneficial to one's intellect to pass through life, striving, however, honestly, to persuade one's self and others that any error is a truth.

An incident in the experience of the present President of Carleton College, Minn., so clearly shows that the very existence, of one faculty, memory, depends upon a special function of the brain, that we introduce it here. A few years since, while in Hartford, Conn., in riding with the President of the Deaf and Dumb Asylum of that city, their vehicle was struck by a passing locomotive, his companion was killed outright, and he, himself, by a severe blow on the head, was knocked senseless. He remained unconscious for

some two or three days-every bodily function arrested except those essential to life, and these in utmost jeopardy. On coming to himself, he had no recollection of the accident, and, what is especially to be noted, he had no memory, not alone of the collision or of any apprehended danger of it, but of everything that happened a number of minutes previous to it. The last of his recollection was stepping into the carriage, up to which point his memory was as perfect as ever.

How can this be explained? Certainly it was not that the collision itself, or the fearful anticipation, however momentary, did not make a sufficiently powerful impression upon the mental faculty, or that there were no incidents in the ride to the spot of sufficient interest to be retained. It would seem to show that something beyond this is required; that the impression upon the brain, be it of a fact or of a thought, must be somehow appropriated, worked up, and finally stored away (perhaps in one of those microscopic cells, which in such myriads crowd the cortical or essential substance of the brain), ere memory of an event can exist at all. If, through alteration of its structure or violence done to it, the brain is unable to complete this needful operation, then there is no resultant memory. So, in the case of any other bodily function - for example, the secretion of bile; it is not enough that the elements of that secretion be supplied to the liver; that organ has still its own special work to do ere the bile is elaborated.

We daily witness a modified form of the experience here related, in very elderly people, who tenaciously retain the memory of what the brain stored away in early life, while its functional activity was in full vigor; but when this faculty is impaired or lost by age, they are wholly unable to recall the events even of the day before. On the theory that man's brain is but the material instrument of an immaterial something, through which the latter acts upon the external world, we can understand how the power of outward communication might be lost; but before this takes place, how could the impaired function of the mere instrument affect the communing of this internal entity with itself, on facts of its own past history? If this immaterial something has no consciousness of its own past - that is, if it does not even know itself, except through the brain, we should conclude that when the brain entirely ceases to act it would neither know itself nor anything else. And such is the statement of Holy Writ, as we have already seen.

4. The fear of future punishment.

Again, IT IS OBJECTED that this doctrine of literal destruction takes away the fear of future punishment; that it robs the law of its terrors. To awaken the sinner, is it indeed necessary to threaten him with such horrors as the human mind cannot conceive, nor endure the thought of? It is a fearful thing to fall, as a sinner, into the hands of the living God, who can, and will destroy the whole being in the fires of hell. Is it nothing - the loss of existence forever? Is it nothing-the looking forward to that fearful day of God's wrath, "that shall burn as an oven," and utterly consume the wicked? And yet this doom is not such as would make the redeemed question the justice and mercy of their Heavenly Father: it is not the frightful, imaginary hell, which would send up shrieks and groans forever, to mingle even with the harmonies of heaven! In reality, the penalty popularly attached to sin overleaps its mark. It is so excessive that the sinner, feeling he does not &serve it, will not believe that it can ever be executed. Or if, as in the case of the more unthinking, he really believes in eternal torment, he quiets himself with the thought that a God of mercy must be so reluctant to inflict such a penalty, that he will, at the last moment, gladly accept of, even the semblance of repentance.

5. In the grave till the resurrection.

ANOTHER OBJECTION is founded upon our natural repugnance to lying in the grave till the resurrection. To the survivors, it is indeed a sad thought; for in truth, death is "the last enemy," notwithstanding hymns may sing of the angel Death, who brings us to our God; and Young, in his "Night Thoughts," may even hail our dreaded foe as the "Prince of Peace! "But this sleep - what is it to the sleeper himself? Closing his eyes to earth, at his next conscious moment, the trump of God, on the resurrection morning, peals through the chambers of the dead, and calls him from his silent dwelling place. Do we call it gloomy to lay ourselves down at night, and soundly, unconsciously sleep till the morning bell arouses us from slumber to a new day? If that sleep has been dreamless; undisturbed, the bedtime and the waking hour are brought into juxtaposition;-and the same were the case, were that interval prolonged to years or to centuries. For, to the sleeping, time is annihilated; and so to Adam it will be the same as to the last to whom death comes. Each will deem it to be but the instant after Death's slumber overtook them.

The thought of this actual sleep of the dead was at first most uncomfortable to the writer, with his early training. But recently, he has had occasion to test his present belief, when, by a surgical disease, and so with unclouded intellect, he was brought to the edge of the grave - life for a fortnight but trembling in the balance, at one time, apparently, but a few hours of it remaining. It seemed sad to bid so early a farewell to life, it was painful to leave loved ones, but he felt he could peacefully fall asleep, in the watchful care of One who had brought him hitherto, and in the joyous assurance that to him the next conscious instant after death would be the great Day of Reward, when we see him, "whom not having seen we love." For we have his word, "because I live ye shall live also," and "I will come again and receive you to myself." In that hour when heart and flesh were failing, it was a joy to be assured his hope was resting, not on uncertain human tradition, but on the sure word of God, and to feel the force of those words, "I know in whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that Day."

Jesus said to John the Revelator, Rev. 22:20: "I come quickly!" How quickly? If six months were to intervene here John should sleep in death, it were to the Apostles just six months to that coming day of the Lord. Nay, rather, on this view, how solemn, how imposing the thought that the day of Judgment is just before any one of us: "The Judge stands before the door;" Jas. 5:9. For, by fire, by flood,

by sudden violence, our life may at any moment be taken - the next conscious moment and the Judge has come! With this thought in mind, how appropriate our Lord's warning; "Watch, therefore; for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come;" Matt. 24.42.

6. But a final objection awaits us.

The advocate of popular theology has failed in his appeals to Scripture. Its uniform testimony, taken as it stands, goes against him. But he has a last resort. He questions whether that meaning of Scripture, which it bears on its face, is the correct one. In vain we show him that this understanding of Scripture but follows the uniform law of the literal and the figurative, which invariably governs our understanding of all other written language. He triumphantly inquires: "If this be the correct understanding of Scripture language, if this be really the Bible doctrine, why have not our religious teachers and Christians generally so understood it? Why did not such a one, of blessed memory, preach it?"

Let us see what this objection amounts to.

We observe, at the outset, that it is an appeal to mere human authority. God has given us our intellect, and in our hands placed his book of truth, that we may judge of it as we are to be judged - each for himself. But we are asked to yield this right and duty, and to receive God's truth at the dictation of fellow-mortals. And for this the appeal is not to our reason, but to the presumption that numbers must be in the right.

An apparent Scripture basis is sometimes adroitly suggested for this course in the reference to a promise of Jn. 16.13, the Spirit "will guide you into all truth." The argument, then, were this:

God has promised his Spirit to guide believers into all truth:

But many believers, good and true men, have not been guided into this doctrine:

Therefore, this doctrine is not included in "all truth."

The argument looks fair, but it is easy to see there is a flaw in it. Else, as the truth is one and the same, honest and true believers, guided by the Spirit, would all be of one mind on points of Christian doctrine, which notoriously is not the case. And such an argument would arrest every work of reform. Luther would have been asked: "Has not God promised his Spirit to his church, to guide them into all truth? Other good men do not understand the truth as you do. Is it not your duty to yield your own convictions to the authority of a church divinely guided? "Thus, ere it began, any investigation into truth were checked.

Where, then, is the error in this argument? It lies in our understanding of "all truth; "one of the terms of its major premise. This evidently cannot be taken absolutely; it does not include physical; plainly it must be restricted to religious truth. But obvious facts require a still further restriction. The honesty of Luther and of Zwingle we cannot doubt. Yet they were never guided to see alike in the question of the real presence in the -sacramental bread. Luther, for some reason here ignoring the law of the literal and the figurative, believed Christ's words, "This is my body," were literal; Zwingle more correctly recognized them as figurative.

The context of Jn. 16.13 shows us that the promised Spirit, in this guiding into all truth, is to testify of Christ. Here, then, is the needful restriction. The Spirit is promised to guide the believer into the truth of Christ; into "all truth," then, essential to his salvation: embracing his guilt and utter helplessness; his need of an atonement; the fulness of Christ's redemption; and God's willingness to freely forgive and accept all in Christ. With such necessary restriction, no one questions the correctness of the syllogism and of its conclusion. Into all truth, essential to salvation, the Spirit will guide every honest inquirer.

But so understanding it, the argument is worthless as against the Bible doctrine of the soul. For that doctrine is not one essential to our salvation. Its belief may tend to lead to, as its denial, may tend to lead from, Christ, but one actually accepts of the Savior from sin, irrespective of his belief in, or rejection of, the doctrine of the soul. But will not God guide the Christian inquirer into this doctrine, if it be a truth? And are not those who reject the doctrine honest and earnest in it? Yes, in rejecting
284 Non-Biblical Objections Answered.

it they are; but is inquiring into it, God forbids us- to judge any man's inner motive; he alone is the searcher of hearts. We cannot say, in things not essential to salvation, that he will necessarily overcome all prejudice, and the power of early and persistent education. Yet we do believe that any one who, humbly laying aside the pride of his own learning and acquirements, laying aside his own will, receives the truth as a little child, as a helpless sinner receives his pardon from his Maker, we believe that such a one "Searching for truth as for hid treasure," will be led to see that the word of revelation is full of this doctrine.

We may insist upon this requirement of entire self-abnegation, for prominent religious leaders have not always displayed such doctrinal questions. In that controversy before alluded to between Luther and Zwingle, the former did not display the teachable spirit

which every man should possess. When his positions had been refuted by Zwingle, he fell back upon one dogged response; pointing to the words which, just before the interview, he had chalked on the table before them, "hoc est corpus meum" (this is my body), he but reiterated, again and again, the sentence in dispute. Man's intellect cannot reason with one in such a frame of mind, nor will the Spirit of God. And (we say it in all charity and in all sadness) such is too much the spirit in which the Bible proof of this doctrine is met by many of our religious leaders. When their attention is called to it, their desire seems to be rather to sustain their position than to discover whether they really are in the truth. Many stay themselves on their previous education, retiring behind the question, by which our Lord's truth was -itself met (directed not against the doctrine, but against the individual holding it), "Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?"

And yet, it is said, this doctrine, though not essential, you claim is of very great importance, reaching, as it does, into all departments of Christian truth. Why has God suffered so important a doctrine to escape the notice of so many earnest men?

Ah I it is but the old question, Why is sin permitted in any form? To ignore, or conceal, the truth is Satan's favorite method of operation. He began in Eden by misrepresenting the goodness of God. He asks, "Yea [is it possible], hath God said, ye shall not eat of all the trees of the garden?" It was craftily making prominent the restriction, and overlooking the fulness of the permission. God had said, "Of all the trees of the garden, with but one exception, thou mayest freely eat."

So, ever since, it has been the constant endeavor of the Evil One to prevent, or conceal the truth he cannot entirely take away. And in the present world of testing and fitting for eternity, God permits this to a certain extent, but no further.

Do we need proof of this? Look over the past history of revealed truth. How continuously was the work begun in Eden carried out. The truths of the real Creator, and of man's dependence on him, were ere long hidden away from man's sight. The very cherubic symbols, showing what man may become in his association with deity, so took the place in men's minds of the one only object of worship, that the world became filled with idol images, "graven by art and man's device." While man's accountability to the unseen Holy One was so completely ignored, that a deluge of water was needed to cleanse a world filled with impurity and violence.

Not even God's chosen people have proved themselves reliable conservators of the truth. Hardly had the echoes of those fearful thundering, and of that audible voice proclaiming the law from Sinai, died away-while the cloud even yet rested on its summit - those, but just before trembling in terror, corrupt themselves; and bowing before the work of their own hands, worship a visible symbol of the unseen Jehovah, who had brought them out from the house of bondage. "How oft did they provoke him in the wilderness, and grieve him in the desert!" Psalm 78.40. And such has been the story, successively repeated from that day onward lapse and reform, and relapse into the bondage of error again. How suggestive of the spiritual darkness in the beginning of Josiah's reign (and not of that day only 1) was that announcement of the high priest, "I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord!"

And when at last those who sat in darkness saw a great light; when the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ shone forth -a light to lighten the Gentiles how soon was the light then spread abroad again dimmed I But it was not at once that the church returned to their image worship. Ensnared by the more subtle influence of the most civilized nation of the age, they bowed before the intellectual power of that philosopher whose commanding genius has swayed the world of thought to this day. They yielded up the Bible doctrine of conditional immortality, and from Plato accepted the pagan doctrine of universal immortality. But it was the original lie of the great adversary - that enemy of all truth - that they thus accepted. And having begun by losing the accessory truths of revelation, ere long the darkness of "The Dark Ages" came down upon them, and again priest and people bowed before the idolatrous shrines of their graven images.

From that gross darkness, the Reformation of the 16th century was but partial. The essential truth of justification by faith was plainly brought into sight; but not so clear was the recognition of all the truth that lay in that simple statement of revelation, "The just by his faith shall live." The Bible meaning of that word live, and the results growing therefrom, it would seem Luther understood, in some measure, at least. In his Defense, prop. 27, published 1520, three years after his first public controversy with Rome, he says:

"I permit the Pope to make articles of faith for himself and his faithful: such as that the soul is the substantial form of the human body, that the soul is immortal, with all those monstrous opinions to be found in the Roman dunghill of decretals."

Whatever his subsequent utterances, the preceding stands a record of his convictions at that time. Perhaps the reformer thought it not worth while to carry out the revealed truth to its full length on points not essential.

But what has been the progress of truth since? It has been stayed! It is a wonderful and sad fact that honest and sincere followers of the Lord, claiming to take his word as their only rule of faith and practice, should be found separated into hostile camps, under the lead of differing religious teachers; clinging to the sayings of Calvin or of Arminius, rather than going direct to the pure fount of revealed truth; that Protestants should take up again that very yoke of bondage to human tradition and human authority against which they uttered their protest. In his address to the Pilgrim Fathers embarking for the New World, their old pastor, Robinson, points out to them

the danger threatening the progress of truth, and gives them words of advice - noble words, worthy to be inscribed on the place of meeting of all religious assemblies:

"I charge you, before God and his blessed angels, that you follow me no further than you have seen me follow the Lord Jesus Christ. THE LORD HAS YET MORE TRUTH TO BREAK OUT OF HIS HOLY WORD. I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the Reformed churches, who have come to a period in religion, and will go at present no further than the instruments of their reformation. Luther and Calvin were great and shining lights in their times, yet they penetrated not into the whole counsel of God."

The old story of Satan's craft is still repeated in our day. He would corrupt and pervert whatever truth he cannot entirely take away. And so he makes use of this subserviency to human authority in things divine, which mankind has displayed in every age. In the very objection we are considering, this craft appears in thus making use of the universal tendency to substitute the word of this or that good or distinguished man for the simple word of God.

The argument really amounts to this: The individual Christian, finding popular theology in some respects is apparently not in accord with the Bible, quiets the rising inquiry by the thought that Christians believe generally it, and especially that some former distinguished theologian taught it. Going back to that noted man, we find he was carefully trained in his belief, and was not led to inquire therein, for the great men of his day believed it. And so, through unbroken human succession we trace the peculiarities of modern theology back to Luther and Calvin, and other early reformers; of whom it could hardly be expected to detect and reject every error of the corrupt church of their day; who, in fact, as Pastor Robinson truly said, "did not penetrate into the whole counsel of God." Yet this argument insists that the progress they made must remain the measure of ours; the errors they failed to expose must abide with the church forever!

Such an argument must highly gratify the arch-enemy of all good.

The reader needs to be reminded that, to repress and trammel God's revealed truth, forces are now at work which do not appear on the surface. The present is thought a day of great religious enlightenment, the pulpit and religious press are so busy spreading the truth. But just here that great lie of the adversary makes its baleful influence felt. We recognized it (Chapter 14, section 9) as largely the cause of the division of Protestantism into so many jarring sects. Each preacher and religious editor is working to sustain one of these' denominations. We would not say that, intentionally, anyone sets the interests of his denomination above that of Christ's cause, but if a question should arise, which interest is the one to yield? Each denomination is so persuaded that its own cause is that of the Master, that no question can ever exist of a conflict between the two. Yet it is most apparent that such conflict often must exist. Christ's cause is one, its interests one; the interests of the different denominations are often opposed to each other. If, then, a question arises between these clashing interests, though both sides claim theirs is the cause of Christ, evidently both cannot be; one side at least is arrayed against him, one side, it may be both, in reality choosing denominational advancement before that of the Master's cause.

And so we find that each preacher or editor, in the work of disseminating truth, is obliged to work within denominational limits. It is not permitted him to investigate very widely- he must confine his labors within certain prescribed channels of thought.

Recently, a minister of some note in his own personal standing, and in that of his ancestry, in his investigations into "Certain Questions Awakened by the Bible," was led into different views from those in which he had been trained, but which he believed not only were sanctioned by, but strengthened, the truth itself. He announced these views. They were not in full conformity with church standards, but so wide a latitude, in interpreting these on other, and what seemed to him essential points, had been allowed his fellow ministers, that he thought his own divergence therefrom might also be tolerated. But he went too far - he assailed Satan's own lie of universal immortality. In his probing about, he had struck the bed rock upon which the peculiar errors of modern theology rest. He was disturbing the foundations; denominational creeds were in danger. "Silence him! turn him out I" was the cry. And it was done.

Well, that was perhaps the safer course; it were easier to crush him, if possible, by the weight of names and numbers, than publicly to answer his arguments. And then there was a show of reason in it. He had not been authorized to preach what he found in the Bible; he was to confine himself to what "the church standards" teach. He should have understood that to him the Bible is a sealed book, except as Calvin and church authorities inform him of its contents. He had accepted the situation; turn him out, if he proves restive! What if there be yet more truth to break out of God's Holy Word, and the church at large and the world need that truth; he has struck a blow at denominational barriers, he is bringing discredit upon the standards of our church; silence that uncomfortable investigator!

We need not say that with a ministry thus in fetters, with the religious inquiry of the present day still in the ecclesiastical shackles of the church as it emerged from the ignorance of the Dark Ages, the individual Christians of our churches by no means have the opportunity they fancy they have of attaining to the full revelation of God's truth. And the more rigid and unyielding those traditional denominational rules, the less hope of progress, or of reform, if such be needed.

The same restraint that is on the pulpit rests also on our religious press. Our religious quarterlies and weeklies belong to this or that denomination; they are committed to specified views of religious truth. With appalling looseness they may discuss the inspiration of

God's -revealed word, but there is one question they may not venture upon. That great lie of the adversary, immortality for all, must not be touched! (Except to sustain it!)

The writer's experience in this direction is instructive. In Feb., 187x, he republished in this country an essay on "The Nature and Duration of Future Punishment," by Rev. Henry Constable, then Prebendary of Cork, Ireland. In the following October, it was sharply reviewed by a long article in the *New Englander*, a religious quarterly published at New Haven. One of the "incontrovertible" positions therein taken has already been noticed on page 179. Permission was requested to insert a reply. The prospectus of the *New Englander* that year stated: "It disclaims allegiance to any party in theology or politics; and signifies the independence with which it acts by adopting as its motto the Horatian line, *Nullius addictus ju-rare in verba magistri*" (accustomed to swear to the words of no master). The year previous, on personal solicitation from its editors, the writer of this had subscribed fifty dollars to help in keeping so independent a magazine above water. But the professions of its prospectus and classic motto, when put to the test, were completely ignored, and the writer was in effect informed that the magazine was no place for a reply to its own charges! Was it fear of the truth, or fear for the article in question, or both, which prompted so ungenerous a response?

The objection we have been discussing, drawn from the attitude of the church generally towards our doctrine, rests upon the presumption that, in this day of freedom, religious truth is not bound, and that all good men are eager in the search after it. We trust the objector perceives that, in this, his position does not rest upon facts as they are.

Let it not, however, be thought that, during the centuries succeeding the lapse of the church into its great error, there have not been faithful ones who rejected all mere human authority, and who received the truth only as they found it in the Word of God. There were such before Luther's day - there have been such since - but their voices were drowned in the clamor of the multitude, or smothered in the fires of persecution. One of these faithful witnesses, "faithful unto death," was the early English reformer and translator of the Bible, William Tyndale, who, for his belief, was burned at the stake, in 1536. He thus quaintly but forcibly replies to the Romanist, Sir Thomas More:

"In putting departed souls in heaven, hell, and purgatory, you destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection. What God doth with them, that shall we know when we come to them. The true faith puts the resurrection, which we be warned to look for every hour. The heathen philosophers, denying that, did put that souls did ever live. And the Pope joined the spiritual doctrine of Christ, and the fleshy doctrine of philosophers together -things so contrary that they cannot agree. And because the fleshy-minded Pope consented unto heathen doctrine, therefore he corrupted the Scriptures to establish it. If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in good case as the angels be, and then what cause of the resurrection?"

That all, before the Reformation, did not accept the essential immortality of the soul, which to doubt our religious teachers now deem almost heresy (heresy for a minister!), is evident from the following article, adopted by the Council of Trent, held A.D. 1513, under Leo 10. pontifex maximus:

"Whereas, some having dared to assert concerning the nature of the reasonable soul, that it is mortal; we, with the approbation of the Sacred Council, do condemn and reprobate all those who assert that the intellectual soul is mortal, seeing that the soul is not only truly, and of itself, and essentially, the form of the human body, as is expressed in the canon of Pope Clement the Fifth, but likewise it is immortal; and we strictly inhibit all from dogmatizing otherwise, and we decree that all who adhere to the like erroneous assertions shall be shunned and punished as heretics."

There were such heretics then, there are many such now, if judged by the standards of that council and of Protestantism in general. But in this judgment from their fellows, they stand with, as they rest upon, God's own word of revelation.

That question, "What is truth?" so carelessly put to our Lord by the Roman governor, is still the question of the ages. And as One was there present who could rightly reply, so now God's book of revelation stands ready with the answer. But, Pilate-like, most turn away to human counsellors. The multitude still chooses the broad way of destruction; the way of life, but few find it. The Evil One is still the "prince of this world" -of this dispensation. Truth is here still struggling with error. Its victory is sure, for God is on its side; but not yet has it conquered. Ever since its utterance, eighteen hundred years ago, the Master's address has been a fitting one for his followers: "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." And so we believe it will ever be throughout this probationary world. We are told, at the day of the King's coming, the flock of believers then living will be a little one still, for we read, even then, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Luke 18.8.

CHAPTER 16

Summary of the Bible Doctrine; and its Appeal.

WE here complete our study of the nature and destiny of the soul, as revealed in Holy Scripture. As to its nature, we have learned that the soul is not a part of a man, but that it is the living organism, the individual itself. It is a term the Bible applies to all living creatures, on the land or in the sea. It is not something immaterial (such were indeed nothing, as far as any knowledge of its nature possible to us); it is wholly material, "formed of the dust of the ground" (Gen. 2.7), "formed out of the ground" (Gen. 2.19). So far from being immortal, its mortality - that its existence is terminated by death - is as distinctly and fully stated as any fact in Scripture.

Such, then, the nature of man, what destiny is awaiting him? A twofold destiny; and each individual decides for himself the question, which of the two shall be his. All depends upon the fact of obedience or disobedience to the will of the Creator, as that is revealed in his holy Word, or simply written upon the heart in our innate consciousness of right and wrong. See Rom. 1.20; 2.15.

All mankind have sinned. That law, which God has established as the condition of their being, they have violated. Death is the penalty, the loss of life; - "the soul that sinned, it shall die." But in his dealings with our guilty race, the Almighty displays the infinite love of his being. He himself has provided a ransom for us. His Son, having been born into our race, and having perfectly obeyed the law, gave his holy life for the life of the guilty. The violated law has thus been honored, and God can pardon the penitent transgressor who accepts the merits of One sacrificed for him; "God can be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus;" Rom. 3.26.

What, then, is the destiny of the believer?

Joined to his Lord, he is "accepted in the Beloved," and so regains his forfeited right to the tree of life. Though, at that death which he meets as Adam's descendant, he loses his life and ceases to exist, it is "not for eternity" (eis ton aion); Jn. 11.26. He who proclaims himself "the Resurrection and the Life" promises: "Because I live, ye shall live also;" Jn. 14.19. "Everyone who believeth on the Son may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day;" as he says again, the believer "hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day;" Jn. 6.40, 54.

The future life of the believer is thus dependent entirely upon his resurrection, upon what Paul styles "the hope and resurrection of dead ones;" Acts 23.6. The intervening time between his death and his resurrection, be it actually centuries or but moments, is virtually the same to the believer of every age. It is a period of unconscious sleep till the awakening at the resurrection of the just, which thus comes to each as the next conscious moment after his falling asleep in death.

It is still in a body that the dead believer is restored to life at his resurrection. He lives again as a soul, an organism. But his body is not the self-same body in which he fell asleep. The old body was corruptible, the new incorruptible; the old was liable to weariness, sickness, death; the spirit-body is subject to none of these things. See Cor. 15.43; Isa. 33.24; 40.30, 31. The same change takes place also in the bodies of believers still living at the time of this resurrection, which is at our Lord's Second Coming. See 1 Cor. 15.51-53; 1 Thess. 4.16; Acts 3.20, 21; Jn. 14.3.

296 Summary of the Bible Doctrine.

Thus the believer follows his Lord into death, burial, and resurrection, with but one point of difference - the believer sees corruption in the grave, while "He whom God raised saw no corruption" (Acts 13.37), because "his soul was not left in hades" (the grave); Acts 2.31.

At his resurrection, our Lord entered upon the new spiritual life. In Scripture language, he was then "PERFECTED."

We read, Hebrew "For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make perfect [Greek teleiosai, to perfect] through sufferings the captain [Greek archegos, leader] of their salvation." Heb. 5.9: "And [Greek teleiotheis] having been perfected, he became the author of eternal salvation." As we read, Heb. 7.28, of "the Son [Greek teteleiomēnon] having been perfected for evermore." In the new resurrection body, he who before was mortal is now immortal. As he himself says, "I became dead, and, behold, living am I for the ages of the ages;" Rev. 1.18. And by that awakening to the immortal life in the spirit-body, "by the resurrection from the dead, he was declared to be the Son of God with power;" Rom. 1.4. So it is stated, Acts 13.33: "He hath raised up Jesus, as also in the second Psalm it is written, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee;" - Greek gennao; brought thee forth - to the new life. As our Lord himself prophesied: "And the third day I shall be perfected;" Luke 13.32.

So also believers, at their resurrection to life, are Biblically said to be perfected; they attain perfection. Thus Paul expresses himself, Phil. 3. r t, 12: "If by any means I might attain unto the Ex-anastasis" [the resurrection of the just, that from dead ones]. Not as though I had already attained it [Greek elabon, received], or already have been perfected [Greek teteleiomai]; but I follow after, if that I may

ly hold of that for which also I have been laid hold of by Christ." As he expresses it, Eph. 4.13: "Till we all come to a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," - "our vile body fashioned like unto his glorious body;" Phil. 3.21. So our Lord speaks of those in that resurrection life as being perfect. When asked, "Good Master, what shall I do that I may have eternal life?" he replies, "If thou wilt enter into life," and again repeating the thought, "If thou wilt be [Greek, dost desire to be] perfect." "To be perfect" is thus a synonym of "to enter into life," or "to have eternal life."

* We call attention to the fact that the N. T. idea of the true Christian perfection is sadly obscured by our E. V. giving the same rendering to two entirely different Greek words, viz., teleios and its derivatives and kataitiso and its derivative. The former, aides, from telos, end, is defined "having reached its end, finished, poled;" the latter, hater-Nab (compounds of kata, thorough, and artist), get ready, perform), is defined to adjust, put in order again, repair, reform, furnish thoroughly. The former word is the one used in the passages above quoted, and, e.g., in Heb. 6.1, "go on to perfection," teleiotes. The latter word, katartiso, is found translated in E. V. "mending their nets," Matt. 4.21, Mark 1.19; "restore such a one, overtaken in a fault," Gal. 6.1; "the worlds were framed" (fitted), Heb. 11.3; "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction," Rom. 9.22. So where it is translated perfect in E. V., it carries the idea of a fitting or training, as 2 Tim. 3.17 "that the man of God may be perfect [Greek artios, able, ready], thoroughly furnished [ex-artiso] unto all good works;" as, also, Eph. 4.12: "For the perfecting [fitting, training] of the saints, for the edifying of the body of Christ." So, 2 Cor. 13.13: "And this we wish, even your perfection; "and so verse 16. We read that the real perfection, teleiosis, could not be by the Levitical priesthood (Heb. 7.1): nor can it be till our Lord's High-priestly work is completed, and he comes again to bring the "salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." Now, believers are "those being sanctified." (so Greek of Heb. 2.11, 10.14); in training for that promised perfection, for "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Clearer views of the N. T. doctrine of the soul and of Christian perfection would save much needless controversy.

The writer of Hebrews tells us that the ancient worthies spoken of in Chapter 11. have not yet been perfected. Having died in faith, in the sleep of the grave they await the promised hour. "These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be perfected" (Heb. 11.40); so literal Greek telei-othasi. The same writer, referring to "the city of the living God" (which, Heb. 13.14, he says is "one to come," as John beheld it in the vision of a day yet to come, "descending from God out of heaven," Rev. 21.2) calls the inhabitants thereof "spirits of just men perfected" (Heb. 12.23); Greek teteleiomenos.

What, then, is this perfection thus spoken of? We have read of our Lord, that he was "declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead." The believer, who follows his Lord in his path of self-denial and humiliation, follows him also in his path of glory! The day of his resurrection is also for him the day of his recognition as a son of God. So Paul declares what no uninspired one would dare to say:

"The Spirit bears witness with our spirit that we are the children [tekna] of God. And, if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified together. For I reckon that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creature waited for the manifestation of the sons [huiou] of God. . . . We ourselves, who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves, waiting for THE SONSHIP ['huio-thesia,' E. V. adoption], to wit, the redemption of our body;" Rom. 8.16-19, 23.

The Apostle John writes: "Beloved, now are we the children [tekna] of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know, when [Greek tan, if, in case that] he should appear, we shall be like him;" Jn. 3.2. As our Lord says in his prayer: "And the glory that thou gavest me, I have given them "(Jn. 17.22); and in his letter to the churches: "He that overcomes will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne;" Rev. 3.21. Well may Paul speak of it as "a far more exceeding [Greek kata hyperbolen eis hyperbolen, through excess to excess!], eternal weight of glory!"

Wonderful, indeed, how little the church of the present appreciates the Resurrection-day, when all this glory is to "be revealed in us! "Then, at last, our eyes behold him "whom, not having seen, we love." Having gone "to prepare a place for us, he comes again to receive us unto himself." Then are reunited all who are Christ's; the Christian friends whom we have lost or must leave; the faithful ones of all ages past are then awakened from their long sleep. To their consciousness, as to ours, it is but the moment after death; and we all rise together on that morning! "And so shall we ever be with the Lord."

Our English translators, very likely through ignorance, have concealed many an Old Testament allusion to the Resurrection. In Psalm 90, "the prayer of Moses, the man of God," when the greatness of God's power, the eternity of his years, has been contrasted with our frailty and impotence, how tame and flat our English version, "O, 'satisfy us early with thy mercy! "The vision of the inspired poet stretched far beyond this present. Beyond this lifetime of sorrow and sin, his eager gaze rests on that promised dawn of immortality and glory, whose radiance can gild even the dark clouds of his trouble. "O, satisfy us," is his prayer, "with thy mercy IN THE MORNING; that we may rejoice and be glad all our days; "-in the morning, when satisfied we "awake in Thy likeness "to everlasting joy. So Psalm 30.6 declares "Joy cometh in the morning." And, again, we read Psalm 46.5 (margin): "God shall help her [the city of God] when the morning appeared."

That here the original Hebrew, "in the morning," denotes the resurrection morn, Lange demonstrates in "Introductory Notes to Genesis;" where he shows this expression is found "in the earliest language and thinking of our race." He quotes from ancient Arabian writers, and from one who represents a beggar poetically saying of the donor of a garment to cover his nakedness: "He shall be covered to-day with my praise, and, in the morning, shall be en-robed with the silk of Paradise."

But there is another side of revelation; a twofold' destiny awaits the race. Some now are living not for that future, but for the present; they will not yield to the condition of obedience, on which alone the blood-bought pardon is offered them.

What shall their future be?

There is a future revealed for them. There is a resurrection for them also; but how suggestive the term our Lord applies to it! It is not a "resurrection to life," but a "resurrection to judgment." (See Appendix F.)

So fully has the fate of such been unfolded in these pages, that we care not to linger upon it now. Those, "whose God is their belly," to use the old-time language of Paul, who have lived but to gratify present desire, and so judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life, "their end is destruction;" Phil. 3.19. Our Lord tells us, Matt. 11.28, man may kill the body, may totally end its existence in those whom in the kindred passage (Luke 12.4) Christ addresses as "my friends; "but man cannot thus kill, or totally end, the soul. The soul is "lost" (see Matt. 11.39, where psyche, soul, of verse 28, is here rendered life); but it is lost only temporarily. It is still kept in God's remembrance; and at the appointed time he will restore it as the same soul, or organism, in its memory, its consciousness, its individuality, though in a changed, an immortal body. But the restoration of the wicked will be with their present mortal organization. And after the Judgment, wherein the justice of their merited doom will be fully manifested, he who created, destroys the entire being, soul and body, in the Gehenna fire.

These truths, thus summarized, have been deduced from, and sustained by, full Bible quotations, by a careful comparison of Scripture with Scripture.

But modern theology rejects them all, and, instead, has constructed a system of theological belief which, we now say, after full proof given, again and again contradicts the Scriptures. Professing to take the Word of God as its standard, it ignores and denies its plain declarations. What does this mean? How comes it that our enlightened Protestantism is found in so false a position?

The answer is found in the incomplete character of the Reformation, whence Protestantism took its rise. The Adversary's great lie, which led our first parents into sin, which had so fearfully corrupted the church of that day, was not then weeded out of received truth. Its statement, as originally made to Eve, declared, "Ye shall not surely die,"- that is, "YE SHALL LIVE FOREVER." (Surely, the Evil One, when he spoke of dying, meant dying; it cannot be thought he was merely declaring that Adam and Eve should never go off somewhere else to live! - which is the popular definition of the first death.) This doctrine of universal immortality is the great, all-pervasive error of the present day. To Eve's descendants it makes still the statement first uttered by the Father of lies, "YE SHALL LIVE FOREVER."

The dogma of universal immortality thus stands disclosed in its unholy parentage. But who can estimate the corrupting influence of such a falsehood, introduced - interwoven-into the very warp of the generally accepted theology. Briefly and imperfectly, we have endeavored to show somewhat of the damage it has done to revealed truth. It casts dishonor upon God and his Word. It brings divisions and heart-burnings into the Christian Church. It saps the strength of its defenders. It dims and blurs all views of the future. It leads multitudes of the professed followers of Christ into carelessness and lukewarmness in his service. It confirms infidels and despisers of Christ in their rejection of the proffered salvation. The prevailing theology of Protestantism, though holding on to the great central truth of Christ as a Savior from sin, is a Samson shorn of his locks. Like the mixed iron and miry clay in the feet of Nebuchadnezzar's image, it is "partly strong and partly broken."

The facts, which have now been laid before the reader, strongly appeal to the judgment and the moral sense of each individual.

Is the reader a professed minister of God's Word?

There have been brought to your notice facts which you cannot safely (in view of the future) ignore. You stand in a position of peculiar responsibility. To you, in large measure, the Church looks for its knowledge of the truth. The Lord said of the religious teachers of a former dispensation: "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they [the people] should seek the law at his mouth;" Mal. 2.8. It is the first requisite of fitness for your work, that, from study of the inspired Word, you know what the Lord has really said.

It cannot be denied that you stand in circumstances of peculiar temptation; - temptation to turn from the question whether this be God's truth or not. Satan may whisper to you that your usefulness will be greatly impaired, if you be led to accept these obnoxious views.

And, moreover, your support and that of your family may be dependent upon your present position, from which the ecclesiastical authorities of this world may thrust you out, if you so widely depart from their creeds.

But when you entered upon Christ's service, did you not resolve to forsake all for him? As new duties rise in your pathway, with them comes the call to fresh sacrifice of self. Can you hesitate for either of these reasons? "Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin." "Now the just by his faith shall live, but, if he draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him," saith the Lord. When Amaziah, king of Judah, was forbidden by the prophet to take the hundred thousand men of Israel he had hired for his expedition, he "said to the man of God, But what shall we do for the hundred talents which I have given to the army of Israel?" "And the man of God answered, "The Lord is able to give thee much more than this."

And your usefulness, as of every Christian, is not to be measured by apparent outward results, but by faithfulness - in the unknown acts of your life, those inner questions of duty that continually arise. "Now he who furnished seed to the sower and bread for food, will furnish and multiply your sowing, and increase the fruits of your righteousness;" 2 Cor. 9.10, so best MSS.

It were difficult to express the damage the ministry suffer from the false dogma so intricately interwoven with the doctrine they are to teach. We have alluded to the injury done to one's reasoning faculty in the constant endeavor to apparently reconcile the irreconcilable. But beyond this, we charge that in the formal acceptance of the church creeds of the present day, the ministry are unconsciously taught the lesson of deception. On occasion of a late trial in Chicago, of one charged with heresy, the fact was freely recognized in religious papers that the ministers of that denomination subscribe to the confession of faith, with mental reservations! That is, they accept the church standards, in such sense as they choose to give to them, not in the sense that the language naturally bears.

We should hardly have expected this of such a profession, yet they are but men. And this line of action they are virtually taught in their theological seminaries; as the Jesuit, we are told, is taught that the end justifies the means. The professor of dogmatic theology, that he may reconcile Scripture declarations with the false doctrine of inherent immortality, is compelled to explain away the natural meaning of Scripture, without appearing to do so. What wonder that his pupil applies the same principle to his acceptance of that particular creed, which is demanded of him, ere he may enter upon the work of preaching the glad tidings We need not state the effect this must have on the moral sense of the young religious teacher, for whom that old time injunction is still in force, "Be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord!"

Why have we these church creeds? So lightly accepted, so carefully worded, and yet of so little practical use, except when a ministerial incumbent breaks over them, in certain directions only. Why is not the Bible the church creed? Why is the Bible good enough as a doctrinal standard for Christian laymen (for them an infallible rule of faith and practice), but for Christian ministers something better, more exact is required? It is because the Bible and church creeds do not fully agree! The Bible contradicts the devil's lie; the church creed upholds it!

We have already spoken of the loss of pulpit effectiveness from the indefinite ideas of truth prevailing among our younger ministry. May not this partly explain the strange fact that, with such demand for laborers in the home and foreign field, so many give up the proper work of the ministry? The writer was told by a theological student of a graduate of a year's standing frankly confessing to him his unsettled condition on points of Christian doctrine. But, as he sadly said, with two sermons a week to prepare, he had no time to investigate what was the truth. And yet he was expected, licensed, to teach others! What becomes of such a man? Either he settles down to a blind reception of what he has been so unsatisfactorily taught, or else he breaks away, openly or privately, from his faith in revealed religion.

It is not strange that a thoughtful, conscientious young man hesitates to proclaim the doctrine of eternal misery. Do our ministers indeed realize that, if it be untrue, it is rank blasphemy against the Father of mercies, which they teach in his name? How can one, with any knowledge of the Bible facts already laid before the reader, preach the doctrine of the church creeds? How dares he publish as God's truth that recognized lie of the Evil One- immortality for all, that all live forever. Read the word of the Lord concerning his prophets, Ezekiel 13.22: "With lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his evil way, by promising him life!"

Does anyone say, "What can I do? I am but one." Your accountability is but for one. "Everyone must give account of himself to God." If each, who has doubts of the theology he has been taught, were, without waiting for others, to investigate the teachings of God's Word on these points, and declare the convictions at which he arrives, he would soon find himself not one alone. He would be one of a mighty host to do battle for the truth, and to drive into its merited darkness that flaunting lie of Satan's device.

To the professed ministers of the Word, whose province it is to instruct our future religious teachers, the truths we have studied make a most forcible appeal. But we can only pray the Almighty to open their eyes; that they may be led to feed those under their charge with "the sincere milk of the word," and no longer deal out to them the poison of Satan's dogma.

Gentlemen of the Committee, English and American, for the revision of the Scriptures: A great responsibility rests upon you. You have a rare opportunity to serve the cause of God and man, by furnishing us a literal interpretation of the Divine records; so pruning from our English version the errors which the ignorance and superstition of the dark ages have engrafted upon them. You possess a more thorough knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek languages, older and more trustworthy manuscripts, than did the translators of our present version. You may not think to shelter yourselves behind the errors of that version; for the work given you is to correct those errors. It is unquestionably your duty, without fear or favor, to give the exact truth, as it is in the original, to the English speaking public. Are you prepared to make your own the dishonesty of concealing from the English reader the fact that the Bible declares the lower animals have souls, as that word is used in the Bible? Will you also be guilty of the deception of giving two words of different English meaning, where in one connected sentence our Lord repeats the same word (as in Matt. 16.25, 26; Mark 8.35-37)? May the Spirit of all truth strengthen you so to discharge your high trust, that the great Judge Himself, "in that Day," may say to you "WELL DONE! "

To those who prepare commentaries upon the Bible, the facts we have set forth make the appeal that in their publications they give us the truth, and nothing but the truth. The temptation is great, in the preparation of such works, where the passage conflicts with the popular theory, to ignore a part of the truth, or so to color it that its objectionable features will be removed. As a sample of frank statement of unwelcome truth, we quote from Prof. Bush's Notes on Genesis, on chap. 2.7:

"The phrase living soul' is in the foregoing narrative ,repeatedly applied to the inferior orders of animals, which are not considered to be possessed of a soul' in the sense in which that term is applied to man. It would seem to mean the same, therefore, when spoken of man that it does when spoken of beasts, viz., an animated being, a creature possessed of life and sensation, and capable of performing all the physical functions by which animals are distinguished, as eating, drinking, walking, etc. As to the intellectual faculties which raise man so far above the tribes of the brute creation, we find no term that expressly designates them in any part of the sacred narrative. . . . Indeed, it may be remarked that the Scriptures generally afford much less explicit evidence of the existence of a sentient immaterial principle in man, capable of living and acting separate from the body, than is usually supposed."

On the other hand, as a sample of the way in which evidence to sustain the popular dogma is manufactured, and the teaching of a passage bent out of shape to fit a theory in the commentator's mind, we call the reader's attention once more to the Transfiguration scene. We have already showed that it was what Christ calls it, a vision; and that an eye-witness testifies (2 Pet. 1.16) that the vision displayed "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." But this is not what some of our modern commentators want. So few are the passages from which even the inference of a disembodied state can be derived, that it is very important to use this for that purpose. It is therefore important to show that this is not exactly a vision after all; because objects seen in a vision do not necessarily have a real existence. So, Prof. Owen does not hesitate to declare it was "not a mere vision," though our Lord himself speaks of it as a vision.

Rev. Lyman Abbott takes different ground. He acknowledges it was a vision; but from him we learn that a statement that anything is seen in a vision, far from raising any question of, in reality proves its actual existence! In which discovery of the meaning of vision he succeeds in contradicting himself, plain Scripture facts, and our mother tongue, whose significance of the term visionary is then a mistake!*

* The reader may judge for himself. On Matt. 17.9, Rev. Mr. Abbott says: "The Greek orama, vision, is sometimes simply equivalent to sight or things seen, sometimes it indicates a spiritual ecstasy or trance, or rather that which appears in the trance state, sometimes an experience which may have been wrought through a dream." On Acts 9.10, he says: "By vision in the Bible is generally meant an experience in which the person retains his consciousness, in which respect it differs from a trance, and the object shown to him possesses a real existence, in which respect it differs from a dream. Thus the Transfiguration is spoken of as a vision," etc. Orama "indicates a trance"-orama "differs from a trance;" and so orama differs from a dream; orama shows objects which possess a real existence, as a dream does not, according to this commentator.

Now, what does the New Testament itself say on these points? In Acts x., Luke calls Peter's trance, verse TO, a vision (orama) in verse 17. Acts 16.9: "A vision [orama] appeared to Paul in the night. There stood a man of Macedonia." Does Mr. Abbott think a man of Macedonia, "a real existence," came to Paul by night? Acts 9.12, when Ananias was directed to go to Paul to restore his sight, it is said "he hath seen in a vision [orama] a man named Ananias coming in," etc. Mr. Abbott thinks "in a vision "an addition by a copyist; then a very early one, showing how orama was then understood, for it is the reading of the Vatican MSS., the earliest of all but one. But let Mr. Abbott himself refute his own finely-drawn distinction (in Acts 9.10) of the difference between a vision and a dream. His note on Acts 18.9, is "'A vision,' that is, by some supernatural appearance to him, though, very possibly, in a dream"! [Italics our own.]

Having thus wildly gone astray in a plain matter of fact, it is not surprising to find his inference equally wild. He informs us that the Transfiguration appears to him "to indicate that the departed dwell [now] in glorified bodies, though [notwithstanding] Paul appears, in 1 Cor. 15.44, 51-53, to imply that the glorified body is raised at the resurrection." "Appears to imply"! As if there were room for a doubt that Paul makes that explicit statement, when he is answering the question, "How are dead ones raised?"

Surely, in view of all the facts, we have a right to ask from commentators, that they will be careful to avoid giving us mere human inventions, and that they will remember that there are Christians to whom God's Word is a sacred book.

But to Christian laymen, the truths we have considered specially appeal. For, my Christian brother, you have not the same temptations to ignore them that our professed religious teachers have. Your acceptance of these views does not interfere with your daily support. You have not been trained, by years of study and special mental effort, to think only in certain prescribed channels. You have not been so carefully and thoroughly taught to cover up, even from your own recognition, the Bible contradictions of popular theology. You have not now hanging over you the former dreaded charge of heresy, which still has terror for your Christian brother in the ministry. For, although a few years since, a Christian layman of unimpeached moral character might be thrust out of the Congregational communion (as occurred in 1845, in Dr. Thismill's church, in the absence of its pastor), that would not be repeated today. In the Presbyterian church recently, the question came up of ordaining a ruling elder who himself declined the office because he held the views of the Bible herein stated. The question was referred to the acknowledged authority in that church on such points, and he decided that such belief was no obstacle to his ordination, if he did not preach his views.

You, therefore, as a layman, have a freedom in investigating the truth which the recognized minister does not possess. You are free from the temptations and difficulties which beset his path.

Surely, you can scarce read over the facts heretofore presented to you, showing the antagonism between the Bible and modern theology, without feeling that reform in the latter is loudly called for. A prominent minister, called from the West to one of our largest cities, expressed to the writer his conviction that "the whole science of theology needs a thorough overhauling."

Now how can this be brought about?

Paradoxical as it may seem, the responsibility of such reform rests largely upon you, as a layman. The ministry are fettered; their hands are tied. God has given you greater freedom, and it is your duty to use it for his cause. If you are Christ's, you have taken the rule of his life as yours- "Seek ye first the kingdom of God." In bringing to you this little book, God in his providence has put before you the duty of inquiring into the truth of its statements. You are to do this carefully, and with prayer for the wisdom promised to those that ask (Jas. 1.5).

If you find the Bible denies the universal immortality which modern theology teaches, then it is your duty, within the sphere of your influence, freely to declare so important a fact. It is your duty to stir up your friends and neighbors to study the neglected Word of God, and to disseminate the knowledge of his truth, till a correct public sentiment in our churches will uphold their pastors and religious teachers in breaking away from the trammels of a corrupt past, and in standing boldly for the truth, as God has revealed it to man.

Surely you cannot, in this day, find it right to sustain the human dictation which prescribes how one must read God's word. What is this but that spirit of Popery against which you protest? That denies to its laity the Bible without note or comment. You say the very idea that God has given a revelation to man which he may not read, is false on its very face. But is not just this the practice of Protestantism itself? That denies the Bible to its ministers, to its religious teachers, except as the church (by its creeds) interprets it to them. Will you not help to free the ministry from their shackles? Will you not do what you can to give to all the privilege of freely studying God's Book of truth?

But, perhaps, one who reads these words is a sceptic. Openly, or in your heart, you deny that the book, which professes to be a revelation from God, is really such. Then, the facts we have considered specially challenge your investigation. Perhaps you have been led to doubt the inspiration of the Bible, not from your personal knowledge of the book, but from the ideas others have given you of it. In a question so important as that of your accountability to your Maker, if there be an alleged revelation of his will to man, is it not reasonable to investigate for yourself whether such be the case?

Will you believe the writer when he tells you that the want of harmony and consistency which troubled his former reading of the Bible, disappears if we read it as written, according to the universally accepted law of human language. And it certainly is a very strong argument for its truthfulness that we discover the correct meaning of the word life, though unrecognized by the church at large even now, runs like a golden thread through every part, binding together in one harmonious whole portions written fifteen hundred years apart.

The story of the fall of man presents difficulties to many minds, as perhaps it does to yours. Do you notice how strong the intrinsic evidence of its truthfulness, when read in the light of the Bible doctrine of the soul?-in that early revelation of life conditioned on simple obedience; in the promise of the forfeited life restored through a promised deliverer, corroborated as this is by the suggestive (otherwise most inappropriate) name of Eve, life, and in the provision made to "keep the way of the tree of life." How strong the evidence in that simple allusion (Gen. 3.21), to what is thus recognized as a well-known fact, the evident Divine unfolding of the principle of animal sacrifice- life for life- as contained in the brief notice of the covering of skins provided for the sinning ones.

Animal flesh had not yet been given for food (compare Gen. 1.29 and 9.3); the skins used, we then see, were those of animals offered in sacrifice to typify the coming sacrifice for sin. The fact of the institution of such sacrifices is assumed in the concise narrative of the next chapter, and also that the sacrifice of life, as offered by Abel, was required of the sinner. And thus also is explained the early and prevalent extension over the world of animal sacrifice, which man's reason alone would never have conceived of-to think to propitiate an offended Deity by taking the life of his creatures!

Will you not thoughtfully read the Bible with the light thus cast upon it? And may you thus be led to find in it the way of eternal life! And for you, my impenitent friend, whoever you may be, "having no hope and without God in the world," this question for you has a fearfully practical interest. It concerns you directly-What is there for you in the future? It may be you are flattering yourself with the thought that you are immortal. This the Word of God, which alone can give you any knowledge of the future, explicitly denies. Immortality is not yours by right. Yet most freely is it offered to you if, "by patient continuance in well-doing," you will "seek for it." In the coming future "all in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of Man, and shall come forth." Which resurrection shall be yours - to life or to judgment? Now is the time to secure that life; then it will be forever too late. Cannot the love of our God, not a stern, revengeful Judge, but a kind, infinitely loving and forgiving Father to us all - cannot his love for your soul, not wishing you to perish, but to have everlasting life, not sparing his own Son to save you, cannot such love reach your heart? Take the Savior to be yours. He gave his life for you, will you not give your life to him? Here you will find that his service is a rich reward, and you "shall receive, in the world to come, LIFE EVERLASTING." You may make this promise yours: "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." For then, "raised incorruptible," the redeemed from death "shall ever be with the Lord."

"FOREVER WITH THE LORD, AMEN! SO LET IT BE!

LIFE FROM THE DEAD IS IN THAT WORD, IT IS IMMORTALITY!"

APPENDIX.

THE Westminster Confession of Faith well says of Holy Scripture:

"The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it may be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.

"The Supreme Judge, by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures;" Chapter 1 , section 8, 9.

The principle above enunciated we have endeavored conscientiously to follow out in our preceding argument. We then stated that fuller proof of the positions taken could be given. Such, with regard to the nature of the soul, it has been deemed best herewith to append. Also the question of the resurrection of the wicked has been discussed at some length.

A. Lower Animals, as well as of Man.

In the Bible, the term "Soul" is used of the Lower Animals, as well as of Man.

Gen. 1.20: "God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath a living soul."

So the Hebrew, but the English version renders it "that hath life."

Gen. 1.21: "Every living soul [E. V. living creature] which the waters brought forth."

Gen. 1.24: "GOD said, Let the earth bring forth the living soul [E. V. living creature] after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast."

Gen. 1.30: "God said . . . to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that creeps upon the earth, wherein there is a living soul" [E. V. life]; or, as Bible usage defines it, a living organism.

Gen. 2.19: "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them. And whatsoever Adam called every living soul [E. V. creature] that was the name thereof." Read in this connection the seventh verse of the same chapter: "And the Lord God formed Adam of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and Adam became a living soul."

Gen. 9.10: "And with every living soul [E. V. creature] that is with you, of the fowls, of the cattle, and of every beast of the earth."

Gen. 9.12: "Between me and you and every living soul [E. V. creature] that is with you."

Gen. 9.15: "Every living soul [E. V. creature] of all flesh."

Gen. 9.16: "Every living soul [E. V. creature] of all flesh."

Ten times is the Hebrew of "living soul" found in the first nine chapters of Genesis. Once, where it refers to man, it is literally thus translated. In nine other instances it refers to the lower orders of creation, and the fact of such reference is carefully concealed from the English reader unacquainted with Hebrew. Please notice, also, in seven of these nine instances it is presented as the language of Jehovah himself!

Precisely the same Hebrew words are found in Lev. 11.10, referring to fishes: "All that have not fins and scales, of all that move in the waters, and of any living soul [E. V. thing] which is in the waters."

Also in Lev. 11.46: "This is the law of the beasts and of the fowl, and of every living soul [E. V. creature] that moves in the waters; and of every soul [E. V. creature] that creeps upon the earth." Jehovah is the speaker in these two instances also.

Lev. 24.18: Jehovah declares: "He that killed the soul of a beast [E. V. simply beast], shall make it good [or recompense] soul for soul." English version has "beast for beast."

Prov. 7.23: "As a bird hastes to the snare and knows not that it is for his soul "[E. V. life].

Prov. 12.10: "A righteous man regards the soul [E. V. life] of his beast "- regarded, cares for, not its life merely, but the comfort of its physical organism, its soul.

Num. 31.25, 28: "And the Lord spoke unto Moses: Levy a tribute unto the Lord, one soul of five hundred, both of the persons, and of the beeves, and of the asses, and of the sheep."

Our English version here classes together souls of men and of oxen, of asses and of sheep! How came our translators thus for once to give the literal rendering of the Hebrew? Was it because they could not well avoid it; because that all of their usual substitutes here failed them? They could not translate "soul" by "life," for that would imply that the lives of these men and animals were to be taken; they could not say one "person" of five hundred, since animals are included in the enumeration; they could not well substitute "creature" or "thing," since men are included. And so of all the instances where the original Hebrew of the Bible speaks of the souls of animals, in this-instance only has the English reader had given him the literal truth!

Ezek. 47.9: "Everything that lives [Hebrew nephesh chayah], whithersoever the rivers shall come, shall live: and there shall be a very great multitude of fish."

Rev. 8.9: "And the third part of the creatures which were in the sea, and had souls [plural Greek psychas, E. V. life], died."

Rev. 16.3: "And every living soul [so E. V., Greek psyche] died in the sea."

In these two quotations from Revelation, the Greek psyche is used of marine animals; in the former case it is rendered; though in the plural, by the abstract word "life" in the singular; in the latter case we have the literal rendering, "soul." Psyche in the N. T. is translated soul, life, twice heart, three times mind. In the latter of the two instances above, the preceding word "living" rendered useless all our translators' substitutes for soul, when that is used of animals. Living life (or heart or mind) died, were too absurd; while the general acquaintance of scholars with the Greek would not permit the substitution of "thing" for psyche, soul, as had been done with the less familiar Hebrew nephesh. Thus once in the New, as but once in the Old Testament, the English reader has the opportunity to learn that the Bible recognizes the soul as appertaining to the lower animals. And yet still stronger is the testimony of our English version to the fact itself, in that it is so evidently the testimony of a most unwilling witness!

With all this Bible proof to the contrary, professed expounders of the Bible tell us that the lower animals have no souls - that the possession of a soul is what distinguishes man from other animals!

[B. Material Nature of the Soul](#)

In the Bible, the Material Nature of the Soul is thus referred to.

It may touch various material objects:

Lev. 5.2: "If a soul touch any unclean thing, whether it be a carcass of an unclean beast, or a carcass of unclean cattle, or the carcass of unclean creeping things." See also Lev. 7.21; 22.6; Num. 19.22.

It may itself be touched, even when dead:

Num. 19.11 "He that touches the dead soul of any man shall be unclean." English Version for "soul" gives "body," but in the margin "soul of man." It may be hungry:

Prov. 19.15: "An idle soul shall suffer hunger."

Prov. 27.7: "The full soul loathes [Hebrew treads under foot] an honeycomb; but to the hungry soul every bitter thing is sweet." See Isa. 29.8.

It eats:

Lev. 7.20: "The soul that eats the flesh of the sacrifice."-

Lev. 7.25, 27; 17.12, 15.

It satisfies its hunger:

Prov. 6.30: "Men do not despise a thief if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry."

Prov. 13.25: "The righteous eats to the satisfying of his soul; but the belly of the wicked shall want." See Jer. 50.19.

It enjoys eating and drinking:

Eccles. 2.24: "Nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink and should make his soul enjoy good in his labor." Our translators, in the margin explain "his soul enjoy good" by "delight his senses."

It is thirsty:

Prov. 25.25: "As cold waters to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country."

It breathes:

Kings 20.32: "Let now my soul [E. V. me] breathe."

It may be bought and sold:

Lev. 22.11: "If the priest buy any soul with his money."

Ezek. 27.13: "They traded the souls [E. V. persons] of men."

Rev. 18.12, 13: "The merchandise of souls of men."

It may be stolen:

Deut. 24.7: "If a man be found stealing a soul "(E. V. any of his brethren).

It is hunted (as a flea):

1 Sam. 24.11, 14: David says to Saul, "Thou hunts my soul to take it. After whom dost thou pursue?"

Psalm 7.5: "Let the enemy persecute [Hebrew pursue] my soul and take it."

The pursuer overtaking it may tear it to pieces:

Psalm 7.2 "Lest he, like a lion, tear my soul, rending it in pieces."

It may be delivered to the sword:

Psalm 22.20: "Deliver my soul from the sword."

It is destroyed by the sword:

Josh. 11.11: "They smote all the souls that were therein with the edge of the sword, utterly destroying them."

It may escape physical danger by flying:

Jer. 51.6: "Flee out of the midst of Babylon, and deliver every man his soul."

Gen. 19.17: "Escape for thy soul "(E. V. life).

And by escaping danger it lives on:

Gen. 19.20: Lot said: "Oh, let me escape thither [to Zoar], and my soul shall live." E. V. here renders nephesh soul, in verse 17, just quoted, also in verse 19, it renders same word life; an apparent reason for which has already been given.

It may escape that danger by aid of a horse:

Amos 2.15: "Neither shall he that rides the horse deliver his soul" (E. V. himself).

It may be laid in iron

Psalm 105.18: "He [Hebrew his soul] was laid in iron." So the margin gives it.

It goes into the grave:

Job 33." He keeps back his soul from the pit."

Job 33.22: "Yea, his soul draws near unto the grave."

Job 33.28: "He will deliver his soul from going into the pit;" or "grave," as the same Hebrew word, in verse 22, is translated.

Psalm 30.3: "Thou hast brought up my soul from the grave."

Isaiah 38.17: "Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption."

It may be left there and "see corruption:"

Psalm 16.10; Acts 2.27: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell [Hebrew sheol; Greek hades; the grave]; neither wilt thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption." We are expressly informed in Acts that this was not spoken of David, whose soul we may then understand was left in the grave, so that he saw corruption. As in Acts 13.36, Paul declares: "For David, after he had served his generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption." Observe these verbs have all the same nominative: David fell on sleep; David was laid unto his fathers; David saw corruption. (We find the same statement in another form in Acts 2.34: "For David is not ascended into the heavens.") If it be claimed, as we believe it is, that the David serving as nominative to these last three verbs is David's body only, then it may be asked, who (same nominative) served his generation? David's body only? But this attempted solution concedes the whole question. Popular theology thus confesses that the Bible denominates the lifeless frame, David. Just what we contend the Bible teaches: the organized body is the man, is David, with the spirit, or principle of life, David alive; without it, David dead.

Though the soul is left in the grave, it is not forever, for we are told:

Psalm 49.15: "God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave."

Recall now the fact stated in Gen. 2.7. We there learn that man, formed of the dust of the ground, became a soul. As a soul, then, he was a dust-made or material soul.

Notwithstanding all these declarations of God's word, theologians teach us that the soul is something immaterial!

C. Mortal Nature of the Soul

In the Bible, the Mortal Nature of the Soul is thus referred to.

It should be observed that, in the account of man's creation in Gen. 2.7, the very term qualifying soul, viz., living soul, in itself implies the possibility of what we find afterward spoken of, viz., dead soul.

Gen. 17.14: "That soul shall be cut off from his people."

Gen. 27.2 "Let us not kill his soul" [E. V. him].

Exod. 31.14: "That soul shall be cut off from among his people."

Lev. 7.21: "The soul that shall touch any unclean thing shall be cut off from his people."

Lev. 7.25 "Even the soul that eats shall be cut off," etc.

Lev. 19.8: The same.

Lev. 20.6: "I will set my face against that soul, and will cut him off," etc.

Lev. 23.29: "Soul shall be cut off."

Lev. 23.30: "Will I destroy."

Lev. 24.17: "He that killed any soul of man "[E. V. any man].

Num. 9.13: "Soul shall be cut off," etc.

Num. 15.30, 31 "That soul shall be cut off."

Num. 19.20: "That soul shall utterly be cut off."

Num. 23.10: "Let my soul [so margin, E. V. text, me] die the death of the righteous."

Num. 31.19: "Whosoever hath killed any soul" [E. V. person].

Num. 35.11, 15: "Killed any soul [E. V. person] at unawares."

Num. 35.30 "Whoso killed any soul [E. V. person], the murderer shall be put to death; but one witness shall not testify against any soul [E. V. person] to cause him to die."

Deut. 19.6, 11: "Slay his soul" [E. V. him]. "Smite his soul" [E. V. him].

Deut. 27.25 "Taketh reward to slay an innocent soul "[E. V. person].

Josh. 2.13: "Deliver our souls [E. V. lives] from death."

Josh. 10.28: "He utterly destroyed all the souls."

Josh. 10.30, 32, 35, 37, 39. "He utterly destroyed all the souls."

Josh. 11.11: "Smote all the souls with edge of sword."

Josh. 20.3, 9: "Whosoever killed any soul [E. V. person] unawares."

Judges 5.18: "Jeoparded their souls [E. V. lives] unto the death."

Judges 16.30: Samson said, "Let my soul [so margin, E. V. text, me] die with the Philistines."

1 Sam. 22.22: "I have occasioned the death of all the souls [E. V. persons] of thy father's house."

1 Sam. 28.9 "Lay thou a snare for my soul [E. V. life], to cause me to die? "

2 Sam. 14.7: "For the soul [E. V. life] of his brother whom he slew."

Job 33.18: "He keeps back his soul from the pit,"- grave.

Job 33.22 "Yea, his soul draws near unto the grave."

Job 33.28: "He will deliver his soul from going into the pit."

Job 36.14: "Let their soul [E. V. they] die in youth."

Psalm 22.20: "Deliver my soul from the sword."

Psalm 30.3: "O Lord, thou hast brought up my soul from the grave; thou hast kept me alive, that I should not go down to the pit."

Psalm 33.19: "To deliver their soul from death."

Psalm 35.7: "A pit they have dug for my soul," -"pit" translated "grave" in Job 33.22.

Psalm 49.15: "God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave."

Psalm 56.13: "Thou hast delivered my soul from death."

Psalm 59.2, 3: "Save me from bloody men; for, lo, they lie in wait for my soul."

Psalm 78.50: "He spared not their soul from death."

Psalm 89.48: "What man is he that lives and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand [or power] of the grave?"

Psalm 94.17: "Unless the Lord had been my help, my soul had almost [Hebrew quickly] dwelt in silence."

Read with this 1 Sam. 2.9 "The wicked shall be silent in darkness."

Prov. 23.14: "Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from the grave "(Hebrew Sheol, E. V. hell).

Isaiah 47.14: "The fire shall burn them; they shall not deliver their souls [E. V. themselves] from the power of the flame."

Isaiah 53.12: "He poured out his soul unto, death."

Jer. 2.34: "In thy skirts is found the blood of the souls of the poor innocents."

Jer. 10.28." The King swore, As the Lord lives that made us this soul, I will not put thee to death, neither will I give thee into the hands of. these men that seek thy soul "(E. V. life).

Jer. 40.14, 15: "To slay thy soul "(E. V. thee).

Ezek. 13.19: "To slay the souls that should not die, and to save the souls alive that should not live."

Ezek. 17.17: "By casting up mounds, and building forts, to cut off many souls "(E. V. persons).

Ezek. 18.20, 21: "The soul that sinned, it shall die; but if the wicked turn, he shall surely live, he shall not die."

Ezek. 22.25: "Like a roaring lion ravening the prey, they have devoured souls."

Ezek. 22.27: "Like wolve; ravening the prey, to destroy souls."

Acts 3.23: "Every soul, who will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people."

James 5.20: "Shall save a soul from death."

Rev. 8.9: "And the third part of the creatures which were in the sea and had souls [Greek plural of psyche; E. V. life] died."

Ezek. 16.3: "Every living soul died in the sea."

Notwithstanding all this, modern theology teaches that the soul cannot die-in this literal way!

[D. Object Visible and Tangible](#)

In the Bible, the Soul is represented as being an Object Visible and Tangible, even after Life has Departed.

Lev. 19.28 "Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead." The literal Hebrew is "for a soul," the word "dead" being understood, from the fact that it was only for one dead that this flesh-cutting would be practiced.

Lev. 21.1: "Defiled for the dead," -Hebrew on account of a soul, dead understood.

Lev. 21.2 "Dead body,"-Hebrew dead soul.

Lev. 22.4: "Unclean by the dead," -Hebrew by a soul, dead understood.

Num. 5.2 "Defiled by the dead," - Hebrew by a soul, dead understood.

Num. 6.6: "At no dead body," - Hebrew dead soul.

Num. 6.11: "Sinned by the dead," - Hebrew by a soul, dead understood.

Num. 9.6: "Defiled by the dead body," - Hebrew by a soul, dead understood.

Num. 9.7: The same, - Hebrew by a soul, dead understood.

Num. 9.10: "By reason of a dead body," - Hebrew of a soul, dead understood.

Num. 31.19: "Hath killed any person [Hebrew soul] and bath touched any slain." Here the adjective "slain" agrees in the Hebrew with "soul," supplied from preceding clause.

Haggai 2.13: "Unclean by a dead body," - Hebrew soul, dead understood.

The Hebrew for "the dead," or "dead body," in the passages above is "nephesh," soul; twice with the Hebrew adjective for dead expressed, in the remaining instances understood from the context. In seven of the twelve instances, it is the language of Jehovah himself; he speaks of the soul, after its death, as still perceptible to our senses.

Mark the contrast. Modern theology teaches that the soul is: 1, the peculiar possession of man; 2, it never dies; 3, it is immaterial, and so of course intangible and invisible. Every one of these particulars the Bible denies. Our Scripture quotations show that - 1, the soul is not the peculiar possession of man; 2, it does die; 3, it is not immaterial, for it can be touched and handled both when alive and when dead.

Certainly, if any conclusion can be drawn from this array of evidence, it is simply this: Both cannot be right. If the Bible doctrine of the soul is true, popular theology is untrue.

E. The Soul and its Parts.

If the soul of man be the human organism, as we claim the Scriptures teach, then the various organs, which make up the organism, are parts of the soul; and, if so, then the Bible should thus speak of them. It should associate the whole and its parts, assigning like attributes to each; and sometimes, by a true synecdoche, it should put a part for the whole, declaring of that part what is true of the whole.

This is just what the Bible does, though our translators, apparently puzzled with such language, have not always made evident that which the original expresses. We select a few of many examples.

Gen. 49.6: Jacob says, "O my soul, come not thou into their secret: unto their assembly, O my liver [E. V. mine honor!], be not thou united," thus addressing first the conjoined organism, or soul; in the next clause singling out one of its organs, as the special object of his address.

Psalms 16.9: "My heart is glad, my liver [E. V. glory!] rejoices, my flesh also shall rest in hope."

Psalms 57.7, 8: "My heart is fixed. Awake up, my liver" (E. V. glory!).

Psalms 108.1 "O God, my heart is fixed; I will sing, and my liver [E. V. glory] shall give praise."

Psalms 7.5: "Let him pursue [E. V. persecute] my soul, and take it; let him tread down my life, and lay my liver [E. V. honor!] in the dust."

Lam. 2.11: "Mine eyes fail, my bowels are troubled, my liver [so E. V.] is poured upon the earth."

Psalms 31.9: "Mine eye is consumed with grief, yea, my soul and my belly" - are consumed.

Prov. 13.25: "The just eats to the satisfying of his soul; but the belly of the wicked shall want."

Ezekiel 7.19: "They shall not satisfy their souls, nor fill their bowels."

Psalms 40.8: "Thy law is [margin] in the midst of my bowels."

Jer. 31.33: "I will put my law in their bowels [E. V. inward parts], and write it in their hearts."

Prov. 22.18: "For it is a pleasant thing if thou keep them [words of wisdom, verse 17] in thy belly" (so the margin, E. V. text, within thee).

John 7.38: "Jesus cried, saying, He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water."

Prov. 20.30 "So stripes [cleanse away evil from] the inward parts of the belly."

Job 32.18: "The spirit of my belly [marginal reading], constrained me."

Philemon 1.7: Paul writes, "The bowels of the saints are refreshed by thee, brother."

Philemon 1.12: "Therefore receive him, that is my own bowels." Here Paul uses the expression "my own bowels" as standing for the whole organization, his soul, himself; he says in effect, "receive him as myself."

Psalms 16.7: "My kidneys [E. V. reins] instruct me in the night season."

Jer. 12.2: "Thou art near in their mouth, and far from their kidneys" [E. V. reins].

Jer. 17.10: "I, the Lord, search the heart, I try the kidneys" [E. V. reins].

Rev. 2.23: "I am he that searches the kidneys [E. V. reins] and hearts."

Mark 12.29, 30: "Jesus answered, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." What is this but a cumulative form of expression, where the whole and one or more of its parts are brought together, as in legal phrase, to cover the whole ground?

Plainly, then, throughout the Bible, the various bodily organs, the liver, the heart, the kidneys, the bowels or viscera, those organs controlled by a special nervous system, the great sympathetic, which presides over "organic life," - are put for the soul, or associated with it, as being allied in their operation. This mode of speech has, at the present day, in great measure passed away; and yet, notwithstanding the inroads of philosophical ideas during centuries past, we find that in respect of one of these organs, the heart, this usage in popular speech still holds good; and traces of the same are still apparent in our not uncommon use of the words "spleen" and "bile."

It may be objected that this is the mode of speech of a ruder age, when the true (philosophical?) conception of man's spiritual composition as not universally accepted as now. On the other hand, is it not more just to say that, like the Assyrian and Egyptian traditions of the Cherubim and the Sacred Tree, it is the relic of a still earlier age-, when God communed with man face to face? It is quite the fashion in our day to speak of the crude ideas concerning God and man's destiny which prevailed, even among God's people, up to the Christian era. We flippantly say the truth was never revealed to them. How do we know that? How do we know what communications of his will God may have made in those earlier days of personal intercourse? Even the heathen once knew more than we are apt to imagine; for Paul says, Rom. 1.21, 28: "When they knew God . . . , they did not like to retain God in their knowledge." This prevalent decrying of the early revelations of the Old Testament, because we cannot make them harmonize with our present theories, is a grievous sin. It dishonors not only God's Word, but the Author of revelation himself. As if he knew not how to reveal to man the simple truths of his nature and destiny in terms that his creature could comprehend! For we cannot gainsay the fact that the use of the language we are discussing is that of our only repository of revealed truth. It is found in the New and Old Testaments alike, and is indeed the language of the Creator himself, as recorded in Jer. 32.41: "I will plant them in this land assuredly, with my whole heart and my whole soul."

[F. Have the Wicked a Resurrection?](#)

It may be thought this question has been already sufficiently answered. But some there are who accept the Bible doctrine of death for sin, who yet deny that there is any resurrection, or any future judgment, for the wicked dead; for whom the first death they believe to be a finality, as for the beasts. Such minds exhibit the peculiar obstacle, in the power of early education, which the Bible doctrine has to encounter. It is difficult for one habituated to a special way of thinking, as the writer found in his own experience, to shake off the power of such habit. In this particular case, those emancipated from the popular method of explaining away the Bible meaning of death, themselves fall back into the same error, and explain away the passages teaching the resurrection of the wicked. It may be well for such to review the Bible proof on this question.

1. We find the resurrection of the wicked is taught in Holy Writ by explicit statements to that effect.

Our Lord declares, Jn. 5.28, 29: "An hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of Man, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment." Impossible that of the "all," one part should "hear and come forth," literally, to the resurrection, and the other part "hear and come forth," figuratively, by remaining in their graves. As to the true N. T. meaning of Greek mnimeion, correctly rendered "graves," see its use, Jn. 11.17, 31, 38; 12.17; Matt. 27.60, etc. See this passage with its context already fully noticed, Chapter 10.

In Acts 24.15, Paul says of himself: "A hope having in God (which even they themselves [the Pharisees] expect), a resurrection about to be of dead ones, both of just and of unjust ones." The Greek to kai, of the latter clause, is rendered, by Liddell and Scott, "both, and," "not only, but also." It is impossible to understand that the passage can be construed so as to make the resurrection of both classes to be the expectation of the Pharisees, not of Paul. If the clause referring to the Pharisees (in the quotation in parentheses), be stricken out, the construction of the sentence remains unchanged; -anastasin, resurrection, in apposition with and defining elpida, hope. And this hope expresses what Paul expected, waited for (pros-dechomai).

In Dan. 12.2, we read: "Many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, some to shame [to be felt by themselves] and everlasting contempt," - to be felt by those surviving them.

In Rev. 20.13, 15, we read of the future restoration of the wicked "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and nodes [the grave, so margin] gave up the dead which were in them: and they were judged according to their works. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire," - "which is the second death."

2. The resurrection of the wicked is taught by the fact of a second resurrection, and a second death.

Rev. 20.6: "Blessed and holy he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power." Here the distinctive epithet "first" assumes a second resurrection, which is spoken of verse 5, and also verse 13 (quoted above); while the stated peculiarity of the first resurrection, that on those having part in it the second death hath no power, assumes that the second death has power over those of the second resurrection; as is explicitly stated, verse 15. The second death is a second loss of existence; it is for the wicked, who could not lose existence twice, except that after its first loss, after the first death, they have existence restored to them by a resurrection.

3. The resurrection of the wicked appears from the account of the final judgment, and of those who are to be there judged.

Matt. 25.31-46: "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as the shepherd divides the sheep from the goats," etc.

It is the wicked of all time that are there gathered:-

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, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men "-men then living, to whom that terror appealed as something to be dreaded by them.

Rev. 22.12, the Lord Jesus says he comes "to give to every man as his work shall be."

Rom. 14.10: "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ,"- not the Roman Christians only, to whom he writes, but the "all" "referred to in the next verse: "For as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to .me."

Rom. 2.12, 16: "For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned under law shall be judged by law. [When?] In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ."

And so all the threatening of a future doom refer to what shall be inflicted upon the wicked of every age.

1. The truthfulness of certain Scripture statements are conditioned upon a resurrection of the wicked.

Rev. 1.7: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they who pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." Remember, this was written by one who, as an eye-witness of the crucifixion, would recall the personal actors therein.

Matt. 26.64, Jesus declares to the Sanhedrim: "I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven." This was addressed to those in the council, not to their descendants of a far distant age.

Luke 13.28, Jesus says to the unbelieving Jews, "There shall be the weeping and the gnashing of the teeth when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you being thrust out."

It were useless to argue further with one who will not accept the proof thus given. Nor do we care to argue for the reasonableness of such a resurrection. It is enough that the Word of God declares it.

The life thus restored to the wicked - their release from the abyssos of death - is but for "a little season;" Rev. 20.3. Eternal life, the prize of our high calling, is now forever lost to them. They will have their trial; the justice of their sentence will be made apparent; and then, in Gehenna, the lake of fire, they meet a "second death," amid "the weeping, and the wailing, and the gnashing of the teeth." In circumstances of utmost horror they again. pass out of existence; and that second death is AN ETERNAL DEATH!

THE END.

www.CreationismOnline.com